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ABSTRACT

The literature on organizational effectiveness revealed a framework with nine dimensions of effectiveness, which has been used to study two- and four-year institutions of higher education. No serious studies examining the use of these nine dimensions for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have been done so far, nor have there been attempts to determine the extent to which United College Fund (UNCF) institutions differ from non-UNCF institutions in effectiveness.

The main purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which faculty members and administrators of a nationally representative sample of HBCUs differ in their perceptions of the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. The major questions addressed in this dissertation were: What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators at HBCUs? What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and
administrators of UNCF institutions? What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators of non-UNCF institutions?

Data were collected by a mailed survey questionnaire of effectiveness criteria from a sample of 1800 randomly selected faculty and all administrators from a stratified random sample of HBCUs across the country. The dissertation reports the analysis of the data and the results of the study.

Independent t-tests performed on the data indicated that, in general, there were no significant differences between faculty and administrators in their perceptions of organizational effectiveness. A comparison of the effectiveness of UNCF and non-UNCF institutions also revealed little differences between the schools, however, faculty and administrators had relatively high perceptions of effectiveness in all HBCUs. The results are discussed and their implications for the role and purpose of HBCUs in the larger context of American higher education are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The justification, utility and viability of historically black universities and colleges (HBCUs) have long been issues of controversy both among black and white educators (Fleming, 1984; Murty & Roebuck, 1992; Wenglinsky, 1996). Some policy analysts of American higher education have charged that the continued existence of HBCUs has resulted in a dual or two-tiered system of higher education, and therefore is counterproductive from philosophical, financial and pedagogical standpoints (Fleming, Harvey & Williams, 1989). Further, critics charge that the continued existence of HBCUs makes racial integration difficult to achieve, results in duplication of academic programs, and is hard to justify because between 18 and 20 percent of African American students now attend HBCUs (American Council on Higher Education, 1987; Wilson, 1994). Some claim that the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, which declared
that racial segregation in public schools was no longer the law of the land, makes it unnecessary to maintain dual systems of higher education because all schools are evaluated on the same standard. The Brown decision reversed *Plessy v. Ferguson* 1896, by stating that "in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place" (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954). Therefore, the continued existence of HBCUs as segregated institutions is incongruous with current policies of social, educational and judicial mandates for integration (Wenglinsky, 1996).

Other critics call HBCUs "diploma-mill service centers" devoid of a learning culture, staffed with unqualified and underpaid teachers, who are unable to perform research (Jenckes & Reisman, 1968; Junod, 1987; McGrath, 1965; Sowell, 1972). Jones (1971) and Sowell (1972) have charged that HBCUs have a vested interest in maintaining mediocrity, and are unable to attract and retain qualified faculty; therefore, they fail to develop bright and intelligent students. Some observers have pointed out that the lack of financial and physical resources at most HBCUs, "intellectually undermine the students attending them" (Fleming, 1984, p. 2). Yet other critics have charged that presidents and administrators at HBCUs are self-serving empire builders who are not interested in establishing or
maintaining academic standards, but operate these institutions as personal fiefdoms (Jones, 1971; Jones & Weathersby, 1978).

Apart from low academic standards and under-achieving students, critics have cited the fact that most HBCUs often experience financial and accreditation problems (Brazziel, 1987; Simmons, 1984). These problems charge the critics, demonstrate that HBCU institutions are inefficient, unable to compete, less responsive to student needs both academically and socially, prone to closing down, and difficult to operate. According to Murty and Roebuck (1992), three HBCUs had their accreditation withdrawn by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in December of 1986 because their financial aid had been substantially reduced when the federal government changed funding from grants to loans. Apart from the wealthier HBCUs, the so called "Black Ivy League", Jencks and Reisman (1968, p. 473) described most HBCUs as "fourth-ranked institutions at the tail end of the academic procession."

A final criticism of HBCUs is that they perpetuate an isolationist curriculum by overemphasizing African-American cultural and political values at the expense of universal educational skills (Haker, 1990). As a result of this approach critics charge that many students are under served,
and are ill prepared to function in the larger society which requires skills that transcend ethnicity. Some critics contend that since Brown v. Board of Education introduced legal school integration, many HBCUs have experienced considerable "brain drain" because the best and brightest black students transferred or have sought admission to predominantly white universities, thus isolating most HBCU campuses, and perpetuating a culture of student illiteracy and under achievement (Morris, 1972; Thomas & McPartland, 1984). Some educators point to the fact that the number of degrees awarded by HBCUs has continued to decline since 1954 as evidence that HBCUs no longer hold a monopoly in training black professionals, educators and leaders. Murty and Roebuck (1992) show that the number of degrees HBCUs awarded increased from 13,000 in 1954 to 32,000 in 1974, but then declined to 28,000 by 1982.

While supporters of HBCUs acknowledge the legitimacy of some of the criticisms, they contend that these criticisms should provide opportunities for improving HBCUs rather than eliminating them altogether (Jaffe, 1968; LeMelle and LeMelle, 1969; Thompson, 1973). Even though HBCUs experience a lack of financial resources, and fail to attract the best qualified faculty, they have provided unparalleled service in the education of African-Americans and in moving them
into the American mainstream; they have also offered to
others opportunities to attain higher educational
aspirations (Fleming, 1984; Murty & Roebuck, 1992; Williams,
1992). HBCUs have not only produced students who have
distinguished themselves at graduate school, but exemplary
black leaders nationally and internationally. "Indeed, 65% of
black physicians now practicing are graduates of HBCUs,
as are 35% of the lawyers and 50% of engineers" (Williams,
1994, p. xxvi). According to Jordan (1975), black colleges
have provided 75 percent of all black Ph.Ds., 75 percent of
all black army officers, 80 percent of all black federal
judges, and 85 percent of all black doctors. Ross (1998)
also confirms that black institutions of higher education
seem to produce a high proportion of leaders.
William H. Gray reported in the Boston Globe (Section B.
p.6, April 18, 1998) that "While only 16 percent of the
country's black students attend historically black schools,
some of the nation's most successful people including 70
percent of black doctors and lawyers, completed their
undergraduate studies at a black college." Several studies
found that attendance at a historically black college is
positively associated with students' completing college by
earning an undergraduate degree (Astin, 1977, 1993; Cross
1997; Cross and Astin, 1981).
The establishment of HBCUs was two-fold: the need to educate the newly freed slaves, and the refusal by southern educators to integrate the freed slaves into already existing white schools and colleges (Wilson, 1993). Proponents argue that because America still practices racial discrimination and is yet to be fully integrated, the existence of HBCUs is justified. Most recently proponents of HBCUs have cited moves to eliminate affirmative action programs in California, as a result of Proposition 209, and in Texas based on the Hopwood case, as grounds for maintaining HBCUs. In *Hopwood v. Texas*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in 1996 ruled that the University of Texas law school's race admissions process was unconstitutional because they considered race in admitting students and awarding financial aid. Meanwhile, the Universities of California-Los Angeles and UC-Berkeley analyzed enrollment statistics and concluded that "race neutral" admissions policies will reduce the number of black students attending these two institutions. "Enrollment of African-American students is predicted to drop by as much as 50% such that Black students will account for less than 3% of the student body" (Tierney, 1996, p. 130). According to the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) statistical report, between 1988 and 1992, California sent more students to
College Fund/UNCF institutions, an increase of almost 63 percent (UNCF, 1993). Based on these data, HBCUs continue to play an important role of providing educational opportunities to black students.

Fleming (1984) did a comparative study of black students in black and white colleges. In that study, she found that black students on predominantly white campuses experienced alienation and had problems adjusting socially and academically because of stress generated by racial tensions and unfulfilled social lives. Consequently, these stresses lead to psychological withdrawal and diminished academic performance. Wenglinsky (1996) in a similar study, found that HBCUs were no better at preparing students to assume positions of leadership than Traditionally White Institutions (TWI); that HBCU students have the same level of student-faculty interaction as did African American students at TWI; and that HBCU students are no more likely to aspire to leadership positions and participate in community services than students at TWI. Wenglinsky, did however, find that HBCUs "are better at preparing African American students for professional life than TWI" (1996, p. 101). Bohr, Pascarella, Nora & Terenzini (1995); Kim, (1999); Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, (1996) found little or trivial differences in
cognitive development between black students attending black colleges and black students attending predominantly white institutions.

Several researchers and authors have also indicated that even though African American students are able to enroll in white colleges and universities, trends in the 1990's show most of them reconsidering HBCUs and choosing to attend them for several reasons: black colleges have established modalities and assets for dealing with special problems of blacks students (Allen, 1987; Goldman, 1963; Smith & Baruch, 1981; Allen 1992; Freeman, 1999, Benavides, 1996); strong psychological, social and cultural factors naturally attract black students to black colleges (Billingsley, 1982; Gless & Smith, 1989; Law and Clift, 1981; Lotomey, 1989; McGrath, 1965); black students are happier in black colleges (Pifer, 1973); the campus ambience of black colleges supports the personal development of black students because of the absence of conflict and isolation they normally experience in white colleges and universities (Gurin & Epps, 1975); HBCUs provide the opportunity for African American students' interest in embracing their ethnic history and tradition (Benavides, 1996); and, black colleges are especially equipped to provide remedial education to inadequately prepared secondary school students.
HBCUs are comprised of approximately 103 institutions, and together constitute at least 3 percent of universities and colleges nationwide (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1996). Among these 89 are four-year institutions (40 public and 49 private).

Forty-one of these colleges and universities (including 1 public institution) are members of the College Fund/UNCF, which was founded in 1944 by 28 college presidents in order to consolidate fund-raising activities for these colleges.

However, all HBCUs have a central mission of providing higher education and training to black students; and they did this exclusively from 1865 through 1950, and have since, remained united and faithful to this mission (Murty & Roebuck, 1992; Wilson, 1992). According to Wilson:

...private black colleges carried the substantial responsibility of educating blacks at the college level, accounting for 72% of black student enrollments in 1992. However, by 1935, public black colleges accounted for 46% of black student enrollments and shortly thereafter surpassed the private black colleges. Currently, nearly 80% of the students who attend HBCUs attend public black colleges” (Wilson, 1994, p. xxvi).

In addition, they have provided and continue to provide job opportunities for sizeable numbers of white faculty and administrators and other ethnics (Wilson, 1994).
Murty and Roebuck (1992) provide several reasons for the attraction of HBCUs: (1) overt discrimination and racial incidents on white campuses; (2) the abandonment of black students by schools following their freshman year in college; (3) the loss of interest and support for black studies programs on white campuses; (4) a resurgence of need for black identity and black consciousness unavailable or neglected on white campuses; (5) HBCUs' aggressive recruitment measures; (6) HBCUs' improvements in academic standards and educational programs.

In recent years, there have been considerably large enrollment gains at most HBCUs, and even larger gains at College Fund/UNCF institutions. According to the College Fund/UNCF Statistical Report (1993), larger proportions of black high school graduates (18-24), are enrolling in UNCF colleges, for example, 29 percent enrolled in 1986; by 1991, 32 percent were enrolled. Between 1986 and 1993, overall enrollment increased from 3.2 percent to 28.8 percent at these same institutions.

The importance of HBCUs is demonstrated by the role they have played in providing higher education to a large portion of the American population that would otherwise have been closed out of higher educational opportunities. Studies by Fleming (1984), Hughes (1987), Harris (1996), Wenglinsky
(1996), Woolbright (1989), and Wright (1987) show that strong mentoring relationships result in greater satisfaction with college life and experiences, and propel students to more successful professional careers. HBCUs have always provided the psycho-social support and mentoring relationships essential to black students' learning experiences, intellectual development and educational success thereby illustrating their important function to the overall system of American higher education.

Other researchers have demonstrated that HBCUs are able to retain their students because they provide role models in the form of strong support figures (Tracey & Sedlacek, 1987) and achievement oriented study groups (Fullilove & Treisman, 1990). HBCUs are likely to be a permanent feature of American higher education because theories of retention show that black students encounter obstacles in gaining membership in white college social systems (Tinto, 1975); that they have more restricted interpersonal networks on white college campuses (Fleming, 1984); and that they experience extreme ethnic isolation on mainstream universities and colleges (Landis, 1991). Therefore, it is essential that HBCUs operate as effectively and as efficiently as possible.
Given their controversial position and yet crucial role in American higher education, a more poignant question is, are HBCUs organizationally effective? What variables should be taken into account in determining their effectiveness? Can effectiveness be measured at HBCUs? Are there differences in level of organizational effectiveness between College Fund/UNCF member institutions and non-College Fund/UNCF member institutions? Do HBCUs have a cadre of faculty members and administrators who are sensitive to the need for institutional effectiveness?

Organizational effectiveness research is in a state of flux. Institutions of higher education present special problems because of their governance structures which range on a continuum from loose to tight. In explaining the loose-tight nature of governance structures, various descriptors have been applied such as, coalitions of powerful constituencies (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1974); open systems (Thompson, 1967), garbage cans (March and Olsen, 1977), organized anarchies (Weick, 1976), and information processing units (Galbraith, 1977). Examples of some colleges and universities with tight and strong internal control systems can be found in the work of Bowen, (1973), Henry, (1972), McMurrin, (1973) and Mincer, (1974). Another characteristic of universities is that they tend to have
multiple competing, and at times conflicting goals due to the autonomy enjoyed by schools and departments within the university structure.

Based on these unique organizational traits of higher education institutions, Cameron (1978) suggested a model that focuses on characteristics rather than goals. In order to tap into these characteristics, Cameron utilized a multiple constituency model and interviewed dominant coalitions (Thompson, 1967) across several universities: administrators and faculty members. His study was concerned with identifying characteristics that interviewers perceived as effective in acquiring resources for the organization. From the responses, several clusters of items emerged and Cameron grouped them into nine dimensions for measuring effectiveness (Cameron, 1978, pp.50-51):

1. Student educational satisfaction
2. Student academic development
3. Student career development
4. Student personal development
5. Faculty and administrator employment satisfaction
6. Professional development and quality of the faculty
7. System openness and community interaction
8. Ability to acquire resources
9. Organizational health

The analysis Cameron performed on the nine dimensions of effectiveness showed that organizational effectiveness could be measured for institutions of higher education, and that a valid, and reliable instrument could be developed for assessing effectiveness among colleges and universities. In addition, his findings indicated that (1) perceptions of effectiveness vary among institutions; (2) that no college or university excels on all dimensions; and that (3) institutions with unionized faculty members have lower mean scores on eight of the nine dimensions.

The current study will focus on all dimensions identified above: student academic development, student career development, student personal development, faculty and administrator employment satisfaction, professional development and quality of the faculty, system openness and community interaction, ability to acquire resources, and organizational health. Incidentally, these nine dimensions of effectiveness coincide with Parsons (1960) four organizational functions that he characterized as essential for organizational effectiveness and continued its continued existence. Parsons (1960) identified these four

Goal achievement concerns an organization’s ability to define its objectives and mobilize its resources toward their attainment. Integration involves the level of social solidarity that exists among organization’s members. Adaptation is the organization’s ability to control its relations with its environment. Latency comprises the cultural patterns, motivations, and commitment of organization’s members.

While Cameron’s work has been helpful and instrumental in understanding organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities, little research has been done to increase our understanding of institutional effectiveness of HBCUs from an organizational perspective. The current and ongoing debate about the place and role of HBCUs in American higher education makes the notion of organizational effectiveness a significant and timely topic of research. From a policy standpoint, organizational effectiveness of HBCUs is important because of the many constituents and stakeholders that they serve and because of the need to provide an answer as to how well they are performing; whether parents and students should consider them as viable centers of learning; whether policy-makers should provide public funds to support their work; or whether corporations and private philanthropic foundations should support their fund-raising efforts.
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1.2 Statement of the Problem

Faculty members and university administrators are an essential and strategic constituency for institutional effectiveness of colleges or universities. In their various positions of university governance and teaching, they determine the formulation and implementation of institutional policies both at the departmental and organizational levels. These policies in turn affect and determine how students, once admitted, move through the college or university system in order to fulfill their academic ambitions. Also, in these key administrative and teaching positions, faculty members and administrators determine the pace of governmental reform for their school. It is important for faculty and administrators to be sensitive to constituency needs, both internally and externally and to institutional effectiveness.

The central questions that this premise raises are: How do faculty members, and administrators perceive their institutions' effectiveness? Are faculty members' and administrators' perceptions of institutional effectiveness sensitive to internal and external constituent needs? This study examines and compares faculty and administrator perceptions of organizational effectiveness at several HBCUs utilizing a multiple constituency model (Tsui, 1990,
Cameron, 1978; Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch, 1980; Whetten, 1978; Zammuto, 1982, 1984;) A comparison of institutional effectiveness between College Fund/UNCF institutions and non-College Fund institutions was performed. The organizational effectiveness variables are derived from Cameron’s model of analyzing institutional effectiveness in higher educational institutions.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Effectiveness is an essential organizational characteristic and an ultimate dependent variable in organizational research and analysis. It is synonymously described as “performance”, “success”, “productivity”, or “accountability”, and thus is of interest to managers, administrators, policy-makers, legislators, university presidents, deans, department chairs, school directors and other constituents.

HBCUs are sub-organizations of a larger American system of higher education, therefore, any attempt to improve the American system of higher education must take into account the effectiveness of its sub-organizations if the entire system is to operate effectively. However, most organizational effectiveness studies on universities and colleges utilizing Cameron’s model have neglected HBCUs, even though they are an important part of the current system.
of higher education. The purpose of this study is to assess the perceptions of effectiveness of key constituents of HBCUs on nine dimensions of effectiveness identified by Cameron (1978, 1983) for colleges and universities. Next, the study compared College Fund/UNCF institutions with non-College Fund member institutions on organizational effectiveness dimensions to determine if differences existed between these two types of institutions.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators at Historically Black Colleges and Universities?

2. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators of United Negro College Fund institutions?

3. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators of none United Negro College Fund institutions?

1.5 Summary

In order to set the context for this study, this chapter discussed the controversy surrounding the continued existence of HBCUs in American higher education. A brief historical overview of the role and purpose of HBCUs was provided. A multiple constituency model was suggested as a
suitable framework to analyze the construct of organizational effectiveness. The unique definitional characteristics of the construct were acknowledged. The chapter outlined the objectives of the study and posited pertinent research questions.

Chapter two presents an extensive literature review of organizational effectiveness and proposes a conceptual and operational definition of the construct. Chapter three discusses the research methods that this study utilized to analyze the constructs within a proposed conceptual framework. In addition, the chapter outlined research issues such as, what instruments are used? How the sample was selected? How the data were collected? What research techniques were applied to analyze the data?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Classical Organization Studies and the Concept of Efficiency as a Precursor to Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness research is a legacy of classical theory in the seminal works of Frederick Winslow Taylor and Max Weber. In 1911, Taylor wrote "The Principles of Scientific Management", which emphasized the mechanistic nature of work in the organization. Taylor introduced a theory of management that seemed perfect as the United States emerged from the Industrial Revolution as a world industrial leader. Management practices had not kept up with advances in technology, and the abundance in raw materials that propelled the country into an era of unprecedented economic growth and productivity. Taylor's ideas of scientific management based on his observations at the Midvale Steel Works in Philadelphia introduced a science of efficiency to the art of management. Scientific management required the quantification of worker output and the measurement of work performance in very precise detail.
Every move of the worker according to Taylor's theory should maximize output and minimize waste both in terms of resource inputs and worker movements. The ultimate goal of Taylor's scientific management was tool and work standardization and finding the "one best way" to organize and perform tasks in order to achieve maximum efficiency and productivity. It was the scientific manager's mandate, indeed his duty, to find the one most efficient way to accomplish a task. Taylor's scientific principles emphasized industrial efficiency and maximum output, and can be viewed as proxies for organizational effectiveness. Taylor's ideas dominated management practice in the United States from 1910 to 1940.

Max Weber's (1947) ideas and writings on the modern bureaucracy assumed that desirable organizations were predicated on the notions of rationality, efficiency, authority, and legitimacy. In his discussion of the ideal type bureaucracy he emphasized hierarchy, specialization, goals, and fixed jurisdictions designed to achieve stability, routine and predictability. According to Weber, the goals of the organization could be accomplished by breaking them down in a rational manner into specific tasks. He viewed bureaucracy as a far superior form of organization in that bureaucracy enabled the efficient coordination of functional specialists (Cummings, 1983).
Another advantage enjoyed by the bureaucratic form of organization was that decisions were based on technical and legal rules, and were therefore assumed to be impersonal and more equitable.

Taylor’s scientific management, and Weber’s ideal-type bureaucracy are value-based systems and have the following characteristics: (1) authority, (2) formality, (3) efficiency, (4) managerial control, and (5) economic incentive (Bozeman, 1979). Both systems essentially view organizations as machines and human beings as cogs in the machine or machine tools (Morgan, 1980).

Both systems are predicated upon the accomplishment of goals through the efficient utilization of resources. In Weber’s words: the bureaucracy would fulfil its goals with “precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict coordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs” (Quoted in Gerth and Mills, 1964, p. 214). In addition to being mechanistic rather than organic in orientation as human relations models are, the bureaucratic or goal model views the organization as an instrument designed to achieve organizational effectiveness, in other words, “... the effective organization is the organization that best serves
those who perceive it (relative to other avenues) as the means to their ends” (Cummings, 1983, p. 199).

With Weber’s and Taylor’s pioneering efforts as catalysts, the study of organizational theory and effectiveness proliferated from other areas such as industrial psychology (Baumol, 1959; Dent, 1959; Katz & Kahn, 1966; Schneider, 1983; Weick & Daft, 1983), operations research (Starbuck & Nystrom, 1981), macroeconomics and critical theory (Nord, 1983), micro-economics and positivistic philosophy (Goodman, Atkin, & Schooman, 1983), and was spearheaded in sociology by Whyte (1948) with his analysis of the restaurant industry and Selznick in the same year with his study of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). Whyte and Selznick applied the institutional framework and used the case study approach as the primary method of analysis. Other sociological examples of effectiveness studies are the work of Geogopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957), which is one of the first to examine effectiveness as a distinct construct. Seashore (1956), examined several criteria of effectiveness and proposed a hierarchical analysis of organizational goals, and Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) recommend an integrated conceptual framework.
2.2 Multiple Definitions of Effectiveness

Definitions of effectiveness have been rather diverse because they stem from the use of multiple models of effectiveness. The construct space of effectiveness is unknown, and there is no consensus for assessing effectiveness (Cameron & Whetten, 1983). Consequently, the study of effectiveness has remained transient with varying approaches and methodologies and weak theoretical constructs. Katz & Kahn summarize the conceptual diversity and apparent confusion in the following terms:

There is no lack of material on criteria of organizational success. The literature is studded with references to efficiency, productivity, absence, turnover, and profitable - all of these offered implicitly or explicitly, separately or in combination, as definitions of organizational effectiveness. Most of what has been written on the meaning of these criteria and on their interrelatedness, however, is with advice that seems sagacious but is tautological and contradictory. (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 49)

There is indeed a large variety of definitions of organizational effectiveness. Barnard (1938) for example, defined effectiveness as the accomplishment of a specific objective aim. Price (1972) defined it as the extent to which multiple goals are achieved. Hannan and Freeman (1977) viewed effectiveness as “the degree of congruence between organizational goals and observed outcomes” (p. 12). Though these definitions are diverse in orientation and
emphasis, they demonstrate the strong influence of the classical tradition with its emphasis on outputs. Preliminary studies of effectiveness were primarily based on the case study approach, which again is a legacy of the classical tradition. However, classical principles of organizational efficiency were criticized by Herbert Simon (1957) for not being scientific, but rather culture-bound and trite statements without universal appeal and for not being grounded in theory (Bozeman, 1978). The work of March and Simon (1958), of Etzioni (1961), and of Cyert and March (1963) are examples of studies that apply theoretically grounded modes of analysis in their examination of organizational effectiveness.

The move toward theoretical models of organizational effectiveness in turn produced a wave of writing and research on construct and organizational analysis in general. This proliferation resulted in the rise of paradigms for analyzing organizational theory, but failed to produce a universal theory for analyzing organizational effectiveness. For example, system-based theories (Baker, 1973; Georgopoulos & Cook, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978), multiple constituency models (Goodman & Pennings, 1977; Seashore, 1983), decision-process models (Simon, 1958; Pedigree, 1973; Likert, 1961 and Argyris & Schon, 1978), and
instrumental organization (Cummings, 1983) were a few of the strong models that emerged from this period of intense study and analysis of the organizational effectiveness construct.

2.3 Goal-Attainment and Systems-Based Models

Historically, studies of organizational effectiveness relied on goal attainment as a criterion for success (Barnard, 1938; Campbell, Brownas, Peterson, & Dunnette, 1974; Etzioni, 1960; Ghorpade, 1971, Katz & Kahn, 1966; Price, 1972; Steers, 1977). However Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) argue that the goal attainment approach replaced organizational goals with external goals, i.e., the goals of individuals who run the organization replace those of society. As an alternative, Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) offered an integrated conceptual framework, which they argued, distinguished the organization as a social structure or "focal frame of reference" and recognized that the organization is linked to its environment. According to Yuchtman and Seashore (1967), organizational effectiveness must be reflected in the organization's ability to negotiate "either in absolute or relative terms, to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources" (p. 898). In addition, viewing the organization through a system resource model of organizational effectiveness:
(1) takes the organization itself as a focal frame of reference, rather than some external entity for some particular set of people; (2) explicitly treats the relations between the organization and its environment as central in the definition of effectiveness; (3) provides a theoretically general framework capable of encompassing different kinds of complex organizations; (4) provides some latitude for uniqueness, variability and change, with respect to the specific operations for assessing effectiveness applicable to any one organization, while at the same time maintaining the unity of the underlying framework for comparative evaluation; (5) provides some guide to the identification of performance and action variables relevant to organizational effectiveness and to the choice of variables for empirical use. (Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967, p. 897)

The system-based model is derived from the general systems theory. The domain assumption of general systems theory is that organizational effectiveness studies must take into account all the elements of the system in their analysis, and they must be viewed vis-a-vis their relationship to the whole. According to Katz & Kahn (1966), whose version of systems model is widely cited in the literature, the system model focuses on relationships or structures and their interdependence within a system. Organizational effectiveness maximizes inputs and outputs in its relationship to the larger system and its environment. Zammuto nicely summarizes the system-based model as:

(1) being nested within larger systems; (2) importing transforming, and exporting energy (inputs, transformation, and output) with their environment to avoid decay (negative entropy); (3) able to reach a given state of (homeostasis) by a number of paths (equifinality); (4) having complex feedback and
regulatory mechanisms that permit adaptive responses to changes in the environment; and (5) social activities are viewed as patterned cycles of events rather than the behaviors of individual actors (p. 34).

As pioneers in applying the systems-based model Georgopoulou & Tannenbaum (1957) defined effectiveness as the "the extent to which an organization as a social system. . .fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing a strain upon its members" (p. 535).

2.4 Multiple Constituency Model

More recently, the multiple constituency model of organizational effectiveness has been proposed as an alternative to the goal and systems approaches (Connolly, Conlon & Deutsche, 1980; Goodman, 1977; Keely, 1978; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Seashore, 1983; and Tsui, 1990; Whetten, 1978; Zammuto, 1982, 1984). The multiple constituency model is based on pluralist theory, which assumes that the political system has multiple power centers and that influence is widely dispersed among various shifting coalitions (Chelf, 1981). According to Goodman organizations can perform effectively if "relevant constraints (imposed by the constituencies) can be satisfied and if organizational results approximate or exceed a set of referents (criteria) for example goals" (Pennings & Goodman, 1977, p. 160).

Essentially, the multiple-constituency model is an integration of the natural systems and goal-based models.
(Seashore, 1983). Its integrative advantage has resulted in its widespread application in many recent studies on effectiveness (Cameron, 1978, 1984; Ehreth, 1988; Hrebiniak, 1978; Jobson & Schenk, 1982; Keeley, 1978; Miles & Cameron, 1982; Pfeffer Salancik, 1978; Rohrbaugh, 1981; Wagner & Schneider, 1987 and, Whetten, 1978;). Seashore argued that there was no need to choose one among the goal, natural system, and multiple constituency models or to reject the others because they are not competitive as explanatory devices. Instead, these models nicely complement each other and refer to different but independent facets of organizational behavior. According to Zammuto (1982), there is a fundamental difference between multiple constituency models and natural systems and goal models in that the former "raise questions and make suggestions as to how decision makers should employ evaluative information about organizations, given that many often conflicting sources of information are represented in the evaluative process" (p. 30). This characteristic of the model is due in part to the inclusion of the decision process component, "which tends to emphasize dynamic process over time" (Seashore, 1983, p. 61).

The multiple constituency model has the following characteristics: process dynamism, responsiveness, and
sensitivity to constituency concerns, which are acknowledged by Connolly and others in their description of organizations as "intersections of particular influence loops, each embracing a constituency biased toward assessment of the organization's activities in terms of its own exchanges within the loop" (Connolly, Conlon & Deutsche, 1980).

The concept of constituencies is developed at length by Pennings and Goodman (1977), who see their role as prime "integrators" based on their value orientations, their transactional relationships to the target organization, and on the information available and on their analytical capital. According to Seashore (1983), constituents bring different value perspectives to organizational effectiveness. The four main perspectives are:

1. Perspectives arising from the interests of subordinates and superordinate organizational units in large hierarchical organizations.
2. Perspectives arising from interests of members of the organization who import personal values and purposes that can only be partially reflected within the focal organization.
3. Perspective arising from interests of 'outside' persons or organizations of interdependence.
4. Perspectives representing the general or public interest (p. 63).

To summarize, the multiple constituency model focuses on symbiotic relationships between the organization and constituent environment, whether organized or unorganized.
The model also views the construct of organizational effectiveness as plural and not amenable to one "true definition", but rather to several depending on the perception of the constituency/constituencies of interest. Next, the model is characterized by strong social dynamics in which constituencies change depending on the valued perspective held by the key constituency/constituencies; in other words, constituencies rise and fall depending on their degree of affinity to the valued or prevailing perspective. Finally, the model requires the researcher to identify the constituency or constituencies for whom organization effectiveness is evaluated (Seashore, 1983).

The models analyzed thus far can also be placed into four major views of organizational effectiveness based on the work of Astley and Van de Ven (1983, p. 247) namely: natural selection, collective-action, system-structural, and strategic choice views. These four views are not different models, but rather, different lenses of looking at organizational effectiveness. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) and Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) describe the natural selection view as the ability of an organization to acquire needed resources. By advocating a systems resource approach, Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) defined organizational effectiveness as
dependent on the organization's bargaining position in obtaining scarce and valued resources (Yuchtman & Seashore 1967, pp. 897-898).

The collective-action view of organizational effectiveness is exemplified in the work of Argyris (1964), Campbell, Brownas, Peterson and Dunnette (1974) and Katz and Kahn (1966) who define effectiveness in terms of how efficiently the organization processes inputs - a variation of the systems model. According to Argyris, (1964) an early human relations proponent, efficiency and effectiveness are the same. He defined organizational effectiveness as the "condition in which the organization overtime, increases outputs with constant or decreasing inputs or has constant outputs with decreasing inputs" Argyris, 1964, p. 123). In brief, the collective-action view is concerned with organizational health, but it also recognizes the interaction of the organization with its environment - both economic and political.

The system-structural view, on the other hand, defines organizational effectiveness in terms of goal attainment (Barnard, 1938; Campbell, 1977; Scott, 1977; Price, 1968). As indicated above, the goal-based approach to organizational effectiveness has a long tradition in organizational theory. However, in the case of institutions
of higher education, this approach presents special problems because universities usually have multiple, conflicting and at times inconsistent goals based on the fact that they are loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976) or organized anarchies (Cohen & March, 1974). In addition, because of this loose structure, decisions-making power is widely dispersed in the university and the criteria for goal achievement will vary according to the values of the focal constituency or constituencies. Therefore, goal accomplishment may not be a viable instrument to assess effectiveness. Campbell, Brownas, Peterson and Dunnette, (1974), articulated the problem of measuring effectiveness well by observing that: “Organizational effectiveness as it has been defined and measured in the literature is an extremely untidy construct. When twenty-five separate variables can be identified and most of these variables have several different operational forms, life becomes rather difficult” (Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette, 1974, p. 131).

The fourth and final frame is the strategic choice view, which is essentially another form of the multiple constituency model. According to (Cameron, 1978a, 1978b, 1984b; Miles 1980) strategic choice view defines organizational effectiveness as the extent to which the organization meets the goals of strategic constituencies.
Organizational effectiveness as developed by Cameron with respect to institutions of higher education is succinctly defined in the following way:

Institutions of higher education are effective to the extent to which they produce valued and desired outcomes, maintain organizational viability and vitality, and acquire needed resources without destroying the environment. (Cameron, 1978a, p. 126)

2.5 Synthesis of Models

Apparently, Cameron's definition is a synthesis of criteria of effectiveness proposed by most of the models of effectiveness described above: goals, with a focus on the criteria of output achievement and efficiency (Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette, 1974; Etzioni, 1960; Weber, 1974); systems with a focus on the criteria of resource acquisition (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967); human relations with emphasis on the criteria of 'viability' as captured by the internal operation of the organization (Argyris, 1964; Bennis, 1966; Likert, 1967); criterion of organizational survival or 'vitality' (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1973; Katz & Kahn, 1966); and multiple constituency, with an emphasis on value perspectives (Connolly, Conlon & Deutsche, 1980; Goodman, 1977; Seashore, 1983; Tsui, 1990).
2.6 Operationalizing Effectiveness

Another problem occasioned by the multiple definitions of organization effectiveness is that of operationalizing the construct. Campbell, Brownas, Peterson, and Dunnette (1974) compiled a list of variables that had been suggested as possible variables in the analysis of organizational effectiveness. In all, they found over twenty-five variables, some operationalized and others not, that had been employed to measure effectiveness. The analysis of Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette (1974) illustrate the broad range of organizational effectiveness measures.

Steers (1975) conducted a similar study to that of Campbell Peterson, Brownas & Dunnette (1974) in which he analyzed seventeen multivariate studies of organizational effectiveness in order to see how frequently measures of the construct were applied. The study found that the most widely used criteria of effectiveness were adaptability-flexibility, productivity and satisfaction.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis of empirical literature on effectiveness is that the construct space of organizational effectiveness is not delimited and will perhaps continue to expand as more empirical studies are conducted on the construct, and that there are multiple measures that are utilized to assess organizational
effectiveness. According to Zammuto (1982), this state of conceptual and operational uncertainty obtains "because there is no one universal criteria which can be used to assess organizational effectiveness across organizations" (p. 26).

Along with Cameron & Whetten (1983), Zammuto (1982) argued that the absence of unifying criteria of the construct implies that no single criterion or universal model will be appropriate for assessing organizational effectiveness for any one organizations or types of organizations. A second conclusion that can be drawn is that "[i]t is more worthwhile to develop frameworks for assessing effectiveness rather than to try to develop theories of effectiveness" (Cameron & Whetten, 1983, p. 267). The justification for this conclusion is that more assessment of effectiveness will result in cumulative work and more comparable models of the construct and thus lead to better understanding of this complicated, multifaceted and elusive construct. Cameron summed it best when he said: "Consequently, the engineering of effectiveness is a more productive activity than is theorizing about effectiveness" (Cameron & Whetten, 1983, p. 267).
2.7 Guides for Assessing Organizational Effectiveness

In order for researchers to engage in productive organizational effectiveness studies, and in light of the current state of flux with respect to the definition of effectiveness and its measurement, Cameron and Whetten (1983) suggested seven guidelines for assessing organizational effectiveness. In their own words:

The purpose is to provide an itinerary for mapping the construct space of effectiveness and for helping to make studies of effectiveness more comparable. If widely used, these guides can help develop a cumulative literature in organizational effectiveness by providing a general framework against which research can be compared. (Cameron, 1983, p.266)

Below is a rendering of the seven guides, and brief explanations by Cameron (1983):

Guide 1: From Whose Perspective Is Effectiveness Being Judged? (p. 270)

This question is important because organizational effectiveness should be assessed from the proper frame of reference. Several authors provide different perspectives from which effectiveness criteria can be applied. For example, Cameron (1978) advocated the use of a dominant coalition perspective, Scott (1977) that of top managers, Miles (1980) that of external constituents such as providers of resources, and Van de Ven & Ferry (1980) that of members of the organization.
Guide 2: On What Domain of Activity Is the Judgement Focused? (p. 270)

Domains of effectiveness are determined by the organizational constituents. Cameron (1981) identified four main domains of effectiveness: external adaptation, morale, academic orientation and extracurricular domains. According to Cameron & Whetten (1981) domains change depending upon the life cycle of the organization.

Guide 3: What Level of Analysis is Being Used? (p. 271)

Several levels of analysis are possible (i.e. individual, subunit, organizational, population, societal etc.) and they influence to a large extent the results of an effectiveness study. According to Freeman (1981) it is imperative to select the appropriate level of analysis because effectiveness at one level is meaningless when viewed from another level. For this study, the level of analysis will be individual respondents or groups because effectiveness is an organizational property is a sum of individual attitudes (Peterson & White, 1992; Shore, Barksdale & Shore, 1993; Pounder, Ogawa & Adams, 1995).

Guide 4: What is the Purpose of Judging Effectiveness? (p. 271)

The purpose of the study of effectiveness will usually affect how the study is conducted, determine what methods and strategies are applied, and the nature of data required.
(Argyris, 1970) Purposes of effectiveness studies vary: "to judge work of programs and to estimate the usefulness of attempts to improve them, to assess the utility of innovative programs and initiatives, to increase the effectiveness of program management and administration, and to meet various accountability requirements" (Rossi & Freeman, 1982, p. 15).

Guide 5: What Time Frame is Being Employed? (p. 272)

Organizational performance is tied to time frames for example how retail establishments perform is subject to how the economy is performing and to seasons of the year i.e. Christmas, Easter and so on. Research also shows that some companies perform differently depending on whether a short-range or long-range time frame is employed. (Miles & Cameron, 1982)

Guide 6: What Type of Data Are Being Used for Judgements of Effectiveness? (p. 272)

There are two kinds of data for analyzing effectiveness: objective (official records or documents) and subjective (questionnaires or direct observation). Hall & Clark (1980) argue that it is important to match types of data with proper effectiveness frameworks in order to assist in assessing or evaluating the desired phenomenon. Cameron & Whetten (1983, p. 273) summarized the argument in these terms: "The selection of data by which to judge
effectiveness on the basis of subjective perceptions while objective data may indicate that the organization is ineffective”. Because survey instruments will be utilized to collect data, this study will rely on subjective data. However, objective data will be helpful in determining the size of the school as demonstrated by enrollment levels.

Guide 7: What is the Referent Against Which Effectiveness is Judged: (p. 273)

Several benchmarks or standards can be used against which effectiveness studies can be judged: comparative judgement, ideal performance, normative judgement, goal-centered judgement, or trait judgement (Cameron & Whetten, 1983, 1995). The ones listed here represent a sampling of what standards can be utilized, and they will differ depending on the type of organization being evaluated, for example, a different set of standards will apply in the case of a university than would in the case of mental health agency. As an example, Molner and Rogers (1976) demonstrated that the meaning attached to effectiveness is different in public-sector organizations from that in private-sector organizations. Clearly, each of these referents addresses a different set of questions, and how the questions are answered determines whether the effectiveness effort was realized or not.
Assessing organizational effectiveness for institutions of higher education is complicated not only by the fluid nature of the construct space of effectiveness and the diversity of frameworks or models of analysis, but also by the fact that universities are “loosely coupled systems” (Weick, 1976) or “organized anarchies” (March & Cohen, 1974) or even “structured bureaucracies” i.e. tightly coupled institutions (Cameron, 1978b), with multiple and at times conflicting goals. The varied organizational structure of universities is also dependent on size and purpose of institution and therefore suggests the following problems as articulated by Cameron (1983, p. 83):

(1) specifying concrete, measurable goals and outcomes in higher education; (2) skepticism and defensiveness against the evaluation of institutional effectiveness engendered by traditional academic values; (3) financial concerns which have led to efficiency research rather than effectiveness research; and (4) the idea that organizational effectiveness may not be an appropriate concept for colleges and universities.

March & Olson (1976, p. 176) characterized universities as “complex ‘garbage cans’ into which a striking variety of problems, solutions, and participants can be dumped”.

2.8 Conclusion on Organizational Effectiveness Research

The literature reveals, first, that organizational effectiveness does not have an overarching theory from which nomothetic principles can be drawn in its analysis.
Consequently, most organizational effectiveness studies are based on constituency perspectives in the form of "values and biases" (Cameron, 1978) or unique sets of criteria, rather than on well-established or universal criteria (Hall, 1972; Rice, 1961; Scott, 1977).

Second, organizational effectiveness studies are characterized by a multiplicity of competing analytical frameworks or models. The models run the gamut from goal-based to natural systems to decision process to multiple constituency to instrumental and various other models too numerous to enumerate here. Multiple models emanate from different views of organizations (Cameron, 1983; Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette, 1974; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Zammuto, 1982)

Third, organizational studies are characterized by a plethora of definitions of the construct (Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette, 1974; Steers, 1977; Zammuto, 1982). Because of the proliferation of definitions, an uncertainty hangs over the whole research enterprise on the effectiveness construct and what it is (Campbell, Brownas, Peterson & Dunnette, 1974; Cameron, 1983; Zammuto, 1982). In addition, studies of effectiveness apply different criteria of the construct in their analyses (Cameron, 1978; Zammuto, 1982).
According to Cameron (1978, p. 606), "Organizational effectiveness criteria are also likely to differ depending on whose viewpoint is taken, that is, on their sources".

Fourth, organizational effectiveness is a complex mental construct which is as difficult to define as the concept of leadership (Cameron, 1982). A comprehensive meaning of the construct is not possible at this juncture, lest by trying to encapsulate organizational effectiveness in a neat conceptual package researchers my run the risk of rendering the construct meaningless and therefore of little research value (Campbell, Brownas, Peterson and Dunnette, 1974, p. 37).

Fifth, analyzing organizational effectiveness for institutions of higher education presents special challenges, because universities are organized structurally in different ways from institution to institution, depending on size and mission. In short, universities are not unitary systems (Goodman, Atkin & Schoorman, 1983).

Organizationally, universities vary from loose structure (autonomous department, schools and other units) to tight bureaucracy (homogenous departments and other units, especially in the case of small universities) to organized anarchies (a combination of autonomous and homogenous characteristics and some variations of same depending on the
mission of the institution, size and on the problems to be resolved). As a result of differentiated structural arrangements, universities tend to espouse different goals and objectives even within the same institution. At times these goals and objectives are in conflict with the overall mission of the university.

2.9 Organizational Effectiveness As A Construct

It is difficult to determine what to measure, how to measure, when to measure, and by whose values to measure in analyzing organizational effectiveness. In light of the unique characteristics of organizational effectiveness such as mutability, comprehensiveness, divergency, transportivity, and complexity, it has been suggested by researchers that organizational effectiveness should perhaps be treated as a construct rather than a concept. A construct is an abstract idea based on the assumption that several variables will covary or fit together (Steers, 1975, p. 551), whereas, a concept is an abstract idea or generic notion derived from a particular class or objects. In the absence of an overarching theory on organizational effectiveness, the measurement of constructs will lead to improved and general understanding of constructs (Cameron & Whetten, 1983, p.267). From this standpoint, Cameron and Whetten (1983) suggested that it is more profitable to
engineer on effectiveness rather than attempt to create theories on the construct.

2.10 Definition of Organizational Effectiveness

Cameron (1978, p. 17) conceptualized organizational effectiveness as "successful organizational transactions"; Miles (1980, p. 375) conceptualized effectiveness as the "ability of the organization to minimally satisfy the expectations of its strategic constituencies"; Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum (1975, p. 33) as "the extent to which an organization as a social system . . . fulfils its objective without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing a strain upon its members"; and, Hage (1980, p. 136) conceptualized it as "achievement vis-a-vis priorities". The purpose of the current study is to assess organizational effectiveness from the view of key stakeholders at HBCUs, i.e., faculty members and administrators. Therefore, organizational effectiveness is subjectively defined by those who hold a stake in achieving success in organizational transactions.

As discussed earlier, Cameron and Whetten (1982) suggested guides that provide a framework in which to map the construct space of effectiveness for any given study, and especially in the absence of universal theory. These guides are sensitive to the definitional problems of the
effectiveness construct and are instrumental in operationalizing the effectiveness construct, and are explained in detail above.

In addition to these guides, the study applied the multiple constituency framework. The multiple constituency framework has the following characteristics: (1) value judgement of effectiveness primarily based on the perceptions of one or more strategic constituencies, (2) the congruence between the importance of an activity and the perception of its achievement for identified domains of activity by one or more of strategic constituencies, (3) the assessment of organizational effectiveness at a stated level of analysis for a clearly stated purpose or purposes within a stated time frame with clearly identified referents and interpreted within the context of a stated theoretical framework, and analyzed from either objective or perceptual (subjective) data (Cameron, 1983, 1995; Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Kleeman 1984, p.39; Smart & Hamm 1993a; Tsui, 1990; Zammuto, 1984).

For this study therefore, organizational effectiveness is a value judgement based on the collective perceptual assessments of faculty and administrators working for the college or university. Organizational effectiveness is the congruence between important domains of activity and their
accomplishment. The analysis applied perceptual data utilizing faculty members and administrators (individual groups) and the organization (institution types - UNCF and non-UNCF) as the units of analysis. The criteria (referents) are the nine dimensions of effectiveness identified by Cameron's research (1978, 1995). Some of these dimensions were found to be applicable internationally, for example to colleges and universities in the United Kingdom (Lysons & Heatherly, 1992; Lysons, 1993) and Australia (Lysons & Ryder, 1988; Lysons, 1990; Lysons, 1993). The nine domains of effectiveness are: (1) Student Educational Satisfaction, (2) Student Personal Development, (3) Student Career Development, (4) Student Career Development, (5) Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, (6) Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty, (7) System Openness and Community Interaction, (8) Ability to Acquire Resources, and (9) Organizational Health.

A preliminary survey of two HBCU institutions (1 UNCF and 1 non-UNCF) indicated that the use of the full 57-item questionnaire severely limited the response rate; thus, the shorter version with 32-item questionnaires was selected for the full study. A complete description of this pilot survey will be provided below.
Educational Institutions and Organizational Effectiveness

Educational institutions bear similar characteristics with other organizations when examined from a systems rather than functionalist view. As organizations, educational institutions have an exchange relationship not only with their environments but with their employees as well; they maintain, modify and transform different aspects of interorganizational relationships in order to construct their own environments and create their own markets (Daft and Weick 1984) as they seek to enhance their survival (Fairtlough 1994); and, they are empirical objects (Clegg, Hardy and Nord, 1998). In other words, we each see something different even though we are looking at the same organization.

Traditionally, educational institutions have not been required to show a profit in order to justify their existence. But with diminishing resources, competitive pressures, emerging and new organizational forms, and in order to maintain legitimacy, they are increasingly being required by their constituents and other stakeholders to be more accountable for the way they expend their resources. As a result, a meaningful assessment of institutional effectiveness is paramount. Essentially, this requirement forces educational institutions to devise resourceful
methods, such as cost reduction measures, to improve product development mechanisms and to institute better instructional delivery services. Cameron and Tschirhart (1992) demonstrated that internal management strategies and decision processes can be incorporated in order to counter the negative external environmental threats such as increasing competition, turbulence, and resource decline. Along the same vein, Ogawa (1996) suggested that effective organizations that are sensitive to environmental dynamics create bridges and buffers between their key functions and the external environment.

Several studies have indicated that highly effective organizations are adaptable (Angle & Perry, 1981; Pounder, Ogawa & Adams, 1995; Smart & Hamm, 1993a, 1993b). For example, Angle and Perry (1981) demonstrated that organizational effectiveness was tied to manager-perceived adaptability and employee-perceived adaptability among several variables. Smart and Hamm (1993a) linked and explored relations between organizational effectiveness and organizational cultures for two-year colleges. Their analysis revealed that organizational effectiveness for two-year colleges is strongly identified with the following cultures: adhocracy (which emphasized entrepreneurship, growth, and adaptability) and market (which emphasized
competitiveness, environmental interaction and customer orientation). Conversely, Smart and Hamm (1993a) found that organizational effectiveness is not strongly identified with hierarchy cultures (which emphasize norms and values associated with bureaucracy for example order, uniformity, predominance of rules and regulations). Cameron (1978, 1981, 1986) and Cameron and Tschirhart, (1992) obtained the same findings for four-year predominantly white colleges and universities, and stated that “Proactive managerial strategies and those with an external emphasis are more successful than are reactive strategies and those oriented toward internal institutional affairs” (p. 108).

Tidball (1973), in a first ever study of Women-Only Colleges found that Women-Only Colleges were more effective than co-educational colleges in producing more visible graduates listed in “Who’s Who of American Women (WWAW). Oates and Williamson (1978), analyzed women graduates listed in Who’s Who published in the 1930’s and Rice and Hemmings (1988) replicated Tidball’s study and found that Women-Only Colleges were at the forefront of producing highly visible graduates as shown in the various editions of WWAW from 1979 through 1984. Wolf-Wendel (1998) using Who’s Who in America, Who’s Who Among Black Americans and Who’s Who Among Hispanic Americans found as in previous studies that Women-Only
Colleges were more productive of highly visible female graduates than co-educational colleges. Finally, Kim (2001, p. 308) in her analysis of the effectiveness of Women-Only Colleges found that "Attending women-only Colleges appears to be more beneficial in developing students' desire to influence social conditions than attending coeducational institutions." Organizations effectiveness in colleges and universities can be assessed by use of different criteria: how the university or college is structured; how the university expends its resources; how the university or college interacts with its environment; and, how the graduates of the university or college perform after graduation.

There is a virtual absence in the empirical literature of more recent studies on organizational effectiveness of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, especially those that utilize Cameron's nine dimensions of effectiveness. The guiding purposes of the current study are to: (1) determine the perceptions of effectiveness of key constituents of HBCUs, and (2) to assess the extent to which College Fund/UNCF and non-College Fund member institutions compare on their perceptions of organizational effectiveness as measured by the nine dimensions.
This is a timely and significant topic for HBCUs, which comprise at least 103 institutions, about 3 percent of higher education in the United States; they educate a significant proportion of the African-American population, who come from low incomes families and are usually first generation college attendees, who would otherwise be left without the opportunity for higher education. According to Gurin and Epps (1975), approximately 60% of African Americans who attended HBCUs had fathers who had not graduated from high school. Apparently, the profile of African Americans who choose to attend HBCUs has remained the same for a long time (Freeman, 1999). In the last few years, HBCUs have been experiencing increased enrollments (UNCF Statistical Report, 1993; Benavides, 1996; Freeman, 1999; National Center for Educational Statistics, 1996, 2001) and are continually challenged to justify their continued existence (Fleming, 1984; Murty & Roebuck, 1992).

Finally, HBCUs are recipients of large amounts of public and private funding. For example, under Title III of the Higher Education Act, HBCUs received a total of $132.6 million fiscal year 1998 (The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 16, 1998); and under the reauthorization act of fiscal year 1999 and under Title III of the same act, HBCUs' undergraduate programs will receive $315 million, and HBCUs'
graduate institutions will receive $35 million, a 75 percent increase from $20 million in fiscal year 1998 (Black Issues in Higher Education, March 19, 1998). Compared to the $41 billion dollars that was spent on higher education in the U.S. in 1996-97 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000), these expenditures appear small. But in an environment of diminishing resources and spiraling federal and state deficits, they are substantial allocations. An examination of organizational effectiveness for HBCUs utilizing the multiple constituency model, is the overarching goal of the current study.

2.12 Hypotheses

The anticipation is that the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness for colleges and universities are different for faculty members and administrators (Peterson & White, 1992, White, 1990). For example, Tichy (1983) suggested that organizational members utilize different mental models in understanding how their organizations function. These "implicit models" are the sorting mechanisms of organizational perceptions, and are responsible for members' different views of organizational reality. Bensimon (1987) described the different views of institutional reality between faculty members and administrators as multiple "cognitive frames", and he argued
that administrators who incorporated different frames are likely to be more flexible in their analysis of organizational reality. Peterson and White (1992), found a great diversity of perceptions between faculty members and administrators for several institutional types such as liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and comprehensive universities on several variables: Academic Purpose, Institutional Culture, Organizational and Administrative Climate. For example, they found that administrators viewed their institutions as more collegial or democratic than faculty. Cameron (1978) found that the differences between administrators and faculty are clearly drawn in a collective bargaining environment. Finally, Campbell and Slaughter (1999), argued that because of their different perspectives, faculty and administrators tend to compete for control over university resources, with each group seeking control over a larger share.

The first null hypothesis is:

H1: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between administrators and faculty members at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Cameron (1978, 1995) found that professionals tend to differ in their responses to all dimensions of organizational effectiveness based on the type of institution, its goals, and objectives. Peterson and White
(1992) also found significant differences in the perceptions of faculty and administrators by institutional type. For example, they found greater differences between faculty members and administrators (28 out of 40 dimensions) for Community colleges; (26 out of 40) for comprehensive universities; and (7 out of 40) for Liberal arts colleges. Scott (1992) suggested that stakeholders hold different views of organizational effectiveness because they focus on unique elements of effectiveness for the organization. For example, administrators tend to focus on policies and institutional capabilities; whereas faculty members tend to focus on institutional processes and student outcomes; and, board members focus on broad strategic and political aspects of the institution. Apparently, different stakeholders assess effectiveness for the same organization differently from one another (Cameron, 1995). Several studies have consistently found perceptual differences on several dimensions between faculty and administrators by institutional type (White, 1990); on organizational dimensions such as climate, academic workplace, and administrative supportiveness (Blackburn, Lawrence, & Associates 1990); and, on environment perceptions (Peterson and White, 1992). According to Peterson and White (1992), administrators utilize a hierarchical, rational model
grounded on authority and board approval, while faculty members have a professional collegial model grounded on peer approval, consensus and professional status.

Thus, the second and third null hypotheses are:

H2: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at College Fund/UNCF institutions?

H3: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at non-College Fund institutions.

The unit of analysis for this study is the individual or group of individuals because organizational effectiveness is assumed to be an aggregation of individual behaviors and/or satisfaction Peterson and White (1992) According to Cameron(1978), "organizational effectiveness is assumed to be indicated by individual behaviors and/or satisfaction" (p. 60). For an extended discussion, see Kaufman, 1960; Argyris, 1962; Lawler, Hall and Oldham, 1974; Hopkins, 1982; these researchers argue that individual level analysis should be used because they assume that organizational characteristics are indicated by individual performance or actions. Organizational phenomena at a college or university occur at many levels: individual, group, classroom, department and so forth. This highlights the complex problem of selecting an appropriate unit or level of analysis. For example, Burstein (1980) advocates a multilevel data
analysis because hierarchical organizations such as schools and universities give rise to multilevel data. Other studies that examined organizational effectiveness utilized institutional or organizational level analyses (Cameron & Tischirhart, 1992; Zammuto & Krakower, 1991; Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Fjortoft & Smart, 1994; Cameron & Smart, 1998).

2.13 Summary

The present chapter performed an extensive literature review of organizational effectiveness, and posited three null hypotheses that will be the focus of the study. An analysis of these hypotheses will provide a comparison of perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators at HBCUs: of faculty members at College Fund/UNCF institutions with those at non-College Fund/UNCF institutions; and, of administrators at College Fund/UNCF institutions with those at non-College Fund institutions. Faculty members and administrators represent two major constituencies or the "dominant coalition" in colleges and universities (Fjortoft & Smart, 1994; Peterson and White, 1992; White, 1990; Cameron, 1995). Several studies have been conducted, which relied on the perceptions of dominant coalition members in colleges and universities (Cameron, 1978; Cameron & Ettington, 1988;
Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Cameron & Tischirhart, 1992; Smart & Hamm 1993a, 1993b). The implications of these perceptions for organizational effectiveness and overall educational practice at HBCUs are examined.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter will outline the method to be employed in the study. First, a description of the sample is given, then the survey instruments are reviewed, and the data collection procedures are summarized. A pilot survey and its results are discussed. The pilot survey was undertaken to determine the response rate, and to evaluate if any modifications to the original questionnaire were necessary. Finally, statistical techniques that are utilized to analyze the data and their relative merits are outlined.

3.1 Sample Plan

3.1.1 Institutional Sample

Initially, a total of 50 HBCUs across the United States were selected to participate in the study: 25 College Fund/UNCF institutions and 25 non-College Fund or non-UNCF institutions. The institutional sample was selected using a two-stage stratified random sample design. Stratified random sampling procedures were employed because the population of HBCU institutions is divided into two subgroups i.e. College
Fund/UNCF and non-College Fund or non-UNCF institutions. This sampling method assured that the sample was representative of the population by insuring adequate cases from each subgroup. According to Hy, Feig, and Regoli (1983, p. 95):

Stratified sampling is a procedure in which the population is separated into categories or strata and then the units within each strata are randomly selected. Stratified sampling insures that a sufficient number of units is selected from each population strata and thereby assures greater representativeness than either simple random sampling or systematic sampling.

The first stage was based on a random sample selection of HBCUs listed according to College Fund/UNCF membership in the 1993 UNCF Statistical Report. The report lists a total of 41 College Fund/UNCF member institutions. A total of 25 College Fund/UNCF institutions, which represent about 61 percent of the universe of these institutions were determined to be needed in the sample. Each college in the population of 41 College Fund/UNCF institutions, was assigned a number consecutively ranging from 00 through 40. Using a table of random numbers, the college with the number corresponding to the number drawn from the table of random numbers was selected. Since all units were numbered with two digits, the last two digits in the table of random numbers were used. This procedure was repeated until the desired number of sample colleges was selected.
The second stage was a selection of non-College Fund or non-UNCF institutions listed in the membership directory of Black American Colleges and Universities. A total of 25 institutions, which represents about 44 percent of the 57 institutions, was also selected. In selecting Non-College Fund institutions, all private institutions were automatically included in the sample. The total number of non-College Fund colleges selected for the sample was 12. When selecting the rest of the sample among public colleges in the Non-College Fund group, the same procedure outlined above for selecting College Fund/UNCF institutions was followed.

Of the 50 institutions selected, 38 (76 percent) were private, 12 (24 percent) were public; 36 (72 percent) were classified as small (200-2500 students) and 14 (38 percent) were classified as medium (2501-10,000 students). Among the College Fund/UNCF institutions, 24 (96 percent) were private and 1 (4 percent was public; while among the non-College Fund institutions 13 (52 percent) were public and 12 (48 percent) were private. Except for one, all College Fund/UNCF institutions were small, that is the student population is below 2500. But among non-College Fund institutions, 11 (44 percent) were small, 14 (56 percent) were medium sized institutions.
Comparable data for the national population of 103 HBCUs that currently exist are: 36 percent public and 64 percent private; and 58 percent small, 38 percent medium and 3 percent large. Table 3.1 reports institutional sample and Table 3.2 reports respondent characteristics.

3.2 Survey Instrument

The survey instrument utilized in this study was developed by Cameron (1978). The items were produced through a series of interviews with administrators, faculty department chairs, and trustees in which they were asked to identify characteristics associated with highly effective colleges and universities. They answered questions about what was needed to be done to improve the effectiveness of their own college or university, what were the characteristics of the most effective schools they knew of, and, what factors in their own college or university most affect its performance. From their responses questions were constructed and these have been found to cluster together into nine dimensions that characterize an institution's effectiveness. A detailed explanation of how the instrument was developed is provided below. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) advised that an already existing instrument be used because the development of an instrument is fraught with problems and therefore not easy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fund/UNCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-College Fund/UNCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (n= 200-2500)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (n= 2501-10,000)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and North East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and South East</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Southwest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1
Characteristics of Institutional Sample
Second, while the development of an instrument is a worthwhile research endeavor, it requires the skills of an expert, considerable investment in time, effort and money. In addition, an already existing instrument is usually developed by experts who possess the necessary skills. "We recommend, therefore, that a strong effort be made to find out if a suitable instrument is already available before trying to develop an instrument of one's own" (p. 104). Based on these cautions and suggestions, the researcher decided to use an already existing instrument for this study.

The original survey instrument contains 57 items that measured nine dimensions of effectiveness. The groundwork for the instrument was based on 130 variables from several sources of literature on organizational effectiveness (Price, 1968; Pace 1969; Mott, 1972; Blau, 1974; Campbell 1973, 1974; Steers, 1975; the Institutional Functioning Inventory, 1970; and the Michigan Survey Research Center Assessment Package, 1975). The instrument asked respondents to rate their perceptions of effectiveness for their respective institutions on a seven-point Likert scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Surveys Mailed N</th>
<th>Surveys Returned N</th>
<th>Return Rate Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>53.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fac. &amp; Admin.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fund/UNCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>57.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fac. &amp; Admin.</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>54.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-College Fund/UNCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>55.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fac. &amp; Admin.</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>47.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2
Respondent Characteristics
When developing the instrument, Cameron interviewed at least 40 administrators and faculty members of six mid-sized (up to 10,000 students) colleges and universities in the Northeast. Based on faculty and administrator judgments of characteristics and activities of higher education institutions indicative of organizational performance, Cameron derived the nine domains of organizational effectiveness. Cameron (1978) describes the procedure more fully in the following words:

Interviews were conducted with individuals associated with a variety of institutions of higher education to ensure that the effectiveness criteria had relevance for colleges and universities and that the criteria could be measured. Separate data were collected in two studies. The first study represented an initial attempt to assess the reliability and validity of the effectiveness criteria through questionnaires and interviews. The second study was designed primarily to effect refinements and improvements in the instruments and to improve their psychometric properties. (p. 613)

Below is a sampling of the questions that guided Cameron's interviews with respondents:

1. What organizational characteristics do effective colleges possess?
2. What is it at this institution that makes a difference in terms of its effectiveness?
3. What would have to change in order to make this institution more effective?
4. Think of an institution of higher education that you judge to be effective. What is it that makes that institution effective?
5. Of the 130 or so items generated from the literature, which ones are not relevant to the effectiveness of this school?
6. Of the 130 items, which ones are not measurable or for which are data not available? (Cameron 1978, p. 613)

Cameron's previous research (1978, 1981, 1992, 1995) indicates that the 57 items on the instrument measure nine dimensions of effectiveness for four-year colleges and universities. Table 3.3 lists the nine dimensions and describes their criteria. Tests of internal consistency and reliability by Cameron (1978) on the nine dimensions of effectiveness, produced acceptable levels of reliability. Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .60 to .92 in Cameron's first study, from .63 to .93 in the second study (p. 617), and in a subsequent study in 1981, Cameron obtained coefficients that ranged from .67 to .82. In addition to these studies, the survey instrument has been used extensively in public, private, two-year and four-year higher education institutions in the United States and other countries and has been found to be valid and reliable in measuring effectiveness characteristics for colleges and universities (Smart & St. John, 1996; Smart & Hamm, 1993a; Lysons, 1993, 1991; Krakower & Niwa, 1985; Cameron, 1978, 1981, 1986; Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Cameron & Whetten, 1983).
1. **Student educational satisfaction (SES):** criteria indicated the degree of satisfaction of students with their educational experiences at the institution. (three items, coefficient alpha = .63) (.80)

2. **Student academic development (SAD):** criteria indicated the extent of academic attainment, growth, and progress of students at the institution. (three items, coefficient alpha = .77) (.65)

3. **Student career development (SCD):** criteria indicated the extent of occupational development of students, and the emphasis on career development and the opportunities for career development provided by the institution. (three items, coefficient alpha = .71) (.67)

4. **Student personal development (SPD):** criteria indicated student development in non-academic oriented areas, e.g., socially, emotionally, or culturally, and the emphasis on personal development and opportunities provided by the institution for personal development. (three items, coefficient alpha = .86) (.69)

5. **Faculty & administrator employment satisfaction (FAES):** criteria indicated satisfaction of faculty members and administrators with jobs and employment at the institution. (four items, coefficient alpha = .89) (.80)

6. **Professional development and quality of the faculty (PDQP):** criteria indicated the extent of professional attainment and development of the faculty, and the amount of stimulation toward professional development provided by the institution. (three items, coefficient alpha = .83) (.74)

7. **System openness and community interaction (SOCI):** criteria indicated the emphasis placed on interaction with, adaptation to, and service in the external environment. (three items, coefficient alpha = .84) (.72)

8. **Ability to acquire resources (AAR):** criteria indicated the ability of the institution to acquire resources from the external environment, such as good students and faculty, financial support, etc. (three items, coefficient alpha = .86) (.77)

9. **Organizational health (OH):** criteria indicated benevolence, vitality, and viability in the internal processes and practices at the institution. (seven items, coefficient alpha = .93) (.85)

Source: Cameron, 1978, pp. 614 & 617
Fjortoft and Smart, 1994, p. 437.

**Table 3.3**
Definitions of Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness for Institutions of Higher Education
3.3 Pilot Survey

Before the main study was conducted, two schools from the sample were selected: one College Fund/UNCF and one non-College Fund to serve as a pilot. The objective of the pilot was not to pretest the questionnaire as such, but to assess the return rate because of the length of the survey instrument which contained 57 items. It is important to observe that several factors have been found to influence the return rate of mailed questionnaires: the length of the questionnaire; the cover letter; who sponsored the questionnaire; the attractiveness of the questionnaire; how easily the questionnaire can be completed and returned; interest in the content of the questionnaire; and, follow-up procedures (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, 1990).

The survey instruments were sent to a pilot sample (N=150) of administrators and faculty members from these two types of HBCU institutions. For a successful pilot survey, a return rate of 50 percent recommended by Hy, Feig and Regoli (1983) and Huck, Cormier and Bounds (1974) was considered justifiable to proceed with the rest of the survey or study. The first mailing was a survey packet containing a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and urging respondents to return the surveys without delay.
In addition, the survey contained a post-paid return envelope and a post-paid return post card that had a message thanking the respondents for their prompt responses. On the top right hand corner of the post card was a number identifying each respondent. Respondents were, however, assured that the number on the post card was for keeping track of responses for follow-up purposes, and that the card would be discarded once a response was received. Respondents were requested to mail the post card and completed surveys under separate cover in order to prevent matching a completed survey with a respondent. Two weeks later, a follow-up letter was mailed to the respondents reminding them to return the completed surveys as soon as possible. This initial mailing yielded 15 (10 percent) completed surveys.

A second follow-up letter was sent and telephone calls were made to the rest of the respondents. As a result of the follow-up letter and telephone calls, several e-mail messages were sent by some respondents requesting new surveys as original ones had been misplaced. In response to the requests, replacement survey questionnaires were mailed to all non-respondents. The replacement packet consisted of a cover letter, replacement questionnaire, a post-paid return envelope and post-paid return post card.
In addition to thanking respondents, the letter informed them that their completed survey had not been received, and requested them to complete the replacement survey and return it as soon as possible. As a result of this effort, 29 (19.3 percent) completed surveys were mailed. In total, 44 (29.3 percent) completed questionnaires were received. Further follow-up efforts failed to yield any new completed surveys.

It is interesting to note that one of the respondents sent an e-mail message in which they indicated that they would not respond to the survey as they did not feel that the survey was addressing issues pertinent to HBCUs; in their words, the survey was treating HBCUs as lesser institutions than Historically White Institutions (HWI). In fact, this respondent offered to rewrite the questionnaire, and assured that their re-writing of the questionnaire would raise the response rate considerably.

This anecdotal information illustrates the problems associated with assessing effectiveness in higher education. In most cases, evaluation of effectiveness in institutions of higher education creates skepticism and defensiveness on the part of faculty and administrators because they see such efforts as unnecessary control, but more importantly, as restrictions on academic freedom. As illustrated in the discussion above, some colleges and universities view
themselves as having unique qualities that are not comparable to other institutions. Any assessment by outsiders is seen as an infringement upon that uniqueness; and, is perceived as creating potential risks to the uniqueness of their schools. Dressel's (1971, p. 6, 7) report nicely captures administrator and faculty concerns of evaluation in higher education:

This evaluation is a waste of time, for either it will demonstrate that the program is excellent or that it is defective is some sense. In the first case it is a waste of time because we already know that it's a good program, and in the second, it's a waste of time because we would not believe any evidence of weakness.

Further search of the literature on organizational effectiveness of higher education institutions revealed that a shorter version of the instrument existed and that it had been used in previous studies successfully (Smart & Hamm, 1993; Smart & St. John, 1996). Apparently, it contained enough items that yielded the same nine dimensions as the longer version of the instrument. Rather than abandon the whole study as a result of the low response rate in the pilot survey, the researcher decided to use the shorter version of the questionnaire for the entire study. The decision to proceed with the use of the shorter version of the instrument was based on research which indicated that reducing the length of the survey questionnaire would increase the response rate considerably.
Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, (1990) also confirm that one of the reasons for low response rates to mailed survey questionnaires is the length of the survey instrument itself.

The shorter version of the questionnaire has 32 items as opposed to 57 and is four pages in length as opposed to nine. In addition, Smart and Hamm (1993a, 1993b, Smart and St. John (1996), Fjortoft & Smart (1994) and Cameron, (1986), in more recent studies confirmed that the shorter version of the instrument with 32 items, measured the same nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness for four-year and two-year colleges. Tests of internal consistency and reliability by Smart and Hamm (1993a, p. 99) on the nine dimensions of effectiveness, produced acceptable levels of reliability; Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .67 to .82. Other studies have established the validity of the instrument (Smart & St. John, 1996, Cameron & Smart, 1998). Table 3.3 provides reliability estimates (second parenthesis) that were obtained by Smart and St. John (1996) for the nine dimensions.

The nine dimensions have 32 Likert-type items, which utilize a one-to-five and one-to-seven response formats: Student Educational Satisfaction is measured by 3 items; Student Academic Development (SAD) is measured by 3 items;
Student Career Development is measured by 3 items; Student Personal Development (SPD) is measured by 4 items; Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (FAES) is measured by 4 items; Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty (PDQF) is measured by 3 items; System Openness and Community Interaction is measured by 3 items; Ability to Acquire Resources (AAR) is measured by 3 items; and, Organizational Health (OH) is measured by 7 items. A complete survey is included in the Appendix section.

All nine dimensions theoretically correspond with the four functions of organizations that Parsons (1960) claimed were essential for organizational effectiveness and its continued existence. For example, integration can be associated with Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction and Organizational Health as they demonstrate the level of social integration and solidarity among members of the organization; goal achievement can be associated with Student Academic Development and Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty, as they demonstrate that the organization is able to define its goals and marshal its resources toward the realization of those goals. Adaptation is closely associated with System Openness and Community Interaction and Ability to Acquire Resources as these demonstrate the ability of the organization to adjust to its
environment and adapt to external stimuli. Finally, latency is associated with Student Personal Development and Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty as these comprise the cultural, social and emotional opportunities enjoyed by members of the organization. These opportunities translate to commitment to and support of organizational goals and objectives, and consequently to organizational effectiveness.

3.4 Respondent Sample

Administrators and faculty members served as respondents to the effectiveness questionnaire. Members of the faculty and administrators represent an internal dominant constituency in the university and have a considerable influence in the way the university functions and is organized (Thompson, 1967). They were selected as sources of effectiveness characteristics because they are major decision makers and by virtue of their roles and positions, determine key aspects of organizational operations such as resource allocation, formulation and implementation of organizational policy, and setting of organizational goals (Peterson & White, 1992; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Price, 1972; Pennings & Goodman, 1977). Several studies on two- and four-year colleges and universities have utilized the perspectives of dominant
coalition members in studying organizational effectiveness and in the analysis of environmental perceptions (Cameron, 1986; Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Cameron & Tischirhart, 1992; Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Smart & Hamm, 1993a, 1993b; Fjortoft & Smart, 1994; Peterson & White, 1992; Smart & St. John, 1996).

Students are also an important constituency and so are their representatives (Kleeman, 1984), but they will not be selected as respondents for this study because: (1) students are not generally in a position to directly influence the direction and functioning of the institution; (2) they generally have more limited information about the overall institution than do other dominant coalition members; (3) they have been found in other studies not to differ significantly in their perceptions of the institution from faculty members or administrators (Educational Testing Service, 1970); and most important, (4) constraints on time and money prohibit a representative sample from being gathered from relevant student groups on various campuses.

Each college catalogue or directory served as a frame representing all administrative and faculty members from each sampled institution. For most current information on administrators at each college or university, a comparison of each college catalogue or university was made with the
information in the 1999 Higher Education Directory. Each faculty respondent in the college catalogue was numbered consecutively. In order to select a representative sample from each institution, it was decided to sample at least a third of the faculty members and all administrators. All administrators were selected because they comprise a small number on most HBCUs. Research textbooks do not provide a definitive guide on determining a desirable sample size (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990; Borg and Gall, 1989, Fraenkel and Wallen, 1993, Hy, Feig, & Regoli, 1983). Rather, they suggest that the sample should be reasonably large in order to be representative, but must not incur tremendous expense in terms of time and money (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1993). The guiding principle in selecting a sample is the homogeneity of the population from which the sample is being selected (Hy, Feig & Regoli, 1983).

Based on the one-third rule and with the aid of a table of random numbers, from between 20 to at least 100 full-time faculty and administrators were selected from each of the 50 sample institutions depending on the size of the faculty pool. The size of the sample also varied from school to school because the schools varied in student population size ranging from 200 to 10,000 students.
However, from each institution more faculty members were sampled and all administrators were selected to be in the sample. A total random sample of 1800 respondents was selected. Each respondent was mailed the questionnaire under a cover letter, in which each respondent and participating institution were guaranteed anonymity. An acceptable response rate is 50 percent (Hy, Feig & Regoli, 1983; Borg & Gall, 1989; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). Cameron (1978) in his study of organizational effectiveness had an institutional response that ranged from 54 percent to 84 percent. In a study linking organizational commitment and effectiveness, Angle & Perry (1981) had a 71 percent return rate when they administered questionnaires on site, however, when they used return mailed surveys, the response rate dropped to 64 percent.

Smart and Hamm (1993a; Smart, Kuh & Tierney, 1997) received 54 percent of the 1,332 surveys mailed to faculty and administrators of 30 community colleges. Of the 698 responses, they eliminated 36 surveys because of excessive missing data, which left 662 (51.3) percent responses for the analysis. Peterson and White (1992) in their analysis of differential environmental perceptions of faculty and administrators had a 50 percent return rate.
In order to maximize the response rate, the following procedures were employed. It should be noted that the procedures are identical to the ones used in the pilot survey. The first mailing or sample pre-contact was a letter to the respondents alerting them of the fact that a survey was in the mail and would arrive in about a week. The pre-contact was essential in order to identify the researcher, discuss the purpose of the study, and to solicit cooperation (Borg & Gall, 1989). The second mailing included the survey and a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and appealing to the respondents to participate in the study. One week later, a follow-up postcard was mailed to the respondents reminding them to complete the survey and return it as soon as possible and thanking them for their participation.

A second follow-up was mailed to non-respondents three weeks after the initial survey. The follow-up contained a cover letter indicating that their responses to the survey had not yet been received, a replacement questionnaire, and a post-paid return envelope (Heberlein & Baumgartner, 1981). The cover letter again appealed to the respondents to complete and return the survey. The third and final follow-up was mailed to the remaining respondents six weeks after the original mailing. The contents of this final
follow-up mailing included a cover letter, another questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. At each mailing, returned surveys were recorded: the first mailing yielded 253 (14.1 percent) responses; the second mailing yielded 577 (32.1 percent) responses; and, the third and final mailing yielded 169 (9.4) responses for a total of 986 responses and a 55.6 percent response rate.

3.5 Statistical Techniques for Data Analysis

Returned questionnaires were edited for their usability and then entered into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) data file for computer analysis. The data that were collected were used to test the following three null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between administrators and faculty members at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at College Fund/UNCF institutions.

Hypothesis 3: There is no difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at non-College Fund institutions.

Data were analyzed using statistical procedures and tests described below. The data were analyzed at both the individual or group level (faculty versus administrators) and at organizational or school level because organizational
effectiveness is an individual and organizational property capable of being analyzed at different levels (Burstein, 1982).

Cameron (1976, 1978) performed exploratory factor analysis to determine the presence of the nine effectiveness in his original and subsequent studies. Factor analysis is a statistical procedure which is often used in exploratory and confirmatory data analysis to analyze inter-correlations among large sets of measures in order to identify a smaller number of common factors. Factor analysis has three goals. First, it allows the researcher to examine the correlations of a large number of variables by clustering the variables into groups (i.e. factors) such that the dominant variables within each factor are highly correlated. Second, it allows an interpretation of each factor based on the variables with which it relates. Third, it allows a summary of variables using a few factors. Variables in this instance, are measurements of an underlying, intangible trait. Factor analysis is helpful in identifying the underlying structure of the interrelationships among several variables. It does not speak to the nature of the interrelationships but rather assists in the analysis of the underlying structure by determining how many and which variables explain that structure.
Because Cameron had performed factor analysis on two occasions and was able to identify the nine dimensions of effectiveness each time, the researcher decided not to perform confirmatory factor analysis on the data. There was enough evidence of the presence of the nine dimensions in the case of four-year predominantly white colleges and universities (Cameron, 1978, 1981; Smart & St. John, 1996), and two-year community colleges (Smart & Hamm, 1993a, 1993b).

Cameron (1978) performed exploratory factor analytic procedures in his original study as a means of determining construct validity. Construct validity seeks to determine the meaning of a construct through the relations between that construct and other constructs. Constructs are defined either by operational definitions or by constitutive definitions. According to Kerlinger (1973, p. 686):

Constitutive definitions are definitions which define constructs with other constructs. Essentially this is what factor analysis does. It may be called a constitutive meaning method, since it enables the researcher to study the constitutive meanings of constructs - and thus their construct validity.

The next step was to compute inter-item correlations and Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha for each of the nine dimensions to determine the reliability and internal consistency or homogeneity of each. Cronbach’s Alpha was the
most appropriate test of internal consistency because the items in the survey questionnaire were not scored dichotomously, rather the responses were in a Likert scale ranging from one to five in some questions and one to seven in others.

A series of independent-samples t tests were used to analyze the data. The independent-samples t test is appropriate because it is a statistical technique used to determine if two group means differ when there are two independent variables. The two independent variables were institution type (College Fund/UNCF or Non-College Fund) and Job Category (Faculty or Administrator). The current study is interested in determining whether there are differences in faculty member and administrator perceptions and between the two institution types of HBCUs on the following dependent variable measures: Student Educational Satisfaction, Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Student Personal Development, Faculty and Administrative Employment Satisfaction, Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty, System Openness and Community Interaction, Ability to Acquire Resources, and Organizational Health. The dependent variables are defined in Table 3.3 above.
3.6 Summary

This chapter described methods used in selecting both the institutional and respondent samples and the survey instrument used to gather the data for the analysis. Next, the chapter described the statistical model for assessing faculty member and administrator organizational effectiveness perceptions of their schools. In chapter four, the findings of the study will be presented. Chapter five will present a summary of the study, its conclusions, limitations, suggestions for future research and implications.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the analysis conducted on the data. The presentation will follow the sequence of research questions stated in Chapter 1 and articulated by the null hypotheses stated at the end of Chapter 2 and the beginning of Chapter 3. The research questions are:

1. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators at HBCUs?

2. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators of College Fund/UNCF institutions?

3. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty members and administrators of non-UNCF institutions?

Before the nine domains of effectiveness are analyzed, a description of each of the domains with their associated questionnaire items will be provided. The questionnaire items have been found to cluster into nine dimensions that characterize an institution's effectiveness.
Below, is provided the name of the dimension and a brief explanation of each dimension.

### 4.1 Explanation of Organizational Effectiveness Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Educational Satisfaction</td>
<td>Items 5, 6 and 7 measure the extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experiences at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Development</td>
<td>Items 12, 13 and 15 measure the extent of academic development, attainment, growth and progress of the students at the institution and the opportunities that are provided by the institution for academic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Career Development</td>
<td>Items 16, 17 and 18 indicate the extent of occupational or career development of students and the opportunities for vocational development that the institution provided to the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personal Development</td>
<td>Items 2, 8 and 10 measure perceptions of student development in non-career and non-academic areas. The items indicate how the institution has provided opportunities for social, cultural, emotional and personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction</td>
<td>Items 19, 20 and 21 indicate the level of satisfaction of faculty and administrators with their jobs at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty</td>
<td>Items 22, 23, and 24 indicate professional development and attainment of the faculty as demonstrated by publications, research and engagement in other professional development activities, and the extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to which the institution provides
stimulation toward professional
development.

System Openness Items 1, 9 and 11 measure the
amount of emphasis placed on the
interaction with, adaptation to, and
service in the institutional external
environment.

Ability to Items 3, 4 and 25 indicate the extent
Acquire Resources which the institution has the ability to
acquire resources from the external
environment in the form of finances,
high quality students, research and
stakeholder support.

Organizational Items 26 through 32 indicate how
Health smoothly the institution functions in
its internal processes and operations,
including its benevolence and vitality.

The items in the questionnaire were scored from lowest to
highest. The lower scores indicate that the college or
university was perceived by the constituents to be
performing at a low level while the higher scores indicate
that the institution was doing well in either one or more
areas. Constituent perceptions on the nine dimensions of
organizational effectiveness relatively high but mixed.

The 32 items that constitute the nine effectiveness
dimensions were scored such that the higher the score on an
item, the higher was the perception of the respondents on a
particular item and on the effectiveness dimension itself.
For example items related to Student Career Development,
Professional Development and Quality of Faculty, System
Openness and Community Interaction and Ability to Acquire Resources are all scored from low to high. In each case, the scores indicate that the higher the score, the higher the perception that the institution is doing well in the area of Student Career Development; the more professional development was perceived to be taking place for faculty; the more was the perception that the institution was interacting with and outreaching to the external environment and community; and, the better able was the institution at attracting high quality students, better qualified faculty and needed financial resources.

Some of the items in the data were re-coded from positive to negative in keeping with the suggestion of Fraenkel and Wallen, (1993): "Once the instruments being used in a study have been administered, the researcher must score the data that has been collected and then organize them to facilitate analysis" (p. 131). After the re-coding, the Alpha coefficients were calculated.

4.2 Results of Alpha tests

All Alpha coefficients indicated high to reasonable reliability of most organizational effectiveness dimensions except Student Academic Development (SAD) with an alpha coefficient of .59. Initially, Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (FAES) had an alpha coefficient of
-1.0149. This was due to the fact that item 21 was negatively correlated to items 19 and 20 (r = -.601) and (r = -.399) respectively. But once item 21 was re-coded, the internal reliability of the dimension improved and the coefficient Alpha for Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction was .79. Table 4.1 shows the alpha coefficients of the nine dimensions of effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Dimension</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student Educational Satisfaction (SES)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Student Academic Development (SAD)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Student Career Development (SCD)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Student Personnel Development (SPD)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty &amp; Administration Employment Satisfaction (FAES)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Professional Development and Quality of Faculty (PDQF)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 System Openness and Community Interaction (SOCl)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ability to Acquire Resources (AAR)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Organizational Health (OH)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1
Alpha Coefficients of Nine Organizational Effectiveness Dimensions
Even though Student Academic Development had a low coefficient Alpha, the researcher kept it in the analysis rather than exclude it. The rationale for retaining Student Academic Development in the study is based on suggestions from other researchers. For example, Nunnally (1967) suggested that a coefficient alpha of between .50 and .60 was acceptable in the case of exploratory research. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) suggested that a correlation alpha of at least .90 is acceptable, while George and Mallery (2001) suggested a correlation alpha of .80 as acceptable. Even with such high standards, instruments differ and different researchers will have different standards. The dimension of Student Academic Development exhibited some evidence of reliability, even though its coefficient of reliability was smaller than that of the other dimensions of organizational effectiveness. The internal reliability and validity of the nine dimensions have been confirmed in other studies (Cameron, 1978; Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992; and Smart and Hamm 1993b). This study also has confirmed the internal consistency of the nine dimension of effectiveness even though Student Academic Development had a lower score from those of previous studies. The Alpha coefficients for the dimension was .594 and the standardized alpha was .607. Both have reasonable and acceptable sizes.
4.3 Correlation Analysis

Bivariate or between-dimension correlations of effectiveness dimensions, means and standard deviations are reported in Table 4.2 for all respondents. As can be seen from the table, correlations vary in their magnitude. Student Academic Development and Student Educational Satisfaction are positively correlated in the and run in the same direction suggesting that as Student Academic Development increases, correspondingly, Student Educational Satisfaction increases. The correlation between System Openness and Community Interaction (\( r = .71, p < .01 \)) and Student Personal Development has the highest magnitude. Table 4.2 shows that the correlations run in a positive direction and are significant, which means for instance that faculty and administrator perceptions of Organizational Health (\( r = .54, p < .01 \)) are positively and significantly associated with Student Educational Satisfaction. As can be seen from the table, an open institution that encourages interaction with the community is associated with high perceptions of student personal growth and development (\( r = .71, p < .01 \)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Dimensions+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means 3.51 3.76 4.48 4.26 4.84 3.37 3.57 3.29 4.19
Std. Dev. 0.854 0.917 1.09 0.681 0.373 1.01 0.913 0.918 1.03

* Correlation is significant at p < .05 level (2 tailed)
** Correlation is significant at p < 0.01 level (2 tailed)

Table 4.2 Combined Bivariate Dimension Correlations for Nine Effectiveness Dimensions for faculty and administrators at all HBCUs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at p < .05 level (2 tailed).
** Correlation is significant at p < 0.01 level (2 tailed).

Table 4.3 Bivariate Dimension Correlations for Nine Effectiveness Dimensions for Administrators at all HBCUs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means 3.49 3.76 4.46 4.26 4.81 3.34 3.56 3.28 4.16
Std. Dev. .848 .714 .946 .683 1.08 .968 .873 .939 1.03
N 678 678 678 678 678 678 678 678 678

* Correlation is significant at p < .05 level (2 tailed)
** Correlation is significant at p < 0.01 level (2 tailed)

Table 4.4 Bivariate Dimension Correlations for Nine Effectiveness Dimensions for Faculty at all HBCUs.
An institution with vibrant and vital internal processes, Organizational Health, is associated with strong and positive perceptions of Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (r = .63, p < .01) and is perceived to have moderately strong community ties and positive interactions with the external environment (r = .64, p < .01). An unsurprising result is that an institution’s ability to attract financial resources and to attract high quality students and faculty is significantly, and moderately associated with Student Educational Satisfaction (r = .45, p < .01); with Student Personal Development (r = .54, p < .01); with Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction (r = .56, p < .01) and, with positive perceptions of social interaction and sensitivity to the external environment, System Openness and Community Interaction (r = .53, p < .01).

The results of these correlations confirm most previous findings. For example, Cameron (1978) found high positive correlations between Ability to Acquire Resources and Student Educational Satisfaction (r = .68); between Organizational Health and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction (r = .69); and between Organizational Health and Ability to Acquire Resources (r = .69). Cameron’s correlations ranged from a low of (r = .05) between Student
Career Development and Student Educational Satisfaction to a high of \( r = 0.69 \) between Organizational Health and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction.

A comparison of the bivariate correlations for all HBCUs with bivariate correlations for faculty alone presents some interesting findings. For example, the correlation between Student Academic Development and Student Educational Satisfaction for all HBCUs \( r = 0.07, p < 0.01 \) not only remains significant for the faculty only correlations, but also increases \( r = 0.43, p < 0.01 \), suggesting that high faculty perceptions of Student Academic Satisfaction are moderately and positively correlated to Student Educational Satisfaction. A significant correlation between Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction and Student Educational Satisfaction \( r = 0.55, p < 0.05 \) for all HBCUs is reduced to almost zero and is not significant in the correlation matrix for faculty \( r = 0.01 \) and might suggest that low perceptions of Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, are correlated with low Student Educational Satisfaction. Two correlations that are not significant for all HBCUs: that between Ability to Acquire Resources \( r = -0.01 \) and Student Academic Development; and that between Organizational Health \( r = 0.05 \) and Student Academic Development, become moderately high and significant.
in the bivariate correlations for faculty only (\( r = .47, p < .05 \)) and (\( r = .47, p < .05 \)) respectively. These two results suggest that high faculty perceptions of the institution’s ability to attract resources to its programs be they financial or in the form of high quality students and faculty; and an institution that has a vibrant and strong internal processes translate into perceptions of moderate and positive impact on Student Academic Development.

Other interesting differences are between the following correlations: that between Professional Development and Quality of Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (\( r = .35, p < .05 \)) for all HBCUs, becomes (\( r = .20, p < .05 \)) for all faculty; that between System Openness and Community Interaction and Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (\( r = .60, p < .05 \)) for all HBCUs, becomes (\( r = .06 \)) for all faculty to almost zero, and is not significant; and, that between Ability to Acquire Resources and Student Academic Development (\( r = .56, p < .05 \)) for all HBCUs, becomes (\( r = .08, p < .01 \)) for all faculty. Finally, the correlation between Organizational Health and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction (\( r = .63, p < .05 \)) for all HBCUs, becomes (\( r = .10, p < .05 \)) for all faculty.
These results suggest low faculty perceptions of these organizational effectiveness dimensions.

A comparison of the correlations for all HBCUs and that for administrators follow the same pattern as was observed for faculty correlations above. For example, the correlation between Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction and Student Educational Satisfaction ($r = .55$, $p < .05$) for all HBCUs, is ($r = -.03$) for all administrators, this correlation is not significant. The bivariate correlations between Ability to Acquire Resources and Student Academic Satisfaction ($r = -.01$) and that between Organizational Health and Student Academic Development ($r = .05$) for all HBCUs become moderately high and significant for administrators ($r = .46$, $p < .05$) and ($r = .50$, $p < .05$) respectively. These correlations indicate that administrators perceive that there is a positive relationship between an institution’s ability to attract resources to its programs and the level of student advancement in their academic pursuits; and that an institution that has vibrant and vital internal processes which exhibit a positive institutional climate is likely to fulfill student academic developmental needs.

The next three correlations offer interesting results. For all HBCUs, the correlation between System Openness and
Community Interaction and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction was ($r = .60$, $p < .05$), but for administrators only the same correlation between these two variables is ($r = .02$), a correlation that is almost zero and is not significant, suggesting that there is almost no relationship between System Openness and Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction. Ability to Acquire Resources and Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction is moderately correlated at ($r = .56$, $p < .05$) for all HBCUs, but for administrators, this same correlation is ($r = .10$), another correlation that is low and is not significant. The final correlation is that between Organizational Health and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction ($r = .63$, $p < .05$) for all HBCUs. For administrators, this correlation is ($r = .05$) and is not significant and suggests that administrators perceive that Organizational Health and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction are almost not correlated.

The correlations for faculty and administrators almost mirror each other indicating that perhaps there are no differences in their perceptions of these dimensions of organizational effectiveness.
While this might be too early to say conclusively, we shall await the analysis of the results of the independent-samples t-test, which will be examined below.

4.4 Independent-samples t tests

To answer research questions 1, 2 and 3 a series of independent samples t test procedures were performed for each question and used to test whether the means for faculty and administrators are significantly different from each other. The two job categories (faculty and administrator) and the two institution types for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (College Fund/UNCF and non-UNCF) were analyzed to determine if differences existed among them. The effects of interest were determined to be statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The justification for performing a series of independent-samples t tests is that an independent-samples t test will determine if two means on some variable of interest differ significantly from each other. More specifically do the means of faculty and administrators differ significantly on Student Educational Satisfaction or Organizational Health effectiveness dimensions? Or do UNCF institutions and non-UNCF institutions differ significantly on Professional Development and Quality of Faculty dimension? This procedure is different from Cameron (1978)
who performed one multiple analysis of variance and a series of univariate analysis of variance tests because he examined more than two groups on the same dimensions of effectiveness. The independent-samples t test is appropriate when comparing two groups, while analysis of variance procedures are more appropriate with three or more groups, they can also be used with two groups (Giglioti, 1987).

Giglioti (1987) was interested in determining if differences existed between types of academic departments, and so in her analysis, she looked at two groups: faculty and department heads in profession-based and discipline-based departments and used analysis of variance procedures.

Next, the researcher compared the means of faculty and administrators for HBCUs overall and for institution types: UNCF and Non-UNCF. Table 4.5 lists the means for all HBCUs and Tables 4.6 and 4.7 list the means for UNCF and non-UNCF institutions. The following set of independent-samples t tests use the individual as the unit of analysis. As indicated above, the level of analysis for organizational effectiveness varies depending on the research focus. Following Cameron (1978), the current study will also use both the organization and the individual as units of analysis. The reason for doing this is that organizational effectiveness is influenced both by individual behaviors and
by the organizational culture and its ability to adapt, manipulate and fulfill expectations of the outside environment. In other words, there is a two way impact: that of the individual on the organization and that of the organization on the individual. Given this exchange relationship, analysis at both levels appears appropriate. In fact, there is no agreement in the organizational effectiveness research literature on what the suitable level of analysis should be Bidwell and Kasarda (1975); Weick, 1977 Hall and Oldham (1974); Smart, Kuh and Tierney (1996); Fjortoft and Smart (1994), Birnbaum, (1987 & 1988).

The data in Table 4.5 shows that the independent samples t-test analysis for 678 faculty and 321 administrators on each of the nine effectiveness dimensions do not differ significantly at p < .05. For example, on the Student Educational Satisfaction dimension, faculty had a mean of 3.49 and administrators had a mean of 3.56. These means do not differ significantly at p < .05, (p = .260). Levene’s test for Equality of Variance also indicates that variances for faculty and administrators on this dimension of organizational effectiveness do not differ from each other at p < .05, (p = .514).
### Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-1.127</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-1.248</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>-1.215</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>-1.484</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-.824</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-1.334</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means for Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness and t-tests for all Faculty and Administrators at all HBCUs.
The data in Table 4.6 shows that the independent samples t-test analysis for 343 faculty and 168 administrators at UNCF institutions do not differ significantly on each of the nine effectiveness dimensions at p < .05. But, Levene's test for Student Academic Development and Student Personal Development showed a significant difference between the means. On the Student Academic Development Dimension, faculty had a mean of 3.69 and administrators had a mean of 3.65. According to Levene's Equality of Variances test these means differ significantly at p < .05, (p = .002). On the Student Personal Development, faculty had a mean of 4.21 and administrators a mean of 4.32. Again, Levene's Equality of Variances test showed a significant difference at p < .05 (p = .002). The same situation is true for System Openness and Community Interaction. Levene's test of Equality Variances showed a significant difference for faculty mean 4.12 and administrator mean of 4.27 at p < .05 (p = .023). According to George and Mallery (2000), "If the Levene's test did show significant differences, then it would be necessary to use the unequal variances test" (p. 128). When the Levene's Unequal Variances test results are examined for each case where the Levene's Equal Variances test showed significant differences between the means of faculty and administrators,
the differences in the means are not significant. Using Levene’s test for Unequal Variances, the new t-value for Student Academic Development is $t = 0.746; \text{df} = 342; \text{NS}$; for Student Personal Development it is $t = -1.861; \text{df} = 322; \text{NS}$; and, finally for System Openness and Community Interaction it is $t = -1.227; \text{df} = 298; \text{NS}$.

The Levene test is a homogeneity-of-variance test and unlike most tests it is less dependent on the normality assumption and it is most useful with t tests and with analysis of variance. “It is obtained by computing, for each case, the absolute difference from its cell mean and performing a one-way analysis variance on these differences” (SPSS for Windows Base User’s Guide, (1993). Table 4.7 shows independent t-tests for 335 faculty and 175 administrators on each of the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. The means do not differ significantly at $p < .05$. For example, faculty had a mean of 4.77 on the Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction dimension and administrators had a mean of 4.87 on the same dimension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>UNCF</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-1.403</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>-1.737</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>-.819</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-1.655</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-1.182</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>-1.027</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-.890</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6
Means for Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness and t-tests for Faculty and Administrators at UNCF Institutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-1.462</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>-1.161</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>-0.972</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>-1.029</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7
Means for Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness and t-tests for Faculty and Administrators at Non-UNCF Institutions
The t-test indicates that these means do not differ significantly at \( p < .05; p = .332 \). The same analysis is true for the remaining eight means of the dimension of effectiveness between faculty and administrators. Administrators scored higher than faculty on all the nine effectiveness dimensions, except on the System Openness and Community Interaction dimension and the Student Academic Development where they had the same size means. Levene's test of Equality of Variance also indicates that the variance for faculty and administrators on Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (\( p = .927 \)) dimension did not differ from each other at \( p < .05 \). Levene's test of Equality of Variance also shows that faculty and administrator perceptions do not differ significantly for the remaining effectiveness dimensions in Table 4.7.

The independent samples t-test analysis on Table 4.8 for 489 UNCF and 510 non-UNCF institutions on each of the nine dimensions are mixed. For example there were no significant differences between the means of UNCF and non-UNCF institutions on Student Educational Satisfaction at the \( p < .05 \) level (\( p = .159 \)); on Student Personal Development at \( p < .05 \) (\( p = .338 \)); on Faculty Administrator Employment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>UNCF</th>
<th>NON-UNCF</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-1.411</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-3.772**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-4.506**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>-.958</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-5.019**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.655*</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p < .05 level.
** Significant at < .001 level.

Table 4.8
Means for Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness and t-tests for UNCF and Non-UNCF Institutions
Satisfaction at the $p < .05$ level ($p = .243$); on System Openness and Community Interaction ($p = .163$); and, on Organizational Health at the $p < .05$ level ($p = .598$).

There were significant differences on four of the organizational effectiveness dimensions. On Student Academic Development, UNCF institutions had a mean of 3.68 and non-UNCF institutions had a mean of 3.84. These means differ significantly at $p < .001$ ($t = -3.772$, df 997). On the effectiveness dimension Student Career Development, UNCF schools had a mean of 4.35 and non-UNCF schools had a mean of 4.62. These means differ significantly at $p < .001$ ($t = -4.506$, df 997). On the Professional Development and Quality of Faculty effectiveness dimension, UNCF schools had a mean of 3.22 and non-UNCF schools had a mean of 3.52. These means differ significantly at $p < .001$ ($t = -5.019$, df 997). Finally, on the Ability to Acquire Resources effectiveness dimension, UNCF schools had a mean of 3.37 and non-UNCF schools had a mean of 3.22. These means differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level ($t = 2.655$, df 997). The fact that both institution types differ significantly on the Ability to Acquire Resources dimension is interesting in light of the fact that both UNF and non-UNCF institutions labor under the strain of scarce financial resources. Perhaps the differences lie in the methods of attracting
resources and the types of resources needed, in the public versus private nature of these institutions, and may therefore reflect institutional culture, rather than differences in the concept or idea itself of obtaining resources. On each of the significant dimensions, non-UNCF institutions had higher means than UNCF institutions. This means that faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institutions had higher perceptions on these effectiveness dimensions than their counterparts as demonstrated by the higher means. Among the dimensions that are not significant, UNCF institutions have higher scores on Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction, System Openness and Community Interaction and Organizational Health. The dimensions that are significant confirm Cameron (1978) who found that institutional affiliation had more influence on perceptions of organizational effectiveness than the job or position held.

Table 4.9 provides a comparison of the means obtained by Cameron (1978) in his two studies and those obtained in this study for all dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Although the means have not been statistically tested by either a t-test or analysis of variance procedures, a cursory examination indicates that they are almost similar in size, with minor exceptions.
For example, the institutions that Cameron (1978) studied in the first study had higher perceptions on Student Academic Development and Ability to Acquire Resources both with a mean of 4.79 than did HBCUs with a mean of 3.76. HBCUs had higher perception scores compared to Cameron’s institutions on both studies on the following dimensions: Student Career Development with a mean of 4.49; Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction with a mean of 4.84, and Organizational Health with a mean of 4.19. These perceptual differences suggest differences in cultural, economic and environmental milieu of these schools.

Although these mean differences are instructive, their purpose here is to highlight the fact that they fall within the same range for every dimension of effectiveness. It is important to remember that they are derived from different samples and from different types of institutions, and therefore any interpretation unsupported by robust analysis may be misleading. There is no attempt here to examine the relationships between the means, nor to ascertain whether they are significantly different from one another, but rather, to see how comparable they are. Another important thing that the means reveal is that HBCU responses are comparable to those of Predominantly White Institutions at least as revealed by the mean responses on Table 4.9.
There is no statistical analysis implied by these observations but a reflection on the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cameron (1978)</th>
<th>Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9
Comparison of Means on all Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness Between Cameron (1978) and Current Study
Up to this point, the unit of analysis has been the individual. The study will now focus on the organization as the unit of analysis and the same independent-samples t test and comparisons of administrators and faculty performed above will be repeated for schools as the unit of analysis. The reason for using both levels of analysis was provided above. Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for all variables are reported in Table 4.10. The results indicate that Ability to Acquire Resources and Student Academic Success are significant but negatively correlated with \( r = -.31, p < .05 \). The negative correlations between these two variables indicates that faculty and administrators at both types of institutions perceive that as the Ability to Attract Resources goes down, Student Academic Development also goes down. This is a puzzling relationship because it appears to go against intuition, which suggests that as the institution is able to attract more resources in the form of qualified faculty, high quality students and or financial endowments, students will tend to develop and mature academically.

Another negative but significant correlation is that between Ability to Acquire Resources and Student Career Development \( r = -.33, p < .05 \). Again this suggests that faculty and administrators perceive that failure to attract
resources to the school negatively impacts student career preparation. That is, the less able the institution is to attract resources, the more likely will the students be fully prepared to enter the world of work. This is surprising, but perhaps strong success in attracting resources leads to unrealistic expectations for students.

Most of the other variables are from low to highly and significantly correlated. The highest correlation is between Organizational Health and Student Educational Satisfaction ($r = .74$, $p < .01$), suggesting that a well operated school with vibrant and viable responsive internal processes, is perceived as more likely to satisfy student educational aspirations. The lowest positive correlations are: that between Professional Development and Quality Faculty and Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction ($r = .34$, $p < .05$); and that between Organizational Health and Ability to Acquire Resources ($r = .34$, $p < .05$).

The next set of comparisons will be based on independent-samples t test between faculty and administrators for all 50 Historically Black Colleges and Universities on the nine effectiveness dimensions. Two separate comparisons will be made of UNCF and non-UNCF institutions based on faculty and administrator perceptions.
The final comparisons will examine UNCF institution and non-UNCF institutions on the same nine effectiveness dimensions.

The independent samples t-tests in Table 4.11 on all organizational effectiveness dimensions indicate that there was no significant difference at the p < .05 level between faculty and administrator perceptions of organizational effectiveness, except on the dimension of Student Personal Development. On this dimension, faculty had a mean of 4.36 and administrators had a mean of 4.11; these means differ significantly at the p < .05 level (p = .013); t = 2.543; df = 98. This suggests that faculty and administrators viewed Student Personal Development in different ways. In other words, their perceptions were different regarding for example the level of emphasis placed on the activities outside the classroom designed to enhance student personal non-academic development. Perhaps they have different perceptions on students' level of social, emotional and social maturity at their schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Dimensions+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means: 3.40 3.72 4.56 4.23 4.78 3.30 3.46 3.21 4.17
Std. Dev.: .467 .353 .534 .351 .625 .534 .503 .556 .598
N: 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50

* Correlation is significant at p < .05 level (2 tailed)
** Correlation is significant at p < .01 level (2 tailed)

Table 4.10 Bivariate Dimension Correlations for Nine Effectiveness Dimensions for all 50 HBCUs.
## HBCU Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.543*</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  
50  50

*T value is significant at p < .05 level.

**Table 4.11**
**Comparison of Means on all Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness for Faculty and Administrators at all 50 HBCUs**

Finally, they appear to have different perceptions regarding the provision of social, emotional, and cultural opportunities for personal development of students at their schools.
As the results in Table 4.11 indicate, the rest of the t-tests were not significant. In each case, Levene's test of Equality of Variance indicates that variances from faculty and administrators do not differ significantly from each other.

On the Student Educational Satisfaction dimension, faculty had a mean of 3.42 and administrators had a mean of 3.40. The means do not differ significantly at p < .05, (p = .896); t = 131, df = 98, NS. In other words, faculty and administrators from Historically Black Colleges and Universities share the same perceptions with respect to Student Educational Satisfaction. The same results are observed for Student Academic Development where faculty had a mean of 3.71 and administrators had a mean of 3.72. The means do not differ significantly at the p < .05 level (p = .938); t = -.078; df = 98, NS. Levene's test for Equality of Variance also indicates that variance for faculty and administrators do not differ significantly from each other (p = .160).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12
Comparison of Means on all Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness for Faculty and Administrators at UNCF Institutions
The independent-samples t test analysis for UNCF institutions on Table 4.12 indicates that faculty and administrator means on all organizational effectiveness dimensions do not differ significantly from each other at the p < .05 level. For example, on the Student Educational Satisfaction dimension, faculty had a mean of 3.29 and administrators had a mean of 3.32. These means do not differ at p > .05; p = .856; t = -.182; df = 48. Levene’s test for Equality of Variance on this dimension also indicates that faculty and administrators at UNCF institutions do not differ significantly (p = .426). The fact that there are no significant differences between faculty and administrators at UNCF institutions suggest that faculty and administrators share the same views on the level of satisfaction among students with their educational experience at UNCF institutions.

The rest of the t tests are not significant and are summarized in Table 4.12. They each suggest the following: that faculty and administrators share the same perceptions on Student Academic Development, on Student Career Development, on Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction, on Professional Development and Quality of Faculty, on System Openness and Community Interaction, on Ability to Acquire Resources, and on Organizational Health.
That faculty and administrators share the same perceptions may be a reflection of the culture of UNCF institutions. Again, these results confirm the findings of Cameron (1978), who concluded that the job or position held did not have a significant influence on the perceptions of organizational effectiveness. Instead, he found that the institution influenced the perceptions held by its constituents.

The results of t test analysis in Table 4.13 for non-UNCF institutions show that the means for Student Personal Development are significantly different from each other at the p < .05 level; p = .021; t = 2.2.394; df = 48. Faculty had a mean of 4.45 and administrators had a mean of 4.09 on this effectiveness dimension. What this suggests is that faculty and administrators have different views on the level of emphasis placed on activities outside the classroom that are designed to enhance students' personal and non-academic development.
## Non-UNCF Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.394*</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.242*</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-value significant at p < .05 level.

Table 4.13
Comparison of Means on all Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness for Faculty and Administrators at non-UNCF Institutions
Another area where views are different may be on how student mature in non-academic areas or how they mature socially, culturally and emotionally. Different views between faculty and administrators may be manifested in the importance students attach to opportunities for personal and non-academic development.

Faculty and administrators differ significantly at the p < .05 level on the System Openness and Community Interaction effectiveness dimension. The mean for faculty on this dimension is 3.67 and that of administrators is 3.25. On this dimension t = 2.242; df = 48; p = .030. The different views of faculty and administrators may be on the level of responsiveness and adaptability of non-UNCF institutions to the changing needs of the external environment; on the level of emphasis placed on institution and community interaction activities; and on the number of community oriented programs, workshops or activities sponsored by non-UNCF institutions.

As shown in Table 4.13, the rest of the organizational effectiveness dimensions are not significantly different. In other words, faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institution share the same perceptions on Student Educational Satisfaction, Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Faculty Administrator Employment
Satisfaction, Professional Development and Quality of Faculty, Ability to Acquire Resources and Organizational Health. Again, these results confirm the findings made by Cameron (1978) who found that the position held had less influence on perceptions than the institution that a person was affiliated with. In other words, the institutional culture has more impact on the individual than the job held; that is, as it relates to perceptions of organizational effectiveness.

The independent-samples t tests in Table 4.14 of HBCU institution types indicate that UNCF and non-UNCF institutions differ significantly on two organizational effectiveness dimensions: Student Academic Development and Student Career Development. On Student Academic Development, UNCF institutions had a mean of 3.62 and non-UNCF institutions had a mean of 3.82 and the means differ significantly at \( p < .05 \). The associated statistics are \( t = -2.168; \ df = 98. \ p = .033 \). The differences might suggest that the two institutions have different views on academic achievement; have different perceptions on student graduation; and have different views about the level of student engagement in extra academic work. Unfortunately, the t-test does not indicate what factors account for the differences.
## UNCF and non-UNCF Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>UNCF</th>
<th>non-UNCF</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-1.687</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-2.168*</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-2.301*</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>-.900</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>-.826</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-1.974</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* = 50  
**Table 4.14**

Comparison of Means on all Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness for UNCF and non-UNCF Institutions

*t value is significant at p < .05 level.*
With respect to Student Career Development, UNCF institutions had a mean of 4.40 and non-UNCF institutions had a mean of 4.70, and the means differ significantly at p < .05. The associated t statistics are t = 2.301; df = 98; p = .024. The differences between the two institution types might suggest that they have different perceptions or views on the proportion of students who graduated from their schools who entered the labor market; that they might not agree on the number of students who attend their schools to fulfil their career goals, and that they might not have the same views on which students who entered their institutions and graduated, actually received training that helped them advance their career goals and ambitions. These differences may be a reflection of institutional cultures.

The remaining effectiveness dimension means are not significantly different from each other suggesting that UNCF and non-UNCF institutions have about the same perceptions on those areas represented by these organizational effectiveness dimensions. Another interesting observation to be made is that non-UNCF institutions scored higher than UNCF institutions on eight of the nine effectiveness dimensions. This may suggest that non-UNCF institutions perceive that they are doing a good job in meeting the requirements of all those dimensions. In other words, they
may perceive that they are meeting all student academic needs by providing an organizational climate that is conducive to successful student outcomes. Hence, student educational satisfaction and academic development needs are being met, and so are their personal and career needs. Faculty and administrators may feel that the institution is providing them with opportunities for professional and personal advancement and that is reflected in higher scores on the faculty and administrator satisfaction index. The lower score on the Ability to Acquire Resources may suggest that they perceive that the institution needs to do more to attract resources. Non-UNCF institutions are mostly public institutions and they are subject to state and federal financial support, which are both subject to fluctuating economic conditions. This wavering of state and federal support may influence perceptions about the institution's ability to attract resources. These results are summarized in Table 4.14. Levene's test for Equality of Variances also indicates that the variances for UNCF and non-UNCF institutions do not differ significantly from each other.

4.5 Summary of Results:

Three guiding questions generated the foregoing tests and analyses: Do faculty and administrators at HBCUs have different perceptions of organizational effectiveness
dimensions? Do faculty and administrators at UNCF institutions have different perceptions of organizational effectiveness dimensions? Do faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institutions have different perceptions of organizational effectiveness dimensions?

An examination of the data at both the individual and organizational levels of analysis (Table 4.5 and Table 4.11) indicates that overwhelmingly, faculty and administrators at HBCUs share the same perceptions of organizational effectiveness. Essentially, the t tests did not reveal that there were any significant differences in the means of these two groups at both levels of analysis for all HBCUs and for all of the nine effectiveness dimensions.

Regarding the second question, Tables 4.6 and 4.12 show the results of faculty and administrator means at UNCF institutions, and the results suggest that these two groups share the same perceptions on organizational effectiveness dimensions. Tables 4.7 and 4.13 show the results of faculty and administrators means at non-UNCF institutions, and the results indicate that groups within the same institution share the same perceptions on organizational effectiveness dimensions, except for significant differences on two of the nine dimensions: Student Personal Development and System Openness and Community Interaction. Giglioti (1987) found
the same results in her analysis of faculty and department heads from professional- and discipline-based departments. She found significant variances across departments between the two groups but found little to no significant differences within the department between the two groups. These findings suggest that the department with which one is affiliated might have more influence on the perceptions of organizational effectiveness than the job held.

Cameron (1978) also came to the same conclusion regarding institutional affiliation and its influence on perceptions held.

Tables 4.8 and 4.18 compare results for institutional means on effectiveness dimensions. Table 4.8 shows significant differences on four dimensions and Table 4.18 indicates significant differences on two dimensions. These results suggest that institutions will tend to vary significantly in their perceptions of organizational effectiveness dimensions. These findings and the findings of the current study in general support previous research findings. Cameron (1978) and Giglioti (1987) both found greater differences across institutions and across departments than within them.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter will begin by summarizing the study and its results and will discuss the implications that stem from the findings and make suggestions for future research.

5.1 Background and Summary of the Study

This study was an investigation of organizational effectiveness at Historically Black Colleges and Universities with a view to understanding faculty and administrator perceptions of organizational effectiveness. The main thrust of the study was to answer three questions that were posed at the end of the first chapter. What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty and administrators at HBCUs? What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty and administrators at UNCF institutions? What are the perceptions of organizational effectiveness of faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institutions? In order to answer these questions, the study first examined faculty and administrator perceptions at HBCUs globally, and then
administrator perceptions at HBCUs globally, and then examined perceptions of faculty and administrators within HBCU institution types by examining UNCF and non-UNCF institutions separately. The analyses were performed at both the individual and organizational levels. Organizational effectiveness was defined as value judgement(s) based on the collective perceptual assessments of faculty and administrators working for the college or university. It is the congruence between important domains of activity and their accomplishment and is characterized by the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness developed by Cameron (1978). The instrument used in this study was also developed by Cameron (1978). It had 32 items that were found to cluster around nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. While this instrument had been used extensively with Predominantly White Institutions and with Community Colleges, it had never been used with Historically Black Colleges and Universities. So, in order to assess the nine effectiveness dimensions, the study relied on subjective responses from samples respondents.
Respondents for this study were 999 faculty and administrators out of 1800 who were randomly selected from among 50 Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The discussion is organized around the three main questions the study is attempting to answer. The first section of the discussion will be about perceptions of organizational effectiveness at HBCUs overall. The second and final sections of the chapter will discuss the findings of organizational effectiveness findings at the institutional or organizational level.

5.2 Results

The results of the study involved an analysis of perceptions of faculty and administrators on nine effectiveness dimensions: Student Educational Satisfaction, Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Student Personal Development, Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, Professional Development and Quality and Faculty, Ability to Acquire Resources and Organizational Health.
5.2.1 Faculty and Administrator Perceptions at HBCUs

The independent-samples t tests on means of faculty and administrators when all HBCUs are examined together (N = 678 faculty and N = 321 administrators) showed no significant differences in their perceptions on all dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Even though administrator means are slightly higher than those of faculty on most dimensions, except Student Academic Development where they are the same, the means are not significantly different (see Figure 5.1).

5.2.2 Faculty and Administrator Perceptions - UNCF

An analysis of the results for UNCF institutions at both the individual level (N = 343 faculty and N = 146 administrators) and school or organizational level (N = 25) showed that the means of both groups do not differ significantly either. (See Figure 5.2.)

5.2.3 Faculty and Administrator Perceptions - non-UNCF

An analysis of the results for non-UNCF institutions at both the individual level (N = 335 faculty and N = 175 administrators) and school or organizational level (N = 25) showed that there were no significant differences.
Figure 5.1: Organizational Effectiveness Profiles for Faculty and Administrators at all HBCUs.
Figure 5.2: Organizational Effectiveness Profiles for Faculty and Administrators at UNCF Institutions.
But at the school level, two dimensions showed that there were significant differences: Student Personal Development and System Openness and Community Interaction. The rest of the dimensions did not show any significant differences between the perceptions of the two groups (see Figure 5.3).

5.2.4 UNCF and NON-UNCF Institutions

A comparison of combined responses for faculty and administrators or institutional means (N = 489 UNCF and N = 510 non-UNCF) at the individual level and those of (UNCF = 50 and non-UNCF = 50) at the school level, show significant differences in some dimensions. At the individual level there are significant differences on four of the nine effectiveness dimensions: Student Academic Satisfaction, Student Career Development, Professional Development and Quality Faculty. And at the school level there were significant differences on two of the nine effectiveness dimensions: Student Academic Development and Student Career Development. (see Figure 5.4)
Figure 5.3: Organizational Effectiveness Profiles for Faculty and Administrators at Non-UNCF Institutions.
Figure 5.4: Organizational Effectiveness Profiles for UNCF and Non-UNCF Institutions.
5.3 Conclusions

The results of this study are a little different from those of Cameron (1978). Cameron found significant differences for combined organizational effectiveness at the institutional level and he attributed that to institutional culture. But in examining the job held, he found that there were no significant differences between these groups. At the individual level, this study found significant differences on four Organizational Effectiveness dimensions: Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Professional Development and Quality of Faculty and Ability to Acquire Resources. At the school level, significant differences were found on two organizational effectiveness dimensions: Student Academic Development and Student Career Development.

In one sense, only a few of the results are consistent with some of Cameron's findings about institutional affiliation having a greater influence on respondent perceptions of organizational effectiveness. Where there are no significant differences, Cameron's findings are not supported. The reason for the differences in findings between this and Cameron's study may be attributed to the fact that Cameron (1978) sampled administrators from different areas such as student affairs, financial
administrators, general administrators, etc; whereas this study sampled faculty members and administrators. Another reason for the differences may lie in the types of institutions the two studies analyzed. Predominantly White Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities are culturally different, even though they are both four-year colleges.

At both levels of analysis, and for both institution types, and by faculty and administrator comparison the maximum effectiveness dimensions in order of magnitude (those with the largest response values) are: Faculty Administrator Employment Satisfaction, Student Personal Development, Student Career Development, Organizational Health and Student Academic Development. In general it appears that both faculty and administrators at both institutions feel that they were doing a better than average job of educating students, while they themselves feel satisfied and that they are working in a responsive environment with a positive climate.
Non-UNCF institutions present a reverse picture from UNCF institutions. The items with midpoint response values are Ability to Acquire Resources and Professional Development and Quality Faculty and Student Educational Satisfaction. It appears that faculty and administrators feel a need for more resources to be attracted to the institution and for more or better opportunities for professional development or in-service training. As with UNCF institutions, faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institutions feel the need to raise the level of student satisfaction with their educational experience. Apparently, faculty and administrators are not satisfied with average results on these dimensions at both institutions.

A look at the four tables above show that faculty and administrators rated all the dimensions of effectiveness above average and between UNCF and Non-UNCF. This suggests that both faculty and administrators are performing at above average with respect to all the dimensions of effectiveness. Both UNCF and Non-UNCF institutions appear to performing at above average job on all dimensions of organizational effectiveness.

Faculty and administrators at UNCF institutions at the individual level of analysis provided lower responses to the
Professional Development and Quality of Faculty dimension, even though administrators gave higher responses on this dimension than faculty. Overall, the low responses suggest that both groups feel that there is a need to improve in-service training and professional development opportunities. Faculty and administrators at non-UNCF institutions on the other hand provided low responses to the Ability to Acquire Resources dimension, also suggesting that both groups feel the need for more resources.

Cameron (1978) had the following responses: the highest responses in the first study were on the Student Academic Development and Ability to Acquire Resources dimensions, while the lowest response was on the Student Career Development dimension. In the second study, the lowest response was on Student Education Satisfaction and the highest response was on the Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction. The institutions that Cameron (1978) studied had different response patterns compared to HBCUs in the current study. In other words, the dimensions with low and high responses were different for Cameron's sample of institutions than they are for HBCUs.

These results support Cameron's observation that there will be significant differences in the way schools respond to the items on the dimensions of organizational
effectiveness. For example when UNCF and non-UNCF institutions were compared on all nine dimensions, at the individual level, they show significant differences on four dimensions: Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Professional Development and Quality of Faculty and Ability to Acquire Resources. At the school or organizational level however, UNCF and non-UNCF institutions were significantly different on only two dimensions: Student Academic Development and Student Career Development.

Cameron (1978, p 618) further indicated that "if institutions scored the same on the nine effectiveness dimensions, the instruments would be of no use in assessing relative effectiveness in institutions of higher education".

The differences in response patterns between this study and those found by Cameron (1978) may be due in part to the nature of HBCUs in terms of their culture, economic situation, historical development, goals and mission. HBCUs were established to provide higher education to African Americans who legally could not attend Predominantly White Institutions. Because there are no barriers that legally prevent African American from attending any higher education institution of their choice, the continued role and existence of HBCUs has been questioned and continues to be questioned.
Another distinguishing feature of HBCUs from Predominantly White Institutions studied by Cameron (1978) is that most HBCUs do not have selective admission procedures and therefore are confronted with the need to establish remedial programs in their schools, hence the concern with the institution's ability or capacity to attract resources and professional development opportunities. HBCUs generally operate strong mentoring programs (Fleming, 1984; Wenglinsky, 1996; and Woolbright, 1989). These programs require a tremendous output of resources in terms of faculty and financial commitments and therefore, the concern with Ability to Acquire Resources and Professional Development and Quality Faculty.

There is agreement between both groups on the need for UNCF and non-UNCF institutions to attract resources to both of their institutions. The term resources as applied in the survey questionnaire refers to the institution's ability to attract qualified faculty, competitive students and monetary contributions. The agreement is also poignant because every year, some of the marginal institutions among HBCUs are forced to close down because of financial difficulty (Wilson, 1993), a situation which also exacerbates an institution's ability to attract leading edge faculty and competitive students. The National Center for Education Statistics
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Report (1996) also confirms the tremendous financial difficulty that these institutions operate under. For example, salaries at HBCUs have continued to remain somewhat lower, even though they have kept pace with those at other colleges; second, financial resources are lower at HBCUs than at other comparable public institutions. "In 1993-94, educational and general expenditure per student was $9,782, or about 88 percent of the average for all public colleges and universities" (p. vii). The need for financial resources is important in that institutions with more financial resources can afford to offer more scholarships with substantial awards in order to not only attract competitive students, but competent faculty as well.

Another area of agreement among HBCU institutions between faculty and administrators is on the Student Educational Satisfaction effectiveness dimension. When students feel that they have had a good experience at an institution, they become its best ambassador to the outside world. In most cases, students who had a good experience at a school advocate for their alma mater through participation in fund-raising efforts on behalf of the institution and by recruiting potential students.
The results of the current study do not support
extensive research: White (1990); Bensimon (1987); Peterson
and White (1993); DiMaggio & Powell, (1983); Pounder, Ogawa
& Adams, (1995); Scott, (1992); which has found in other
studies that faculty and administrators share differences on
many disparate organizational variables; that these
differences can be found in all institutional types; and
that these differences can have negative consequences for a
college or university. However, this body of research did
not analyze the nine organizational effectiveness that the
current study examined. Perhaps that can explain the
differences in results. In addition, the differences may lie
in the peculiar nature of HBCUs and the Predominantly White
Institutions that these other studies focused on. Here again
cultural differences and institutional goals and missions
may serve to explain the differences.

The analysis of HBCUs overall and of the two
institutional types: UNCF and non-UNCF indicated that there
were no significant differences in the way faculty and
administrators perceive organizational effectiveness. There
were differences in four dimensions when faculty and
administrators were compared by institutional type.
Institutional type is an indirect measure of institutional
culture, decision-making approaches, institutional mission
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and goals. Even with these institutional differences, the results showed many similarities in the way faculty and administrators perceive organizational effectiveness dimensions. Therefore to answer the question whether there are differences in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between administrators and faculty members at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the results indicate that there are no significant differences.

To answer the second question whether there is a difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at College Fund/UNCF institutions, the results indicate that there are no significant differences. Finally, to answer the question whether there is a difference in perceptions of organizational effectiveness between faculty members and administrators at non-College Fund institutions, again the results indicate that there are no significant differences. A comparison of UNCF and non-UNCF institutions indicates that there are significant differences in perception on some of the organizational effectiveness dimensions. These differences may indicate different institutional culture rather than differences in the job or position held.
5.4 Limitations of the Study:

A number of limitations imposed by the nature of the study will be identified and presented below:

First, the approach of this study was exploratory in nature and the intent was to investigate the applicability of the organizational effectiveness questionnaire to HBCUs. While this was a worthwhile research endeavor, it essentially narrowed the focus of the inquiry in that while generally the results indicated that there are no differences between faculty and administrators, the study was not structured in such a way as to look into why significant differences did not exist. The failure to address this critical issue is a serious limitation of the study.

Second, the survey was administered to faculty and administrators. The results of the study cannot be generalized to the larger populations of HBCUs, such as students, board members, parents, legislators, and members of boards of regents who run higher education. It is however important to note that at least half of the institutions that comprise HBCUs was sampled. Because of this broad representation, it may be safe to generalize the results to all faculty members and administrators at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
Third, the survey questionnaire that was used to collect data in this study is a subjective instrument, which by its very nature is limited and limiting due to the predetermined responses it requires of respondents. In addition, the questionnaire fails to capture the richness that is possible through open-ended questions that an interview and participant observation or self description make possible. While the instrument attempted to capture and gather data in a systematic way, and while its items were derived from the research literature, ultimately its convenience was its limitation.

Fourth, the study did not directly examine perceptions of faculty and administrators as a function of personal characteristics such as age, gender, length of employment, faculty rank and stage in career. These variables or characteristics have been found in other research studies (Kleeman, 1984, Petersen and White, 1992, Thorenson, Kardash, Leuthold & Morrow, 1990, Baldwin and Blackburn, 1985) to contribute to statistically significant differences. A new study may be necessary to explore the effects of these characteristics on organizational effectiveness dimensions. They have been known to predict member's perceptions of the academic workplace and their
commitment to undergraduate education and organizational commitment in general.

Fifth, the study did not analyze additional organizational variables such as financial status, size, union status, and culture. Factors such as these have been found to significantly influence perceptions of organizational effectiveness (Smart and Hamm 1993; Cameron, 1984; Smart and St. John, 1990; Giglioti, 1987).

Sixth, while the independent-samples t-test used in this study to determine significance of difference between to sample means is appropriate, it cannot account for underlying reasons for the differences, perhaps because other variables were not included or considered. Independent-samples t test results can be interpreted as significantly or marginally different, but unless there is a strong theoretical relationships among the variables, it is difficult to establish with confidence complete causal connections. A further limitation is that this study used multiple t-tests and the potential exists that some of the group differences on the dimensions of effectiveness may reflect chance effects. Fortunately, the direction of group differences in the study was known based on previous research. Even though this study was exploratory in nature, it used the same variables throughout and was not attempting
to test new variables because they are interesting or because their measures are easily available - a practice that can result in chance rather than true differences, especially when repeatedly used with t tests (Borg and Gall, 1989).

5.4.1 Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

Research implications for this study are presented below:

First, the sample size in future studies of perceptions of organizational effectiveness should include students. Students are important stakeholders in the university or college community and their perceptions of organizational effectiveness should be solicited in order that broader and more responsive institutional policies may be crafted and implemented.

Second, future studies of organizational effectiveness need to consider the use of interviews in addition to a survey questionnaire. Face to face interviews coupled with observations of respondents are likely to catch rich data that are often missed or overlooked because respondents are limited to forced choices in a survey instrument. Perhaps combining these research methods will allow researchers to
perform fine-grained analyses that will provide a better understanding of not only of faculty and administrator perceptions, but those of other constituents and other issues that may be of interest in the study of university governance.

Third, this study did not examine the relationship between personal factors such as gender, race, tenure, stage in career and perceptions of organizational effectiveness. This gap not only in this study, but in many other effectiveness studies suggests the need for future investigation of the impact of personal factors on perceptions of organizational effectiveness.

Fourth, results of this study have uncovered significant differences between faculty and administrators on perceptions of effectiveness at the institutional level. This suggests that there is a need to understand the cultural determinants that contribute to such differences at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Other studies have examined the role of culture types at Predominantly White Institutions (Smart and St. John, 1990; Gigliotti, 1987; and Smart and Hamm, 1993) in the context of organizational effectiveness for higher education institutions. A more important question is that raised in
the sub-title to this dissertation: Do faculty members and administrators have different views or different models of organization with respect to organizational effectiveness? The results of this study do not reflect that. Rather, they indicate that faculty and administrators share perceptions in common with respect to organizational effectiveness dimensions.

Finally, the absence of significant and consistent differences in faculty and administrator perceptions of organizational effectiveness point to the need to examine if differences exist among other constituent groups within the university or college community. For example, a fruitful line of research might involve exploring differences between upper class undergraduate (sophomore and seniors) perceptions of organizational effectiveness with those of graduate students. Here, the concepts of different views or different models of organization can be explored more fully and more specifically.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

LONG SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (57 ITEMS)
### SECTION I

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS TYPICAL OF THE UNDERGRADUATE PORTION OF THIS UNIVERSITY? PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE SCALE IMMEDIATELY BELOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very true, or highly typical of this institution</th>
<th>Neither typical nor atypical</th>
<th>Very untrue, or highly atypical of this institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This university has the reputation of possessing a stimulating intellectual environment with high concern for student academic development.

2. One of the outstanding features of this university is the opportunity it provides students for personal development.

3. This university is highly responsive and adaptive to meeting and changing needs of the external university community or environment.

4. This university has a very high ability to obtain needed financial resources in order to provide a high quality educational program.

5. When hiring new faculty members, this university can attract the leading people in their respective fields to take a job here.

6. This university can attract the leading high school graduates in the country to attend.

7. This university has a very high ability to obtain the resources it needs to be effective.

8. In general, after students leave this institution, they maintain a strong commitment to the university.

9. At activities or events where alumni are invited by the university to participate, a large showing of support generally occurs.

10. There seems to be a feeling that dissatisfaction is high among students in general at this institution.

11. There have been a relatively large number of students either drop out or not return because of dissatisfaction with their educational experience here.

12. I am aware of a large number of student complaints regarding their educational experience here as registered in the campus newspaper, meetings with faculty members or administrators, or other public forums.
SECTION II

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVE

13. Think of last year’s graduating class at this institution. Please rate the academic attainment or academic level achieved by that class as a whole.

Section II - Page 2

_____ 1) That class is among the very top university graduating classes in the country
_____ 2) That class is well above average
_____ 3) That class is slightly above average
_____ 4) That class is about average
_____ 5) That class is slightly below average
_____ 6) That class is below average
_____ 7) That class is near the bottom of university graduating classes in the country

14. Estimate what percent of the graduates from this institution go on to obtain degrees in graduate or professional schools.

_____ 1) From 91% to 100% of the students here go on to obtain advanced degrees
_____ 2) From 76% to 90% go on
_____ 3) From 61% to 75% go on
_____ 4) From 46% to 60% go on
_____ 5) From 31% to 45% go on
_____ 6) From 16% to 30% go on
_____ 7) From 0% to 15% go on to obtain advanced degrees

15. How important is it to students here that opportunities for personal and non-academic development (e.g., social, emotional cultural, etc.) are provided at this institution?

_____ 1) Personal development activities are very important to students here
_____ 2) They are important
_____ 3) They are somewhat important
_____ 4) They are neither important nor unimportant
_____ 5) They are somewhat unimportant
_____ 6) They are unimportant
_____ 7) They are very unimportant to students here
## SECTION III

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE (UNIVERSITY) ENCOURAGE OR EMPHASIZE THE FOLLOWING? PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE SCALE BELOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very high degree of emphasis or encouragement here</th>
<th>Moderate degree of emphasis of encouragement here</th>
<th>No emphasis or encouragement here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Activities outside the classroom designed specifically to enhance students' academic development.

17. Activities outside the classroom designed specifically to enhance students' personal, non-academic development.

18. The engaging in professional activities outside the university by faculty members and administrators.

19. College-community or college-environment relations.
SECTION IV

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A very large number or amount</th>
<th>A moderate number or amount</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ 20. How many career development opportunities are provided for students at this university?

____ 21. How much would you say students develop and mature in non-academic areas (e.g., socially, emotionally, culturally, etc.) directly as a result of their experiences at this university?

____ 22. How many faculty members and administrators at this university would you say serve in the community government, on boards or committees, as consultants, or in other capacities?

____ 23. How many community oriented programs, workshops, projects, or activities would you estimate were sponsored by this university last year?

SECTION V

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE

7 - Almost all
6 - A large majority
5 - More than half
4 - About half
3 - Less than half
2 - A small minority
1 - Almost none

____ 24. How many faculty members would you say have national reputations in their respective academic fields?

____ 25. How many students would you say engage in extra academic work (e.g., reading, studying, writing, etc.) over and above what is specifically assigned in the classroom?

____ 26. What proportion of students who graduated from this university last year and entered the labor market would you estimate obtained employment in their major field of study?

____ 27. How many students would you say attend this university to fulfill definite career or occupational goals as opposed to attending for social, athletic, financial or other reasons?

____ 28. Approximately what proportion of the undergraduate courses offered at this university are designed to be career oriented or occupation-related as opposed to liberal education, personal development, etc.?

____ 29. Of those students who went on the job market after graduating from this college last year, how many would you say obtained the job of their first choice as opposed to settling for a less than optimal choice?
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30. Think of those students who have obtained employment after graduating from this university. For how many of them was the career training received at this institution important in helping them obtain their job?

31. If given the chance of taking a similar job at another university of his/her choice, how many faculty members do you think would opt for leaving this university rather than staying?

32. If given the chance of taking a similar job at another university of his/her choice, how many administrators do you think would opt for leaving this university rather than staying?

33. Estimate how many faculty members at this university are personally satisfied with their employment?

34. Estimate how many administrators at this university are personally satisfied with their employment?

35. Estimate how many faculty members are personally satisfied with the way things are done around this university?

36. Estimate how many administrators are personally satisfied with the way things are done around this university?

37. Approximately what proportion of the faculty members and administrators at this university attended a conference or workshop specifically oriented toward professional and/or personal development last year?

38. How many of the faculty members at this university would you say published a book or an article in a professional journal, or displayed a work of art in a show last year?

39. What proportion of the faculty members would you estimate teach at the “cutting edge” of their field i.e., require current journal articles as reading, revise syllabi at least yearly, discuss current issues in the field, etc.?

40. How many faculty members at this university would you estimate have at some time received an academic award or honor such as teaching, research, or professional award or a listing in a national honorary directory?

42. Universities may be rated on the basis of their relative “drawing power” in attracting top high school students. In relation to other universities with which it directly competes, what proportion of the top students attend this university rather than the competition?
SECTION VI

THIS SECTION ASKS YOU TO RATE YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL DAY-TO-DAY FUNCTIONING OF THE UNDERGRADUATE PORTION OF THE OVERALL INSTITUTION, PLEASE RESPOND BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF EACH ITEM. IF YOU AGREE STRONGLY WITH ONE END OF THE SCALE, CIRCLE A NUMBER CLOSER TO THAT END OF THE SCALE. IF YOU FEEL NEUTRAL ABOUT THE ITEM, CIRCLE A NUMBER NEAR THE MIDDLE OF THE SCALE.

For example:

***How is the weather in this town?

| warm, bright and sunny | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | cold, wet, and dismal |

HOW DO YOU PERCEIVE THE FOLLOWING?

43. Student/faculty relationships.

unusual closeness, lots of informal interaction, mutual personal concern | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | no closeness, mostly instrumental relations, little informal interaction

44. Interdepartmental relations in the university.

lots of coordination, joint planning, collaboration, no friction | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | no joint activity, conflict, lack of coordination and communication

45. General pattern of supervision and control.

rigid control, strict supervision, pressure for conformity | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | respect for differences, personal freedom and individual autonomy

46. Equity of treatment and rewards.

people treated fairly and rewarded | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | favoritism and inequity present, unfair treatment exists

47. Recognition and rewards received for good work from superiors.

recognition received for good work, no one rewarded for success | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | no rewards for good work, recognises success

48. The amount of information or feedback you receive.

feel informed, in-the-know, information is always available | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | feel isolated, out-of-it, information is never available

49. Type of communication that is typical.

guarded, screened, cautious, formal | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | open, authentic, personal, free
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50. The general social environment.

cooperative, supportive, mutual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 competitive, no support
unsympathetic concern for others, humane for himself

51. The flexibility of the administration.

willing to change, adaptable, 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 rigid, unwillingness to change, progressive, flexible stagnant, unyielding

52. General levels of trust among people.

high suspicion, fear, distrust 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 high trust, security, openness insecurity

53. Conflicts and friction in the university.

large amount of conflict, disagreement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no friction or conflicts, friendly, disagreements, anxiety, friction collaborative

54. Resolution of disagreements or conflicts.

imposition, avoidance, dictum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 face-to-face, compromise, suppression, bad feelings result democratically, positive feelings result

55. Use of the talents and expertise of faculty members and administrators.

competencies and talents used maximally, 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 competencies not used, no opportunities chances for fulfilment and development for growth, talents unused are present

56. Organizational health of the university.

university runs smoothly, healthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 university runs poorly, organization, productive internal unhealthy organization, unproductive internal functioning functioning

57. Long term planning and goal setting.

much goal directed activity, long-term 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no goal directed activity, no planning, no goal planning assessments

opportunities for growth, talents unused

competencies not used, no opportunities chances for fulfilment and development for growth, talents unused

university runs poorly, unhealthy organization, unproductive internal functioning

no goal directed activity, no planning, no goal assessments
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ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Institutions of Higher Education

SECTION I

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS TYPICAL OF THE UNDERGRADUATE PORTION OF THIS UNIVERSITY? PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE SCALE IMMEDIATELY BELOW.

5 - Strongly Agree
4 - Agree
3 - Neither
2 - Disagree
1 - Strongly Disagree

1. This college is highly responsive and adaptive to the changing needs of its external constituents.
2. One of the outstanding features of this university is the opportunity it provides students for personal development in addition to academic development.
3. This college has a very high ability to obtain needed financial resources in order to provide a high quality educational program.
4. When hiring new faculty members, this college can attract the leading people in the country in their respective fields to take a job here.
5. There seems to be a feeling that dissatisfaction is high among students at this institution.
6. There have been a relatively large number of students either drop out or not return because of dissatisfaction with their educational experience here.
7. I am aware of a large number of student complaints regarding their educational experience here as registered in the campus newspaper, meetings with faculty members and administrators, or other public forums.
8. There is a very high emphasis on activities outside the classroom designed specifically to enhance students' personal, non-academic development.
9. There is a very high emphasis on institution-community or institution-environment activities.
10. Students develop and mature in non-academic areas (e.g. socially, emotionally, culturally) to a very large degree directly as a result of their experiences at this institution.
11. A very large number of community-oriented programs, workshops, projects, or activities were sponsored by this institution last year.
12. Think of last year's graduating class at this institution. Please rate the academic attainment or academic level achieved by that class as a whole.

____ 1) That class is among the very top university graduating classes in the country
____ 2) That class is well above average
____ 3) That class is slightly above average
____ 4) That class is about average
____ 5) That class is slightly below average
____ 6) That class is below average
____ 7) That class is near the bottom of university graduating classes in the country

13. Estimate what percent of the graduates from this institution go on to obtain degrees in graduate or professional schools.

____ 1) From 91% to 100% of the students here go on to obtain advanced degrees
____ 2) From 76% to 90% go on
____ 3) From 61% to 75% go on
____ 4) From 46% to 60% go on
____ 5) From 31% to 45% go on
____ 6) From 16% to 30% go on
____ 7) From 0% to 15% go on to obtain advanced degrees

14. How important is it to students here that opportunities for personal and non-academic development (e.g., social, emotional cultural, etc.) are provided at this institution?

____ 1) Personal development activities are very important to students here
____ 2) They are important
____ 3) They are somewhat important
____ 4) They are neither important nor unimportant
____ 5) They are somewhat unimportant
____ 6) They are unimportant
____ 7) They are very unimportant to students here
PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE

7 - Almost all
6 - A large majority
5 - More than half
4 - About half
3 - Less than half
2 - A small minority
1 - Almost none

15. How many students would you say engage in extra academic work (e.g., reading, studying, writing, etc.) over and above what is specifically assigned in the classroom?

16. What proportion of students who graduated from this university last year and entered the labor market would you estimate obtained employment in their major field of study?

17. How many students would you say attend this university to fulfill definite career or occupational goals as opposed to attending for social, athletic, financial or other reasons?

18. Of those students who obtained employment after graduating from this institution, for how many of them was career training received at this institution important in helping them obtain their jobs?

19. If given the chance of taking a similar job at another university of his or her choice, how many faculty members do you think would opt for leaving this school?

20. If given the chance of taking a similar job at another university of his or her choice, how many administrators do you think would opt for leaving this school?

21. Estimate how many faculty members at this college are personally satisfied with their employment.

22. How many faculty members at this school would you say published a book or an article in a professional journal, or displayed a work of art in a show last year?

23. What proportion of faculty members would you estimate teach at the “cutting edge” of their field i.e., require current journal articles as reading, revise syllabi at least yearly, discuss issues in the field, etc?

24. How many faculty members at this college are actively engaged in professional development activities - e.g., doing research, getting an advanced degree, consulting, etc?

25. Colleges may be rated on the basis of their relative “drawing power” in attracting top high school students. In relation to other colleges with which it directly competes, what proportion of the top students attend this college rather than the competition?
THIS SECTION ASKS YOU TO RATE YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL DAY-TO-DAY
FUNCTIONING OF THE UNDERGRADUATE PORTION OF THE OVERALL INSTITUTION,
PLEASE RESPOND BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR
PERCEPTIONS OF EACH ITEM, IF YOU AGREE STRONGLY WITH ONE END OF THE SCALE,
CIRCLE A NUMBER CLOSER TO THAT END OF THE SCALE. IF YOU FEEL NEUTRAL ABOUT
THE ITEM, CIRCLE A NUMBER NEAR THE MIDDLE OF THE SCALE.

For example:

***How is the weather in this town?***

| warm, bright and sunny | 1 2 3 4 6 7 | cold, wet, and dismal |

HOW DO YOU PERCEIVE THE FOLLOWING?

26. Student/faculty relationships.

unusual closeness, lots of informal interaction, mutual personal concern |
1 2 3 4 6 7 |
no closeness, mostly instrumental relations, little informal interaction |

27. Equity of treatment and rewards.

people treated fairly and rewarded equitably |
1 2 3 4 6 7 |
favoritism and inequity present, unfair treatment exists |

28. Organizational health of the university.

university runs smoothly, healthy organization, productive internal functioning |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
university runs poorly, unhealthy organization, unproductive internal functioning |

29. General levels of trust among people.

high suspicion, fear, distrust insecurity |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
high trust, security, openness |

30. Conflicts and friction in the college.

large amount of conflict, disagreement, anxieties, friction |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
no friction or conflicts, friendly, collaborative |

31. Recognition and rewards received for good work from superiors.

recognition received for good work, recognizes success |
1 2 3 4 6 7 |
no rewards for good work, no one rewarded for success |

32. The amount of information or feedback you receive.

feel informed, in-the-know, information is always available |
1 2 3 4 6 7 |
feel isolated, out-of-it, information is never available |
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Respondent Demographics

THESE ITEMS ASK FOR PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION. THIS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE USED TO IDENTIFY YOU, RATHER IT SIMPLY WILL HELP US IN OUR ANALYSIS OR THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA. PLEASE ANSWER EACH ITEM.

1. What is your sex?
   □  Male
   □  Female

2. What is your highest academic degree?
   □  Associate
   □  Bachelors
   □  Masters
   □  Doctoral or other terminal degree

3. What is the length of your employment at your college?
   □  0 - 5 years
   □  6 -10 years
   □  11-19 years
   □  20-25 years
   □  26-30 years

4. In what year were you born?

5. What is your job category?
   □  Faculty Member
   □  Administrator

6. What is your current academic rank?
   □  Professor
   □  Associate Professor
   □  Assistant Professor
   □  Lecturer/Instructor

7. How many years have you been in your current position?
   □  0 - 5 years
   □  6 -10 years
   □  11-19 years
   □  20-25 years
   □  26-30 years
8. How many years have you been affiliated with this institution?
   □ 0 - 5 years
   □ 6 - 10 years
   □ 11-19 years
   □ 20-25 years
   □ 26-30 years

9. Is the faculty unionized or organized?
   □ Yes
   □ No
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER
SENT WITH INITIAL PILOT SURVEY
We at the School of Educational Policy & Leadership in the College of Education are conducting a nationwide survey of four-year colleges. The survey attempts to understand the governance of undergraduate institutions and seeks to isolate factors that might influence their effectiveness. You are one of few administrators and faculty members who was randomly selected and are being asked to participate in this survey. Because of the small number of respondents, it is extremely important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. It will take ten to fifteen minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. Because your response is critical to the success of the study, we urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed postage paid envelope by May 30th, 2000. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we receive your completed survey.

Please be assured that your responses are completely confidential. We guarantee your anonymity as an individual respondent. A post card with an identification number on the top right hand corner is enclosed. It will be used only to track responses, and exclude your name from follow-up mailings when your questionnaire is returned. Please mail it under separate cover so that we cannot match questionnaires with names. After your responses have been numerically coded and entered into the computer for analysis, the questionnaire will be destroyed. Because the results are confidential, no names of any institution will be used in any report of the research.

If you have any questions about the study, please write or call. You can reach us at (614) 447-0844 extension 115 during the day and at the following e-mail address any time of the day: Mzozovana.1@osu.edu.

Your cooperation in responding to the questionnaire and its prompt return are deeply appreciated. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Mbulelo G.Mzozovana
APPENDIX D

POST CARD

197
Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

Mbulelo G. Mzozoyana
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER
SENT WITH ACTUAL STUDY SURVEY
Dear Respondent:

The School of Educational Policy and Leadership in the College of Education is conducting a nationwide survey of four-year colleges. The purpose of the survey is to understand the governance of undergraduate institutions and to isolate factors that might influence their effectiveness. You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey. Because of the small number of respondents, it is extremely important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. It will take ten to fifteen minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. Your response is critical to the success of the study, so I urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed post paid envelope by May 30, 2001. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until I receive your completed survey.

Please be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. In the business reply envelope is a business reply postcard with an identification number. This number will enable me to keep track of returned responses. Please mail it under separated cover after mailing the completed survey. Once the completed questionnaire is returned and your name checked off the mailing list, the postcard will be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire. Because the results are confidential, no names of any institution will be used in any report of the research.

If you have questions about the study, please write or call. You can reach at (614)447-0844 extension 115 during the day, and at the following e-mail address at any time of the day: Mzozoyana.1@osu.edu.

Thank you for your time, your cooperation in responding to the questionnaire and for returning it promptly.

Sincerely,

Mbulelo G. Mzozoyana
APPENDIX F

FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Professor Respondent:

Two weeks ago I sent you a survey on the governance of four-year institutions. I am writing you to remind you to complete the survey and return it as soon as possible. It is extremely important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. It will take a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. Your response is critical to the success of the study, so I urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed post paid envelope by June 30, 2001. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until I receive your completed survey. In the event that you have misplaced the original survey, I have enclosed a new one in this letter.

Please be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. In the business reply envelope is a business reply postcard with an identification number. This number will enable me to keep track of returned responses. Please mail it under separated cover after mailing the completed survey. Once the completed questionnaire is returned and your name checked off the mailing list, the postcard will be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire. Because the results are confidential, no names of any institution will be used in any report of the research.

If you have questions about the study, please write or call. You can reach at (614)447-0844 extension 115 during the day, and at the following e-mail address at any time of the day: Mzozoyana.1@osu.edu.

Thank you for your time, your cooperation in responding to the questionnaire and for returning it promptly.

Sincerely,

Mbulelo G. Mzozoyana
APPENDIX G

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Professor Respondent:

Four weeks ago I sent you a survey on the governance of four-year institutions. I am concerned that I have not heard from you because your responses are important and critical to the success of the study. Other phases of the research cannot be completed unless I hear from you. In case you have lost or misplaced the original survey I have enclosed a new one. Please complete the survey and return it in the post paid envelope by July 6, 2000. It will take a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

I want to personally assure you that your responses will remain completely confidential. In the business reply envelope is a business reply postcard with an identification number. This number will enable me to keep track of returned responses. Please mail it under separated cover after mailing the completed survey. Once the completed questionnaire is returned and your name checked off the mailing list, the postcard will be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire. Because the results are confidential, no names of any institution will be used in any report of the research.

If you have questions about the study, please write or call. You can reach at (614)447-0844 extension 115 during the day, and at the following e-mail address at any time of the day: Mzozoyana.l@osu.edu.

Thank you for your time, your cooperation in responding to the questionnaire and for returning it promptly.

Sincerely,

Mbulelo G. Mzozoyana
APPENDIX H

INTRODUCTORY LETTER
Dear Professor Respondent:

I am a graduate student in the School of Educational Policy Leadership here at the Ohio State University. I am writing to inform you that in a about a week you will be receiving a survey on institutional governance of four-year colleges. The reason I am mailing you this survey is to solicit your help in my finishing the next phase my graduate work. Once you receive the survey, please complete it and mail back as soon as you can.

If you have questions about the study, please write or call. You can reach at (614)447-0844 extension 115 during the day, and at the following e-mail address at any time of the day: Mzozoyana.1@osu.edu.

Thank you for your serious consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Mbulelo G. Mzozoyana