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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The cooperation among groups of colleges or universities is hardly a new phenomenon in higher education. Some of the earliest universities were, and still are, the aggregate of cooperating collegiate parts. However, recent rapid growth in higher education has raised interinstitutional cooperation for the first time to the level of a new educational dimension.

Today, colleges and universities of the United States are confronted with ever increasing demands, obligations, and opportunities that necessitate and command the responsibility of finding material, resources, and manpower to meet the challenge of the present age. As one means of meeting such a challenge, more and more institutions of higher learning are turning to cooperative undertakings.¹

Higher education in America, with its more than 2,200 institutions, presents a complex picture which ranges from intercollegiate competition to interinstitutional cooperation. Most individuals are familiar with the competitive side, but most are not aware of the new cooperative spirit which has come over the higher education community.

Interinstitutional cooperation is operationally defined as the existence of two or more institutions joined together to share staff, students, or various services. The basic concept is that the cooperating institutions may be able to do things together which they could not do alone. This type of cooperation "represents a combination of resources which may, or may not, be a means of achieving the economics which are available to the larger educational enterprises." ²

Historically, the separateness of colleges appears to have been primarily due to three factors: (1) the "ivory tower" concept of many higher education institutions, which separated them from the community; (2) the self-sufficient

concept, which separated them from one another; and (3) the highly selective nature of single purpose programs, which drew relatively few students to any one college. In many cases both the desire for and felt need to establish cooperative arrangements and programs were lacking. Where such a need did exist, the benefits and potentialities of a cooperative effort were not clearly defined by the existing agencies.

Practically speaking, in the past it was possible and somewhat educationally advantageous for colleges and universities to operate unilaterally, each determining its own goals and programs and seeking its own resources. Certain factors can be identified to illustrate how the current social, economic, and political setting is making unilateralism a much more difficult path for colleges and universities to follow.

A primary causative factor in the increased need of higher education to establish cooperative programs in order

---

to satisfy clientele demands more adequately is that of steadily rising college and university enrollment figures. In 1960 alone, the degree-credit student enrollment total for all colleges and universities of the United States was reported at 3,610,007. From this figure it is anticipated that fall enrollments will have more than doubled by 1970. In situations where special admissions requirements and enrollment restrictions are not established institutional policy, these figures can give even greater cause for concern. Such figures may be of little concern to those colleges which have committed themselves to a definite limitation of institutional size. However, the side effects of generally growing pressures in college enrollments may be influential in stimulating interest and a genuine concern for the establishment of cooperative programs.

A second factor influencing the need for interinstitutional programs among colleges, universities, and related organizations is that of limited financial resources with which to underwrite the mounting costs of higher education.

---

As the numbers of students seeking higher education in the years immediately ahead increase, so, too, will the need for a greater amount of dollars be increasingly felt. These two factors together make it imperative that colleges and universities seek additional funds for the maintenance of current programs, innovation of new programs, and the admission of larger numbers of students.\(^5\)

The need for interinstitutional cooperation is also heightened because of the current and projected shortage of adequately trained teaching staff.\(^6\) At the present time there are indications that a shortage of qualified teaching personnel will impede the growth and expansion of our colleges and universities in the next decade. There are many plans and suggestions for meeting the increasing demand for qualified instruction, such as the use of more persons holding the master's degree, or rehiring retired persons possessing the needed qualifications. The use of cooperative curricular and teaching arrangements can also play an

\(^5\)Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, *Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities*, p. 3.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 4.
important role in aiding the problem of increased instructional needs in higher education.

Interinstitutional cooperation, as it presently exists, has developed to the point that it can be put to almost any use. Cooperation in higher education represents a combination of resources which may, or may not, be a means of achieving the economics which are available to the larger educational enterprises. The purpose of the cooperative arrangement may be to coordinate the educational efforts of the participating institutions. Such cooperation might include joint programs, research, facilities, students, faculty, consultants, and purchasing.7

The many forms of cooperation in higher education today are almost as numerous and varied in purpose as are the institutions themselves. Moore cities six major classifications of consortia or cooperative efforts.

1. The single bilateral may be a simple one like the Rutgers-Monmouth arrangement in business administration, or complex like that of North Carolina Board of Higher Education, "Interinstitutional Cooperation in North Carolina Colleges and Universities," (unpublished study, June 1, 1968), p. 1. (Mimeographed)
Texas State and Texas Women's Universities, which cuts across many disciplines.

2. The **fraternal bilateral** usually covers only one discipline, but finds more than one institution involved in separate but similar programs with a central school. Duke's program in forestry is an example of this arrangement.

3. The **federation of bilaterals** is actually a multilateral. It is similar to the fraternal bilateral except that the lateral or guest schools join in common planning with the central school, as with American University in its Washington Semester.

4. The **multilateral** includes three or more institutions and may be (A) simple and centered, such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which concentrates on one broad disciplinary area with a center in Boulder, Colorado; (B) simple and dispersed, like the cooperative Ph.D. in classical civilization of the Universities of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin whose center changes yearly in a shift of administration from school to school; (C) complex and centered, such as CIC or the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area; or (D) complex and dispersed, like the Connecticut Valley Consortium, which may be administered from Amherst, Holyoke, Smith, or the University of Massachusetts.

5. The **college or university center** may be bilateral or multilateral, but has a definite academic center most often used by geographically contiguous campuses or by institutions within daily commuting distance.

6. The **constellation of consortia** finds two or more consortia involved in partnership with a teaching, research, and/or service center or program or central consortium. The Argonne National Laboratory is an excellent example, with seven participating consortia totaling
more than 100 institutions in addition to a number of bilaterals.8

As a general rule, reports of various types or examples of cooperative ventures involving colleges and universities point to one or more reasons which create an initial interest in establishing or conducting such programs. "Among the reasons frequently given for considering cooperative arrangements are that such endeavors provide:

1. More effective utilization of resources, both physical and personnel.

2. Program enrichment in the way of broadened offerings and a more stable selection.

3. Economy of operation by reducing faculty, plant, and fund needs to an operational level consistent with sound administration.

4. Enhanced community service through the selection of competence areas by cooperating insti-

tutions and through reduced duplication of offerings.

5. Institutional stimulation embracing students, faculty, administration, and staff."

Given the aforestated reasons and a willingness on the part of the leaders of higher institutions, there appears to be no single aspect of college operation which is beyond the bounds of collective effort. Ertell provides a compilation of possible areas of cooperation which appears to be both comprehensive and realistic. Included as possible areas of cooperation are the following:

1. Planning
2. Providing programs and educational opportunities for students
3. Sharing faculty resources
4. Sharing physical facilities
5. Use of joint classes
6. Library activities
7. Contracts for service
8. Business affairs, administrative practices, and fund raising
9. Activities with other cultural institutions
10. Other cooperative activities

---

9Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities, p. 4.

Beyond the aforementioned practical reasons for consideration of a cooperative effort by institutions of higher learning lies the ever present aspect of important philosophical justification for such a project. A review of both the published and unpublished literature in the area of interinstitutional programs reveals at least five basic philosophical considerations for institutions contemplating a cooperative effort.

1. Interinstitutional cooperation, without limiting the independence of individual institutions, tends to promote the more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources.

2. Interinstitutional cooperation, without requiring expansion of offerings, makes it possible for a college or university to enrich those programs which might otherwise lack luster, challenge, or the opportunity for broad educational experiences.

3. Interinstitutional cooperation, without infringing on institutional budgetary affairs, can actually result in definite savings or at least promote the possibility of economies in future operational costs.

4. Interinstitutional cooperation, without restricting a college's area of influence, allows a group of colleges to expand their community service projects and thereby enhance their respective offerings.

5. Interinstitutional cooperation, without force or coercion, is capable of producing academic and cultural stimulation to the entire institutional program. As a result of this approach
to problems, students, faculty, and administrators will have access to hitherto unused resources for increasing intellectual growth.\textsuperscript{11}

With the above positive, practical, and philosophical considerations of cooperative efforts must be combined some of the negative or deterrent factors of such arrangements in higher education. In some instances the negative factors represent the reverse side of factors previously identified as being helpful in fostering cooperative efforts. Some of the more common restrictive influences to cooperative efforts may include the following:

1. **Unilateral institutionalism.** This situation results when a single college believes that it can do all things well by itself. For example, a college board, administration, and faculty may continue to add courses, physical facilities, and personnel, within narrow financial limitations, in order to maintain or enhance the reputation of the institution, even though a cooperative arrangement with another institution would have served the student clientele needs better and more economically.

2. **Nescience.** This constitutes an unawareness or indifference, on the part of college and university personnel, of the possibilities inherent in cooperation with other institutions, or a reluctance to explore such possibilities.

\textsuperscript{11}Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, \textit{Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities}, p. 5.
3. **Special interest groups.** Alumni and "friends" of a college may wish to retain without modification the old rivalries and competitions between their alma mater and other institutions.

4. **Administrative policy and procedure.** These can be so restrictive in language, intent, or execution that they prevent, or reduce to a minimum, opportunities for cooperation. They may also tend to reduce individual interest in exploring the possibilities of cooperation with another institution or community resource.

5. **Legal barriers.** Statutory provisions may prohibit an institution from participating with other institutions in cooperative agreements or activities. Where such legal difficulties exist, change in the law will probably be necessary before interinstitutional agreements can be effected. While not clearly legal in nature, political factors may deter collective approaches to higher education problems. This is seen, for example, in some cases where legislators develop intense loyalties to particular institutions in a State system of public colleges and universities.12

However, today in American higher education, many of the institutions recognize their inability to provide for themselves the necessary staff and facilities for more complex, costly, and increasing numbers of programs and services. Furthermore, there is increasing wide-spread acceptance of the virtues of interdependence as well as

12Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, *Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities*, p. 37.
those of self-sufficiency. An institution, when it enters into a cooperative arrangement, may surrender a degree of its autonomy and uniqueness; however, it is the diversity of unique qualities among cooperating institutions that enables them to become more useful and effective in concert. In summary, the predominant reason for interinstitutional arrangements appears to be the desire to provide improved and expanded opportunities for the clientele of higher education through the more effective utilization of facilities, programs, personnel, and other resources. All of the previously mentioned factors have been the basic assumptions taken into account in the establishment and continuing development of both the Piedmont University Center and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges.

With the advent of the 1960's, a survey was conducted among the colleges and universities of Western North Carolina to determine the need for a coordinating educational agency. The result of this survey brought the establishment of the Piedmont University Center in 1963 with headquarters in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The avowed purpose of the Piedmont University Center is to "provide
the means whereby each member institution may enter into voluntary programs of interinstitutional cooperation in areas of academic planning, scheduling of visiting scholars, scheduling of performing artists, placement services for students, cooperative employment of faculty, and joint business programs in matters of purchasing, including library books and a film service.\textsuperscript{13}

Through such institutional cooperation, the Center's goal is to "help its member institutions (1) enrich and expand their present educational program, (2) increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the auxiliary services, and (3) achieve greater economy in total institutional operation."\textsuperscript{14}

Likewise, the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges was established in 1966. This association is also a non-profit organization formed by fifteen colleges in the Eastern region of North Carolina to foster cooperation and coordination of the educational efforts of its


\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
member institutions. Both the Piedmont University Center and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges seek to provide a means whereby the needs of each member college may be met through cooperative projects without the loss of identity or threats to institutional autonomy.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is multidimensional in its nature. The heart of the study, rather than being essentially a study or survey of the member institutions and the historical background of the evolution and program of each of the primary cooperating agencies in North Carolina, will consist of an attempt to determine variations in perceptions or attitudes toward membership and degree of institutional involvement among selected faculty and administration of the participating institutions.

It is the conviction of this writer that the way in which the faculty and administration of a member institution perceive the role of their college with regard to its involvement and participation within a cooperative agency greatly affects the degree or extent of participation or involvement of a college in center or association sponsored
activities, projects, opportunities, or attitudes. With the Piedmont University Center completing its sixth year of operation and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges undertaking its third, the time is quite appropriate to attempt to evaluate each agency in terms of the attitudes or variance in position toward all aspects of such interinstitutional cooperation as expressed by the faculty and administration representatives of the member institutions who comprise the numerous working committees of each cooperating agency. As the result of a questionnaire technique, it is hoped that perceptions or attitudes conveyed in the study will reflect to some degree the successes and/or failures of the two primary attempts at coordinating higher education among the smaller institutions of North Carolina. Of more importance, however, would be the way in which such perceptions or expressions of attitude might assist both agencies in determining the way for future growth and development of cooperative planning among the participating institutions.
Definition of Terms

At present, there appears to be little agreement on the terms used to describe the multitude of cooperative arrangements which colleges and universities have utilized. As has been previously indicated in this chapter, Moore has identified six major classifications of cooperative efforts. These six classifications and their explanations can be referred to by the reader when necessary. The following additional terms and their definitions are offered for further clarification.

1. **Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges**

   shall refer to a cooperating center composed of the following member institutions representing the eastern sector of North Carolina:

   Atlantic Christian College
   Campbell College
   Chowan College
   East Carolina College
   Elizabeth City State College
   Fayetteville State College
   Louisburg College
   Meredith College
   Methodist College
   Mount Olive Junior College
   N. C. Wesleyan College
   St. Augustine's College
   Shaw University
   Southwood College
   Wingate College

2. **Bilateral arrangement** shall refer to cooperative arrangements such as the Association of Eastern North
Carolina Colleges and Piedmont University Center which have a paid executive director or other chief executive whose office is disassociated from the campus of any participating institution.

4. **Consortium** shall refer to the centralized separate corporate entity arrangement such as the Piedmont University Center and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges. Consortium may also be used to describe the non-centralized and smaller arrangements of two or three institutions.

5. **Decentralized arrangement** shall refer to a cooperative arrangement which is administered from the campus of one or more of the participating institutions.

6. **Interinstitutional cooperation** shall refer to an arrangement whereby two or more colleges and/or universities work together for the benefit of each other. Such cooperation might include joint programs, research, facilities, students, faculty, consultants, and purchasing.

7. **Multilateral arrangement** shall refer to a cooperative arrangement involving three or more institutions of higher education.
8. **Piedmont University Center** shall refer to a cooperating center composed of the following member institutions representing the western half of North Carolina:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barber Scotia College</th>
<th>Livingstone College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Abbey College</td>
<td>Mars Hill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett College</td>
<td>North Carolina A &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba College</td>
<td>State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson College</td>
<td>Pfeiffer College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon College</td>
<td>St. Andrew's Presbyterian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro College</td>
<td>Salem College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford College</td>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point College</td>
<td>Winston-Salem State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson C. Smith University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenoir Rhyne College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Satellite arrangement** shall refer to a cooperative arrangement established as a result of the programs of another cooperative arrangement.

**Limitations of the Study**

The primary limitation of this study will be evident in the nature of the sample utilized in the questionnaire survey. The questionnaire participants include only those faculty and administrators of the member institutions who are directly involved with the cooperating agencies through their membership on the various agency committees, commissions, and councils. It is recognized that such a survey
sample could produce biased attitudes or opinions toward the various aspects of interinstitutional cooperation as practiced by the member colleges and universities. It is assumed, however, that the survey of the individuals most actively involved in their institution's several roles as a cooperative agency member would more adequately reflect both the positive and negative attitudes toward involvement in a cooperative arrangement - its projects, committees, and goals for the future.

A second possible limitation of this study is the fact that the older of the two cooperating centers has only been in existence for six years. Therefore, participation in the study could be limited due to a lack of knowledge in the area of interinstitutional cooperation on the part of the survey sample. Also, another limitation to this particular study is the fact that a validated survey or questionnaire in the field of interinstitutional cooperation has never been developed. Very little evaluation has been attempted with this relatively recent development in higher education. This is particularly true in North Carolina where there has been no published attempt at an evaluation of any of the existing cooperative efforts.
Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the opinions expressed in this survey study will reveal attitudes or opinions that may assume an influential role in the future growth and development of the various cooperative programs of both the Piedmont University Center and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The second chapter of this study shall consist of a review of the literature pertaining to the field of interinstitutional cooperation in contemporary higher education. The review of literature will be preceded by a historical survey of the phenomenon of the various cooperative efforts nationally and will include a brief historical summary of interinstitutional cooperation in North Carolina.

Chapter three of the study will include a discussion of the measurement of attitude with an emphasis upon the development and use of the Likert Attitude Scale. The methodology of the study will be revealed, and the chapter will conclude with a presentation and analysis of data collected in the survey.
The concluding chapter will consist of general summary statements about the study. It will also include conclusions and recommendations based upon the analytical significance of the attitude perception data.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

I. National

Cooperation in any form among colleges and universities is not new. In reality, cooperative efforts have been known to predate the Oxford-Cambridge arrangements. There is evidence that even on the ancient continent of Africa the University of Sankori at Timbuktu exchanged professors with Moorish University as early as A.D. 600.¹ Much later, in the United States, Cornell University, through contractual arrangements with New York State, entered a cooperative enterprise in 1894. Elsewhere during the same period, Harvard and M.I.T. entered into a means of informal

cooperation through their mutual agreement to pursue very separate paths of academic emphasis.\textsuperscript{2}

The first real initial emphasis for cooperative arrangements in this country came with the work of the General Education Board and the support given its work with Negro colleges by John D. Rockefeller about the time of World War I.\textsuperscript{3} Economic benefits were derived and/or projected through planned consolidations of Negro institutions. The board was unsuccessful in its initial attempt at such a combination as Fisk University and Mehany Medical College rejected a proposed merger. However, the board was successful in reorganizing Straight University, New Orleans University, and Flint-Goodridge Hospital as Dillard University. Other early successful combinations of Negro institutions included the initial cooperation between Spelman College and Morehouse College between 1921 and 1929.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{4}Howard, \textit{Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education}, p. 6.
In 1923 James A. Bliesdell, president of Pomona College, originated the cluster system which was to be a direct reproduction of the Oxford pattern. This movement along with the establishment of the Claremont College group in the mid-1920's is usually considered "the standard point for dating the true trend toward cooperation." The Claremont Colleges of today include five undergraduate institutions and one graduate center, all of which share common library facilities. The primary reason for the existence of such a cluster concept of colleges has been given as an effort to reduce or eliminate the unnecessary duplication of facilities.

The advent of the 1930's brought more numerous efforts at various types of interinstitutional cooperation. Whether such efforts were officially recognized or classified as true attempts at cooperation or whether they were

---


merely implemented out of the necessity of the time is purely suspect. Nevertheless, cooperation among Bryn Mawr College, Swarthmore College, and Haverford College was established for the purpose of cooperation in interdependent activities. The need for a better and more centralized library system brought forth the cooperation of Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College, and Scarritt College during the late 1930's.

The decade of the 1940's saw the founding of an entire new concept in higher education. The University Center in Georgia and the University Center in Virginia were among the first to incorporate the grouping of separate institutions into a cooperative center. The mid-1940's also witnessed another significant "first" in that Harvard and Radcliffe College agreed to permit an exchange of students between their respective campuses.8

Henderson has made a helpful documentation of cycles of collaboration for the period since World War II.

Utilizing admissions records as his chief source, he is able to follow the cooperative trend as a result of the effect of developments of a historical nature. For example, in the years immediately after World War II, institutions of higher education soon discovered that cooperation in admission processes greatly helped with the returning surge of post war servicemen. It is then interesting to note that, as the Korean War reduced enrollments, cooperating institutions retreated to a more competitive attitude. With the end of combat in Korea came a renewed surge of enrollment and cooperating institutions returned to their pre-war attitudes of assistance.9

Some of the other highlights of this period in inter-institutional cooperation appear to be fairly evident to those close to higher education. As previously mentioned, the University Center in Virginia was founded in 1946, and the Manhattan District -- "a cooperative program which


developed the atomic bomb -- in the same year spawned Argonne National Laboratory cooperative programs."\textsuperscript{10} The first of the three existing regional compacts, the Southern Regional Education Board, was formed. The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education took the lead of the Southern Board about the same time. "As a countermove to prevent a compulsory compact for the midwestern states, the Committee for Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago (CIC) was begun in 1957 with a major grant from the Carnegie Foundation."\textsuperscript{11}

Members of the C.I.C. include the aforementioned "Big Ten": Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue and Wisconsin, plus the University of Chicago. The startling uniqueness of this combination has to be that each of the participating institutions is really what Kerr has referred to as a "multiversity." Each offers an almost endless variety of programs. Thus, the question of why such institutions of

\textsuperscript{10}Howard, \textit{Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 7.
long standing competition, both academically and athletic-
ally, should want to combine into a committee of cooperation
has been raised. Bunnell and Johnson respond to this
question by asserting that "the demand for learning and the
quantity of knowledge have grown so rapidly in the past
decade that no one institution can possibly offer all the
courses, all the research opportunities, and all the
contacts with distinguished teachers that its students
need."12

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation did not
come into its own without long, careful planning on the
part of top-level deans and vice presidents representing
the eleven institutions. They convened in 1958 and began
to identify areas of teaching and research that were too
costly or too specialized for one institution to undertake.
In this light, one important ultimate objective was to
improve educational and public services at a minimum cost.
From this beginning the committee, its administrators, and

12Kevin P. Bunnell and Eldon L. Johnson, "Interinstitu-
tional Cooperation," in Higher Education: Some Newer
Developments, ed. by Samuel Baskin, New York, McGraw-Hill,
the faculties of the universities have developed a wide variety of cooperative programs.

Perhaps the most widely publicized effort to date has been the C.I.C. traveling-scholar program. Since the fall of 1963, graduate students have been able to cross institutional lines to study at other C.I.C. universities. The participating students benefit by gaining access to a variety of library collections, research facilities, and specialized courses. Traveling scholars are registered at their home universities and pay fees there, but they have access to the resources of eleven universities.13

The C.I.C. has recently developed cooperation in several foreign language areas. The member institutions cooperate in developing programs for the teaching of twenty-six less common languages, and through the traveling-scholar program the student has access to the languages offered by any of the eleven institutions. Other forms of C.I.C. cooperative programs include coordination of study-

abroad programs, a joint study of ways to stimulate economic
growth in the Middle West, joint preparation of alumni
publications, and the cooperative production of television
courses.\textsuperscript{14}

The real emphasis and expansion of interinstitutional
cooperative efforts came with the 1960's. With the
regional compacts (Western, Southern, and New England)
firmly implanted and the C.I.C. showing signs of stability
and early maturity of cooperative efforts, the attention of
cooperative involvement was drawn by increased urban or
community problems. Urban institutions were destined to
play a significant role in the establishment of intracity
cooperation to aid community oriented programs. In 1963
the Association of Urban Universities held a conference in
Louisville that encompassed the theme of the cooperative
involvement by urban institutions in community problems.
In that same year "a cooperative organization of colleges

\textsuperscript{14}Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Annual
Indiana, Purdue University, 1965, p. 5."
and universities in the Kansas City area (the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education) was also formed.\textsuperscript{15}

1962 saw renewed interest in the predominantly Negro colleges. Of significance was the fact that the separate Class "A" accreditation of such colleges was dropped, and they were all required to acquire the regular regional accreditation. As a result of the spirit of the civil rights movement, the cooperative trend or movement was extended to the predominantly Negro colleges. By 1964 several cooperative arrangements had been established between financially stable universities of the North and predominantly Negro colleges of the South.\textsuperscript{16}

The mid-1960's saw traditionally independent collegiate institutions drawn into all types of cooperative programs. A U. S. Office of Education study conducted in 1965-66 indicated that 1017 cooperative arrangements were in existence and that 245 more were in various planning

\textsuperscript{15}Howard, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 8.
It should be noted that, traditionally independent and separate, Catholic higher education has become deeply involved with such programs both with Catholic and non-Catholic Colleges.

Interinstitutional cooperation among Roman Catholic colleges had taken place on a small scale in bilateral relationships for some time, but in 1952, as a result of a National Catholic Education Association meeting, the Sister Formation Conference was created and cooperation followed at a greatly accelerated pace.\(^{18}\)

Likewise, "Protestant church boards and the institutions themselves have established cooperative arrangements both within and without the various denominations."\(^{19}\)

Many of the more than 800 church related institutions have been examining or experimenting with a wide variety of combinations. Relationships with non-religious associations have evolved and other colleges have found themselves in new groupings as a result of actions taken by their own

\(^{17}\)Coss, "Consortiums," *American Education*, p. 28.


church boards. J. Lynn Leavenworth, a director of the American Baptist Board of Education, has expressed in words some of the pressures of change being felt by church related colleges and seminaries in particular. He stated: "Ironically, it is likely to be practical considerations rather than devotion to ecumenism that dictates the future of our theological seminaries ... now it is consolidate or else! Within ten years even some of the most determined and proud of our seminaries will be driven to seek cooperative relationships in order to survive."20

One of the most recent significant stimuli for cooperative efforts has come from the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Federal Government has exerted positive pressure toward cooperative undertakings through its funding of over eighty cooperative programs during the 1967 fiscal year. The Education Professions Development Act which amended the Higher Education Act also provides continued evidence of the Federal position favoring most aspects of interinsti-

In conjunction with this position, the idea of achieving strength and quality through cooperation has been promoted and encouraged in nearly every segment of higher education and with an ever increasing pace.

The nature of recent cooperative efforts has become more complex and varied as numerous institutions have begun to develop arrangements in accordance with their individual needs. The multilateral, multi-program pattern was established with the University Center in Virginia and the University Center in Georgia. "This pattern has been followed closely by similar groups such as the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the College Center of the Finger Lakes, the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, the Central States College Association, and the Northern Plains Consortium, all of which have developed cooperative arrangements to serve their unique needs."22


In 1958 ten Middle Western liberal arts colleges (Beloit, Carleton, Coe, Cornell of Iowa, Grinnell, Knox, Lawrence, Monmouth, Ripon, and St. Olaf) joined in forming a corporation that would enable them, while maintaining their full independence, to strengthen their educational programs by accomplishing collectively what they could not accomplish individually. To date their joint efforts have carried them into such areas as standardization of scholarship qualifications, pooling of library resources, sharing of faculty, promotion of joint purchasing, research, and fund raising.

From the beginning, the research emphasis of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest has been evident. One of the Association's first accomplishments was a program in cooperation with the Argonne National Laboratory, a center for research into the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Students and faculty alike have gained access to valuable and rare laboratory equipment. The Association has also been quite involved in foreign language research projects, a cooperative purchase of institutional insurance, joint collection of NDEA loans, operation of a wilderness-area
field station, self-studies of institutional characteristics, and student and faculty conferences and seminars on current issues.\textsuperscript{23} International projects have also been undertaken with an experimental work-study program in India and a cooperative library exchange program with Cuttington College in Liberia.

One of the more recent corporate groups is the Great Lakes Association, organized in 1961 with the participation of the following twelve institutions: Albion, Antioch, Denison, DePauw, Earlham, Hope, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Wabash, and Wooster.\textsuperscript{24} The work of this association is characterized and summarized through its five existing broad program areas which include international education, graduate education, faculty development, educational research, and a visiting-scholar program.

Emphasis of this cooperative arrangement has been centered upon a comprehensive program of non-Western or

\textsuperscript{23}Bunnell and Johnson, "International Cooperation," p. 264.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid.
intercultural studies with both on-campus and overseas dimensions. With foundation support, overseas centers for student instruction and faculty research are being established and are representative of several distinct cultures. The Near East is represented through American University in Beirut, the Far East through Waseda University in Tokyo, and the largest arrangement, to date, is with the Latin-American Center in Bogota, established in 1964.25

Other major corporate groups of national reputation include the College Center of the Finger Lakes and an association of five major universities in the Washington, D.C. area. The College Center of the Finger Lakes is a corporation of seven small colleges in southern and central New York State. Established in 1961, its cooperative projects have included block bookings of performing artists, workshops on problems of college teaching and administrations, a cooperative visiting scholar program, and joint publication of a journal.

The Washington, D.C. consortium of five universities is an excellent example of cooperation at the graduate level. American, Catholic, Georgetown, and Howard Universities have joined forces at this level to provide a wider variety of student opportunity and to improve the overall quality of graduate instruction and research.

Aside from the large interstate compacts and the increasing numbers of multilateral arrangements, examples of which have been identified above, the present decade has inspired a tremendous growth in multilateral arrangements involving the bare minimum of organizational structure. Such arrangements do not embody the services of a separate corporate body or an independent executive director. Rather, they are true arrangements in an informal manner engaging only several institutions. Three prominent groups of colleges engaged in an informal cooperative arrangement include the Massachusetts group (Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts), the Pennsylvania group (Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, and the University of Pennsylvania) and the California group involving the Claremont Colleges, Occidental, the University of Redlands, and Whittier.
These three groups have a number of characteristics in common. Each is made up largely of liberal arts colleges, with the Massachusetts group involving a state University. The cooperating institutions are located close enough to one another so that transportation of students or teachers among colleges is feasible, if not always easy. The disciplines and services touched by these cooperative efforts are many rather than few, and the areas of cooperation tend to change over time in response to changing faculty strengths and student needs. The administration of the arrangements among the participating colleges tends to be informal and adjustable to evolving realities rather than highly structured.26

In direct contrast to the development of the compacts and multilateral corporations stands the true strength of the informal cooperative arrangement of colleges in relatively close proximity with each other. The strength of this type of cooperative enterprise lies not in complex structure but in the collective vision of the potential advantages of working together rather than duplicating and competing. According to Bunnell and Johnson, this is the type of cooperation that can most easily succeed.

Bilateral programs such as the Alfred-Syracuse arrangement and the Flint Junior College-Flint College of

26Bunnell and Johnson, "Interinstitutional Cooperation," p. 265.
The University of Michigan cannot be overlooked in tracing the development of cooperative efforts. Such arrangements between only two institutions are currently almost too numerous to count. Coss has indicated that a 1965-66 study by the U. S. Office of Education revealed at least 1017 cooperative arrangements had been established with at least 245 others in planning stages. The problem with an attempt at accuracy in a study of this type is the multitude of bilateral arrangements that are taken for granted by reporting institutions and are easily overlooked or they are not indicated as being in existence because of their seemingly insignificant role in the total area of cooperative efforts.

All of the aforementioned arrangements in interinstitutional cooperation appear to suggest that some form of voluntary cooperation can prove to be effective and beneficial for a contemporary institution of higher education. As can be seen from this review of historical developments in interinstitutional cooperation, such arrangements have

been realized as a result of a combination of factors such as the climate of the times, academic pressures, experimentalism, or merely the curiosity of institutions contemplating various necessary changes. It is also obvious from the preceding pages that the history of what has been done or is being done in interinstitutional cooperation is so diverse that it seems to encompass something for everyone and for every purpose.

It has been often suggested that the appropriate question for institutions contemplating possible cooperative efforts is not: What do we have in common? Rather, it should be: What can we do better in common, and what will we do? Cooperation between institutions in the coming years will necessitate a serious consideration of these questions. With well justified purpose, organization, means, and will, interinstitutional cooperation can and does offer a valuable new dimension to contemporary higher education.

II. North Carolina

The practice of interinstitutional cooperation has been evident in North Carolina since the earliest days of the trend. Arrangements in the late 1900's and early 1920's
represented only token efforts and were born out of necessity rather than as officially recognized and formally established cooperative efforts. An example of such an arrangement is the still existing cooperation between the School of Pharmacy of the University of North Carolina and the cooperative programs of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy which was first instituted as a cooperative effort in 1917.

Cooperative arrangements involving one or more institutions in North Carolina began as early as the 1930's. In 1931 the University of North Carolina and North Carolina State University employed a cooperative exchange of graduate students. Soon after this exchange was instituted, graduate students from nearby Duke University were included. 1933 brought the cooperation of the libraries of the University of North Carolina and Duke University. The program included joint research projects, central acquisitions, library development, and usage. This particular cooperative library program has shown steady expansion, "and new agreements have been established to include six college and university libraries and the Chemstrand Corporation Library
in the Research Triangle Park."28

Cooperative efforts between the two large state insti­tutions, North Carolina State and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, continued to expand in 1945 with the establishment of the jointly sponsored Institute of Statistics. At the same time, the Research and Home Eco­nomics cooperative arrangement was culminated between the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and North Carolina State University. Also, in 1948 North Carolina State began to expand its strong agricultural influence by parti­cipating with other Southern institutions in the Southern Regional Research Projects in Agriculture.29

The roots of more than 100 cooperative arrangements in North Carolina have been attributed to the decade of the 1950's. Of these at least 80 were merely cooperative transfer programs founded on a bilateral basis between North


29Ibid.
Carolina State University and Duke University and included similar arrangements with other institutions both in and out of the state.

The North Carolina Foundation of Church Related Colleges was founded in 1953 and currently consists of twenty-five two and four year institutions. Other significant developments in cooperative efforts on the part of North Carolina institutions include the 1957 arrangement between Appalachian State University and Indiana University in graduate programs in education, the 1958 establishment of the now famous Research Triangle Institute involving North Carolina State University, Duke University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the 1959 Duke University and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Joint Psycho-analytic Training Program.\footnote{North Carolina Board of Higher Education, "Inter-institutional Cooperation in North Carolina Colleges and Universities," p. 11.}

Not unlike the national trend in interinstitutional cooperation, the 1960's have brought the greatest increase in cooperative efforts in North Carolina. Diversity has
been the chief characteristic of the more than 120 arrangements initiated in the current decade. This is evidenced by the emphasis of cooperation in scientific areas, international programs, incorporation and involvement of Negro institutions, regional programs of service, cooperative research programs, and programs initiated with the aid of the Federal Government.

Institutions in close geographic proximity are currently beginning to recognize and receive the benefits of mutual effort as opposed to traditional competition. The 1968-69 academic year has witnessed the growth of metropolitan arrangements including the arrangement between Shaw University, Meredith College, Saint Augustine's College, and North Carolina State University in Raleigh, North Carolina. The Charlotte and Winston-Salem areas are also in the process of developing cooperative programs between their respective metropolitan institutions.

Probably the two greatest impacts on institutional cooperation in North Carolina have been forged by the establishment of two multilateral, multi-program arrangements. The Piedmont University Center with twenty-one
member institutions was established in 1963. It is a corporate organization with a full-time executive director and headquarters in Winston-Salem. Member institutions are concentrated in the western or Piedmont region of North Carolina. Likewise, a similar arrangement of colleges was established in 1966 and embodies some fifteen member institutions in the eastern regions of the state. The Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges is also a corporate body and has its headquarters in Raleigh. Both of these cooperative arrangements utilize similar programs; however, one basic difference is the fact that the Eastern group is involved with two-year as well as four-year institutions.

These two corporate centers of interinstitutional cooperation represent the two primary efforts at consortium type arrangements for collegiate institutions of North Carolina, and, as such, they have been employed as the focal point of this study.

The North Carolina history of cooperative programs, arrangements, and, more recently, the established consortium operations is not more evident than what is mentioned in this chapter. In summary, elementary and basic inter-
state arrangements were established in the early years of the movement; however, the vast expansion and creation of significant patterns of interinstitutional cooperation in the state of North Carolina has come with the more recent recognition of the potential of metropolitan efforts and the two primary multilateral arrangements of the 1960's.
A Review of the Literature

As has been indicated in chapter one, interinstitutional cooperation and related arrangements are currently enjoying a wide acceptance among college administrators. "As a device for overcoming mounting problems, cooperative programs linking institutions of higher education are multiplying."31 Even though much "lip service" is currently being given to this rather recent trend in higher education, very little is really known about its internal characteristics. Emphasis in most of the current literature treats only the descriptive or surface aspects of cooperative arrangements or patterns. A second problem, in a related sense, is the fact that "an appropriate classification system and a clearinghouse for current relevant materials on interinstitutional cooperation is badly needed."32


32 Ibid., p. 2.
In view of the current situation or status of any organization of literature in the area of interinstitutional cooperation, this chapter will be devoted to a presentation and survey of those sources incorporated into this particular study as well as to a brief consideration of other recent literature relating to the internal structure and problems of developing cooperative efforts. Emphasis will also be placed upon aspects of interinstitutional cooperation where information is lacking or the literature is difficult to acquire.

Within the past decade or so the literature descriptive of interinstitutional cooperation has grown considerably in volume and variety. This is due primarily to the vast expansion of the types of arrangements and the variety of institutions involved. The public and educational press have given widespread coverage and exposure to the planning, organization, financing, administration, and other facets of the cooperative concept. Evaluation of cooperative efforts virtually remains an untapped resource for information and future literature in the area of interinstitutional arrangements.
As has been previously indicated, one of the most obvious problems to those concerned with this "movement" in higher education today is not so much the lack of published discussions concerning interinstitutional cooperation but rather the locating of such information. Interinstitutional main entries and cross references in such basic sources as *Books in Print*, periodical index, government documents, or *Dissertation Abstracts* are virtually non-existent. Unedited, unclassified bulletins, brochures, proposals, conference reports, and papers presented at various meetings currently provide the most valuable information. Examples of such information include the following:


3. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., *Interinstitutional Cooperation: Hopes and Reality*, an address delivered to the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional

These are but a few of the many papers, bulletins, and conference reports that cry out for an appropriate classification system relevant to interinstitutional cooperation. This need is not only apparent to those directly involved with the mechanics of cooperative efforts, but it has been
echoed by the American Council on Education and the C.I.C. or Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago.

Much information concerning interinstitutional cooperation is initiated from within the more than 100 departments, or centers for higher education currently in existence. Such higher education research centers as located at the University of Michigan and the University of California at Berkeley have contributed extensively to the literature concerning the philosophy and mechanics of cooperation in higher education. However, Dibden, in an article from *Educational Record*, has indicated that even the centers for the study of higher education and the numerous graduate departments of higher education need to develop a strong interdisciplinary framework. He contends that strength in the literature and research of higher education rests with the incorporation and utilization of faculty and students representative of a variety of areas and not merely products of a college or school of education.33

A similar or related approach could be employed in expanding the literature relative to interinstitutional cooperation. The 1967 study by the U. S. Office of Education encourages the examination of works outside the field of education. The study suggests that "Riesman's assessment of institutional attitudes and behavior, Havighurst's analysis of four-year colleges as shaped by the forces of economy, demography, and ideology, and Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson's construct of radical-liberal and conservative-reactionary models for two-year institutions," open new avenues to the study of cooperative efforts. 34 The 1967 study also urges the consideration of "utopian" literature to facilitate a broader perspective for the area of institutional cooperation. The following excerpt is indicative of this suggestion.

The critical issue is to reconcile the ideology of the university with the organizational and administrative forms and patterns that higher education seems destined to take. For example, the ideology embraces personalized, student-faculty relationship,

34Howard, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, p. 3.
the development and worth of the individual, and 
the activation of social concern and involvement; 
yet our institutions increasingly become more 
massive, depersonalized, fragmented and obscure 
in purpose.35

That the descriptive literature on interinstitutional 
cooperation is extensive is obvious at this point. 
However, assessments of programs and the various arrange­
ments are few. The current literature permits only a sur­
face overview of interinstitutional cooperation. Categor­
izations of a basic sort have been accomplished by indivi­
duals such as Ertell, Koenker, Martorana, and Anderson. 
They organized programs by: (1) the number of partici­
pating units (bilateral, multilateral, constellational); 
(2) the distance separating institutions (metropolitan, 
statewide, regional, interregional, or national); (3) par­
ticipating clientele (church-related, small colleges, Roman 
Catholic institutions, or predominantly Negro colleges); 
(4) the nature of the activity (instructional, research, 
administrative, or service); (5) the level of instruction 
(precollege, undergraduate, graduate, or continuing educa­

35Howard, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher 
Education, p. 4.
tion); or (6) the legal basis of the agreement. Such basic groupings of related projects in the current literature suggest a void which should be filled by the incorporation of well classified comparative studies which might measure the effectiveness of institutional cooperation in meeting the new pressures confronting higher education. Little analysis has been made of the cooperative efforts between a well established university and a developing college. For example, what can a developing college contribute or bring to the program of a more established institution? If such projects have been undertaken, and if the results of an analysis of this type have been in print, the common scattering of information and literature concerning cooperative efforts has once again succeeded in deterring from the attempts at a well organized and well conceived information or data bank for interinstitutional cooperation. Hicks supports such a proposition, as he believes that the accumulation of literature and knowledge on how cooperative programs actually work, will eventually

convince higher education that interinstitutional cooperation is worth the additional investment.\textsuperscript{37}

Additional information concerning interinstitutional cooperation can also be obtained from several of the more common references used in higher education. The \textit{College Blue Book}, reprinted every three years; \textit{Lovejoy's Guide}, an indication of the cooperative programs of institutions but geared to the prospective student's level; and the American Council on Education's \textit{American Universities and Colleges}. Government projects at the state, regional, and national level may also prove of value in supplying statistical information. Private foundations and the more generalized reports of individual state governments can also yield information. Often these works contain duplications and can be found to be in conflict on various points of information. They are also unstandardized as to the semantics of cooperation; however, they still tend to

\textsuperscript{37}John H. Hicks, "Promoting Institutional Cooperation by Small Dribbles of Money," \textit{College and University Inter-institutional Cooperation}, Corning, New York, College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962, p. 46.
provide significant data on colleges participating in cooperative programs.38

Much of the literature used in this study was accumulated from (1) the North Carolina Board of Higher Education, (2) the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges, (3) the Piedmont University Center, (4) published U. S. Government studies and documents, (5) periodicals such as Liberal Education, Journal of Higher Education, and Educational Record, (6) various texts relating to higher education, and (7) miscellaneous materials from cooperating agencies such as the Great Lakes College Association, Associated Colleges of the Midwest, and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

Some of the earlier studies in interinstitutional cooperation have also played a significant role in the composition of this study. Two of the earliest works in this area include the published studies of Klein and Thomas (Co-operation and Co-ordination in Higher Education, 

1938) and Sanford (Interinstitutional Agreement in Higher Education, 1934). Both of these early studies deal with the general concept and developing idea for cooperation among institutions of higher education. In a related sense, Eckert contributed a survey study in 1953 which was a comprehensive overview of interinstitutionalism as it had developed to the early nineteen fifties with the outcome of the study expressing the author's genuine concern that cooperative efforts of the future should be employed primarily to develop academic excellence.

Newsom, in his study, "Furthering Interinstitutional Cooperation," provides an additional survey of cooperative


efforts up to the early 1950's. With an emphasis toward programs in the New York State System, he attempts to prove the futility of institutional competition and advocates cooperative programs in teacher education, community instruction, international relations, educational broadcasting, and library cooperation. Another survey which is significant in the area of program development in college and university cooperative efforts is the previously cited publication by Martorana, Messersmith and Newton. Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities was published in 1961 and includes a detailed discussion of factors conducive and deterrent to cooperative arrangements. Principles and guidelines for the establishment of such programs are also included in this publication.


have all published articles dealing with the procedures for establishing cooperative programs, the pros and cons of such arrangements, and their predictions for the future of interinstitutional cooperation. Related to these publications are the case studies of Associated Midwest Universities, Western Governors' Conference, and a publication on interinstitutional cooperation.


by Fitzroy (Cooperation Among All of the Institutions in an Area) in which he describes the programs of the University Center in Virginia and outlines problems encountered and programs that are anticipated.  

Salwak, in 1964, and Wells, in 1967, published articles specifically related to the development of programs within the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. However, each of these case studies has a direct relationship to the development of future programs for all cooperative endeavors.

In keeping with the previously expressed desires of Martorana, the C.I.C., the Association of American Colleges, and the U. S. Office of Education Study of 1967, chapters three and four of this study will present an

---

50 Herbert W. K. Fitzroy, Cooperation Among All of the Institutions in an Area, Richmond, Virginia: University Center in Virginia, 1964, pp. 1-5.


attempt at the evaluation of two established cooperating centers in North Carolina. The absence of evaluative studies is quite apparent in the preceding review of the literature in the area of interinstitutional cooperation. Evaluative criteria in this study will consist of various attitudes toward the general aspects and mechanics of cooperative arrangements as expressed through a survey questionnaire by persons actively engaged in the programs of the two cooperating centers.
CHAPTER III

ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT AND THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

As it has been indicated in the previous chapters of this study, the primary purpose of this undertaking is to attempt to survey various attitudes as expressed on a written questionnaire by participating committee and commission members of the Piedmont University Center and the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges. Basic or essential to a survey of this nature is a clear understanding or interpretation of the concept of "attitude" as well as a concise and comprehensive knowledge of the construction techniques employed in the design of a questionnaire instrument for the purpose of attempting to measure attitude.

Thurstone and Chave have referred to attitude as a concept whereby man devotes the sum total of his "inclinations or feelings, prejudices or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions, to any
specific topic."¹ Oppenheim has also stated that attitude "is a state of readiness, a tendency to act or react in a certain manner when confronted with certain stimuli."² Also, Thurstone has included the term "opinion" into any discussion or definition of attitude, as he has written that "an opinion symbolizes an attitude and that the opinion has interest only in so far as we interpret it as a symbol of attitude."³ Similarly, like Thurstone's conception of attitude and opinion, the questionnaire instrument for this survey was constructed with the expressed purpose of using the opinions expressed in the returns as the means for measuring the attitudes of the respondents. It is obvious that this type of survey leaves itself open to much question as to its validity or reliability in terms of accurately assessing attitude. Neither the opinions

¹L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave, A Psychophysical Method and the Experiment with A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward the Church, Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago Press, 1929, p. 6.


gathered or the overt actions of a respondent constitute in any sense an infallible guide to his inclinations and preferences which constitute his attitude toward a topic or subject. Thus, it appears that those engaged in this type of study "must remain content to use opinions or other forms of action merely as indices of attitude."\(^4\)

Through the utilization of an attitude scale, the investigation can, at best, measure the attitude as expressed with the full realization that the subject may be consciously hiding his true attitude or that the social pressure of the situation has made him really believe what he expresses on the scale.

Edwards has noted three distinct methods or techniques utilized in attempting to learn about an individual's attitude. Such techniques include (1) direct observation of behavior, (2) direct questioning, and (3) the utilization of attitude statements.\(^5\) One approach to the problem of


investigating attitudes has been to observe the behavior of individual with respect to a psychological object or subject, rather than to ask direct questions, either verbally or written, about how the person feels about the subject or object. Limitations to this approach are quite obvious. For example, if a researcher was interested in observing the attitudes of a large number of individuals, he may not have the opportunity to observe in detail the behavior of each individual.

If a certain form of behavior is observed by the researcher, it, of course, may also fail to reveal the true feelings of the individual under observation. According to Edwards, there are many cases where the behavior of an individual is designed to conceal feelings. He further states that there is no necessary one-to-one correspondence between overt behavior and attitudes. If a researcher expects to infer attitudes or feelings from direct observations of behavior, aside from having a well trained and

---

perceptive eye, he must always be willing to consider the possibility that his inference will be incorrect simply because the behavior may be determined by factors other than the individual's feelings.

In view of the many limitations inherent in direct observation as a technique of measuring attitude, and due to the obvious expertise needed to perceive such behavior, it might seem logical to assume that if a researcher wanted to know how individuals feel about some particular subject or psychological object, the best procedure would appear to be to ask them directly. By means of direct questions the researcher might be able to eventually classify individuals into three groups: those with favorable attitudes, those with unfavorable attitudes, and those who say that they are doubtful or undecided about their attitudes or opinions.

At once, an outstanding disadvantage to this type of investigation should be clear and obvious to the researcher. He must be cognizant of the reluctance of many individuals to give public expression to their feelings or attitudes. It appears that "only when the social atmosphere is free from
felt or actual pressures toward conformity might we expect to obtain evidence about a person's attitudes by means of direct questioning."

Most devices for measuring attitudes have to do with a single situation or institution and are limited to the development of quantitative scales for indicating the direction and the intensity of the attitude at the time of testing. A very high score on such an attitude scale thus means a highly favorable (or unfavorable) attitude toward the object in question; a very low score indicates a strong feeling in the opposite direction, with the point of indifference somewhere between the two.

The advent of attitude scales or attitude statements has been attributed to Thurstone. Thurstone's most commonly known technique for the measurement of attitude is his "method of equal-appearing intervals." In the construction of an attitude scale by this method, the first step is


to secure as wide an expression of opinion concerning the point at issue as possible. From the mass of data secured in this way a large number of statements can be chosen according to the following criteria: (1) the series as a whole should comprise a range of opinions from the most to the least favorable; (2) each statement should be short, permitting (as far as can be judged) only one interpretation; (3) each statement should embody a single idea only; (4) each statement should be put in such a form that it can be either accepted or rejected; (5) each statement should imply something of importance with respect to the institution in question; (6) as far as the experimenter can judge, each statement should be fairly evenly spaced along the continuum from most to least favorable, and should include some that are near the midpoint of indifference; (7) the number chosen should be definitely greater than the number of statements proposed to remain in the scale.9

Each of the statements to be tested for possible inclusion into a Thurstone scale is then typed on a sepa-

rate card. A group of judges, usually numbering around two hundred individuals, is chosen by the researcher. They proceed to arrange the carded statements according to their favorability or unfavorability and attempt to make the arrangement of the cards in such a way that the favorableness of the expressed attitudes between the first and second pile will be equal to that between the second and third, and so on until the last pile. When all of the card arrangements are completed, the data is tabulated and pooled. The final or most commonly selected items are then indicated for inclusion into the finished scale. A measure of variability is then found for each of the items. Items that show a large variability in judgments are eliminated on the assumption that they probably convey different meanings to different people. After the variability of each item has been substantiated, those items that show the least variance in judgment are eliminated from inclusion in the final scale. When the scale has been completed, the subject is merely asked to place a check before each item with which he agrees.
In an attempt to save the time and labor of a judging group, Likert proposed a scale for the measurement of attitude in which he advocated that the subjects be asked to express the "extent" of their agreement with each of the scale items, instead of merely indicating agreement or disagreement in all-or-none fashion.\textsuperscript{10} Research terminology of those who have utilized the Likert scale usually varies to some extent, but in general it conforms to the following scheme: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. Scores are given for each question or item on the attitude scale depending on the response made. The five possible responses on a Likert scale may be weighted in terms of numerical value 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 or 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1. Either a 1 or 5 is consistently favorable or unfavorable, although the continuum is reversed in about half of the statements contained in such a scale. That is, about half of the scale statements are worded so that a strongly agree response indicates a favorable reaction to the issue in question, while the other half of the

statements are worded so that a strongly agree response indicates an unfavorable reaction. The score for the individual subject is the sum of all scores for the separate items. This method of "summated ratings" was originally developed by Likert; however, Edwards and Kennery indicate that the term "summated ratings" was introduced by Bird in an attempt to describe Likert's procedures.

According to Goodenough, the relative merits of the two methods of attitude measurement described above have never been adequately tested. There are, however, certain comparisons that can be made. Researchers who have utilized Likert's method have commonly selected items of a rather definitely favorable or unfavorable import. Neutral opinions are then usually indicated by rating the attitude toward the item as "undecided" or "no opinion."


12Ibid., p. 72.

13Goodenough, Mental Testing, p. 381.
Thurstone has attempted to include in his scale one or more items or statements that in themselves indicate a neutral attitude. Advocates of the Likert technique commonly include a greater number of items in their scale than those utilizing the method of equal-appearing intervals. This creates a longer scale for Likert users and thus could tend to neutralize the time saved by not using the Thurstone technique. Goodenough contends that "it has been repeatedly shown that if the items on a Likert scale are well chosen and properly worded, the self-correlations obtained for the scales developed by the Likert method are usually high enough to be satisfactory for most of the purposes for which the scales are likely to be used."\textsuperscript{14}

Further evidence of a quasi-reliability in the Likert technique can be found in the following statement by Edwards and Kennery:

As far as we can determine there is nothing of a practical nature to indicate that a judging group, in the Thurstone sense, is a prerequisite for the construction of an adequate attitude scale.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14}Goodenough, \textit{Mental Testing}, p. 381.

The position of Edwards and Kennery concerning the use of the Likert scale is also substantiated by Oppenheim as he contends that "Likert scales tend to perform very well when it comes to a reliable, rough ordering of people with regard to a particular attitude." 

The preparation of an adequate attitude scale needs little further attention. However, previously mentioned pioneers in the area of attitude measurement such as Bird, Likert, Thurstone and Chave, and Edwards and Kilpatrick, have suggested various informal criteria for editing statements to be utilized in the construction of attitude scales. This multitude of suggestions is summarized below:

1. Avoid statements that refer to the past rather than to the present.
2. Avoid statements that are factual or capable of being interpreted as factual.
3. Avoid statements that may be interpreted in more than one way.
4. Select statements that are believed to cover the entire range of the affective scale of interest.
5. Each opinion should express as far as possible only one thought or idea.
6. Statements should be free from related or confusing concepts. 

---

16 Oppenheim, *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*, p. 141.

It was with the above basic guidelines under consideration that the attitude scale used in this study was developed. Also, items were drawn from a related survey conducted by the North Carolina Board of Higher Education in 1968. The Board of Higher Education study was primarily a statewide survey of all institutions of higher education and attempted to identify in as much detail as possible every cooperative arrangement or agreement currently in existence. This study did not in any way attempt to measure attitudes or opinions toward such arrangements. Additional ideas incorporated into the construction of the attitude scale utilized for this particular study were extracted from publications by Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson and by Moore.

Methodology of the Study

The methodology utilized in this attitude survey employed the basic tenets of the Likert technique of


assessing opinion or attitude. It was anticipated that those selected participants receiving the written questionnaire would, as a result of their direct involvement with one of the two primary cooperating agencies in North Carolina, express perceivable opinions or attitudes toward a multilateral, multiprogram arrangement for interinstitutional cooperation.

The survey instrument for this study consisted of three parts. Part one of the questionnaire involved information gathering statements. Such statements included requests for the name of the participating institution, the institution's cooperating center, the type of institution (private, church-related, state supported), the title of the person responding (professor, academic dean, dean of students, librarian, business manager), and the length of time the respondent has served on a commission or committee of his cooperating agency.

Part two of the questionnaire consisted of thirty statements to which the respondents were requested to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each
item. Both Edwards and Goodenough have strongly advocated the inclusion of at least twenty such statements and no more than forty when the Likert technique is employed to measure attitude. The sample was given the standard five choices of agreement or disagreement in accordance with the Likert technique. These choices included "strongly agree," "agree," "no opinion," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." An effort was made to include a relatively even distribution of positively and negatively oriented statements. The final breakdown of statements used in this survey revealed the inclusion of eighteen positive statements and twelve statements of a negative type. Such a combination of positively and negatively stated items can help alleviate a common problem associated with the use of this type of survey. If all statements were of a positive nature, it would not be uncommon for the respondent to reply to the items in a particular way, almost independent of the item content. The response set problem is not completely overcome by the inclusion of both positive and negative statements; however, a good balance of both types will help combat a set pattern of response. (See page 128 of the appendixes for entire questionnaire.)
Part three of the instrument consisted of four statements of a summary nature. One of the four statements was strongly positive toward cooperative arrangements and a second of the four items was very negative in nature toward the concept of the cooperative agency and its programs. The remaining two statements were designed to indicate a slightly favorable reaction or a slightly negative opinion toward the existing cooperative program in which the respondent is currently involved. It was recognized that the inclusion of these four rather obvious statements would not necessarily provide true indications of opinion or attitude toward the cooperating agencies due to their rather "loaded" nature. Nevertheless, it was hoped that through the utilization of the percentage of positive individual response to each statement, a general or summary opinion could be acquired.

The four-page questionnaire was mailed to a selected sample of 277 faculty members and administrators who, according to the current committee and commission membership lists of each cooperating center, were active participants in one or more of the center programs. One hundred
twenty of the questionnaires were sent to commission members of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges and 157 were mailed to committee members participating in the programs of the Piedmont University Center. The sample receiving the questionnaire included faculty and administrative institutional representatives of the following working committees of the Piedmont University Center:

sion on Visiting Scholars, (8) Commission on Student Affairs. The current list of committee and/or commission members of each cooperating agency was obtained with the cooperation of its Executive Director.

Those in the sample who were considered to be "administration" included Registrars, Admission Directors, Head Librarians, Business Managers, Academic Deans, and Student Personnel Deans. "Faculty" respondents included all professors, some of whom serve their institution as Department Chairmen. The Presidents of the member institutions of each cooperating center were not included in the survey. The primary reason for their exclusion was the fact that they do not comprise a working committee or commission of a center even though they usually attempt to meet together informally at least once during the academic year. Also, it was felt that the individual faculty and other administrative officers of each of the member institutions, because of their more active involvement with the actual programs of each center, would be in a much more advantageous position to express their opinions.
According to Goodenough, the initial return or response to this type of mailed questionnaire usually approximates 30 per cent thus making a follow-up letter of request for a response a necessity.\textsuperscript{20} Such was not the case in this study, as the initial response appears to have been quite adequate. Enclosed with each questionnaire was a covering letter, personally addressed to each of the selected participants. (See pages 126 and 127 of appendixes for content of covering letters.) Of those questionnaires sent to the 157 committee members of the Piedmont University Center, 116 or approximately seventy-four per cent responded. Of the 120 questionnaires sent to the commission members of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges, sixty or exactly fifty per cent responded. Several reasons can be suggested for the lesser response from the members of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges. The Piedmont University Center is currently completing its fifth year of operation whereas the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges is completing only its third year of

\textsuperscript{20}Goodenough, \textit{Mental Testing}, p. 382.
existence. Several assumptions can be made as the result of a two year difference in the establishment of the centers. Several returns from those sampled in the Eastern Association indicated that the respondent felt he had not been a faculty or administrative representative to a center commission long enough to warrant his completion of the instrument. Others felt that the cooperative efforts of the Eastern Association had not had time to mature or realize their full potential, and hence the respondents were hesitant to complete the instrument.

Geographic distance in North Carolina should also be considered when one is undertaking a survey of this type. Lenoir Rhyne College is located in the Western region of the state as are many of the Piedmont University Center member institutions. It is felt that a significant reason for the difference in response was simply because the administration and faculty members of the other Piedmont University Center member institutions felt more compelled to respond to a study being conducted by a fellow representative to their Piedmont University Center. Faculty and administrators from the Eastern region of the state would
be much less inclined to respond as heavily as those of the Piedmont University Center for the reason stated above.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

Upon receipt of the 176 questionnaires out of a total sample of 277 requested, the collected data was divided into nine different groupings for the purpose of tabulating the frequency of response to the five choices indicated for each of the thirty statements on the instrument. The nine groups created for the proper analysis of data collected in this study included the following: (1) the total N for all respondents to the study which equalled 176, (2) the total N for all respondents from the Piedmont University Center which equalled 116, (3) the total N for all respondents from the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges which equalled seventy, (4) the responses from the administrators representing the Piedmont University Center whose N was equal to forty-three, (5) the responses from the administrators representing the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges whose N was equal to thirty-eight, (6) the responses from the faculty members representing the
Piedmont University Center whose N equalled seventy-three, (7) the responses from the faculty members representing the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges whose N equalled twenty-two, (8) the responses from all administrators representing both cooperating centers whose N equalled eighty-one, and (9) the responses from all faculty members representing both cooperating centers whose N was ninety-five. In brief, all data collected in this survey was broken down into the aforementioned nine groupings in the belief that perceivable differences in attitudes or opinions toward the existing cooperative agencies might be more readily identified.

Once the nine groups were determined, the frequency of agreement response to each question was tabulated. For example, in group one which comprised the total N for this study or 176 respondents, the reaction to the first question of the survey was tabulated as follows: strongly agree - 63, agree - 109, no opinion - 2, disagree - 2, strongly disagree - 0. This procedure of tabulating the frequency of agreement response to each item of the survey was repeated for all nine of the identified groups.
In accordance with the Likert technique, numerical values were assigned to each degree of agreement. The eighteen positively stated questions in the instrument received the numerical values 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 which applied to the five response choices open to the participants. The twelve statements in the instrument written in a negative manner received the numerical values 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 or exactly the opposite values of the positively oriented statements. Thus with a total of thirty statements in the instrument, complete agreement with all items would provide a maximum agreement index of 150. The completely negative response, or response to all items in a "strongly disagree" indication, would result in an index of only thirty.

With the established range of 150 to thirty, agreement to disagreement, the mean quotient of agreement for each of the nine groups was computed. This procedure was accomplished by multiplying the Likert value of the responses to each question (5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1) by the frequency of response to the question. Using question one and group one as examples of this step in the procedure, it is noted that
sixty-three respondents of the total N of 176 for group one indicated a strongly agree or five point response. Hence, the Likert value of five was multiplied by sixty-three. One hundred nine of the group one N of 176 indicated that they "agreed" with the statement. The corresponding point value of four for "agree" was then multiplied 109 times. Two of the N of 176 indicated "no opinion" for a multiplied value of six. Two respondents indicated disagreement with the first statement for a multiplied point value of four. None of the 176 respondents comprising group one of this study indicated a "strongly disagree" response to statement one of the instrument. This multiplication of the Likert value by the frequency of response to each statement was repeated for all thirty items on the questionnaire.

The next step in determining the mean for each of the nine groups within the established agreement-disagreement range of 150-30 was to add the total values for each statement as determined by the aforementioned multiplication process and divide the total by the group N. Again using group one as an example, the total point value for the first statement of the instrument was 761. The point
values of the remaining twenty-nine statements were computed in a like manner and all total points were added together for a group total of 18,753. This figure was then divided by the total N for group one or 176. This process produced the desired group mean agreement quotient of 106.55. Since group one represented the total N or all respondents to this study the figure of 106.55 is indicative of the mean quotient of agreement on the part of all respondents to all items on the questionnaire. The results of the previously mentioned process of determining the mean agreement quotient for the total N of each of the nine groups is illustrated on Table 1, page 89.

As has been previously stated, there appears to be general agreement among those engaged in attitude assessment research studies that expressed or indicated opinions are symbolic of an individual's attitude toward the subject or object in question. In the case of this particular survey, the analysis and interpretation of data collected was based upon the assumption that the agreement values for each statement in the instrument were indicative of or reflected the attitude of the respondent. A high agreement
### TABLE 1

**MEAN SCORES ON SUMMATED RATINGS ATTITUDE SCALE WITH A RANGE OF 150 TO 30 - POSITIVE TO NEGATIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Sample</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>106.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Piedmont University Center</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total A.E.N.C.C.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total Administrators</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>106.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Faculty</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. P.U.C. Administrators</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>108.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A.E.N.C.C. Administrators</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. P.U.C. Faculty</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A.E.N.C.C. Faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>106.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
value is accepted as an indication of a favorable attitude toward that particular aspect of interinstitutional cooperation described in that particular statement of the instrument. Thus by an analysis of all of the agreement values expressed by the participants of the nine groups, an assessment of an overall attitude toward interinstitutional cooperation through a multilateral-multi-program center appears to be quite possible.

In interpreting the data illustrated in Table 1, it is important to note that all nine groups identified in this study have indicated a mildly favorable or agreeable attitude toward interinstitutional cooperation as they have experienced it to date. The average score of agreement (based on the range of 30 - 150 or "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree") for the entire sample responding to the survey (group one) was 106.55. For the total respondents from the Piedmont University Center (group two) the mean was 107.22, and for the total respondents representing the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges (group three) the mean score was 105.25. The slight difference in the average agreement between the Piedmont Center respon-
dents and those of the Eastern Association cannot be considered as being of any significance.

The assumed insignificance of this slight difference is not merely because of the purely physical numerical values. Rather, Oppenheim and others have indicated that the neutral point on a scale of this type is not necessarily the midpoint between two extreme scale scores (in this instance 30 and 150). Also, scores could vary for several reasons such as a lukewarm response, lack of knowledge, lack of an opinion of attitude on the part of a respondent, or because of the presence of both strongly positive and strongly negative responses.

The most obvious difference of note between the nine groups is found in Table 1 between the administrators representing the Piedmont Center (group four) and the administrators representing the Eastern Association (group five). The average agreement for group four was 108.23, whereas the average agreement for group five was slightly

21Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, p. 140.
less at 104.42. Again, it is assumed that the individual's tenure of involvement or direct participation in the programs of his cooperating center could account for this slight variation in agreement or favorability on the part of the two groups of administrators.

Of even greater import is the fact that Table 1 reveals almost no disagreement between the agreement attitudes of groups eight and nine. Group eight, or all administrators responding to the study, showed a mean agreeability quotient of 106.44 and group nine, or all faculty members responding, showed an average agreeability of 106.64. Taken together, these two groups constitute the total N of this study or 176 respondents with the previously indicated average agreeability index of 106.55.

In summarizing the findings revealed in Table 1 of this study, it is quite apparent that there was little if any difference between the favorability or agreeability measured for all nine groups. The groups expressed a favorable attitude toward the two primary interinstitutional cooperative efforts as they know them and as they currently exist in the state of North Carolina.
To provide a further analysis of data collected in this study, the mean agreement quotient for each item of the survey instrument was computed according to the responses of each of the nine groups. Utilizing the same point values assigned to the five possible responses to each statement (5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1), the Likert values were again multiplied by the frequency of response to the statement. The totals were then added and the total figure for each statement was divided by the total N of each group. Referring once again to the first statement and the response of group one as an example, the point total for all responses to this statement was 761. This figure was then divided by the total group N of 176 which produced a mean favorability quotient of 4.32 for the first statement. A favorable response to this statement by the participants in group one (in this case the total N of the study) is obvious as the mean favorability quotient was computed to be 4.32 out of a possible strongly favorable response of 5.0. The mean favorability quotient for each statement in the survey, as computed from the responses from each of the nine groups is illustrated by Table 2 found on pages 94 through 100.
### TABLE 2

**MEAN SCALE VALUE OF AGREEMENT FOR EACH QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT AS REFLECTED BY NINE GROUPS**

<p>| QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT                                                                 | TOTAL  | TOTAL  | TOTAL  | PUC    | AENCC  | PUC    | AENCC  | TOTAL  | TOTAL  | TOTAL  | PUC    | AENCC  | PUC    | AENCC  | TOTAL  | TOTAL  | TOTAL  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                                                                        | N-176  | N-116  | N-60   | N-43   | N-38   | N-73   | N-22   | N-81   | N-95   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 1. Membership in a cooperating agency generally enhances the program of a college.     | 4.32   | 4.36   | 4.26   | 4.41   | 4.21   | 4.32   | 4.31   | 4.32   | 4.32   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 2. The fact of the membership of your institution in a cooperating agency is recognized by most of your faculty members. | 3.89   | 3.99   | 3.70   | 4.16   | 3.71   | 3.89   | 3.68   | 3.95   | 3.84   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3. Cooperation among colleges decreases instructional costs.                           | 3.44   | 3.42   | 3.48   | 3.44   | 3.42   | 3.41   | 3.59   | 3.43   | 3.45   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 4. There is a general problem of communication among the member institutions of the cooperative center. | 2.89   | 2.91   | 2.85   | 2.93   | 2.84   | 2.90   | 2.86   | 2.88   | 2.89   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PUC</th>
<th>AENCC</th>
<th>PUC</th>
<th>AENCC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>AENCC</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional cooperation increases the scope and quality of the educational program at participating college.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is often difficult for busy administrators and faculty to give enough time to the complication of cooperation.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cooperative arrangements help to reduce geographic isolation.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Membership of your institution in a cooperating agency will foster the future growth and development of its programs.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</td>
<td>N-176</td>
<td>N-116</td>
<td>N-60</td>
<td>N-43</td>
<td>N-38</td>
<td>N-73</td>
<td>N-22</td>
<td>N-81</td>
<td>N-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most faculty members utilize opportunities available through your cooperating agency.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cooperative arrangements threaten the autonomy of the individual institution.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A combining of resources of colleges reduces unnecessary expense.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Variance in college calendars hinders the successful operation of cooperative programs.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooperative arrangements increase the opportunities available to students.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</td>
<td>N-176</td>
<td>N-116</td>
<td>N-60</td>
<td>N-43</td>
<td>N-38</td>
<td>N-73</td>
<td>N-22</td>
<td>N-81</td>
<td>N-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Efforts should be made to expand the existing cooperative arrangements.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Interinstitutional cooperation suffers from the domination of stronger member colleges.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Taking into account all aspects of a cooperating agency, the results are worth the effort.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There is a need for greater interdependence of colleges in today's society.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Students are aware of opportunities available through a cooperating agency.</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</td>
<td>N-176</td>
<td>N-116</td>
<td>N-60</td>
<td>N-43</td>
<td>N-38</td>
<td>N-73</td>
<td>N-22</td>
<td>N-81</td>
<td>N-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lack of geographic proximity of participating colleges makes cooperative efforts difficult.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cooperation significantly increases the economy of operation of an institution.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cooperative arrangements are currently restricted because a single member institution believes that it can function successfully by itself.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. There is a need to increase the awareness of faculty members to the cooperative programs already in existence.</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</td>
<td>TOTAL N-176</td>
<td>TOTAL N-116</td>
<td>TOTAL N-60</td>
<td>TOTAL N-43</td>
<td>TOTAL N-38</td>
<td>TOTAL N-73</td>
<td>TOTAL N-22</td>
<td>TOTAL N-81</td>
<td>TOTAL N-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. A deterrent to cooperative arrangements is the reluctance of college personnel to explore the possibilities inherent in cooperation with other institutions.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Cooperation among member colleges provides a small institution with the benefits of a larger institution.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Differences in organizational structure of a college have an unfavorable effect on the cooperative enterprise.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A cooperative attitude toward other institutions exists at your college.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</td>
<td>N-176</td>
<td>N-116</td>
<td>N-60</td>
<td>N-43</td>
<td>N-38</td>
<td>N-73</td>
<td>N-22</td>
<td>N-81</td>
<td>N-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Cooperative arrangements result in better utilization of physical and personnel resources.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Administrative policies of your institution reduce opportunities for cooperation.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Cooperation among colleges is an efficient means of enriching college programs.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Basic differences in institutional philosophies have hindered the cooperative effort among member colleges.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of the data incorporated into Table 2, page 94, indicates results or findings which are very similar to those found through a study of the figures contained in Table 1. Whereas Table 1 was organized to show how the total N for all nine groups reacted to the questionnaire as a whole, Table 2 was designed to indicate how each of the nine groups responded to the thirty individual statements included in the instrument. The mean scores used in Table 1 reflect the average agreeability index based on the possible range of 30 to 150 when dealing with all thirty statements in the instrument as a whole. In Table 2 the figures are representative of the average agreeability index based upon the Likert technique range of 1 - 5 which is employed when an item by item analysis is conducted to determine if the different groups comprising the sample vary to any extent in their indicated agreement or disagreement with each statement.

As previously indicated from Table 1, the item by item analysis produced no obvious difference in the degree of agreement on particular statements by any of the nine groups. Table 2 provides a ready resource for indicating
in an illustrated fashion the agreement among the sample groups as far as their reaction to each of the individual statements was concerned.

The single most evident difference or disagreement between one or more of the groups as expressed by their reaction to any single statement was between groups four and five. The statement in question was number nine and concerned whether or not the respondents agreed or disagreed that most faculty members of their respective college utilize opportunities available through their cooperating agency. On the five point scale for mean agreeability quotients, a statement receiving an index of 5 to 3.5 was considered as being favorable or agreeable to respondents. 3.50 to 2.51 indicated a neutral or no opinion response and 2.50 to 1 indicated a negative or disagreeable response. The Piedmont Center administrators indicated an average or mean agreeability figure of 3.09. Based on the ranges for agreement, neutral or no opinion, and disagreement on the five point maximum agreement scale, the 3.09 index would place the reaction of that particular group in the neutral or no opinion area of the
scale. In contrast to this response, the administrators of the Eastern Association produced an agreement index of 2.44 thus placing their indicated attitude toward this statement in the disagreement area of the scale. Both of these reactions to the question of whether or not the respondents felt their faculty colleagues were well aware of or utilized the opportunities available to them through their cooperative center were indicative of a possible lack of knowledge concerning all programs of a particular center on the part of the faculty of the participating institutions. It could also be assumed that communication between the administrators and faculty members concerning their (faculty) involvement in center programs and opportunities has been lacking. The apparent inability of the responding administrators to take it upon themselves to judge whether or not their faculty colleagues utilize the opportunities of their cooperating center cannot be ignored.

Again, the relative youth of the Eastern Association can be an assumed reason for the negative reaction to statement nine. However, the reaction of the Piedmont
Center administrators was not as favorable as could be expected. Administrative and faculty communication problems, as well as a possible lack of knowledge on the part of the administrators as to all programs available for utilization by faculty members, appear to be the primary reasons for the indicated reaction to statement nine found on Table 2.

To summarize the data presented in Table 2 of this study is to repeat the findings indicated in Table 1. A statement by statement breakdown of responses by each of the nine groups produced few obvious differences in attitude. As was reflected in the data of Table 1, the response to the individual items of the questionnaire was what could be termed mildly favorable when taken as a whole. Tables 1 and 2 reflect a generally agreeable attitude toward the various facets of interinstitutional cooperation as expressed by the nine groups which were designated for the purpose of providing a detailed evaluation of the total sample.

The third analysis of data collected in this survey consisted of a rank order distribution of the thirty state-
ments from the questionnaire according to the mean favorability quotient indicated for each statement as illustrated in Table 2. As has been previously indicated, the range of the mean favorability quotient for statements receiving agreement was 5 to 3.51. For statements where a neutral or no opinion reaction was measured the range was 3.50 to 2.51. Statements indicative of an unfavorable reaction were identified by a mean favorability quotient range of 2.50 to 1. These ranges and/or cut off points in the ranking of statements according to their computed mean favorability or agreement quotient are identified in Table 3 found on page 106.

The data assimilated in Table 3 has been computed in the same manner as that presented in Table 2. The mean favorability or agreement index for each of the thirty questionnaire statements has been arranged in a vertical rank order ranging from the highest indicated degree of agreement (4.32 for statement number one) to the lowest index of agreement or unfavorability which is statement twenty-two, recipient of an index of only 2.01.
TABLE 3

RANK ORDER OF QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS BASED ON THE MEAN AGREEABILITY SCALE VALUES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>MEAN SCALE VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of significance is the fact that seventeen of the thirty statements were considered to be favorable or agreeable to the respondents. Eleven statements constituted those included in the neutral or no opinion area of response, and only two statements received a mean quotient negative enough to place them in the disagreeable area of response. Of the seventeen agreeable statements, the content of the first nine statements of the rank order could be considered to be information of a general nature pertaining to interinstitutional cooperation. To this type of statement the response received ranged from 4.32 to 4.05 which was indicative of a strongly agreeable to a mildly agreeable attitude toward the first nine statements of the rank order shown on Table 3.

Statements pertaining more to the specifics of, or mechanics associated with, cooperative efforts tended to dominate the bottom half of the mildly agreeable portion of the scale as well as the entire neutral or no opinion area of the rank ordering of statements. Such statements dealt with economic considerations, geographic concerns, differences in college policies and calendars, awareness of students and faculty, and communication considerations.
It appears obvious that the respondents were much more willing to commit themselves to a definite opinion or attitude in terms of the general nature of statements 1, 29, 16, 14, 5, 13, 10, 26, and 8. In the remaining thirteen statements the sample was called upon to react more to specifics, many of which reflected to a degree their (the respondents) attitude toward the programs and operation of their particular cooperating center as well as their personal attitudes toward their institutional policies and practices with regard to its involvement in a cooperating agency. Hence, a more middle of the road or neutral attitude prevailed in the responses to eleven out of the bottom thirteen statements as indicated by the rank order. Also, it must be assumed that many of the respondents did not know of or were not certain about specific aspects of their involvement with a cooperating agency, and therefore, they found it quite easy to indicate "no opinion."

Several related statements should be considered individually when examining the data contained in Table 3. Statements seven and nineteen both deal with the question of whether or not cooperative agencies can affect the geo-
graphic isolation of colleges and whether the distance in terms of mileage between member institutions hinders or makes cooperative efforts difficult. The response to statement seven indicated quite strongly (3.98) that cooperative arrangements helped to reduce the geographic isolation of an institution. However, when the respondents considered statement thirteen which intimated that a lack of geographic proximity on the part of member institutions makes cooperative arrangements difficult, they indicated an agreement index of only 2.77. Statement nineteen was a negatively stated item, and when computing the average agreeability index for such an item the usual 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 point values are reversed and computation is on a 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 point value for strongly agree to strongly disagree. In this particular example the 2.77 index was interpreted to mean the respondents indicated that they agreed that the lack of geographic proximity of member colleges makes cooperative efforts difficult.

It is assumed that a closer examination of the word structure or semantics of statements seven and nineteen produces at least some rationale for the contrast in
response to two similar statements concerning the relative import of geographic consideration for institutions participating in a cooperative center. Statement seven states positively that cooperative arrangements help to reduce the geographic isolation of an institution. As indicated, the response showed an agreeable attitude. Statement nineteen indicated that a lack of geographic proximity makes cooperative efforts difficult. It can only be assumed that the respondents felt that great distances between member institutions hindered the actual communication and direct participation in the various programs of the center but at the same time, as shown in statement seven, they felt that the fact of membership in a center helped to reduce a felt geographic isolation for their institution or gave it a greater sense of identity among neighboring institutions.

On the basis of their position within the rank order illustrated in Table 3, statements 4, 18, 9, 23, 6, and 22 indicate a need for greater communicative efforts on the part of the cooperating agencies as well as among those who represent the member institutions. The response to these
statements is interpreted as indicating that a lack of awareness of the various opportunities through the established cooperative agencies is widespread among students and faculty members at the participating colleges. Respondents indicated that their students held very little awareness of the cooperative relationships of their institution. Related to this fact was the indication that other than those faculty members actively involved or holding membership on a committee of one of the two cooperating centers in question, little concern for such endeavors prevailed among other faculty members. As the rank order of statement six indicates, "lack of time" for additional duties off-campus contributes heavily to a lack of concern on the part of many faculty and administrative personnel.

As previously mentioned in this chapter, part three of the questionnaire employed in this survey consisted of four statements of a summary nature. The respondent was asked to indicate the one statement which he felt best summarized his opinion or attitude toward the cooperative arrangement of his institution. Statements one and four were designed to reflect a strongly positive or negative
attitude respectively. Statements two and three were designed to reflect a more neutral reaction to the cooperative concept as perceived by the respondent.

Table 4, found on page 113, illustrates the percentage of positive response of the total N for each of the nine groups as determined on the basis of their response to the four statements. Of some importance is the fact that fifty-two per cent of the total N for the study checked statement one as best summarizing their opinion of their cooperative arrangement. This percentage figure is very representative of the overall slightly favorable attitude perceived from the data analyzed from part two of the questionnaire. Table 4 also indicates a slightly more negative attitude toward the existing program of the Eastern Association than for that of the Piedmont Center. This is exemplified by the figures expressed for groups two and three which represent the total responding sample from the two centers. Group two or the Piedmont Center respondents gave statement one a fifty-six per cent response as opposed to a forty-five per cent response on the part of the total Eastern Association sample or group three. This
### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENT</th>
<th>N-176</th>
<th>N-116</th>
<th>N-60</th>
<th>N-43</th>
<th>N-38</th>
<th>N-73</th>
<th>N-22</th>
<th>N-81</th>
<th>N-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The cooperative arrangement is proving itself very worthwhile for our administration, faculty, and students.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Programs provided by our cooperative arrangement are currently suffering from lack of awareness and acceptance by the members of our academic community.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our cooperative arrangement appears sound in theory but is weak in practice.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Membership in a cooperative agency is not vital to the future growth and development of this institution.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference is even more pronounced when the responses according to groups four and five are examined. Group four (Piedmont Center administration) responded to statement one at a sixty-five per cent rate. Group five (Eastern Association administration) responded to statement one at only a forty-five per cent rate.

Statements two and three from part three of the questionnaire can be utilized to provide some indications for the differences in attitude expressed in the percentage of response to statement one. A response to statement two would indicate that the respondent's general attitude or opinion toward the programs of his cooperative arrangement was that such programs were currently suffering from a lack of awareness and acceptance by the members of his academic community. Sixteen per cent of the total N representing the administrators of the Eastern Association (group five) checked statement two as opposed to seven per cent of the similar group from the Piedmont Center. In statement three, a response would indicate an opinion that the cooperative arrangement appeared sound in theory but was weak in practice. Twenty-one per cent of group four made
such a response, whereas thirty-seven per cent of group five indicated such an opinion. The response to these two statements is obviously reflected in the differing percentages for statement one on the part of groups two and three.

Statement four of part three received very little response as indicated on Table 4. This is indicative of the fact that the vast majority of respondents to this survey felt that a cooperative arrangement was in some way vital to the future growth and development of their institution. It is also recognized that, with only one choice permitted for the four statements comprising this part of the survey instrument, the low percentage of response to statement four could be quite easily attributed to the selective process.

Chapter four will continue with a summary of conclusions and will provide specific recommendations based upon the interpretation of the data collected.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has attempted to provide an indication of general attitudes or opinions of interinstitutional cooperation as expressed by the participants of two multilateral multi-programmed cooperating centers. Through the expression of such attitudes it was hoped that the two centers could benefit from or utilize the indicated reactions as possible guidelines for future growth and development.

In terms of a rather general conclusion for this study, it can be stated that the 176 respondents indicated a mildly favorable reaction to the cooperative efforts of their center. This fact was illustrated in Table 4 where fifty-two per cent of the respondents indicated their cooperative arrangement was proving itself very worthwhile. In contrast to this is the four per cent whose response indicated that they did not feel that their institutional membership in a cooperating agency was vital to the future
growth and development of their institution. Of greater significance for the two centers, however, is the thirty-one per cent who indicated that their cooperative arrangement was sound in theory but was weak in practice. This reaction was further accentuated by the response to statements in the instrument dealing with awareness and communication problems.

More specifically, the major findings of this study included the following:

1. There appears to be little or no difference in response to individual items of the survey or to the survey instrument as a whole on the part of the nine groups designated for evaluative purposes.

2. While the respondents representing the Piedmont University Center appeared to be slightly more favorable toward most aspects of their cooperative arrangement than their counterparts representing the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges, the maturity of programs has to be taken into account and must be considered a significant variable when making such a comparison.
3. As illustrated in Table 1 there was very little difference in the overall reaction of the total faculty respondents as opposed to the total administrative response.

4. Statements 1, 29, 16, and 14 of the questionnaire all dealt directly or indirectly with the proposition that cooperative arrangements generally enhance the programs of a participating institution and are considered to be an asset by cooperating members. As shown in Table 3 these four statements received the most favorable or agreeable response on the part of all nine groups. This would indicate strong support for some type of cooperative effort. Such support is further exemplified by the 1968 North Carolina Board of Higher Education study. It reported that ninety-three per cent of the respondents indicated that they felt the results of all forms of cooperative arrangements were worth the required effort and thus demonstrated a general feeling that cooperation is worthwhile.¹

5. Survey statements dealing with the areas of communication problems, awareness of students, faculty, and administration to the full opportunities of cooperative arrangements, and the realization of the full potential of such a cooperative arrangement on the part of the centers and the participating institutions attracted a more definite reaction on the part of the respondents. As shown in Tables 2 and 3 the response to such vital statements indicated this expressed need on the part of the faculty and administrative respondents.

The following conclusions seem justified on the basis of the findings reported above:

1. Little difference in favorability for the total cooperative program of the two centers was expressed by the total response. The overall reaction to the two cooperating centers was indicative of a mildly favorable attitude.

2. There is a need for better communication between the centers and the participating institutions. Specifically, faculty and administrators both indicated that there is a lack of awareness of center programs on their respective campuses.
3. Coupled with the indication of publicity or communicative problems is an indication that center participants are not fully cognizant of the true and untapped potential of their respective agencies.

4. Results indicate a general lack of knowledge in many areas or mechanics of interinstitutional cooperation. It can be concluded that many of the institutional representatives actively participating in center programs are merely "going through the motions" in representing their respective colleges.

5. Based upon the strongly favorable response indicated for statements of a general nature in this survey, it can be concluded that the respondents have expressed a highly favorable attitude toward the basic tenents of interinstitutional cooperation. Such basic areas include the propositions that cooperation enhances the programs of a college, increases the scope and quality of educational program, helps reduce the geographic isolation of a college, generally can reduce some expenses through a combining of resources, and that cooperative arrangements can result in the better utilization of physical and personnel resources.
In view of the presentation and analysis of the findings of this study and the conclusions drawn therefrom, it is recommended that further study and/or consideration be given to the following recommendations:

1. All participating institutions should be requested to periodically reevaluate their present interinstitutional cooperation status to determine if additional programs could be initiated to make fuller use of the potential offered by such an arrangement. Also, some arrangement or currently existing program might be replaced with what is deemed to be a more effective or relevant program. An example of this might include the acquisition of a cooperative venture in shared computer and data processing programs.

2. The primary effort for communication or publicity for center programs rests with the agencies. However, it is recommended that greater consideration be given to the proper communication of center programs on the campuses of each participating institution. Faculty and administrative representatives should not keep their particular cooperative area of concern to themselves. Rather, they should
work together with the executive director and staff of their center and seek a better means of communicating center activities, opportunities, and potential to their respective academic community.

3. Interinstitutional cooperation requires a commitment not only on the part of an institution as a whole but also on the part of each faculty member or administrator designated to represent his institution. Participating individuals as well as institutions must feel a need and express a determined desire for participating in a cooperative effort. Adequate communication, relevant programs, and proper administration at both ends of the cooperative venture appear to be the catalysts necessary to build an expressed need or desire within an institution as well as within a designated representative.

4. Some consideration should be given to the establishment of an annual orientation booklet or conference for all newly designated faculty and administrative representatives to the two cooperating centers. Such an orientation might include brief resumes of the center history, goals and purposes, and the potential and projected growth or expansion of center operations and programs.
5. At least every three to five years a study of this type should be repeated in an attempt to continually assess the attitudes of the participants toward the mechanics and programs of the two primary cooperating centers.

There can be little doubt that interinstitutional cooperation is today considered a flexible and valuable approach in meeting the many problems faced by our colleges and universities. "A positive posture evidenced by numerous accounts of its success has made interinstitutional cooperation one of the most dynamic movements in contemporary higher education."\(^2\) The 1968 North Carolina Board of Higher Education study on cooperative arrangements revealed no less than 233 in existence.\(^3\) While the vast majority of these arrangements were bilateral or involved only two institutions, it is significant to note that the general concept of institutional cooperation, as a means of dealing with many of today's problems, has been widely accepted in North Carolina. In most instances, the need

\(^2\)Interinstitutional Cooperation in North Carolina Colleges and Universities, p. 41.

\(^3\)Ibid.
for cooperation has been brought about by a common sense recognition of its potential for providing economy without sacrificing quality.  

The 1968 study strongly supports the potential of the two primary cooperating centers. However, at the same time it indicates that even though the burden of work and development rests with the centralized staff away from the member campuses, the success of the total program is contingent upon the dedicated and continually active support and participation of each member institution.

Herman Wells, one of the founders of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, provides an appropriate concluding statement for this particular study.

The day has long since passed when a college or university can consider itself a fort of knowledge in a hostile frontierland of ignorance, jealously guarding unto itself its hoard of facts and ideas. Academic isolation has long been impractical; in today's world, it is impossible. At a time when yesterday's bright new fact becomes today's doubt and tomorrow's myth, no single institution has the resources in faculty or facilities to go it alone. A

---

4 Interinstitutional Cooperation in North Carolina Colleges and Universities, p. 41.
University must do more than just stand guard over the nation's heritage; it must illuminate the present and help shape the future. This demands cooperation — not a diversity of weaknesses, but a union of strengths.5

As a faculty representative to a Piedmont University Center committee, you are being asked to complete the enclosed attitude perception questionnaire. This research which is being conducted with the cooperation of the Piedmont University Center is the basis of my dissertation requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree from The Ohio State University.

The intent of this research is to provide a frame of reference for the future growth and development of the two primary coordinating agencies for higher education in North Carolina. Therefore, this survey is being administered not only to the faculty committee members of the Piedmont University Center committees but also to the faculty members of the various commissions of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

William M. Malloy
Dean of Students

WMM:dks

Enclosures
APPENDIX B

February 12, 1969

As a faculty representative to an Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges commission, you are being asked to complete the enclosed attitude perception questionnaire. This research which is being conducted with the cooperation of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges is the basis of my dissertation requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree from The Ohio State University.

The intent of this research is to provide a frame of reference for the future growth and development of the two primary coordinating agencies for higher education in North Carolina. Therefore, this survey is being administered not only to the faculty commission members of the Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges but also to the faculty members of the various committees of the Piedmont University Center.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

William M. Malloy
Dean of Students

WMM:dks

Enclosures
APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

PART I

The following information is necessary to the accurate analysis of data gathered in this study.

1. Name of your cooperating center

2. Name of your institution

3. Type of institution (private, state, church related, etc.)

4. Title of person responding

5. Years of membership on committee or commission of your cooperating agency

PART II

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as they specifically apply to your institution's membership with its cooperating agency. Please circle your response.

1. Membership in a cooperating agency generally enhances the program of a college.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

2. The fact of the membership of your institution in a cooperating agency is recognized by most of your faculty members.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree
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3. Cooperation among colleges decreases instructional costs.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

4. There is a general problem of communication among the member institutions of the cooperative center.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

5. Institutional cooperation increases the scope and quality of the educational program at participating colleges.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

6. It is often difficult for busy administrators and faculty to give enough time to the complications of cooperation.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

7. Cooperative arrangements help to reduce geographic isolation.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

8. Membership of your institution in a cooperative agency will foster the future growth and development of its programs.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

9. Most faculty members utilize opportunities available through your cooperating agency.
   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

10. Cooperative arrangements threaten the autonomy of the individual institution.
    strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

11. A combining of resources of college reduces unnecessary expenses.
    strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

12. Variance in college calendars hinders the successful operation of cooperative programs.
    strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

13. Cooperative arrangements increase the opportunities available to students.
    strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree
14. Efforts should be made to expand the existing cooperative arrangements.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

15. Interinstitutional cooperation suffers from the domination of stronger member colleges.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

16. Taking into account all aspects of a cooperating agency, the results are worth the effort.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

17. There is a need for greater interdependence of colleges in today's society.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

18. Students are aware of opportunities available through a cooperating agency.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

19. Lack of geographic proximity of participating colleges makes cooperative efforts difficult.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

20. Cooperation significantly increases the economy of operation of an institution.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

21. Cooperative arrangements are currently restricted because a single member institution believes that it can function successfully by itself.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

22. There is a need to increase the awareness of faculty members to the cooperative programs already in existence.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

23. A deterrent to cooperative arrangements is the reluctance of college personnel to explore the possibilities inherent in cooperation with other institutions.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree
24. Cooperation among member colleges provides a small institution with the benefits of a larger institution.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

25. Differences in organizational structure of a college have an unfavorable effect on the cooperative enterprise.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

26. A cooperative attitude toward other institutions exists at your college.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

27. Cooperative arrangements result in better utilization of physical and personnel resources.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

28. Administrative policies of your institution reduce opportunities for cooperation.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

29. Cooperation among colleges is an efficient means of enriching college programs.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

30. Basic differences in institutional philosophies have hindered the cooperative effort among member colleges.

   strongly agree  agree  no opinion  disagree  strongly disagree

PART III

DIRECTIONS: Check the one statement which best summarizes your opinion of the cooperative arrangement of your institution.

1. The cooperative arrangement is proving itself very worthwhile for our administration, faculty, and students.

2. Programs provided by our cooperative arrangement are currently suffering from lack of awareness and acceptance by the members of our academic community.
3. Our cooperative arrangement appears to be sound in theory but is weak in practice.

4. Membership in a cooperative agency is not vital to the future growth and development of this institution.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Jamrich, John X. "Interinstitutional Cooperation in Research and Instruction." College and University, XL (Fall, 1964), pp. 25-34.


Thurstone, L. L., and Chave, E. J. A Psychological Method and The Experiment With a Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward the Church. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.


