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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND SETTING

It is well documented that trustees have been legally empowered as overseers of institutions of higher learning in this country. Frequently that legal trust involves the responsibility for and management of multimillion dollar budgets in institutions that have a considerable impact upon the economics and general health of the communities and regions in which they are located. Yet these legally important components of the collegial governance structure have not been the subject of frequent in-depth, scholarly studies (Martorana, 1963, 1972; Gilliland and Nunnery, 1970; Russock, 1974). Cohen and Roueche (1969) attempt to shed light on the reasons for the dearth of studies and observe that educational leadership or any other "intangible dimension" (p. 28-29) of the community college is difficult to assess because community college educators do not publish frequently.

Of the studies of community college boards of trustees, the majority had as their objective the description of attitudes and biographical characteristics (Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan, 1973). Typical of these studies are those of
Hartnett (1969), Mills (1971), and Ingram (1973). With minor variations these studies concur that the mean profile of a local community college board member can be described as: Protestant, caucasian, well-educated, over fifty, Republican, from a business or professional background, back academic freedom, endorse open-door policies (except at their school), and more than half earn thirty thousand dollars or more per year.

Against this backdrop of scant and narrowly focused research, it was not surprising to find that there have been no studies that systematically examine the performance of community college trustees in decision-making capacities (Paltridge et al., 1973). The Center for Educational Research and Evaluation (hereafter referred to as CEERE) indicated that "...exact knowledge of how these boards of trustees actually function, and of what forces are most critical in assuring functioning, is not available" (1974, p. 1).

Statement of the Problem

What are the decision-making strategies utilized by selected community college boards of trustees and what factors have a relationship to decision strategies, levels, and type of board involvement in the decision-making process?

Research Objectives

1. What do selected community college boards of trustees make decisions about?
2. What are the specific strategies utilized by selected community college boards of trustees in making decisions and how can they be described within the framework of Thompson's and Tuden's model?

3. Is there a relationship between the decision-making strategies, type of involvement and the level of decisions as described in the Paltridge, Hurst and Morgan model?

4. Do structural variables pertaining to board size, composition, and frequency of meetings tend to have a relationship to the decision-making strategies of selected community college boards of trustees?

5. What are the internal and external pressures that selected community college boards of trustees perceive as having a relationship to their selection of decision-making strategies?

6. Does the source of information tend to have a relationship to the decision-making behavior of selected community college boards of trustees as analyzed in the Thompson and Tuden, Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan models?

Significance of the Problem

Boards of trustees have awesome responsibilities. They are called up to formulate the broad philosophical and policy directives of the institution. In addition, they:
select the chief executive of the institution; enter into contracts; exercise statutory and legal powers; oversee the institution's assets and act as title holders of those assets; arbitrate conflicting demands from internal and external sources, function as two-way communications conduits between the institution and the external community; act as courts of last resort in settling intra-institutional disagreements; buffer the institution against external threats; and, in a general sense, play a pivotal role in the creation of a climate within the institution that promotes problem resolution and goal achievement.

The impact of board decision-making in the discharge of their responsibilities is considerable. Not only are individuals and institutions directly served by the college affected, but entire communities contiguous to the sphere of the college's influence are impacted as well. Therefore, it is important to know how (and as a sub question, "why") boards make the decisions about the issues that they do.

At the 1971 meeting of the Association for Higher Education, more than one-third of the educators interviewed felt that the lay board of trustees was an outmoded governance anachronism (Hodginson, 1971). Pray (1975) also indicates that "Community colleges are failing to realize their potential because of problems at the very highest level of policy and management" (1975, p. 1). The potential to which Pray addresses himself is multi-dimensional, and includes - in the view of this investigator - opportunities
to democratize a higher education arena traditionally permeated with elitism. And opportunities to develop, perfect, and implement creative pedagogy, androgogy, and curricula. The achievement of the promise held for community colleges will rest in no small measure upon the degree to which carefully conceived and executed inquiries can be brought to bear on the areas of board management and decision-making.

The significance of the decision-making variable in this study was underscored by Griffiths (1959) when he noted "all other functions of administration can best be interpreted in terms of the decision-making process. Decision-making is becoming generally recognized as the heart of organization and the process of administration" (p. 89; also see Livingston, 1952).

Culbertson, Jacobson and Reller (1960) indicate that: "Decision making is a primary source of control and a definer of action. It frequently involves intense wrestling with relevant facts against a background of value conflicts. Its stringent demands on decision makers no doubt contributes to the feeling of many top executives, from the President of the United States down to the local school superintendents, that administration is a lonely profession" (p. 458).

The findings of this study should begin to shed light on a gamut of problems related to the board (of which only a few have been mentioned thus far). The theoretical and
practical levels of information to be generated by this inquiry should prove useful to educators, researchers, students of collective decisioning, politicians, state-level governing or coordinating agencies, community college and board associations, trustees and laymen alike.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, RESEARCH, AND THEORY

Historical Perspectives

Because there have been no systematic studies of the decision-making processes of community college boards of trustees, much of the material in this section has been selected from research and commentary found in the fields of business administration, sociology, psychology and political science. Relevance to this study was the primary criterion for selection.

This section will be developed under four major headings: 1) Historical; 2) Approaches to Studying Decision-Making; 3) Decision-Making Theory; and 4) Decision-Making Studies and Expert Opinion in Education.

Among the earliest attempts to make sense out of the quandries posed by decision situations were those made by rational philosophers over two thousand years ago (Davis, 1957). Their focus was concerned with the goodness or rightness of a possible alternative in achieving acceptable effects. During this period, most approaches to decision-making were based on the premise that there was
only one known alternative, while all others were speculative. However, with the advancement of the predictive aspects of mathematics (probability calculus), the study of decision-making grew and concentrated upon an expanded view of the universe: the analysis of multiple choice situations had its beginnings.

The growth of knowledge about decision-making theory has, in its slowness, a striking similarity to the growth of knowledge about boards of trustees. And particularly, the decision-making process.

During the period 1956-1962, one dissertation per year dealt with decision-making theory of any kind (Ebel, 1969). During the period 1963-1966 an average of six dissertations per year dealing with decision-making theory were generated (Ebel, 1969).

Among the classic and pioneering studies were those of Barnard (1938) and Simon (1955) which drew on the methodology of the social sciences to analyze a variety of institutions. From those early beginnings, mathematicians, economists, sociologists, psychologists, statisticians, political scientists and others have paid increasing amounts of attention to man as the decision-maker (Leoni, 1964; Erickson, 1973).

Approaches to Studying Decision Making as Found in Literature

A general comment before moving into a discussion of specific studies. Lundberg (1962) has very astutely observed that literature in the field of decision-making can be
categorized in terms of the approach to studying decisions. He suggests the following:

**Intuitive Approach**

This approach drew on the unverified experience of practitioners. And as a consequence, few generalizations could be made because of the lack of verification and scientific method.

**Normative Approach (Deductive)**

This approach included studies utilizing rational models with mathematical and/or statistical undergirdings. Outside of the experimental setting, the generalizability of studies utilizing the normative approach were and are in need of further verification.

**Research Approach (Inductive)**

This approach encompassed efforts that ranged from the formulations of categories of decision products, and "quasi-experimental efforts in natural settings" (Lundberg, 1962, p. 166), to formulations drawn from field data and socio-psychological explanations.

The key point that is being made is that the literature is characterized by a lack of consensus as to the approach to the study of decision-making and as a result, to the findings of decision-making studies (Gore, 1956; Cyert, Dill, and March, 1958; Walter, 1960).
Decision Making Theory and Models

Of the many views of man as an individual or participant in a collective decision-making process, Simon (1955) offers a classic analysis. He recognized that man's intellect and the technology of the times had their limitations and that the consideration of all possible alternatives in every decision situation would be impossible. Therefore, he hypothesized that the selection of an alternative solution to a problem was frequently based on the most satisfactory rather than the best alternative.

Lindblom (1964) offers an approach similar to Simon (1955), in recognizing the impossibility of a global survey of all possible alternatives in a decision situation. Lindblom (1964) viewed the decision-makers as involved in a process of successive limited comparisons with the criteria for the alternative to be selected being a general level of consensus among the participants. Total agreement among all participants on all aspects of the selected alternative was not required.

As noted earlier, "The 'administrative man' approach of Herbert Simon (1957) suggests that individuals and organizations cannot maximize decision-making in an objectively rational way. That is, in a decision-making situation, an individual does not possess the knowledge of alternatives or the consequences of alternatives to select the one alternative that will maximize utility. Instead, the individual seeks an alternative that is satisfactory..."
of Simon's (1957) analysis of decision-making, by adding what can be described as a confirmation phase. In this phase, decision-makers were found to have developed a pool of alternative courses of action among which several were deemed acceptable to a majority of those involved in the process. Soelberg (1966) further found that from the pool of alternatives, two were usually selected, and from those two (the choice and confirmation candidates), a final selection was made. Soelberg (1966) argues that the final phase in decision-making is the confirmation of decisions or choices earlier made, rather than satisficing as Simon (1957) suggests.

Thompson and Tuden (1959) developed a decision-making model that extends the earlier work of March, Simon and Guetzkow (1958). Their (Simon, et al.) model posited four major categories of decision-making processes: persuasion, problem solving, bargaining and politics.

The Thompson and Tuden (1959) typology represents an attempt to rework the basic rational-psychological perspective of March, et al. (1958) into a sociological model that incorporates environment as an influence upon the decision-making process and accounts for more than the resolution of conflict. The Thompson and Tuden model also articulates decision strategy type with the following organizational structure types: bureaucracy, collegial,
representative and anomic. The insights offered by this juxtaposition are extremely valuable in terms of prescribing the optimum structural type, in an ideal typical sense, for a given type of decision and its concomitant strategy(s).

Griffiths (1959) pursued a mode of analysis similar to that of Thompson and Tuden (1959) and Baldridge (1971). He argued that the decision-making process determined the structure of an organization, and that issues concerning organizational span of control are easily clarified if thought of as outgrowths of a particular type of decision-making process. However, the relationship of organization structural type and decision-making process, as suggested by Thompson and Tuden, and Griffiths, will not be explored. The rational for this decision evolves from two positions. First, all boards in the sample will be of the same general type, and secondly, this study is descriptive and will not focus upon predictive hypotheses. A modified graphic representation of the Thompson-Tuden typology follows in Figure 1.

Writing from the perspectives of political scientists and ethical philosophers, Braybrooke and Lindblom (1970) suggest that economists, social scientists and policy analysts use strategies of decision-making in regard to public policy matters, that differ markedly from the rational step by step sequential decision-making models found and recommended in the literature on decision-making.
The authors argue that organizations usually adopt one of the indicated strategies as the dominant approach to decision-making, but frequently mixed approaches occur.
As a result of their inquiry, a decision-making model with two major continua was developed. The first continuum involved the dimension of the degree of understanding that a decision-maker had about a problem or issue under consideration. The second dimension concerned the potential impact of the final choice. This dimension was described on a continuum of incremental to large change. Braybrooke and Lindblom's (1970) model is similar to that of Thompson and Tuden (1959) in that it clearly indicates the relationships between rational decision-making strategies and the availability of data central to the issue or problem situation. What Braybrooke and Lindblom (1970) refer to as "'Technical' Decision Making" (p. 78) is directly paralleled by the "computation" category of the Thompson and Tuden (1959) model, and there are other parallels throughout both models.

Perhaps the most insightful finding of Braybrooke and Lindblom's (1976) work, was that the majority of policy decisions were directed to small, inconsequential (incremental) changes regardless of the decision issue. And that the decision makers generally had a low degree of understanding about the problem or issue which was the object of the decision.

Figure 2 provides a graphic illustration of all four categories of the Braybrooke and Lindblom (1970) model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 2</th>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Understanding</td>
<td>Low Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quadrant 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quadrant 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Administrative and &quot;Technical&quot; Decision-Making</td>
<td>Revolutionary and Utopian Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Method: Synoptic</td>
<td>Analytical Method: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 3</th>
<th>Quadrant 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Change</td>
<td>Large Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quadrant 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quadrant 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Politics</td>
<td>Wars, Revolutions, Crisis And Grand Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Method: Disjointed Incrementalism</td>
<td>Analytical Method: Not Formalized or Well Understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(among others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**

Source: Braybrooke and Lindblom (1970, p. 78)
By way of a summary statement, the majority of the sequential decision-making schemes presented in the literature contain four to nine steps (see Strong, 1955; and Abendroth, 1956, for classic discussions and examples of sequential decision-making schemes). And the majority of them suffer the common shortcoming of assuming rational behavior (Lundberg, 1962). An example of a typical sequential scheme as found in the literature would suggest:

1. "recognize, define, and limit the problem;
2. Analyze and evaluate the problem;
3. Establish criteria or standards by which the solution will be evaluated or judged as acceptable and adequate to the need;
4. Collect data;
5. Formulate and select the preferred solution or solutions, test them in advance;
6. Put into effect the preferred solution" (Lundberg, 1972, p. 171).

Hall and Williams (1973) have approached the analysis of decision-making from a perspective quite different from those offered by sequential decision-making schemes. The authors developed an instrument called the "Group Encounter Survey" (1973). The instrument measures the dimensional aspects of conflict resolution, individual attitudes, leadership preference and intergroup relations. For the purposes of this study, however, the most important feature of the instrument concerns the two-dimensional analysis of individual decision-making.
Decision-making is analyzed through the use of a mathematical grid structured around the following psychological dimensions: the extent of concern an individual might have about the quality of a decision, as he or she subjectively defines quality, and the concern an individual might have about the commitment of others to decisions reached. The decision-making grid produces five categories of individual decision-making: self-sufficient, good neighbor, default, traditional, and integrated.

A modified illustration of the decision-making grid is provided in Figure 3.

Numerous correlational and experimental studies have focused on the relationship of specific independent variables to decision-making behavior. "Information" was a frequently examined variable. Griffiths (1967) found that experience, prior knowledge, served as a primer before a decision-maker had any acquaintance with an emerging problem. Poral and Haas (1969), drawing upon the assumptions of Cyert and March (1963), tested the hypothesis that "the more specific information a decision-maker has the more accurate will be his levels of aspiration and decision" (p. 98). The results of their study tended to partially support the hypothesis. In a controlled laboratory experiment, Cangelosi and Robinson (1968) found that "In general, subjects who received information behaved more rationally in their choice decisions than those that did not" (p. 142). Simon (1951) and Gregg (1957) report similar findings to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/9 Response Bias (Good Neighbor)</th>
<th>9/9 Response Bias (Integrated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task competence is seen as a</td>
<td>Involvement via participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential criterion of accept-</td>
<td>is recognized as the key to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ance. Task issues are therefore</td>
<td>commitment. Heightened involve-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a source of threat and tend to</td>
<td>ment increases the likelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be de-emphasized. Behaviors</td>
<td>that more ideas and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflect a preoccupation with</td>
<td>will be expressed and decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the quality of interpersonal</td>
<td>quality is enhanced through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations, and individuals</td>
<td>increased resources coupled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress mutual support, accept-</td>
<td>with greater ego-involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ance, and the avoidance of</td>
<td>Behaviors reflect a concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict.</td>
<td>with decision processes and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resolution of conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5/5 Response Bias (Traditional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expediency and smooth functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are valued as indices of success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An implicit faith in majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinions as a decision mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for balancing quality and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment demands is evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors reflect a need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize activities and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolve conflicts impersonally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so that tasks can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplished efficiently with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum of effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1/1 Response Bias (Default)      | 9/1 Response Bias (Self-         |
|----------------------------------| sufficiency)                    |
| The social interaction inherent  | Task competence is emphasized    |
| in group situations constitutes | as an index of personal          |
| a source of personal threat,    | effectiveness-                      |
| particularly in instances in    | forces which would render this   |
| which the individual opposes    | incompetence less meaningful are  |
| the group position. Personal    | resisted; group membership is a  |
| misgivings are displaced on to   | source of threat to the extent   |
| the group, and behaviors reflect | that there is an implication of   |
| rationalized needs for escape.  | shared control. Behaviors reflect|
| Individuals withdraw and become  | a need for autonomy coupled with  |
| detached, simply complying with  | a fear of failure. The individual |
| membership demands.             | tries to insulate himself against|
|                                  | external influence attempts.     |

**FIGURE 3.**

Adapted from Hall and Williams (1973)
those previously discussed on the positive relationship between information and decision-making behavior.

Without question, source of information as well as the time of its arrival will be explored in this study.

Hall and Williams (1966) offered the thesis that many of the generalizations about decision-making that were being developed from group research were the result of observations and experimentation with ad hoc groups. They argued that the decision-making behavior of established groups may differ from that of an ad hoc group.

Several findings have relevance for this study. The authors found that ad hoc groups tended to avoid conflict, to seek compromise, and to be less effective than established groups in developing creative solutions and alternatives in decision-making situations. On the other hand, established groups reacted objectively to conflict and sought constructive means of allaying differences, while not displacing the problem or issue about which a decision had to be made.

Fisher (1970) notes that most research concerning small groups has concentrated on the socio-emotional dimension of group behavior. Concurring with McGrath and Altman (1966), the author called for an increased emphasis upon the analysis of the interactional aspects of group behavior "as opposed to the products or outcomes of that behavior" (1970, p. 51).

A most helpful insight offered by the author was contained in his observation that lack of understanding
of group interactional processes has led to a reliance upon ways of viewing the decision-making process that were designed for the explication of the reflective thinking of individuals. John Dewey's formulation was a case in point. The author, citing Kelley and Thibaud (1954), warned that schemes of analysis designed for the examination of individual behavior are inappropriate for analyzing group decision-making behavior.

The results of the author's research provided data for the construction of a four phase model of decision-making which assisted in determining and describing how, in an interactional process, group patterns of communication assisted in establishing a consensus or final decision-making choice.

As this investigator delved into the literature in the field of decision-making, it became apparent that the majority of the systematic studies - as illustrated in previous sections of this study - concentrate upon the individual rather than upon the individual as a member of a group involved in collective decision-making. Moskowitz (1973) documents this condition and indicates that other than team theory, there has not been a complete development of a broad theory of "collective decisions" (p. 5). Lundberg (1962), speaking about the state of knowledge in the field of decision-making in general (in 1962) indicated that "...knowledge of this process [decision-making] is not only slight but obscure" (p. 165).
This review will next focus on studies and expert opinion related to the issue of decision-making in educational institutions.

Baldridge's (1971) typology of educational governance structures provides an appropriate entre to the development of this section. Baldridge's analysis does not, nor was it designed to, explicate the specific processes of decision-making at either the organizational, group, or individual levels. However, his discussion of the general features found in each governance category does establish the relationship between organization-governance structure and the general institutional approach to decision-making. Baldridge found that the political governance structure utilized a bargaining approach to decision-making; the bureaucratic structure commanded adherence to prescribed rules and procedures in the making of decisions; and the collegial structure relied upon a democratic, shared participation approach to decision-making.

Baldridge's findings are useful in the development of this study for the general overview that they provide. That usefulness is further heightened when the findings of Hartnett (1969) that most community college boards of trustees prefer bureaucratic governance structures are recalled.
Utilizing a group dynamics approach, Ziegler's (1964) study of public school superintendents examined both the decision-making process and the most important independent variables associated with the making of selected decisions. Key research questions that relate to this study were:

"(1) What is the effect of the decision-making procedure on the probable success of the decision?
(2) What are the steps for problem-solving in the decision-making process?
(3) What are the factors and resources the superintendent of schools can use as bases for his decisions?
(4) What are the situational factors that should be considered by the superintendent before he determines the decision-making procedure he will use?
(5) What are the recommended procedures, techniques, and resources for reaching decisions on major problems and areas of school administration?" (p. 4)

A partial summary of Ziegler's findings indicates that a majority of the respondents believed that decision-making ability was as important as any other factor to the success of a superintendent. The most important factors considered in the making of decisions were: student welfare, the educational program, staff and community welfare, district policies, the philosophical-value framework of the superintendent, community concerns and past decision-making precedence.
A majority of the respondents preferred a sequential decision-making procedure, endorsed the use of committees and groups as opposed to individual decision-making, felt that decision-makers needed critical information such as problem magnitude and complexity, precise data, constituencies affected by the decision and the need for immediate or delayed action.

Sharples (1975), in an illuminating analysis, observed that the socio-economic conditions of today have led to an increased interest by educators in maximizing the efficiency and productivity of their institutions. This interest, in Sharples' view, has led to an over-emphasis on economic input and output variables to the neglect of others in examining alternative solutions to a problem situation. Among the neglected variables are those that could be called political. Sharples contends that political considerations frequently are superordinate to technical and economic based reasoning. Therefore, in Sharples' (1975) scheme, acknowledgement of the political factors having bearing on a decision situation is a prime prerequisite to problem resolution. Additional awarenesses would include recognition of the role of self-interests on behalf of the decision-makers in moderating the findings of rational inquiries that are congruent with the goals and objectives of the institution. Sharples (1975) also sees the goals and objectives of the institution coming into
conflict on occasion with, for example, economic rationality. To illustrate the point, given an institutional goal of equal educational opportunity for all and given a twenty per cent across the board budget reduction, what would be the lines of reasoning that would create a conflict? Economic rationales would say cut those programs with low FTE and high cost. Developmental education could be pointed to as an example. Reasoning linked to the goals of the institution for equal education opportunity would pose a direct conflict. The central point is, in Sharples' view, that frequently over-reliance upon economic rationality generates a conflict with the basic goals and objectives of an institution.

Research objectives concerning factors relating to board decision-making strategy selection and the relationship of internal and external pressures to the decisioning process relate to Sharples' findings.

Drawing on Stufflebeam's scheme, Sharples (1975) offers a modified typology of decision categories which has potential usefulness in this study. A schematic representation follows in Figure 4. In explaining the utility of the typology, Sharples indicates that "The usefulness of such analysis [rational-economic] for decision-making is dependent upon the nature or type of decision being considered. In the field of education, thousands of specific decisions must be made within a year, all somewhat different from each other...one means of ensuring a more appropriate
### Types of Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Intended</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ends</td>
<td>Policy planning to determine goals and objectives</td>
<td>Evaluation and recycling to judge attainments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Implementing planning to design procedures</td>
<td>Operating to utilize control and refine procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Sharples (1975, p. 59)
application of this type of analysis is to define those decisions which might benefit from this approach. Some help in this matter may be derived from a typology developed by Stufflebeam, which classifies decisions along two dimensions: (1) whether the decision pertains to ends or means; and (2) the relevance of the decision..." (p. 60).

Schmidtlein (1973) studied the policy making behavior of education institutions and found that there are generally two ideal typical (in the Weberian sense) policy making paradigms in use. The paradigms (types of rationality) are identified as market or incremental-remedial and plan or comprehensive-prescriptive. Condensed and simplified, the two approaches to decision-making are based on the following rationales which have historical roots in the thinking of Adam Smith (1776), John Stuart Mill (1859), Hayek (1944), Freidman (1962), Marx (1867), Mannheim (1940), and Dahrendorf (1968):

(1) Market or incremental-remedial: left alone, social forces will work to the benefit of man. A minimum of planning is necessary.

(2) Plan or comprehensive-prescriptive: emphasis is upon the establishment of social norms, determining in advance what is required and tightly binding means to ends.

Utilizing the two basic approaches as units of analysis, Schmidtlein (1973) reported that the environment in which education organizations exist impose constraints upon the
selection of decision-making processes. Quoting Alexander (1972), Schmidtein (1973) suggests that "Instead of developing decision models, in general it might be more valuable to look at decision-making as a process which varies in response to the particular societal environment" (p. 325).

Time and space limitations, knowledge or casual relationships, changes of technologies and outputs, resources available for analysis, degrees of consensus, and behavioral patterns resultant from environmental influences were all found to have constraining or limiting effects upon the decision-making processes (Schmidtein, 1975). In his examination of the constraining impacts of the previous listed factors, Schmidtein (1975) neatly supports some of the findings and arguments of Sharples (1975), Gleazer (1972), Pray (1973), and the CFERE (1974) when he notes that more may be understood about decision-making behavior by examining constraints than by examining the behavior itself.

The open systems approach of Schmidtein (1973) holds some relevance for this study. In a concluding observation Schmidtein (1973) stresses that "Policy-making [in educational organizations] requires a mixed strategy of decision-making that is dependent upon situational constraints and trade-offs between desirable but conflicting values. The desired mix of decision processes has important
structural implications for organizations since the location of decision authority is a critical consideration in the design of an institution" (p. 3).

The analyses and findings of Schmidtlein (1973) are supported by studies pre and post dating them. Gross (1958), in a study of public school board members, found that nineteen outside pressures and the attitude of the board members toward important education issues have a positive relationship to the type of decision made. Pray (1975), Gleazer (1972), and CFERE (1974) document political and external pressures that impact upon the decisioning behavior of boards of trustees. The CFERE (1974) also found that in a scheme requesting the designation of the importance of factors as they related to the decision-making process, community college boards indicated that outside pressures were the least important and the recommendations of the president were most important.

Rauh (1974), in a study of boards of trustees of four year institutions that has direct relevance for the analysis of community college boards, indicates that boards can be categorized according to their operating style. There is the working board that is quite similar to a public school board in its involvement, not only in the most important institutional decisions, but in the details of administration. And, there is the policy board which delegates decision-making responsibility, evaluates, criticizes and
supports management; reviews, approves and offers advise, but does not analyze data and alternatives in a decision situation. Rauh (1974) likens this board to the large corporate board of directors. And in a final observation on boards in general, Rauh (1974) explains that boards "...appear to reach decisions when in fact it is only giving pro forma assent to a decision made elsewhere in the university" (sic) (p. 230; also see Hatfield, 1971).

As this review has been illustrating, problems concomitant to the decision-making of boards are many and complex. Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi (1971), Bunnell and Vadala (1968), and Wattenbarger and Bender (1972) document another aspect of the problem: the narrowing of decision-making prerogatives of the board as a result of the shifting of the locus of power away from the local communities to state level agencies or what Glenny (1971) called "anonymous" sources of power.

Another aspect of the problem involves the boards' attempt to recoup decision-making prerogatives long since atrophied as a result of board delegation of authority in all but a few areas such as finance and plant operation (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970; Hartnett, 1969; Rodda, 1970; Roueche, 1971; Hobson, 1971; Morgan, 1971; Mills, 1972). One impact of the belated attempt to recapture prerogatives by the board is an increasing tension between them, the faculty and staff (Gleazer, 1972).
The multifaceted character of the decision-making issue emerges even more clearly as Griffiths (1959) in a laboratory experiment documents that questions of group size, composition, structure and method of selection have direct implications upon the decision-making process.

Pray (1975), drawing upon extensive experience as a student of and consultant to boards, found, as did Griffiths (1959) in his study of administrators, that size, composition, structure and method of selection had an effect upon trustee decision-making. Pray (1975) indicated that with an average board size of 7-9, boards are too small to have committees which could become knowledgeable about specific problems or issues. He recommended a board size of 16-24. The size problem also forces boards to meet as committees of the whole on all issues, which squanders valuable time.

Regarding the impact of selection and composition on decision-making, Pray (1975) noted that 95% of the board members are there by virtue of either election (60%) or appointment (35%) and that both are procedures which permit the intrusion of special interest influences upon trustee behavior. The ramifications for decision-making are obvious.

Hartnett's (1969) study is known primarily for its lucid description of the personal attributes and attitudes of trustees. However, there are other important aspects of this classic study. Hartnett (1969) inquired as to the
number and percentage of board actions taken that could be classified as follows:

"Decided: you were directly involved in the decision-making process. Alone or with others, you examined data and decided on a course of action;

Reviewed and Advised (R & A): you considered proposals made by others (usually staff of the college). You reviewed these proposals and advised those who were in the process of making them;

Approved or Confirmed (A or C): you took a pro-forma action on decisions already committed; decisions which could not be changed substantively at that point in time." (p. 19).

The three categories descriptive of types of trustee action, or "involvement", to use Hartnett's term, will be incorporated into the research objectives for this study.

Charges that "...the board of trustees is perhaps, most uninformed and incompetent component in a community college structure" (Moore, 1973, p. 171), and that the board is too incompetent to have as much legal authority as it does, coupled with the growing concerns of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Association of Governing Boards and the Association of Community College Trustees (Pray, 1975) underscore the urgency for well designed and executed inquiries into all aspects of board behavior.
The Decision Seminar: A Strategy for Problem Solving (Slonaker and Burgess, 1975) represents a plan for establishing the facilities and circumstances within which specific procedures are to be utilized in the making of decisions. The total plan represents the extension of the work of Harold Lasswell (1960, 1963, 1971).

The seminar plan is the most comprehensive strategy for the facilitation of problem-solving/decision-making included in this review of research and literature. The place where the decision makers are to deliberate is carefully prescribed. Tools and resources are specified and categories of permanent and transient participants are carefully described. In summary, the plan calls for the creation of a total milieu and culture for decision-making.

Within the milieu, a seven phase/function decision process model is offered. The decision process model primarily addresses itself to institutions in the public sector and the manner of their involvement in the decision-making process in each of the seven phases. Figure 5 is a graphic illustration of the decision process model.

This review is now at the point of examining the one study that comes closest to examining the objectives for this study. Paltridge (1973) studied the decision-making behavior of boards of trustees of four year institutions of higher learning. The relevance of his findings for community college boards of trustees is supported by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Phases/Function</th>
<th>Definitions as Questions</th>
<th>Typical Units/Institution(s) Which Perform This Decision Function In the Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>How is the information that comes to the attention of decision makers gathered and processed?</td>
<td>The mass media/scientific and social research organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>How are policy/decision recommendations made and promoted?</td>
<td>Legislative hearings, council/committee recommendations/political candidates and/or reformers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>How are general rules of a newly adopted policy developed/prescribed?</td>
<td>City council - based on need and constraints of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation</td>
<td>How are general rules of the policy provisionally invoked in reference to conduct?</td>
<td>Acts of alleged non-compliance are/may be handled by the police or special administrative units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>How are general rules applied?</td>
<td>Courts and commissions determine what, if any, deprivations are to be assigned to violators, e.g., alleged cases of non-compliance found in the invocation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>How is the working of prescriptions appraised?</td>
<td>Legislative and executive commissions are often established and authorized to appraise to what extent policy-prescriptions have been effective and efficient in guiding the workability of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>How are the prescriptions and arrangements entered into within the framework of such rules brought to termination?</td>
<td>Normally the same structures responsible for policy-prescriptions will have major involvement in the termination of the policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5**

Source: Slonaker and Burgess, 1975
following. Pray (1975), cited earlier in this study, requested and received a letter from Paltridge (1973) indicating that his study of four year institutional boards had direct applicability to community college boards. This investigator concurs with that judgment.

In the Paltridge et al. (1973) study, the minutes of over one hundred meetings of eleven boards of trustees were analyzed. A summary of the findings revealed that matters concerning long range planning, review of performance and policy level decisions were infrequently dealt with. Instead the board made a tremendous number of decisions related to detailed operational matters. Reinforcing the findings of Rauh (1974) and others, the study found that the most frequently used pattern of decision-making involved the implementation, the rubber stamping of previously made decisions or approved programs.

Paltridge et al. (1973) also found that the independent variables that had a high correlation with board decision-making behavior were: nature of the board's jurisdiction; size and composition; manner of selection; state laws, (and many others that were highly suspect).

Drawing on Simon's (1957) scheme, Paltridge (1973) offered a typology that categorized decisions on a policy-making continuum ranging from legislative and management to working policy. Figure 6 is a modified and abbreviated graphic representation of the typology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Decisions</th>
<th>Level I (Legislative)</th>
<th>Level II (Management)</th>
<th>Level III (Working Policy)</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc., Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6**

*Source: Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan (1973, p. 38)*
Assumptions

The most important assumptions generated from the review of the literature and research are:

1. Individual and group decisions are not unique, non-repeatable events.
2. Individual and group decisions can be identified, categorized and studied.

Summary of the Rationales for Research Objectives as Found in the Literature, Research and Theory Review

The work of Hartnett (1969), Morgan (1971), Henderson (1972), Paltridge, et al. (1973) and others clearly document the frequency of trustee decision-making activity in the various categories of a college's operation. Their findings indicate a disproportionate amount of trustee decision-making activity in the areas of fiscal and plant operational concerns.

In pursuing the notion that decision-making strategies may be related to functional areas within the institution or issues under deliberation, objective number one which reads as follows was constructed: What do boards of trustees make decisions about?

Objective number two asks: What are the specific strategies utilized by selected community college boards of trustees and how can they be described within the framework of Thompson and Tuden's (1956) model? This objective represents an attempt to rectify the lack of knowledge about
how boards make decisions. The work of Martorana (1963), 1972); Gilliland and Nunnery (1970); Russock (1974); and others document the infrequency of systematic studies of community college boards. Cohen and Roueche (1969) note that there is difficulty in studying the "intangible dimensions" of community colleges. Both Paltridge et al. (1973) and the Center for Educational Research and Evaluation (1974) further document the dearth of studies specific to board decisioning behavior.

Objective number three asks: Is there a relationship between decision-making strategies, type of board involvement, and the level of decisions as described in the Paltridge et al. (1973) model? The review of research, literature, and theory uncovered the only study this researcher was able to find that dealt with the decisioning behavior of trustees (in this instance, of four year institutions) through systematic procedures. The Paltridge et al. model establishes categories of decisions by subject area and by levels which are described as legislative, management, working policy or no policy. Objective three will examine the relationships between decision strategies (Thompson and Tuden, 1959) and the subject area and decision level at which the strategy was employed (Paltridge et al., 1973).

Objective number four, which asks whether structural variables pertaining to board size, composition and frequency of meetings tend to have a relationship to the
decision-making strategies of community college boards of trustees, was structured as a consequence of the importance placed upon the listed variables in the decision-making process by the following researchers and experts as found in the literature: Griffiths (1959); Pray (1975); and others.

What are the internal and external pressures that selected community college boards of trustees perceived as having a relationship to their selection of decision-making strategies? The importance and appropriateness of objective number five in furthering the inquiry into trustee decision-making behavior is underscored by the following. Gross (1958) found that there were nineteen outside pressures that influence school board decision-making. Schmidltein (1973), Pray (1975), Gleazer (1972), Sharples (1975), and the CFERE (1974) all document the impact of external and political factors upon the decision-making process.

Objective six asks whether the source, and time of arrival of information have a relationship to the decision-making behavior of selected community college boards of trustees as analyzed in the Thompson and Tuden (1959) and Paltridge, Hurst and Morgan (1973) models? This objective was constructed as a result of the findings of the following researchers. Griffiths (1967) found that information made available to decision-makers prior to the act of decision-making affected the quality of the decision
and the manner in which it was made. Poral and Haas (1969),
drawing upon the assumptions of Cyert and March (1963),
tested the hypothesis that "the more specific information
a decision-maker has the more accurate will be his levels
of aspiration and decision" (p. 98). The findings partially
supported the hypothesis in a controlled laboratory experi­
ment. Cangelosi and Robinson (1968) found that "In general,
subjects who received information behaved more rationally
in their choice decisions than those that did not" (p. 142).
Simon (1951) and Gregg (1957) report similar findings to
those previously discussed on the positive relationship
between information and decisioning behavior.

Definitions of Key Terms

Decision-Making Strategy

As used in this study, the general meaning of the
phrase "decision-making strategy", refers to the process
in which board members find themselves prior to the final
selection of a course of action or choice. This general
process has four subcategories drawn from the model of
Tüuden and Thompson (1959). A description of the sub-
categories follows in declining order of rationality.

Computation

This strategy is said to be utilized when parties to
da decision agree on the causes of a given problem or issue
and the selection of a course of action. In other words,
most of the crucial data concerning a problem is available
to the decision-makers and rational choices based on facts can be made.

**Bargaining**

This strategy of decision-making occurs when parties to the making of a decision agree about the causes of a problem or issue, but cannot agree on the course of action to be taken.

**Majority Judgement**

This strategy occurs when decision makers are in agreement about the course of action to take, but cannot agree about the cause of a problem or issue.

**Inspirational**

This last strategy is the least rational of the four sub-categories, and is said to be in effect when decision-makers disagree about the causes of a problem or issue, and also disagree about the course of action to be taken. The result is usually a decision not to make a decision, or in some cases, the use of charismatic leadership or Divine Guidance.

**Choice**

This term refers to the final selection between two or more alternative courses of action in a decision-making situation.

**Local Board**

This term describes the board of trustees responsible for a single institution. This board performs in compliance with state statutes, and state department of education
or state board policy.

**Types of Involvement**

This term is descriptive of three categories of board decision-making in the spectrum of issues under its purview. A description of each level follows.

**Level 1 (Legislative)**

This level describes board activity in the act of making decisions that involve policy formulation, and/or the development of broad institutional goals and objectives.

**Level 2 (Management)**

This level describes board decision-making behavior that involves the interpretation of policy and rules where areas of conflict exist with regard to a broad spectrum of issues.

**Level 3 (Operational)**

This decision-making level describes board activity in the decision-making process, that involves the implementation of management decision, and the expediting of routine matters involving rules, regulations, and procedures.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was boards of trustees of public community colleges. The following steps were utilized in constructing the sample:

1. A list of 510 public community colleges was secured from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

2. The 510 colleges represented 30 states. These states were grouped roughly by regions designated as Northwest, Southwest, Midwest, Northeast, and Southeast.

3. The institutions in each region were numbered and, utilizing a table of random numbers, a stratified random sample was drawn. Fifteen institutions from each region were selected, for a total of 75 institutions.

4. Utilizing the most recent college catalogs and telephone contact, a list of trustees by name and institution was constructed.

5. One board chairperson and one board member per institution were randomly selected from the list. The random sample comprised 75 board chairpersons and 75 board members,
for a total of 150 trustees. Telephone calls were made to be certain that the board member had not previously been a chairperson. In cases where the board member had served as a chairperson, another name was randomly drawn from among those not having been chairpersons.

**Design**

This study is a descriptive survey of the decision-making behavior of boards of trustees of public community colleges. The process or strategy selection dimension of trustee decision-making is described by the following variables and their concomitant definitions extracted from Thompson and Tuden's (1959) model: bargaining, computation, majority judgment, and inspiration. The subject area and level at which the decision occurred is described by the following variables and their concomitant definitions drawn from the Paltridge et al. (1973) model: levels - legislative, management, and working policy; subject areas - personnel, student affairs, business and finance, physical plant, external affairs, internal affairs and administrative organization. Type of board involvement in the decision-making process is described by the following variables drawn from Hartnett (1969): Decided, Reviewed and Advised, Approved or Confirmed.

A second descriptive aspect of this study investigated relationships among and between the variables addressed by the research design. See figure 7.
FIGURE 7

Design of the Study of Local Community College Board of Trustee Decision-Making

Adapted from Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan (1973)
Data and Instrumentation

A questionnaire has been developed specifically for this study. The following represents a summary of the most essential steps in the questionnaire construction:

1) The target population was defined.
2) The specific research objectives were reexamined.
3) Questions were developed that operationalized each research objective.
4) All tables and graphs were roughed out.
5) A cost analysis and calendar were developed.
6) The reaction of a panel of experts was sought.
7) A pilot test of the questionnaire was undertaken.
8) Rewriting and finalizing was completed.

Data Collection

This procedure was implemented utilizing the previously discussed questionnaire. Pursuant to the suggestions of Parten (1950) and Linsky (1975) the following steps were taken in an attempt to stimulate maximum response and minimize non-response bias.

1) Pre-contact was made with the trustees and the presidents of the institutions in the sample.
   a) The importance of the project and the anonymity of the respondents and their institutions was stressed.
2) Each contact - after step one - with the respondents included:
   a) a questionnaire
   b) a stamped, addressed return envelope
3) There were two follow-up mailings to non-respondents.
4) Records were kept of the number and dates completed questionnaires were received and trend lines of "early" and "late" responses were developed. This step assisted in making intelligent guesses about potential non-response bias.
5) Information from follow-ups was utilized to adjust previously compiled data.
6) Ten percent, or 5 of the 53 non-respondents were contacted by telephone to determine reasons for their non-participation, which might be useful in implementing future studies.

**Analysis of Data**

The objectives for this study were analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics. Frequency distributions, means, percentages and tallies were used to describe findings related to objectives one, two, and seven. Pearson's correlation and cross tabulations were employed to describe the relationships investigated by objectives three, four, five, and six.

**Limitations**

This study is limited by statistical and non-statistical inferences related to the research sample. Size of the sample, percent of complete responses to the questionnaire and the basic survey design also imposed constraints upon what could be said about the findings and to whom they may be generalized.
The incomplete and tentative state of the body of theory about decision-making, and particularly group decision-making, circumscribed several facets of this study. A last limitation is the fact that there have been no studies reported in the research literature that systematically examine the decision-making behavior of community college boards of trustees.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter will be developed utilizing the following format. The first section will contain a discussion of the response rate, followed by the presentation of a demographic profile of the respondents. Subsequent sections will present data and analyses for each of the six research objectives.

Response Rate

A total of 75 boards and 150 trustees were contacted. Ninety-eight (or, 65%) of the trustees, representing 56 (or, 75%) of the boards in the sample completed and returned at least one survey instrument. Of the 52 trustees who did not respond, telephone contact was made with five (or, 10%) of them.

Of those contacted, three indicated that they were too busy with personal/professional responsibilities to answer the survey instrument. One indicated that he did not wish to participate in the study. And a final board member attributed his non-response to procrastination.
A Demographic Profile

The average respondent in the sample for this study was between 50 and 51 years old, Caucasian, Protestant, and male. He held a bachelor's degree, and was a professional in business and industry, earning between 29 and 30 thousand dollars per year. Additionally, the average respondent had served 2.4 years on the board.

Research Objective #1

The first research objective for this study was: what do selected community college boards of trustees make decisions about? Data for this objective was secured by requesting the participants to rank, on a scale of 1-10 in descending order of importance, those areas of most frequent board decision-making activity. Forty-one respondents indicated that their boards' most frequent area of decision-making activity was business and finance. This figure represents a percentage of 41.8% of those responding (N = 98). Another sixteen (or, 16.3%) ranked business and finance activity number two; 11 (or, 11.2%) ranked it number three, and 13 (or, 13.3%) ranked it number four. Collectively, 82.6% of the respondents indicated, on a scale of 1-10, that board activity in business and finance was either the most frequently dealt-with concern, or no lower than the fourth most important concern.

The next most frequent area of board activity was found to be in the personnel area. Fifteen respondents (or, 15.3%)
indicated that personnel considerations occupied most of their boards' time; sixteen (or, 16.4%) indicated that personnel concerns were the second most important items of deliberation; seven (or, 7.1%) ranked it third; and twenty (or, 20.4%) ranked it number four. A total of 59.1% of the respondents indicated that personnel was either the most important, or no lower than the fourth most important item coming before their board.

Thus far, the data have clearly indicated that business and finance, followed by personnel, are the areas occupying most of the boards' time. The next area of deliberation most frequently ranked number one was physical plant. Eleven (or, 11.2%) of the respondents ranked physical plant as the item occupying most of their boards' time; twelve (or, 12.2%) ranked it number two; thirteen (or, 13.3%) ranked it number three; and eleven (or, 11.2%) ranked it number four. A total of 47.9% of the respondents ranked physical plant considerations either number one, or no lower than number four.

Collective bargaining was the next most frequent area of board activity. Ten (or, 10.2%) of the respondents ranked this issue number one; eleven (or, 11.2%) ranked it number two; thirteen (or, 13.3%) ranked it number three; and four (or, 4.3%) ranked it number four. Across the first four rankings, a total of 39.0% of the respondents indicated that collective bargaining was the most, and no lower than the
fourth most frequent item of board discussion.*

At this point, there have been few surprises in the findings. The data are entirely consistent with those found in the review of the literature (see Hartnett, 1969).

In further developing this analysis, the data indicated that education programs and institutional and program evaluation had identical frequencies of 8, and percentages of 8.3%, as the next most frequently dealt-with areas. Across the first four rankings, the collective data for education programs indicated the following: thirty-six (or, 37.0%) of the respondents (N = 98) ranked education programs as either the most frequent area of deliberation, or no lower than the fourth most frequently discussed area.

The data for institutional and program evaluation, across the first four rankings, indicated that 36 (or, 41.2%) of the respondents (N = 96) ranked institutional and program evaluation as high as the most frequent area of deliberation, but no lower than the fourth most frequent area.

Faculty concerns had a frequency and percentage of five (or, 5.1%); student affairs had a frequency and percentage of two (or, 2.0%); and external agencies had a frequency and percentage of one (or, 1.0%) in the most frequent area of concern category.

* Forty-six (49.9%) of the respondents (N = 96) ranked collective bargaining 7, 8, 9, or 10. This investigator infers that those boards may not work in a setting where collective bargaining units exist.
A composite look at the data (see Table 1 for details) indicates the following overall ranking:

1. Business and finance
2. Personnel
3. Physical plant
4. Collective bargaining
5. Education programs or institutional/program evaluation
6. Faculty concerns
7. Student affairs
8. External agencies

These findings, as indicated earlier, are entirely consistent with those found in the review of the literature. The preponderance of decision-making activities in the first three categories has been interpreted by some authorities to represent the "business" orientation of the board. This preoccupation obviously leaves decision-making in other areas to lower echelons within the institution, and commands a "rubber stamp" posture by the boards of those recommendations forwarded to them.

Research Objective #2

Having established the areas about which boards deliberate most often, it is appropriate to turn to the next research objective. Research objective number two asks: what are the specific strategies utilized by selected community college boards of trustees in making decisions, and how can they be described within the framework of the Tuden and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 6</th>
<th>Rank 7</th>
<th>Rank 8</th>
<th>Rank 9</th>
<th>Rank 10</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>15 15.3</td>
<td>16 16.3</td>
<td>7  7.1</td>
<td>20 20.4</td>
<td>17 17.3</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>5  5.1</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2  2.0</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>12 12.2</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
<td>20 20.4</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>16 16.3</td>
<td>14 14.3</td>
<td>5  5.1</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>40.42.3</td>
<td>16 16.3</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>4  4.1</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>12 12.2</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>7  7.1</td>
<td>9  9.2</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>16 16.3</td>
<td>5  5.1</td>
<td>2  2.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>17 17.3</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>14 14.3</td>
<td>15 15.3</td>
<td>7  7.1</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>2  2.1</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>4  4.1</td>
<td>14 14.4</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td>24 24.7</td>
<td>24 24.7</td>
<td>8  8.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>4  4.3</td>
<td>7  7.1</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>10 10.9</td>
<td>4  4.3</td>
<td>22 23.9</td>
<td>5  5.4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
<td>5  5.1</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>18 18.4</td>
<td>23 23.5</td>
<td>7  7.1</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>3  3.1</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional &amp; Program Eval.</td>
<td>8  8.3</td>
<td>5  5.2</td>
<td>8  8.3</td>
<td>9  9.4</td>
<td>6  6.3</td>
<td>12 12.5</td>
<td>11 11.5</td>
<td>21 21.9</td>
<td>13 13.5</td>
<td>2  2.0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief review of the decision strategy model will assist in the analysis of data in this section. For the purposes of this study, two major dimensions of decision-making, along with two sub-levels of those dimensions, have been utilized within the decision strategy model.

The major dimensions are a decision-maker's preferences about the possible outcomes of a decision, and a decision-maker's beliefs about the causes of problems related to an issue being deliberated. The sub-levels for each dimension are agreement or non-agreement among the participants in the collective decision-making situation. For example, if there is agreement among the decisioners about the causes of problems related to an issue, and agreement as to preferences about possible outcomes, the Tuden and Thompson model would translate that juxtaposition of dimensions and sub-levels into a decision-making strategy labeled computation. This decision strategy is predicted upon straightforward analysis, which is possible as a result of sufficient data about the problem to be resolved and agreement among the decisioners about the cause of the problem and how they would like to see it resolved.

The bargaining decision-making strategy results when there is non-agreement among decisioners about a preference hierarchy for the outcome of a problem, but agreement about the causes of the problem. In this situation, trade-offs and negotiating must occur because the selection of one
preference about outcomes automatically drops from consid-
eration other preferences.

Another decision strategy in the Thompson and Tuden model is that of majority judgement. This strategy is indi-
cated when there is disagreement among the decisioners about "causes" and agreement about "preferences". Without suffi-
cient data or consensus about the preferred solution of a problem, the solution must be arrived at through reliance
upon the judgement of the decisioners.

The final decision strategy category in the model results when there is disagreement among the decisioners about "causes" and "preferences". In this deadlocked situation, decisioners may choose to avoid confronting the issue and thereby make decisions by default. They also may resort to "Divine Guidance" (Tuden and Thompson, 1959, p. 202), or a charis-
matic leader. Figure 8 provides a modified graphic illus-
tration of the Tuden and Thomson model.

With the decision strategy categories in mind, the data for the second research objective alluded to earlier will
now be analyzed. A word of clarification before moving forward. Only the largest frequencies and percentages of responses in each category will be discussed. Table 2 provides complete data.

**Personnel**

In this area, 20 (or, 20.6%) of the respondents indi-
cated that their board strongly agreed and 58 (or, 59.8%) indicated that their board agreed about the causes of
### Preferences About Possible Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Non-Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Computation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agreement</td>
<td>Majority Judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8**

Thompson and Tuden

Decision Strategy Model

Source: Thompson and Tuden (1959, p. 204)
TABLE 2

Trustee Levels of Agreement or Disagreement About Causes of Problems or Preferred Outcomes In Problem Resolution in Selected Areas

N = 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unable To Say</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N - 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Causes</td>
<td>20 20.6</td>
<td>58 59.8</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>9 9.3</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Causes</td>
<td>14 14.4</td>
<td>60 61.9</td>
<td>6 6.2</td>
<td>13 13.4</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Causes</td>
<td>14 14.4</td>
<td>63 64.9</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td>7 7.2</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Causes</td>
<td>15 15.5</td>
<td>67 69.1</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>5 5.2</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>25 28.1</td>
<td>30 33.7</td>
<td>20 22.5</td>
<td>13 14.6</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>24 27.0</td>
<td>35 39.3</td>
<td>18 20.2</td>
<td>8 9.0</td>
<td>4 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns Causes</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
<td>63 64.3</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns Causes</td>
<td>12 12.2</td>
<td>62 63.3</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Policy and Procedures Causes</td>
<td>22 22.4</td>
<td>63 64.3</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Policy and Procedures Causes</td>
<td>24 24.5</td>
<td>61 62.2</td>
<td>6 6.1</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
<td>35 35.7</td>
<td>55 57.1</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
<td>30 30.6</td>
<td>60 61.2</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies Causes</td>
<td>22 22.7</td>
<td>40 41.2</td>
<td>29 29.9</td>
<td>6 6.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies Causes</td>
<td>22 22.4</td>
<td>44 44.9</td>
<td>27 27.6</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Pressure Groups</td>
<td>9 9.3</td>
<td>52 53.6</td>
<td>27 27.8</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation Causes</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>64 65.3</td>
<td>11 11.2</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation Causes</td>
<td>9 9.2</td>
<td>71 72.4</td>
<td>13 13.3</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Board Performance Causes</td>
<td>15 15.3</td>
<td>31 37.8</td>
<td>39 39.8</td>
<td>7 7.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Board Performance Causes</td>
<td>17 17.3</td>
<td>36 36.7</td>
<td>37 37.8</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant Causes</td>
<td>34 35.0</td>
<td>50 51.0</td>
<td>4 4.0</td>
<td>5 5.0</td>
<td>5 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant Causes</td>
<td>28 29.0</td>
<td>60 61.0</td>
<td>4 4.0</td>
<td>4 4.0</td>
<td>6 6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
problems under discussion in the personnel area. Fourteen (or, 14.4%) reported that their board strongly agreed about preferred outcomes of a decision-making situation, and 60 (or, 61.9%) indicated that their board agreed. What the data is indicating is that in the area of personnel, a computation decision-making strategy can be expected.

The only other substantial cluster of responses occurred in the disagreed category. Thirteen (or, 13.4%) of the respondents said that their board was in disagreement about the preferred outcome of a problem situation.

**Student Affairs**

Fourteen (or, 14.4%) and 63 (or, 64.9%) of the respondents indicated that their board strongly agreed and agreed, respectively, about problem causes in the student affairs area. Fifteen (or, 15.5%) and 67 (or, 69.1%) strongly agreed and agreed about preferred outcomes.

**Collective Bargaining**

Other than in the "unable to say" category, the most frequently indicated responses were as follows: 25 (or, 28.1%) strongly agreed and 30 (or, 33.7%) agreed about the causes of problems in the collective bargaining area. Twenty-four (or, 27.0%) and 35 (or, 39.3%) strongly agreed and agreed about preferred outcomes.

The presentation of data for the first three decision areas is typical of that found for all remaining decision area categories. Without exception, respondents indicated that their boards either strongly agreed or agreed about
the causes of problems related to a decision area, and about preferred outcomes in problem resolution.

This finding is important in that it suggests that further analysis of the data will indicate the overwhelming use of the computation decision-making strategy, of the four available in the decision-making model.

Before determining the specific decision-making strategies used in each area of decision-making, each cross tabulated chart, which establishes relationships between the key variables and their sub-levels in the Tuden and Thompson model, was divided into five quadrants. The resultant juxtaposition of data yielded the following findings. Across all decision area categories, the computation decision-making strategy was the most frequently used. Eighty-eight (or, 90.0%) of the respondents indicated that their board used a computation strategy in the area of business and finance. Eighty-two (or, 84.0%) used the computation strategy in administrative policy and procedures deliberation; sixty-nine (or, 71.0%) in personnel; fifty-one (or, 57.0%) in collective bargaining; sixty-five (or, 66.0%) in faculty concerns; seventy-four (or, 76.0%) in student affairs; sixty (or, 62.0%) in external agencies; seventy-three (or, 74.0%) in institutional and program evaluation; forty-nine (or, 50.0%) in evaluation of board performance*; and ninety

* Forty (or, 43.0%) were unable to say. This might indicate that no evaluation of the board was undertaken.
(or, 92.0%) in the physical plant area indicated that their boards used a computational strategy.

Consistent with the definition of the computation decision strategy as used in this study, the predominant use of the strategy makes safe the following inferences. The majority of the respondents perceive that the quality as well as the quantity of information available to them in each of the decision areas was at a level that enabled them to utilize the most rational approach to decision making, which involves the straight-forward analysis of data, followed by the recognition of the obvious best choice based upon the facts.

Across all decision area categories, the respondents clearly indicated that their boards' next most frequently used strategy of decision-making was that defined as inspirational in this study. The data found in Table 3 illustrates this finding.

As discussed earlier, in the inspiration decision strategy, logic and systematic analysis of data are not used. There is disagreement among the participants in the collective decision process as to the causes of problems related to a decision area, and also as to preferences about outcomes. Once again, this finding is entirely consistent with criticism found in their literature concerning the board's competency (Moore, 1973; and others).

The third most frequently used strategy was that defined as majority judgement. Lacking a consensus or sufficiently persuasive data about the causes of problems in a decision
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Majority Judgement</th>
<th>Inspiration</th>
<th>Unable To Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Policy and Procedures</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Pressure Groups</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Program Evaluation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Board Performance</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
area, but finding themselves in agreement about how they would like to see the problems resolved, participants in this situation were left to their judgement in prescribing a way to remedy the problem. The decision areas where this strategy was most frequently used were collective bargaining, faculty concerns, and institutional and program evaluation (see Table 3).

The least utilized decision strategy, as reported by the respondents, was that defined as bargaining. No more than seven (or, 7.0%) of the respondents indicated that their board utilized the bargaining strategy in any of the decision areas. To briefly recapitulate points made at the beginning of this section, the bargaining strategy is in effect when participants in a decision situation agree about "causes", but cannot reach a consensus about the preferred outcome or hierarchy of outcomes. This results in negotiating, trade-offs, and in the final analysis, bargaining.

The data also indicated that in the "unable to say" category, twenty (or, 22.0%) of the boards reporting were in the collective bargaining area; sixteen (or, 16.0%) were in faculty concerns; thirty-one (or, 32.0%) were in external agencies; 29 (or, 30.0%) were in external pressure groups; and 42 (or, 43.0%) were in evaluation of board performance.

In summary, the data indicated that boards utilize a mixture of decision strategies. The most frequently employed strategy was that defined as computation, followed in
declining order of usage across the eleven decision area categories (i.e., personnel, business and finance, etc.) by inspirational, majority judgement, and bargaining.

Research Objective #3

Research objective number three asks: is there a relationship between decision-making strategies, type of involvement, and the level of decisions as described in the Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan model?

Before analyzing the relationships specified in objective three, the extent of board participation in each of the three levels of the type of involvement variable will be established. A brief recapitulation of the definitions of each level follows:

1. **Reviewed and Advised**: Board members reviewed work submitted to them and advised the submittors as to the course of action to take.

2. **Decided**: Board members analyzed data and made a decision based upon that analysis.

3. **Approved and Confirmed**: Board members approved and confirmed (rubber stamped) decisions made at other levels within the institution.

Without reiterating the data for each category presented in Table 4, a summary of the data reveals the following. The "approved and confirmed" type of involvement was most frequently used in the areas of: personnel (64, or 65.3%); student affairs (38, or 39.6%); education programs (65, or 67.7%);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Reviewed and Advised</th>
<th>Decided</th>
<th>Approved and Confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>21  22.9</td>
<td>10  10.4</td>
<td>64  65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>33  34.4</td>
<td>15  15.6</td>
<td>47  49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>21  21.9</td>
<td>37  37.8</td>
<td>38  39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>28  29.5</td>
<td>40  42.1</td>
<td>27  28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td>19  19.8</td>
<td>12  12.5</td>
<td>65  67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies</td>
<td>42  47.2</td>
<td>28  32.6</td>
<td>18  20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>24  30.0</td>
<td>44  55.0</td>
<td>12  12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
<td>42  45.7</td>
<td>12  13.0</td>
<td>38  41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>38  41.8</td>
<td>16  17.6</td>
<td>37  37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and business and finance (38, or 39.6%). The "reviewed and advised" type of involvement prevailed in the areas of: external agencies (42, or 47.2%, N = 89); faculty concerns (42, or 45.7%, N = 92); and institutional and program evaluation (38, or 41.8%). The "decided" mode of involvement was the least used and was dominant in only two areas: physical plant (28, or 39.5%); and collective bargaining (44, or 55.0%).

A safe inference from these data would be that trustees spend very little time analyzing and deliberating about the raw data of issues. Instead, they make recommendations about or give their stamp of approval to proposals brought to their attention from other echelons within the institution. This finding would appear to clash with the earlier finding that trustees use a computational decision-making strategy across all decision areas the majority of the time.

It will be recalled that the computational strategy, by definition, involved agreement among the decisioners as to preferences about outcomes as well as about the causes of problems related to a decision area. This consensus dictated a straightforward analysis of data and the most rational type of decision strategy (heavy reliance upon computer print-outs, audit reports, and other quantified forms of data).

The question is, how can boards utilize a computational decision-making strategy the majority of the time, yet indicate that they "review and advise" and "approve and confirm"
rather than analyze data and "decide" most of the time?  
There is no objective data in this study to answer the question. This investigator would suggest that the problem may be linked to a weakness related to the decision-making model, in that the ideal-typical categories of decision-making strategies leave no room for different degrees of fit among the data.

Another alternative hypothesis would be that the computational decision-making strategy and the implied analytical style is not focused on new or raw data coming to the board about an issue, but upon issues and recommendations having been deliberated previously in other institutional sectors. This would clear up the apparent inconsistency between the predominant "reviewed and advised" and "approved and confirmed" types of involvement, and the computational decision-strategy style.

**Decision Levels**

Again, a brief review of definitions before delving into the data. Decision-making levels describe three types of board decision-making:

- **Legislative** - this level describes board activity in the act of making decisions that involve policy formulation, and/or the development of broad institutional goals and objectives.
- **Management** - this level involves boards in the interpretation of policy and rules where areas of conflict exist with regard to a broad spectrum of issues.
Operational - this level finds boards involved in the implementation of management decisions, and the expediting of routine matters involving rules, regulations, and procedures.

Now to the data. As Table 5 illustrates, in all decision areas except collective bargaining, the legislative level of decision-making was most frequently used. In collective bargaining, boards most frequently used a management level of involvement.

The management level of involvement is the second most utilized level, and the operational level is the third most frequently found level of board operation.

The literature of the community college is replete with admonitions to the board to stay out of operational matters (Pray, 1975, and others). The data for this study indicate that they do, most of the time. But, from 7.6% to 18.9% of those responding indicated board involvement in decision areas at the operational level.

Relationships Between Decision-Making Strategies, Decision Levels, and Type of Involvement in the Decision-Making Process

Thus far, the data has established the following across all areas of decision-making (i.e., personnel, student affairs, etc.):

1. Most boards in this study utilize a computational decision making strategy most of the time.
2. Most boards participated in the decision-making process at the legislative level the majority of the time.
TABLE 5
Frequencies and Percentages of Trustee Decision-Making Levels by Decision Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>67 70.5</td>
<td>19 20</td>
<td>8 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>66 69.5</td>
<td>16 16.8</td>
<td>12 12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>53 67.1</td>
<td>6 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
<td>61 64.2</td>
<td>23 24.2</td>
<td>10 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>61 64.2</td>
<td>23 24.2</td>
<td>11 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies &amp; External Pressure Groups</td>
<td>54 58.7</td>
<td>29 31.5</td>
<td>8 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Program Evaluation</td>
<td>68 71.6</td>
<td>16 16.8</td>
<td>10 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>63 66.3</td>
<td>14 14.7</td>
<td>18 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Program</td>
<td>71 75.5</td>
<td>13 13.8</td>
<td>10 10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Most boards utilized an approving and confirming type of involvement the majority of the time.

What is the relationship between board decision-making strategies and their type of involvement in the decision-making process? As Table 6 indicates, the strongest relationship between strategies and levels in terms of frequencies and percentages was between the computation decision strategy, and the approved and confirmed type of involvement.

The strongest clusters of relationships in the faculty concerns area were as follows: reviewed and advised/computation (35, or 55.6%); approved and confirmed/computation (22, or 34.0%). The decided/computation category yielded a frequency of 6 (or, 9.5%).

It appears from the data that the boards, in the faculty concerns area, are recipients of proposals and recommendations that have received considerable deliberation at other levels within the institution. Once receiving the recommendations and proposals, it appears that the data was sufficient enough, both quantitatively and qualitatively, to permit straightforward, rational analysis, which is the essence of the computation strategy. A substantial amount of rubber stamping appears to take place in this area (22, or 34.0% in the approved and confirmed level of the type of involvement variable.)

Significant scores computed from \( x^2 \) yielded \( S = 0.016 \). This is highly significant at the .05 level. Therefore, generalizations to the population of boards could be made


### TABLE 6
**Relationships Between Decision-Making Strategies and Type of Involvement in the Personnel Area**

*N = 98*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
<th>Decision-Making Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R & A = Reviewed and Advised

A & C = Approved and Confirmed*
with a great deal of confidence about the relationships found in the faculty concerns area.

A summary of the relationships found between levels of the type of involvement variable, and levels of the decision strategy variable establish that all except those in the faculty concerns decision area were rejected at the .05 level.

The relationships of strongest significance in the faculty concerns decision area, as stated earlier, were: computation/reviewed and advised (35, or 55.6%); computation/approved and confirmed (22, or 34.0%); and computation/decided (6, or 9.5%). (See Table 7)

Decision-Making Strategies and Decision Levels

The data for this section will be presented succinctly. The pattern of significance scores being greater than the .05 level, and therefore allowing the substantial probability of chance relationships, continues in the analysis of decision strategies and decision levels, as it had occurred previously in the relationships between decision strategies and type of involvement. Across all categories of decision areas, relationships between the variables being discussed here were rejected at the .05 level, with the exception of the institutional and program evaluation area. In the institutional and program evaluation area, the findings were that 54 (or, 76.1%) of the respondents indicated that their boards operated at the legislative level while utilizing a computational decision-making strategy. Eleven (or, 15.5%) of the boards were reported in the computation/management
TABLE 7

Relationships Between Decision-Making Strategies and Type of Involvement in the Area of Faculty Concerns

N = 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Majority Judgment</th>
<th>Inspiration</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; A</td>
<td>35 55.6</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>1 16.7</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>3 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided</td>
<td>6 9.5</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>3 50.0</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
<td>22 34.9</td>
<td>2 50.0</td>
<td>2 33.3</td>
<td>3 42.9</td>
<td>9 75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = 0.016

R & A = Reviewed and Advised
A & C = Approved and Confirmed
category; and six (or, 8.5%) utilized an operational level and the computational decision-making strategy.

What does this mean? It is this investigator's interpretation that in the institutional and program evaluation area, the systematic analysis of data (computational strategy) in the process of formulating policies and broad goals and objectives (legislative level) was the most frequent mode of operation (see Table 7). The relationships in the area just discussed are highly significant at the .05 level because S = 0.0002.

**Research Objective #4**

The next research objective for which data will be reported and analyzed asks: do structural variables pertaining to board size, composition, and frequency of meetings tend to have a relationship to decision-making strategies of selected community college boards of trustees?

The first task to be undertaken here will be the establishment of a description of board structural characteristics. Boards ranged in size from two to 23 members, with an average size of 8 (7.6). Seventy-six of the boards reporting indicated that they had one or more female members. Twenty-two indicated that all members were male, and the average number of females per board was 2 (1.5).

In examining the ethnic composition of the boards, the data indicated the following: of the 95 boards responding to questions about ethnicity, 89 indicated having no oriental members and six indicated having one. Fifty-nine boards
TABLE 8
Relationships Between Board Decision-Making Strategies
And Levels of Decisions
In The Institutional and Program Evaluation Area

N = 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Decisions</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Majority Judgment</th>
<th>Inspiration</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.1 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>20.0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>92.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>60.0 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>20.0 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=71  n=1  n=5  n=4  n=13

S = 0.0002
had no black members; 24 had one; 8 had two; and 4 had three \((N = 95)\). Native Americans fared even worse than the previous ethnic groups. Ninety-one boards had none \((N = 92)\), and one had 3. Persons of Hispanic origin were not present on 88 boards \((N = 95)\), and only five had one, and two had two.

In viewing all minorities as one category, divided into male and female levels, the data indicated that 56 (or, 58.9%) of the boards reporting had no minority males. The remainder of the data produced a mean of less than 1 \((0.53)\) minority males per board. Minority females were not present on 80 \((N = 95)\) of the boards reporting. Again, the mean was less than 1 \((0.17)\) per board.

These findings substantiate and continue the charges (Bernd, 1973, and others) that boards are unrepresentative of the constituencies they serve.

Having established the size and composition of the boards, the next question to be dealt with concerns the number of meetings held. This feature identifies the community college board as accurately as any other from the boards of four year public and private institutions of higher learning. Community college boards in this study met an average of 12.9 times per academic year. This finding is completely consistent with those reported in the literature.
Relationships Between Structural Variables and Decision-Making Strategies

The first structural variable to be examined as related to the four levels of the decision-strategy variable will be frequency of board meetings. The data indicate no significant relationships at the .05 level between the variables in the following decisioning areas: personnel, student affairs, collective bargaining, external pressure groups, and institutional program evaluation and faculty concerns.

However, in the decision area of administrative policies and procedures, the computation decision strategy is strongly related to boards that meet between 9 and 12 times per academic year (26, or 66%, N = 63). $S = 0.000$ for these relationships, leaving virtually no possibility for chance to be a plausible alternative hypothesis.

The data suggest that boards who use straightforward analysis (I am inferring here), and the technical aids that are available to assist that process (computer information systems, etc.) in the decision area of administrative policies and procedures, need to and do meet often.

Relationships between frequency of meetings and the computation decision-making strategy in the decision area of business and finance were very significant at the .05 level ($S = 0.0002$).

As was true with relationships discussed in the area of administrative policies and procedures, a strong relationship exists between the computation decision strategy
and boards that meet from 9-12 times per academic year (45, or 53.0%, N = 85). It should be recalled that business and finance related concerns were reported as the board's most frequently dealt with topic.

A final decision area evidencing a strong relationship ($S = 0.0289$) between the computation decision strategy and the frequency of meetings was that of external agencies. In this area, boards (35, or 66.0%, N = 53) meeting between nine and twelve times per academic year most frequently utilized the computation strategy.

The next relationships to be examined are those between sex, ethnicity, and the four levels of the decision strategy variable. The data indicated, and predictably so, a strong relationship ($S = 0.000$) between boards that were predominantly male (all of them) and the computation decision-making strategy, across all categories of decision areas. There were no significant relationships between the presence of female or oriental board members and decision-making strategies in any of the decision area categories. It appears that the number of female or oriental members per board is too small to substantially influence the board's operating style.

In examining the relationship between the presence of black and Hispanic board members and decision-making strategies, the data indicated the following. There were no significant relationships between black or Hispanic
membership and board decision-making strategy, except in three areas. In the external agencies decision area, the computational strategy prevailed. In the external pressure groups area, relationships between black presence and the computation strategy were significant at the .05 level ($S = 0.007$), and in the administrative policies and procedures area, relationships between Hispanic minority presence and the computation strategy were significant at the .05 level ($S = 0.002$).

It would appear that black or Hispanic minority presence exerts influence over the selection of board decision-making strategy in the areas just outlined. That appearance is dispelled, however, when it is recalled that across all decision areas, and all relationships examined thus far, the computation strategy is the predominant one used by the boards. Were minority presence to make a difference, a strategy other than computation would have to be related to that presence.

An examination of the data for the remaining structural variables revealed the following. Of the 95 boards responding to questions concerning sub-committee usage, 66 indicated that they utilized subcommittees and 29 indicated that they did not. Of the 66 responding to questions about the usefulness of subcommittees, 62 (or, 91.1%) indicated that they were useful in expediting board business. Six (or, 8.8%) felt that subcommittees were not very useful.
Cross tabulations and statistical procedures were undertaken to determine if the usage of subcommittees had an effect upon board decision-making strategy. The data revealed no significant relationships across decision area categories at the .05 level.

Identical analytical procedures were undertaken to ascertain whether board size was related to decision strategies and, once again, no significant relationships were found.

Research Objective #5

External and Internal Pressures and Decision-Making Strategies

Research objective number five asks: what are the internal and external pressures that selected community college boards perceive as having a relationship to their selection of decision-making strategies?

External Pressures

The respondents reported as illustrated in Table 9 that they perceived federal agencies (23, or 24.2%) and state agencies (34, or 36.2%) as having exerted considerable pressure upon the decision-making process. Thirty-eight (or, 40.4%) and 28 (or, 29.5%) reported that state agencies and federal agencies, respectively, had a moderate influence upon board decision-making. Viewing the considerable and moderate categories as aggregates, the data reveal that 72 (or, 76.6%) of the respondents felt that state agencies had influence upon their decision-making, and 51 (or, 53.7%) felt that
### TABLE 9
Trustee Perceptions of External Sources of Pressure As Related to Decision-Making

\( N = 98 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Unable to Say</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>29 30.5</td>
<td>5 5.3</td>
<td>39 41.1</td>
<td>21 22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td>23 24.2</td>
<td>28 29.5</td>
<td>11 11.6</td>
<td>22 23.2</td>
<td>11 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>34 36.2</td>
<td>38 40.4</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>14 14.9</td>
<td>6  6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td>13 13.7</td>
<td>19 20.0</td>
<td>5 5.3</td>
<td>16 16.8</td>
<td>42 44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Government</td>
<td>10 10.4</td>
<td>25 25.5</td>
<td>5 5.2</td>
<td>32 33.3</td>
<td>24 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certifying Agencies</td>
<td>17 17.7</td>
<td>38 39.6</td>
<td>14 14.6</td>
<td>17 17.7</td>
<td>10 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colleges or Univer-</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>28 29.2</td>
<td>17 17.7</td>
<td>29 30.2</td>
<td>21 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Groups</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>21 21.9</td>
<td>12 12.5</td>
<td>30 31.3</td>
<td>32 33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
federal agencies influenced board decisioning behavior.

In the area of community organizations, boards indicated that only 1.1% of the time did community organizations exert a considerable influence upon board decision making, but 29 (or, 30.5%) said that community organizations exerted a moderate influence. The largest single influence category to be reported was that indicating little influence. In this category, 39 (or, 41.1%) of the boards felt that community organizations exerted little influence over board decisioning, and 21 (or, 22.1%) said that they had no influence over board decisioning.

In the labor union area, the largest frequency of responses was in the no influence area. Forty-two (or, 44.2%) of the boards were in this area.

The city government area was viewed by 10 (or, 10.4%) of the respondents as having considerable influence; by 25 (or, 25.5%) as having moderate influence; by 32 (or, 33.3%) as having little influence; and by 24 (or, 25.0%) as having no influence at all.

Certifying agencies were viewed by 38 (or, 39.6%) of the boards as having a moderate influence upon board deliberations, while an equal number (17, or 17.7%) of boards reported that certifying agencies exerted considerable or little influence. Fourteen (or, 14.6%) of the respondents were in the "unable to say" category, and 10 (or, 10.5%) felt that the agencies had no influence upon board deliberations.
The data concerning the influence of other colleges or universities upon board decision-making indicated that most respondents (29, or 20.2%) felt that other institutions exerted little influence. However, 28 (or, 29.2%) felt that other institutions exerted a moderate influence. This finding may be indicative of the differing levels of emphasis placed upon transfer programs by schools in the sample, even though all were public, two-year community colleges.

Business and industry was viewed by 44 (or, 45.8%) as exerting a moderate influence upon board decisioning; four (or, 4.2%) indicated considerable influence; 28 (or, 29.2%) indicated little influence; and 13 (or, 13.5%) indicated no influence.

The final potential external source of pressure or influence to be examined is that of special interest groups. Most respondents (30, or 31.3%) indicated little pressure from special interest groups. Twenty-one (or, 21.9%) indicated moderate influence; 12 (or, 12.5%) were unable to say; and one (or, 1.0%) indicated considerable influence.

A composite ranking of external sources of pressure in declining order of influence would indicate the following: (1) state agencies; (2) federal agencies; (3) business and industry; (4) certifying agencies; (5) city government and other college and universities (these two sources had the same composite score); (6) labor unions; (7) community organizations; and (8) special interest groups.
Internal Pressures

The data provided in Table 10 describe the data which the respondents characterized their boards as perceiving the president and his staff, faculty committees, collective bargaining units, administrative officers, and student organizations as internal or intra-institutional sources of pressure as related to board decision-making. Most boards (42, or 43.8%) felt that the president and his staff exerted considerable pressure upon trustee decisioning. An almost equally large number (32, or 33.3%) reported that the president and his staff exerted moderate influence or pressure.

Only four (or, 4.2%) of the boards considered faculty committees as exerting considerable pressure. But 50 (or, 52.1%) felt that they exerted moderate pressure. And on the other end of the scale, 24 (or, 25.0%) felt that faculty committees exerted little pressure; while 12 (or, 12.5%) felt that they exerted no pressure at all.

In considering collective bargaining units as influencer of trustee decision-making, 17 (or, 18.3%) of the boards perceived them as exerting considerable pressure; 31 (or, 33.3%) indicated moderate pressure; six (or, 6.5%) indicated little pressure; and 34 (or, 36.6%) reported no pressure. If considerable and moderate response categories are combined, a total of 49 (or, 51.6%) of the respondents felt that collective bargaining units exerted some degree of influence. On the other hand, if the "little" and "no"
TABLE 10  
Trustee Perceptions of Internal Sources of Pressure  
As Related to Decision-Making  

N = 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Unable To Say</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President and staff</td>
<td>42 43.8</td>
<td>32 33.3</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>11 11.5</td>
<td>9  9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committees</td>
<td>4  4.2</td>
<td>50 52.1</td>
<td>6  6.3</td>
<td>24 25.0</td>
<td>12 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>17 18.3</td>
<td>31 33.3</td>
<td>5  5.4</td>
<td>6  6.5</td>
<td>34 36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officers</td>
<td>12 12.6</td>
<td>43 45.3</td>
<td>2  2.1</td>
<td>25 26.3</td>
<td>13 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations</td>
<td>1  1.0</td>
<td>36 37.5</td>
<td>9  9.4</td>
<td>46 46.9</td>
<td>4  4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categories were combined, 40 (or, 43.1%) of the boards felt that collective bargaining units exerted almost no influence.

It is this investigator's supposition, stated in earlier sections of this chapter, that the polarity of the data distribution may result from the condition that some boards responding do not have collective bargaining units to contend with.

In regard to administrative officers (other than the president and his staff), the data indicate that most boards (12, or 12.6%) in the considerable category, and 43 (or, 45.3%) in the moderate category consider them as sources from which pressure comes to bear upon board decisioning. Twenty-five (or, 26.3%) felt that administrative officers exerted little influence, and 13 (or, 13.7%) felt that they exerted no influence.

A surprising finding occurred in the student organizations category. While only one (or, 1.0%) felt that student organizations exerted considerable pressure upon board decisioning, 36 (or 37.5%) reported that they exerted a moderate influence. Considering the voluntary and involuntary non-participation of student organizations in the governance of institutions of higher learning, it was not anticipated that they would be considered as having an impact upon board decision-making to the extent described by the data.

Consistent with the pronouncements in the literature about student involvement in institutional governance, was the finding that 46 (or, 46.9%) of the boards felt that
student organizations exerted little influence upon board
decision-making, but only four (or, 4.2%) reported student
organizations as exerting no influence.

A composite ranking of internal sources of pressure areas
would indicate the following in declining order of influence:
(1) the president and his staff; (2) faculty committees;
(3) administrative officers; (4) collective bargaining units;
and (5) student organizations.

Research Objective 6

Research objective number six asks: does the source and
time of arrival of information tend to have a relationship
to the decision-making behavior of selected community col-
lege boards of trustees as analyzed in the Thompson and
Tuden, and Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan models?

The following is a statistical description of infor-
mation sources used by trustees in decision-making. Most
board members (47, or 49.5%) indicated that expert outside
opinion played a moderate role as an information source in
their decision-making. Twelve (or, 12.6%) reported that it
played a considerable role; 23 (or, 24.2%) listed expert
outside opinion as having little role; and 7 (or, 7.4%)
indicated no role. Combining the largest categories, con-
siderable and moderate, 59 (or, 62.1%) of the boards indi-
cated that outside expert opinion had played a substantial
role as an information source in their decision-making process.

As an information source, 74 (or, 77.1%) of the boards
responded that the institution's president and his staff
were of considerable importance in board decision-making; and an additional 18 (or, 18.8%) reported that the president and his staff were of moderate importance. Only one (or, 1.0%), and three (or, 3.1%) indicated that the president and his staff were of no or little importance. No respondents indicated that they were "unable to say".

Data for the board advisory committee information area was mixed across response categories. Ten (or, 10.4%), and 35 (or, 36.5%) of the boards reported that advisory committees were considerably and moderately important, respectively, while 31 (or, 32.3%) and 14 (or, 14.6%) indicated that advisory committees were of little or no importance.

There is no data in this study which determines whether boards did or did not have advisory committees. This data, if available, would assist in clarifying the distribution of data across response categories. Two of many plausible alternative hypotheses may explain why 45 (or, 46.9%) of the respondents indicate considerable to moderate importance of board advisory committees as an information source, while 45 (or, 46.9%) considered advisory committees of little or no importance. The first hypothesis is that advisory committees are weak and used ineffectually by some boards. The second is that some boards do not have advisory committees.

Concerning board sub-committees as sources of information, 36 (or, 38.7%) of the respondents said that they were of moderate importance. Twenty-one (or, 22.6%) said they were of
considerable importance; 22 (or, 23.7%) said they were of no importance; and 13 (or, 14.0%) said they were of little importance.

The data concerning sub-committees is distributed similarly to those in the advisory committee area. This investigator would conjecture the same tentative plausible alternative hypotheses: little or poor use of sub-committees by some boards, and no sub-committees to use in the case of other boards.

A comment before moving to the next category. Pray (1975) warns that part of the problem concerning the poor performance of boards evolves around the fact that far too often they attempt to be experts in all areas, meeting in plenary session and consuming great amounts of time while accomplishing little.

The remedy he suggests is boards of sufficient size (no smaller than nine) so that sub-committees could be established with the charge to become expert about a circumscribed issue or range of issues.

Boards reported that they relied heavily upon personal knowledge as an information source. Thirty-four (or, 36.2%) indicated personal knowledge was of considerable importance; 40 (or, 42.6%) reported that personal knowledge was of moderate importance; 9 (or, 9.6%) said it was of little importance; and no respondents said it was of no importance. Combining the considerable and moderate response categories, 74 (or, 78.8%) felt that personal knowledge was an important
source of information in board decision-making.

The above fact, coupled with the majority of board members being professionals in business or industry, may explain why boards spend most of their time making decisions in the areas of business and finance, personnel, and physical plant.

Considering special interest groups as sources of board information, only one respondent felt that they were of considerable importance. Thirty-five (or, 36.5%) said special interest groups were of little importance; 32 (or, 33.3%) indicated they were of no importance; and 10 (or, 10.4%) were "unable to say".

In the student or faculty groups area, only two boards indicated that special interest groups were important sources of information in board decisioning. Fifty-one (or, 53.1%) said that they were of moderate importance; 33 (or, 34.4%) indicated that they were of little importance; and 3 (or, 3.1%) reported that they were of no importance.

State or county government information sources were viewed by boards as of considerable importance in 14 (or, 14.6%) of the responses received. In 47 cases (or, 49.0%), state or county government sources were perceived as being moderately important; 6 (or, 6.3%) of the boards were "unable to say"; 23 (or, 24.0%) said that state or county government sources were of little importance; and 6 (or, 6.3%) said that they were of no importance.
In analyzing the data for the federal government area as an important information source, the following pertains: 30 (or, 31.9%) felt that data from the federal government was of little importance; 28 (or, 29.8%), however, felt it was of moderate importance; 16 (or, 17.0%) felt it was of considerable importance; 13 (or, 13.8%) were "unable to say"; and 7 (or, 7.4%) reported it was of no importance.

The following is a composite ranking in declining order of importance of information sources: (1) the president and his staff; (2) personal knowledge; (3) state or county government; (4) expert outside opinion; (5) board subcommittees; (6) student or faculty groups; (7) federal government; (8) advisory committees; and (9) special interest groups. Table 10 provides data for this section.

Relationships Between Expert Outside Opinion as an Information Source and Decision-Making Strategies

All relationships have been analyzed at the .05 level of significance. The following decision areas contained insignificant relationships between the four levels of the decision strategy variable and the information source variable: personnel, student affairs, faculty concerns; administrative policies and procedures; business and finance; external pressure groups; and institutional and program evaluation.

Significant relationships were found between expert outside opinion and levels of the decision strategy variable in the collective bargaining decision area ($S = 0.01$; only levels of each variable that contain substantial frequencies
TABLE 11

Sources of Information Used In
Trustee Decision-Making

N = 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Unable To Say</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Outside Opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Staff</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Advisory Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Sub-Committee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Knowledge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or Faculty Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or County Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will be discussed. All frequencies for all levels of each variable are represented in the significance score.)

A significant relationship was also found between the variables under consideration in the external agency decision area ($S = 0.04$).

**Relationships Between the President and His Staff as Information Sources and Decision-Making Strategies**

Across all decision areas, no significant relationships were found between the variables under consideration.

**Relationships Between Board Sub-Committees as Information Sources and Decision-Making Strategies**

In the personnel decision area, a significant relationship ($S = 0.0005$) was found between board sub-committees as a source of information and the computation decision-making strategy (65, or 70.7%). Significant relationships were also apparent in the student affairs area. Seventy (or, 76.1%) of the respondents comprised the frequency of responses relating the computation decision-making strategy to board sub-committees as an information source in the student affairs area ($S = 0.0009$).

All other decision areas contained no relationships significant at the .05 level.

**Relationships Between Board Member Personal Knowledge as an Information Source and Decision-Making Strategies**

As was true in the previously discussed relationships, a highly significant relationship was found between
variables in the personnel decision area. Personal knowledge was strongly related to the computation decision strategy in the personnel area ($S = 0.0053$), and $N = 66$ (or, 71%) of the boards reporting.

The personal knowledge variable and the computation decision were also significantly related in the following decision areas: student affairs ($S = 0.0002$, $N = 71$ or 76.3%); collective bargaining ($S = 0.0213$, $N = 49$ or 57%); faculty concerns ($S = 0.0088$, $N = 63$ or 67%); institutional and program evaluation ($S = 0.0001$, $N = 71$ or 75.5%); and business and finance ($S = 0.0002$, $N = 84$ or 89.4%).

In relating personal knowledge to decision strategies, board members appeared to be less confident of their own resources in the following areas in which no significant relationships were found at the .05 level: administrative policies and procedures; external agencies; and external pressure groups.

**Relationships Between Special Interest Groups as Information Sources and Decision Strategies**

Significant relationships between the computation decision-making strategy and special interest groups as an information source were found in the decision areas of administrative policies and procedures ($S = 0.032$, $N = 81$ or 89.4%), and external agencies ($S = 0.019$, $N = 58$ or 61.1%).
Relationships between the variables being discussed here proved to be insignificant at the .05 level in the remainder of the decision areas.

**Relationships Between Student or Faculty Groups as Information Sources and Decision Strategies**

Across all decision area categories, no relationships between the variables being discussed were significant at the .05 level.

**Relationships Between State or County Government as Information Sources and Decision-Making Strategies**

Analysis of the data disclosed that there was a significant relationship between the computation decision-making strategy and state or county government as an information source in the following decision areas: business and finance ($S = 0.003, N = 86$ or $89.6\%$); and external pressure groups ($S = 0.002, N = 54$ or $56.8\%$).

No significant relationships were found between the variables being described in the remaining decision areas.

A comment before describing the next category of relationships. Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi (1972) and others have warned of the increasing encroachment of external governmental agencies into the operation of community colleges.
Relationships Between the Federal Government as an Information Source and Decision-Making Strategies

Significant relationships were found between the federal government as an information source and the computation decision strategy in the following decision areas: institutional and program evaluation ($S = 0.040, N = 72$ or $76.6\%$); external pressure groups ($S = 0.0002, N = 52$ or $55.9\%$); and student affairs ($S = 0.0001, N = 71$ or $76.3\%$).

No relationships were found to be significant at the .05 level between the variables being discussed here in the remaining decision areas.

In all of the decision areas examined, boards were "unable to say" about decision-making activity in the area of board evaluation of board performance. Therefore, no relationships between variables could be examined. The condition of board inattention to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of their performance in dispatching their considerable responsibilities continues.

Relationships Between Information Sources and Decision Levels

The definitions for decision levels are in need of review at this point. The concept of decision levels as modified and developed in this study has its origin in the work of Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan.

Decision levels are defined as follows:

1. Legislative - This level describes board decisioning behavior that involves policy formulation, and/or the
development of broad institutional goals.

(2) Management - This level describes board decision-making behavior that involves the interpretation of policy and rules where areas of conflict exist with regard to a broad spectrum of issues.

(3) Operational - This level describes board decision-making behavior that involves the implementation of management decisions, and the expediting of routine matters involving rules, regulations, and procedures.

Relationships Between Expert Outside Opinion as an Information Source and Decision Levels

In the physical plant area, the data indicated a significant relationship (S = 0.019) between expert outside opinion and the decision levels. Legislative (N = 63 or 69.2%) was the level having the largest frequency; operational had 17 (or 18.7%); and management had 11 (or 12.1%).

It appears that the boards in this sample are not as involved at the operational level as their brethren have been accused of in the literature. However, optimum practice would urge them not to get involved at the operational level at all.

In the decision area, external pressure groups or agencies, information from expert outside opinion was found to be significantly related to decision levels (S = 0.023). Again, the legislative level had the highest frequencies (N = 53 or 60.2%), followed by management (N = 28 or 31.8%).
Expert outside opinion was found to be related to the legislative level \((N = 59\) or 64.8\%); the management level \((N = 22\) or 24.2\%); and the operational level \((N = 10\) or 11.0\%). The significance score of 0.0009 virtually rules out the possibility of these relationships occurring by chance.

The last area in which information from expert outside sources was found to have significant relationship to the decision levels was institutional and program evaluation. The legislative level had a frequency and percentage of 67 (or, 73.6\%). The management level was 14 (or, 15.4\%); and the operational level was 10 (or, 11.0\%). \(S = 0.0009\) for these relationships.

No significant relationships were found in the remaining categories.

Relationships Between the President and His Staff as Information Sources and Decision Levels

Analysis of the data indicated no significant relationships between the level at which boards operated in the decision-making process and the president and his staff as information sources.

Students of the community college trusteeship agree that the president, acting as the pivotal staff person to the board, controls the quantity and quality, as well as the form of information being transmitted to the board in most instances. But, it appears from the data that the
level at which the board operates is not related to the
president and his staff as information sources.

Relationships Between Board Advisory Committees as Infor-
mation Sources and Decision Levels

Advisory committees as information sources were related to decision levels in the following decision areas.

In the personnel area, the two variables had a significance score of $S = 0.010$. Frequencies were 66 (or, 71.7%), legislative; 15 (or, 16.3%), management; and 11 (or, 12.0%), operational.

Student affairs contained significant relationships between advisory committees and decision levels ($S = 0.005$). Again, most of the relationships occurred in the legislative level where $N = 66$ (or 71.7%).

The physical plant area held significant relationships between the legislative level and advisory committees. The data appeared as follows: $N = 63$ (or 68.5%), $S = 0.030$.

Data analyzed in the faculty concerns decision area indicated significant relationships between advisory committees and decision levels. As was true with previous analyses, the legislative area held the largest frequency, 60 (or 65.3%). The significance score was $S = 0.004$.

No other significant relationships were found in the remaining decision areas.
Relationships Between Board Advisory Committees, Sub-committees, and Decision Levels

Sub-committees as information sources were found to be significantly related to the legislative decision level in the personnel decision area. Sixty-five (or, 72.2%) of the boards comprised the frequency from which relationships were computed. The significance score at the .05 level was $S = 0.004$, indicating that this relationship could have occurred by chance in 4 of 1000 cases.

Continuing the pattern where relationships have existed between variables in decision areas, board sub-committees as information sources were significantly related to the legislative decision level at the .05 level. Sixty-eight (or, 76.4%) of the boards represent the frequency and percentage of the relationship. The significance score was $S = 0.033$.

Other decision areas in which board sub-committee use of the legislative decision level were found to be significantly related were faculty concerns, $N = 59$ (or, 65.6%); and institutional and program evaluation, where 65 (or, 72.2%) of the boards comprised the frequency and percentage of boards within which sub-committees as information sources had a significant relationship to the level at which the board operated (in this instance, the legislative level.) The student affairs decision area also contained statistically significant relationships between board sub-committees as
The data indicates that \( N = 65 \) (or, 71.4\%) and \( S = 0.020 \). No other significant relationships at the .05 level were found in the remaining decision areas.

**Relationships Between Special Interest Groups as Information Sources and Decision Levels**

Only two decision areas contained relationships significant at the .05 level in this category of analysis. Those areas were business and finance, and physical plant. In the business and finance area, the frequency and percentage found in the relationship between special interest groups as information sources and decision levels was 59 (or, 64.1\%). Data in the physical plant area revealed that in 63 (or, 68.5\%) of the boards, decision levels were related to special interest group information.
Chapter five is divided into four sections. The first will summarize the findings presented in chapter four. The second will develop conclusions that can be drawn from the summary of findings. The third will present implications, and the fourth will present this investigator's recommendations.

**Summary**

Institutions of higher learning were forced by demands from the disenchanted in the sixties to take introspective stock of their goals, philosophies, and governance structures. The board of trustees (across institutional types), as a vital component of that governance structure, was a special target for those demanding reform.

It appears, from an in-depth examination of the literature of the community college in the seventies, that little has been done to systematically study and present information about the dynamics of board operation. It appears that the seeds for future disenchantment are awaiting germination, and, in the meantime, community colleges are stumbling over one more obstacle in their attempt to fulfill their educational
missions. Data from this study document generalizations empirically tested and presented in the literature, that women and ethnic minorities are grossly under-represented on the board. Specifically, less than one percent of board membership is comprised of women and minorities of any ethnic category. Additionally, boards are dominated by college educated, middle to upper middle class professionals from business and industry. By any standards, these categories of individuals do not represent a cross section of the professional, blue collar and socio-economic strata of most communities.

Critics of the community college have observed that little is known about the dynamics of board performance. Much of this study has been devoted to the examination of selected facets of the all-important decision-making process.

Research objective number one has attempted to determine what boards of trustees make decisions about. The findings were that, in declining order of importance as measured by the amount of time spent in each decision area, boards concentrated their decision-making as follows: (1) business and finance; (2) personnel; (3) physical plant; (4) collective bargaining; (5) education programs or institutional and program evaluation; (6) faculty concerns; (7) student affairs, and (8) external agencies.

These findings are consistent with those presented in the literature, and establish a data base for the analysis of subsequent research objectives.
Having established a description of what boards have been making decisions about, the next category of findings to summarize are those generated by research objective two, which asked: what are the specific decision-making strategies utilized by selected community college boards of trustees, and how can they be described within the framework of Tuden and Thompson's model?

A summary of the findings indicates that in all of the decision areas (i.e., personnel, business and finance, etc.), board members reported that they agreed the majority of the time about causes of problems, and also about the preferred outcome in resolving those problems. By definition, this finding translates into a computation decision strategy which presumes a high level of rational behavior.

The data further indicated that the next most often employed decision strategy was that defined as inspirational. This conclusion was drawn when analysis of the findings indicated that in all decision areas, the number and percentage of board members who disagreed about the causes of problems, and also about preferences concerning the outcome in resolving problems was second only to the "agreed" and "agreed" juxtaposition of levels of the decision-making model (which translated in the computation strategy).

Boards found themselves lacking a consensus about the causes of a problem but in agreement about how they preferred to see it resolved a third of the time. The majority judgement decision-making strategy was translated from the
"disagreed"/"agreed" juxtaposition, and was the third most frequently used strategy.

The least utilized strategy of decision-making was that defined as bargaining. No more than 7 (or 7.0%) of the boards reporting indicated that they agreed about problem causes, but could not reach a consensus about preferred outcomes.

The next body of data to be summarized was that generated by responses to research objective number three, which asked: is there a relationship between decision-making strategies, type of involvement, and the level of decisions, as described in the Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan model?

Prior to answering objective three, a data base describing the extent to which board member decision-making behavior could be described in the three levels of the involvement, and four levels of the decision strategy variables will be summarized.

Type of Involvement

The most frequently used type of involvement was found to be the "approved and confirmed" level. This level was most often utilized in the personnel (64, or 65.3%); student affairs (38, or 39.6%); education programs (38, or 39.6%); and business and finance (38, or 39.6%) decision areas.

Trustees were found to have used the "reviewed and advised" level of the type of involvement variable to an extent second only to the "approved and confirmed" level. Decision areas where this level most frequently was employed
were: external agencies (42, or 47.2% where N = 89); faculty concerns (42, or 45% where N = 92); and institutional and program evaluation (38, or 41.8%).

The "decided" level of involvement was the least employed, but did have substantial frequencies in the physical plant (28, or 29.5%) and collective bargaining (44, or 55%) decision areas.

**Decision Levels**

The legislative decision level was the most frequently employed across all categories of decision areas except in the areas of collective bargaining and physical plant. In these areas, the management and operational levels were the most frequently employed, respectively. Overall, a ranking of the three levels according to the frequency of their use produced the following: (1) Legislative; (2) Management; and (3) Operational.

**Summary of Relationships Between the Type of Involvement and Decision Strategy Variables**

With the exception of the faculty concerns decision area, all relationships between the variables were rejected at the .05 level. In the faculty concerns area, the computation/reviewed and advised relationship had the highest frequencies, 35 (or, 55.6%); computation/approved and confirmed held 22 (or, 34.9%) of the boards; and computation/decided was represented by 6 (or, 9.5%) of the boards. All relationships were significant at .05 because S = 0.016.
Summary of Relationships Between Decision-Making Strategies and Decision Levels

Relationships between the variables were rejected at the .05 level across all decision areas with the exception of institutional and program evaluation. Significant relationships with varying frequencies were found between: computation/legislative - 54 (or, 76.1%); computation/management - 11 (or, 15.5%); and computation/operational - 6 (or, 8.5%). The relationships had a significance score of $S = 0.0002$.

Research objective number four asked: do structural variables pertaining to board size, composition, and frequency of meetings tend to have a relationship to the decision-making strategies of selected community college boards of trustees?

A summary of the data will be divided into two sections: the first, a description of board characteristics; and the second, an examination of relationships between the variables.

A Description

Boards in this study had an average size of 8 (mean = 7.6), and ranged from 2 to 23 members. Seventy-six of the boards had one or more female members (mean = 2.5), and twenty-two reported being all male.

Of the ninety-five boards responding to questions about ethnicity, only six had one oriental member, while eighty-nine had none. Fifty-nine reported having no black
members, and ninety-one reported having no Native Americans.

In examining the frequency of board meetings, it can be reported that boards met an average of 12.9 times per academic year.

All of the findings to this point support those generalizations found in the literature.

Relationships Between Frequency of Board Meetings and Decision-Making Strategies

In the majority of the decision areas, no significant relationship was found between the frequency of board meetings and the selection of a decision-making strategy. However, in the following decision areas, significant relationships were found between boards meeting 9-12 times per academic year, and use of the computation strategy:

1. administrative policies and procedures ($S = 0.000$);
2. business and finance ($S = 0.0002$); and
3. external agencies ($S = 0.0289$).

Relationships Between Sex, Ethnicity, and Decision-Making Strategies

As expected, a strong relationship was found between male dominated boards and the computation decision strategy ($S = 0.000$). No significant relationship was found between female membership and board decision-making strategies.
An apparently surprising finding was that black or Hispanic membership, even though comprising less than 1% of board memberships, was statistically significant in three areas. In the external agency and external pressure group areas, relationships between black or Hispanic membership and use of the computation strategy were significant, $S = 0.007$. And in the administrative policies and procedures area, Hispanic presence was related to the computation strategy, $S = 0.002$.

What appears to be significant relationships may not necessarily be so, when it is recalled that across most decision areas the computation strategy predominates. If black or Hispanic membership were to make a difference, this investigator would suggest that a strategy other than computation would be found in the relationship.

Relationships Between Sub-Committee Usage and Decision-Strategies

Though 62 (or, 91.1%) of the boards indicated that they had sub-committees, and that they were useful in expediting board business, no significant relationships were found between sub-committee usage and decision strategies.

Relationships Between Board Size and Decision Strategies

No significant relationships were found at the .05 level.
The fifth research objective for this study was designed to determine: what are the internal and external pressures that selected community college boards of trustees perceive as having a relationship to their selection of decision-making strategies?

A final composite ranking of external pressures indicated the following, in declining order of influence: (1) state agencies; (2) federal agencies; (3) business and industry; (4) certifying agencies; (5) city government and other colleges and universities (identical composite scores were computed); (6) labor unions; (7) community organizations; and (8) special interest groups.

A composite ranking of internal sources of pressure as perceived by board members indicated the following in declining order of influence: (1) the president and his staff; (2) faculty committees; (3) administrative officers; (4) collective bargaining units; and (5) student organizations.

The last section of the summary of data concerns research objective six: does the source of information tend to have a relationship to the decision-making behavior of community college boards of trustees as analyzed in the Thompson and Tuden, and Paltridge, Hurst, and Morgan models?

A Summary of Information Sources

There are a number of interesting and objectively unexplainable distributions of data in this section (Chapter IV discussed each). For example, board advisory committees
had identical frequencies and percentages of respondents indicating them as being of considerable or moderate importance as an information source, and indicating them as being of little or no importance. A statistical coincidence? There is no empirical data to clarify this finding. Two of the plausible alternate hypotheses, suggested in explanation of the negative responses and offered in Chapter IV were:

(1) advisory committees are weak and used ineffectually by some boards;

(2) other boards do not have advisory committees at all.

A final composite ranking of internal information sources, in declining order of importance, follows:

(1) the president and his staff; (2) personal knowledge; (3) state or county government; (4) expert outside opinion; (5) board sub-committees; (6) student or faculty groups; (7) federal government agencies; (8) advisory committees; and (9) special interest groups.

**Relationships Between Information Sources and Decision-Making Strategies**

Significant relationships at the .05 level were found between and within the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Between Information Sources and Decision-Making Strategies</th>
<th>Decision Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Strategies</td>
<td>Decision Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expert Outside Opinion/</td>
<td>External Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sub-Committees/</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sub-Committees/</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal Knowledge/</td>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Special Interest Groups/</td>
<td>Administrative Policies and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Special Interest Groups/</td>
<td>External Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. State or County Government/</td>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. State or County Government/</td>
<td>External Pressure Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Federal Government/</td>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Federal Government/</td>
<td>External Pressure Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Federal Government/</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships Between Information Sources and Decision Levels

Significant relationships at the .05 level were found between and within the following:

Relationships Between Information Sources and Decision Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Information Sources and Decision Levels</th>
<th>Decision Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Expert Outside Opinion/Management</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Expert Outside Opinion/Legislative</td>
<td>External Pressure Groups or Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Expert Outside Opinion/Legislative</td>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Advisory Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Advisory Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advisory Committees/Management</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Advisory Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sub-Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sub-Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Faculty Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sub-Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Institutional and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sub-Committees/Legislative</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Special Interest Groups/Legislative</td>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Special Interest Groups/Management</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having distilled and presented the significant relationships found between information sources, decision levels, and decision-making strategies, a comment about a totally unexpected insignificant relationship is in order. The president and his staff were considered of foremost importance as an information source. Yet, it appears from the data that the role of the president and his staff as a critical information conduit does not determine whether boards will dabble in operational or management levels of an issue, or confine their work to policy and institutional goal type considerations.
CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented in this section represent generalizations drawn from the data that have further corroborated and extended those found in the literature. They also represent new contributions to the body of knowledge concerning the community college board of trustees.

Without reservation, it can be concluded that boards do not represent a cross-section of the people in the communities that they serve. This situation may have serious implications for the governance structure of community colleges, and, intimately related to that structure, the capacity of the colleges to determine what educational resources are needed in their constituency areas, and to deliver those resources via the most effective means. The board of trustees would be an excellent level within the institution to begin to eliminate the incongruity between the philosophies, goals, and objectives of the institutions and the way they actually function, by developing appropriate policies and the means for their implementation.
Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings concerning what boards make decisions about. The literature has indicated, and this study substantiates further, that boards spend most of their time in the business and finance, physical plant, and personnel areas. When the fact that most board members are professionals from business and industry is considered, this finding is not surprising. The problem is that other important areas within the institution (academic affairs, etc.) receive less than the full, in-depth scrutiny of the board, which is charged as the public trustee of the entire institution.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the findings is that while boards are aware of the warnings being sounded about the encroachment of external agencies and/or government offices into the affairs of the institutions, they are not making decisions about how to handle the problem. In an eight category ranking of areas about which the board spent most of its time making decisions, external agencies (which includes state or federal government) was ranked eighth.

Concerning decision-making strategies, it can be concluded that boards are generally in agreement about the causes of problems and about how they would like to see them resolved. Therefore, in the language of our decision strategy model, a computation strategy was used most of
the time (see Thompson and Tuden, p. 56). This is not to say that other strategies were not employed, but the greatest frequencies were in the computation category. An inference might be that the homogeneity of the board composition may be related to this finding.

Based upon the findings it is clear that boards operate at the approved and confirmed type of involvement in their deliberations and employ a computation decision strategy which implies the straightforward analysis of data. The problem is that the analysis that the board brings to bear on data is not as effective as it might be, because they are approving and confirming decisions that have already been made at other levels.

Though boards utilized the approved and confirmed type of involvement most of the time, they also used the other types of involvement. In the decision areas of faculty concerns, external agencies, and institutional and program evaluation, boards used the reviewed and advised type of involvement, for example. The decided type of involvement, which implies systematic analysis of data and conclusions based upon those analyses, was used frequently in the areas of collective bargaining and physical plant.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the findings is that boards in this study generally concerned themselves with the broad policy and institutional goals and objectives
aspects of problems (the legislative level). Management and operational levels of involvement were employed occasionally.

Regarding the data which described whether decision strategies and type of involvement are related, other than with the exception of the faculty concerns area, there is no significant relationship between whether boards wish to operate at the policy or implementation levels, and the kind of decision strategy they might use.

An overriding conclusion that permeates every aspect of this study is that there is a strong \( S = 0.000 \) relationship between male domination on the board and the use of the computation decision strategy, and it can be concluded that everything that the board does is influenced by its composition, which finds minorities of any category - females included - totalling less than 1.0% of the membership. This finding confirms earlier studies.

The structure of the board as described by the data in this study is basically the same as that found by Hartnett in 1969. In analyzing whether there were relationships between board structural components such as size, subcommittees, and so forth, few significant relationships were found.

The data clearly indicate, and it must be concluded, that the president and his staff are not only the key information conduits to the board, but are also viewed as
the foremost internal sources of pressure related to board decision-making, followed by faculty committees, administrative officers, collective bargaining units, and students.

The previous conclusions withstanding, the president and his staff do not appear to affect the level of board involvement in issues.

In spite of the fact that the use of sub-committees and advisory boards holds potential for the improvement of board performance, the data indicate that neither are considered as important sources of information by the majority of the boards.

Another conclusion drawn from the data is that within selected decision areas, the source of information appears to be related to board decision-making strategies.
IMPLICATIONS

The following represents five of the major implications of this study.

1. If boards are going to be more efficient and competent in the dispatch of their duties (while representing all sectors of their constituency area), systematic orientation and educational programs are going to have to be implemented by the institutions and professional associations, which stress the importance and usefulness of subcommittees and advisory committees.

2. Board inattention or minimal attention to the full range of issues brought before them may be decreased if boards were more representative of the people in the communities that they serve.

3. Though realizing that state and federal government agencies are exerting an increasing influence over the affairs of the institutions, the lack of proaction by boards may find their decision-making prerogatives narrowly circumscribed. This lack of action can inhibit boards from reflecting and reacting to local constituent needs.
4. Though boards have recently been attempting to reassert themselves in decision areas long since delegated away, the fact that they continue to "rubber stamp" proposals and recommendations without thoroughly analyzing the implications of their approval, indicates that the erosion of board usefulness will continue in the foreseeable future.

5. The lack of effective problem solving/decision making by boards may be a direct function of the lack of debate and dissension on issues. If the homogeneity of opinion of the boards continues, community colleges may suffer from a paucity of quality performance at the top of the governance pyramid.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The review of the literature was unable to uncover any study that systematically analyzed the decisioning behavior of community college boards. Therefore, this study represents a first foray. Several recommendations will be offered to those interested in extending the findings of this study by further developing what we know about board decision-making, and to those interested in further developing the incomplete state of the art as regards the theory of collective decisioning.

It is recommended that:

1. Further studies be undertaken that utilize in-depth case studies, participant observation, and the analysis of board minutes and related documents. (Paltridge et al. offer an excellent example of non-reactive data collection and analysis.)

2. Future studies include an in-depth inquiry into the source and kind of influences, and the method by which they are brought to bear upon board decision-making.

3. Future studies would analyze and compare data concerning board decision-making according to the region in which the
institution is located, and according to whether the setting is rural or urban.

4. Future studies would attempt to determine whether an institution's use of technological hardware (computers, etc.) influenced decision-making, and if so, in what direction, and how and why.

5. Future studies building upon these findings be designed so that linear distributions of data can be collected and analyzed through the use of partial correlations, multiple regressions, and crossbreaks.

6. Future studies further refine and test the usefulness of the Hartnett decision categories and the Paltridge et al. and Thompson and Tuden models.

7. Boards set up a systematic decision-making process.

8. Boards undertake regular and systematic evaluation of their performance. Perhaps with the assistance of outside expertise.

9. Procedures be developed to insure a board composition that is representative of the people in the communities being served.

10. Boards undertake a careful analysis of the impact of external agencies upon their institution and design ways to maximize the positive contributions of external agency encroachment, while minimizing the negative aspects.
APPENDIX

The Survey Instrument
Correspondence with The Association of
   Governing Boards of Universities
   and Colleges
Correspondence with The American
   Association of Community and
   Junior Colleges
Pilot Test Letter of Transmittal
First Follow-Up Letter
Second Follow-Up Letter
Dear Board Member:

Trustees rarely speak for themselves in the literature and research that is published about community colleges. As a consequence, most of what we know about trustees is reported from the points of view of persons other than yourselves. And frequently suggestions are made as to what board members ought and ought not to do.

This national study is an attempt to record the points of view of board members regarding the discharge of their essential responsibilities.

Your institution has been selected at random. However, neither you or your institution will be identified in the final research report. Code numbers will be used for recording return rates and for follow-up mailings, if needed.

The identification of your response will remain in strictest confidence.

Your participation is wanted and needed. No one except you can provide the necessary information.

The results of this study will be available to you upon request.

Your assistance is sincerely appreciated. Please return the completed instrument to:

Alfred F. Head
The Ohio State University
Room 012, West Hall
1050 Carmack Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Sincerely,

Alfred F. Head
Doctoral Candidate
Educational Administration

Please return the completed instrument by April 25, 1977.
I. Decision-Making Strategies

Two dimensions of decision making will be examined in this section. For each area of concern (personnel, student affairs, etc.) two questions will be asked: 1) What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement of your board in the past year about the causes of problems or issues related to the area of concern and 2) What was the general extent of board agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to resolve or effectively address the problem or issue related to the area of concern.

Instructions: Please circle the number under the statement in the area marked "answer column" that most accurately describes the extent to which your board was in agreement or disagreement about questions 1 and 2 described in the previous paragraph and listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to personnel? ..........
| 2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to resolve or address the problems or issues related to personnel? .....................
| 1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to student affairs? .............
| 2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to resolve or address the problems or issues related to student affairs? ..................... |
1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to collective bargaining? 

2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to resolve or address the problems or issues related to collective bargaining?

1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to faculty concerns?

2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to address the problems or issues related to faculty concerns?

1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to administrative policy or procedures?

2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to address the problems or issues related to administrative policy or procedures?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to institutional and/or program evaluation? 

2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) or action needed to resolve or address the problems or issues related to institutional and/or program evaluation? 

1. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the causes of problems or issues related to evaluation of board performance? 

2. What was the general extent of agreement or disagreement about the course(s) of action needed to resolve or address the problems or issues related to evaluation of board performance? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agreed</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>unable to say</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>strongly disagreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agreed</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>unable to say</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>strongly disagreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Decision Making Levels

Please indicate which one of the three levels of board decision-making most accurately describes your board's typical level of activity in the listed areas by placing the number of the level in the spaces provided.

### Level 1 (Legislative)
- Policy formulation, that is the development of broad goals and objectives of the institution with regard to:

### Level 2 (Management)
- The interpretation of policy and rules where areas of conflict exist with regard to:

### Level 3 (Operational)
- The implementation of management decisions, including the expediting of routine matters (rules, regulations & procedural activities) with regard to:

### Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External Agencies or Pressure Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collective Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Institutional and/or Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Areas of Concern and Type of Involvement

Below are listed areas about which your board may have taken action in the past year. Please rank order the areas listed below according to which received the most attention in the past year, by placing the numbers 1 - 10 in the spaces provided in the answer column. The number "1" would indicate the area receiving the most attention, the number "10" the least. Use each number only once.

**Example:**
1. Personnel .................................. 4
2. Student Affairs ......................... 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External Agencies or Pressure Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collective Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Institutional and/or Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the number under the statement in the "answer column" that most accurately describes the type of board action taken in dealing with the below listed areas of concern.

**Explanation of answer statements:**

**Types of Involvement**

1) **Reviewed & Advised**
   - Reviewed work submitted and advised the submitters

2) **Decided**
   - Examined data and made a decision

3) **Approved & Confirmed**
   - Approved or confirmed decisions made at other levels.
### Areas of Concern and Type of Involvement (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External Agencies or Pressure Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collective Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Institutional and/or Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Involvement

- Revised
- Decided
- Approved
- Concluded
IV. Structural Variables

Please provide the information requested in the spaces below.

1. How many times did your board meet during the period September, 1975 to June, 1976.

2. How many members serve on your board?
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. How many of your board members are Oriental, Black, Native or Spanish surrogate Americans?

4. If other than 0 was indicated for the previous question, how many of the minorities are male or female?

5. Does your board utilize sub-committees?
   yes or no

6. If yes to the previous question, are the sub-committees helpful in the making of decisions?
   yes or no

V. External Pressures

To what extent did the following sources exert pressure upon the decision-making of the board in the past year?

Please circle the number under the statement in the "answer column" that most accurately describes the extent of pressure exerted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Pressure</th>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Coordinating or Controlling Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V. External Pressures (con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Pressure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Labor Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. City or County Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Certifying Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Area Universities or Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Business or Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Special Interest Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. Internal Pressures

To what extent did the following listed sources exert pressure upon the decision-making of the board in the past year?

Please circle the number under the statement in the "answer column" that most accurately describes the extent of pressure exerted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Pressure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President or his staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective Bargaining Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Background Information

Please check (✓) the appropriate space.

1. What is your age?
   (a) Under 30
   (b) 30 - 40
   (c) 41 - 50
   (d) 51 - 60
   (e) Over 60

2. Highest degree earned: (check one)
   (a) High School Diploma
   (b) Associate (or equivalent)
   (c) Bachelor's
   (d) Master's
   (e) Professional, other than master's (e.g., M.D., LLB)
   (f) Ph.D., Ed.D.

3. What is your race?
   (a) Caucasian
   (b) Black
   (c) Spanish
   (d) Native American
   (e) Oriental
   (f) Other

4. What is your sex?
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

5. Please indicate your total approximate family income last year. Consider annual income from all sources before taxes.
   (a) Less than $6,000
   (b) $6,000 - $9,999
   (c) $10,000 - $14,999
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many years have you served on your present board?
(a) 1 - 3 .........................
(b) 4 - 6 ........................
(c) 7 - 9 ........................
(d) 10 or more  ...................

7. What is your religious affiliation?
(a) Jewish ...........................
(b) Catholic ........................
(c) Protestant ....................... 
(d) Other ...........................
(e) No Formal Religion ..............

8. Please check (✓) the one category that best describes your primary occupation:
(a) Lawyer ...........................
(b) Judge ...........................
(c) Doctor of Medicine or Dentistry
(d) Clergy ...........................
(e) Businessman or Industrialist...
(f) Public Official ..................
(g) Student ........................
(h) Homemaker ......................
(i) Farmer, rancher, agriculturist
(j) Other (specify) ...............
VIII. Information Sources

To what extent did information from the listed sources play an important role in board decision-making in the past year?

Please circle the number under the statement in the "answer column" that most accurately answers the above question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Expert outside opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. President or his staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advisory Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board sub-committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal first-hand knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student groups or Faculty Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State or County Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Federal Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. Agendas

1. Do board members receive an agenda prior to the day of the meeting? yes no
   
2. If an agenda is received prior to the meeting, does the board receive information pertinent to agenda items a week or more prior to the meeting? yes no

3. Does the early arrival (a week or more prior to a meeting) of information facilitate the board's decision-making process? yes no

4. Does the late arrival (less than a week prior to a meeting) hinder the board's decision-making process? yes no
X. Literature

In the spaces provided please list those publications (books, journals, etc.) that you have read or read regularly that relate to community colleges.

1. ________________________________________
2. ________________________________________
3. ________________________________________
4. ________________________________________
5. ________________________________________
6. ________________________________________

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED INSTRUMENT TO:

Alfred P. Head
The Ohio State University
Room 012, West Hall
1050 Carrack Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Mr. Alfred F. Head  
2354 Grasmere Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43211

Dear Mr. Head:

The Association of Governing Boards does not maintain a list of governing boards for all colleges and universities. However, there are two other organizations which may be willing to provide you with information on the population you are interested in for your dissertation research.

Ms. Sandra Drake, Communications Associate at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, is preparing a survey on the composition of local boards of community colleges. Her address and telephone number is as follows:

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges  
Suite 410, 1 Dupont Circle  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: 202-293-7050

You may also find it helpful to contact the Association of Community College Trustees since their entire membership is comprised of trustees from this institutional category. They are located at 955 L'Enfant Plaza N., S.W., Suite 1406, Washington, D.C. 20024.
Mr. Alfred P. Head
page two
July 12, 1976

I hope that you will share the results of your research with us when this information is available.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy R. Axelrod
Coordinator
Trustee Information Clearinghouse
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

September 10, 1976

Alfred P. Head
2334 Grassmere Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43211

Dear Mr. Head:

Forgive my delay in responding to your request for information about our study of community college trustees. Our survey will be sent to approximately 200 private two-year colleges and to about 550 public two-year colleges with local governing boards. I have enclosed the list of public colleges and have marked the colleges that are, as far as I know, single campus colleges. You may want to check the information with the colleges or with state directors for two-year colleges. All of these names and addresses are in the 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory; a brochure is enclosed.

I'll be glad to send you a copy of our survey instruments when they are ready. In the meantime, please feel free to call or write with additional questions.

Concerning names and addresses of college trustees, we do not have such a listing but both the Association of Governing Boards and the Association of Community College Trustees have partial listings. Contact the Association of Community College Trustees at 953 L'Enfant Plaza, Suite 1046, Washington, D.C. 20024.

Sincerely,

Sandra L. Drake
Staff Associate
Data Information
December 6, 1976

Dear Board Member:

Your assistance in the refinement of the enclosed questionnaire designed to explore the decision-making strategies utilized by community college board members will be greatly appreciated.

Please complete the instrument and include any notations that you wish by the item in question.

I would also request that this instrument be returned by December 31, 1976.

Again, your contribution is crucial, and appreciated.

Cordially,

Alfred Head
Doctoral Candidate
February 25, 1977

Dear Board Member or Chairperson:

This letter is a follow-up reminder concerning the survey instrument sent to you on February 2, 1977, by Alfred F. Head, a research associate in the Department of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University.

I would like to again ask for your assistance in completing the survey instrument. The importance of this project cannot be minimized. As I am sure you are aware, everyone seems to speak for members of boards of trustees except the board members themselves. The results from this study will provide a beginning in rectifying this situation, and also will provide board members with information detailing how board members nationwide see themselves in decision-making situations. I believe that this information will be valuable feedback for you, and your response is an essential part of that feedback.

May I thank you for your consideration.

With highest regards, I am

Very sincerely,

[Signature]

William Moore, Jr.
Professor and Advisor to
Alfred F. Head

Survey instrument, Form "A", Board Chairperson not received

Survey instrument, Form "B", Board Member not received
April 12, 1977

Dear Board Member or Chairperson:

This letter is an additional reminder concerning the survey instrument sent to you on February 2 or March 2, 1977. While I do not wish to be a pest, I am again asking for your assistance in completing the survey instrument.

I recognize, with your considerable responsibilities, you may have misplaced the first instrument, therefore I am enclosing an additional one.

May I reiterate the importance of this project by stating that this study is one of the first designed to solicit from board members their perceptions and opinions concerning the important process of decision-making. The results from this study will provide board members with information detailing how board members nationwide see themselves in decision-making situations. I believe that this information will be valuable feedback for you, and your response is an essential part of that feedback.

May I again thank you for your consideration.

With highest regards, I am

Very sincerely,

William MacCoun
Professor and Advisor to
Alfred F. Pood

Survey instrument, Form "A", Board Chairperson not received.

Survey instrument, Form "B", Board Member not received.
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