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Chapter I

Introduction, Background and Statement of the Problem

Introduction

College student personnel work has, in its brief history, made several significant attempts to define a legitimate professional role for itself in higher education (COSPA, 1972). Traditionally, student personnel work has been defined by the services it provided to students. These services were generally supportive and extra curricular (Brown, 1972). Recently, it appears that questions of accountability and effectiveness from administrators, faculty and students are casting doubt as to the legitimacy of student personnel work and its future usefulness. The events of the 60's and 70's on college campuses have provided even greater emphasis on these questions about student personnel work. Many institutions perceived their student personnel staffs as control agents whose job was to "keep the lid on." When the "lid" came off in 1970, student personnel workers were accused of ineffectiveness and of not being able to "control their students." These events and these accusations have led to a general re-examination of the field of college student personnel work and its ability to deal with the more complex campuses that are emerging (COSPA, 1972).
The meritocracy of Jencks and Reisman (1968) outlines an institution (higher education) that values professional relations, research, consulting and personal advancement. The student has become the pawn for this professionalism. Parsons (1971) further describes higher education. He contends that a form of organization has evolved called "collegial associationalism," in which the primary responsibility of each member of the organization is to pursue and contribute to knowledge in such a way as to enhance one's position rather than to be responsible for this process to any group of people such as students. The dilemma this kind of organization presents to the student personnel worker is that to obtain the rewards offered by higher education (career advancement, prestige, professional recognition) would mean to disregard the student as the focus of work and pursue research and publication in order to advance. At present there is no adequate reward system in higher education to encourage the student personnel worker to pursue the traditional supportive services model of college student personnel work.

Many issues have been named as root causes for the recent upheavals in our colleges. It is becoming increasingly clear, however, that no matter what the demands, be they peace in Vietnam, ending racism, loosening parietal regulations, that the real issue was the role of students in the governance of their institutions. The painful experiences of rioting on our campuses resulted in students becoming a legitimate constituency in the campus community in the sense of true organization members. It placed the focus on higher education, in terms of its organizational arrangements, in ways that were both new.
and uncomfortable. Students gained power but many lacked skills to be effective organization members. Faculty were being scrutinized and asked to change priorities. Perhaps most painful of all was that the public was being asked to accept and support (with their tax dollars) a style and philosophy portrayed by some students that was morally reprehensible to them.

Where were the student personnel professionals during this upheaval? How have they changed their role to meet new needs? Penney (1969) talked of a "Profession Stillborn." Many began to wonder if there was perhaps more prophecy than pun in those words. The traditional responsibility of student affairs, control and discipline, had been shattered by a student body that understood power politics and who needed, not a patronizing "Dean" but a collaborator-consultant who understood risk taking and could mediate with students, as they encountered faculty and administrators.

The glaring need for new understanding of higher education as a social organization is only recently becoming evident. Student personnel, if it is to be a part of higher education, must change the nature of its questioning from what is its intrinsic role to what is its role in an organization. Further, it must be clear that organizations differ. No two colleges are alike. This means process models must be developed that are applicable but that each institution is unique in how these models may intervene. Silverman (1971) describes higher education, not as communities, but as social organizations distinguished by a power and exchange relationship among students, faculty and administration. He outlines a mediation role for the student personnel worker of the future.
The processes through which organizations change are only recently becoming understandable and applicable. Change in our society has become a fact of life (Toffler, 1970), a particularly disconcerting fact for higher education since, as Gross (1963) wrote, change has historically not come easily to higher education. How can higher education adapt to the new demands being placed on it? What knowledge from organizational behavior literature can be applied to facilitate these changes? Is change necessary? These are questions the student personnel worker must explore. The student personnel worker must develop new skills to become effective in resolving these issues.

Background

For the past three years the Dean of Students staff at The Ohio State University has been involved in self-study in order to develop an operational philosophy that would be effective in the changing environment at The Ohio State University. A retreat was held in August of 1971 to develop better relationships among staff members of the Dean of Students office. One of the results of that retreat was a call for a new operating philosophy that would provide new directions for student affairs at Ohio State. A small committee was appointed to prepare a "philosophy." Later that fall (October) a one-page summary statement, purporting to be a philosophy and rationale for the Dean of Students Office was introduced. Because of its briefness and failure to reflect any current concepts the document met with widespread rejection. At approximately the same time a reorganization of the university structure was occurring that removed part of the responsibilities assigned
to the Student Affairs Office. In a meeting of all staff members in student affairs, a request was made, by the Vice President to prepare a major statement of goals and objectives for the Student Affairs Office at Ohio State. A task force on the future of student affairs was created. The task force had three specific changes: (1) to develop a statement of philosophy for the future development of student affairs including goals, roles and functions to be specified; (2) to prepare implementation plans for this statement of goals and objectives; and (3) present a plan for gaining the support of the university community for this new program.

In order to avoid the pitfall of developing proposals for change without gaining commitment of the chief decision makers, the task force made a conscious decision to create an action research model of organization development as it pursued its charge. It was decided that a modeling approach would be taken with the aim of developing an ideal model of goals and objectives for student affairs. In order to obtain information from members of the student affairs organization as to their goals and priorities for the future, an intervention was planned utilizing the Delphi technique, a data-gathering device that collects intuitive judgments about future events and encourages consensus on these judgments (Helmer, 1967). This researcher presented the Delphi proposal to the task force as an appropriate intervention technique and as a valuable first step in gathering data about the organization the

* At that time the author served on the student affairs staff and was appointed to the Task Force.
task force was studying. The task force had developed eleven (11) essential objectives and the Delphi proposal was judged to meet several of the objectives as well as providing entry to others. These objectives are:

(1) To build trust among individuals and groups throughout the organization, and up-and-down the hierarchy.

(2) To create an open, problem-solving climate throughout the organization—where problems are confronted, both within groups and between groups, in contrast to "sweeping problems under the rug" or "smoothing things over."

(3) To increase the sense of "ownership" of organizational goals and objectives throughout the membership of the organization.

(4) To move toward more collaboration between interdependent persons and interdependent groups within the organization, in contrast to each service or staff going its own way.

(5) To create conditions where conflict is brought out and managed in contrast to "leaving conflict buried and festering" or "pretending that conflict does not exist." Where competition exists, it is used to enhance the realization of our objectives.

(6) To increase awareness of group "process" and its consequences for performance—that is, to help persons become aware of what is happening between and to group members while the staff is working on communication, influence, feelings, leadership styles and struggles, relationships between groups and how conflict is managed.

(7) To involve all of the staff in processes of the Task Force in order to get better decisions and planning, and decisions that have the personal commitment of the staff.
(8) To make sure that the Vice President is kept fully informed on our work prior to or as it happens (rather than after it is done) in order to profit from his leadership, to make sure of his support, and to make sure that we avoid the situation where he has to veto the work of the Task Force and the Staff after the product is already under way.

(9) To develop statements of philosophy, goals, roles, and functions for the future of Student Affairs through some process that involves all the staff.

(10) To develop proposed implementation plans for the goals, roles, and functions through some process that involves all the staff and other relevant consultants and colleagues such as the faculty, other staff, and students.

(11) To develop a plan for gaining the support of the rest of the University and other publics for our philosophy and programs.

(Rodgers and Lipsetz, 1972)

The Delphi was chosen specifically to develop goal statements and obtain organizational priorities concerning these goals. Additionally, the Delphi process is designed to develop consensus which was hoped by this researcher to be a basis for some commitment to planning organizational goals. Further, it was planned to use the Delphi data in a retreat involving all of the student affairs staff. Delphi avoids face-to-face confrontation in an attempt to avoid specious kinds of persuasion in decision-making situations. This is why Delphi was chosen only as a first step. Discussion and face-to-face confrontation was a crucial stage in the planning process being undertaken.

No formal design was created to evaluate the amount of commitment to the goals being developed. Outcomes of the retreat as well as new programs decided upon were to be two of the informal criteria.
This project was designed as an organizational development intervention and will be presented here in case study form so that the subjective nature of the data obtained not be generalized. However, it is hoped that the model used in this planning project might have utility beyond this problem. Although most of the following discussion involves the task force project, this researcher did expand the project somewhat in order to obtain an over-time analysis of the Delphi procedure. The purpose was to examine the strength of consensus over time and to investigate whether or not commitment could be a function of Delphi itself. If that were the case then Delphi could be viewed as an important change agent itself.

This project is presented as an example how a student personnel worker can take on the role of a change agent in a process of organizational development. Beyond the examination of the data obtained from the Delphi project, my purpose is to explore the role of the student personnel worker as a consultant and organizational development specialist. Further, the purpose is to look at an institution of higher education as an organization. To that end, my role as a consultant in the project is an important part of this discussion.

Finding ways to operationalize the student development model is an important motivation for this project. Developing organizational theory as a base is crucial as well. Many of the basic assumptions of organization development are congruent with student development assumptions. For example, the argument that Argyris (1962) presents of the need for individual interpersonal effectiveness for organizational effectiveness may be a way of tying the two together. Developing the
change agent role by practicing organization development principles may be a new approach to operationalizing the student development model.

Statement of the Problem: Goals and Objectives

This project has as its major goal the description of a practical example of applying organization development methods to higher education; specifically student affairs at The Ohio State University. It also hopes to provide a useful model for examining the goals and objectives of a student affairs program and a method for developing future directions. Hopefully, this project will show that the student personnel worker can profit by filling the role of the organization development specialist. While the data gathered is not necessarily generalizable beyond this example, certainly comparisons are possible as well as an inference of the generalizability of the model described within this study. An outline for the model of developing a strategy for planned change within the Office of Student Affairs at The Ohio State University is presented. The major contribution of this project is to provide research procedures for organizational decision-making. The Delphi procedure has been selected for this task and the description of its role in this project is a central objective.

The operational objective of this proposal is to assist in the construction of a set of goals and objectives for the student affairs staff at The Ohio State University. The impact of these data will facilitate a strategy for organizational change within the Office of Student Affairs.
A further operational goal will be a description of a Delphi procedure as it applies to higher education. While there are examples of its use in higher education, these examples are limited and not nearly as focused as this project attempts to be (Cyphert and Gant, 1970, Uhl, 1971).

This project will show the value of using the Delphi as a practical tool for gathering data for the student personnel worker. The items that develop consensus will then be viewed as the essential ideas expressed in a statement of goals and objectives for the student affairs program at The Ohio State University. It is further expected that the analysis of the data from the Delphi rounds will represent a more useful package of information than the literature presents as typical Delphi results.

Another operational goal will be to examine the consensus items developed by the Delphi in an extended time analysis. A basic question to be answered is whether or not the Delphi procedure produces "change" in its participants in the sense of bringing about consensus and having the consensus sustain over a period of time. While not specifically answering the question of whether or not "consensus items" are operationalized (i.e., change behavior), the hypothesis can be used to infer attitudinal change.

A final operational goal is to examine subgroup differences within the Student Affairs staff at Ohio State. The express purpose for this analysis will be to offer input to the Student Affairs staff as to their own areas of agreement and disagreement in terms of future goals and objectives as well as to demonstrate how data, within an organization development strategy, can be used as input.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The process of planning is under scrutiny in higher education (Winstead and Hobson, 1971). The purpose of this section is to examine the change processes in both the individual and organizational dimensions. To say that individual change and organizational change are complementary is perhaps too strikingly simple. However, the literature dealing with these two concepts is unclear. The relationship between individual and organizational change typically espoused is post hoc: organizations change as a result of individuals changing within the organization. The reverse has been argued as well. However, it may prove to be more insightful to pursue the argument that they are symbiotic events rather than causal. One of the weaknesses of the student development field has been ambiguity as to the focus of its work. One answer is that the work is done with individual students. This is a somewhat empty notion if it ignores the environment in which the student lives. Student development work is done with individuals and groups of students in organizational settings (COSPA, 1972).
Student Development

The process of individual change is being discussed here in terms of human development. Brown's (1972) recent attempt to summarize and define "student development" offers several "handles" for definition that show close parallels to the human development model. Central to the theme is the notion of predictable life stages occurring with accompanying tasks and hurdles. With the general knowledge that most college students are within a limited age bracket (18-25) it is possible to make some assumptions about the problems and anxieties facing them as human beings even before adding the complexity of the college environment to the milieu. Brown restricts this notion by implying that there are certain attitudes and values that are peculiarly a function of "student" development. Nonetheless, he succinctly outlines goals of student development.

Generally, the changes are in directions consistent with the humanistic goals of education. Students become less authoritarian, dogmatic and ethnocentric. The pattern of change tends to be in the direction of differentiation of self from others and integration of self into whole—what is commonly referred to as developing a sense of identity.

(Brown, 1972, p. 30)

He describes the goal of higher education to be the making of better persons out of its students. Of course the weakness of that goal is the defining of "better persons." It does, however, imply a commitment to a value orientation, at least nominally. Brown asks if this still remains the goal of higher education and, if so, where does student development fit?
Commitment to goals of value requires an axiological undergirding. Student personnel work, as a field of study, has neglected generating a philosophical base for creating a legitimate profession and academic field. Recent attempts appear to be attacking this problem (Tripp, 1966).

The notion of facilitating an individual's growth and development to his fullest potential assumes the basic tenets of Maslow's description of the nature of man and the dynamic elements of growth that occur in the universe of man (Ard, 1966). For Maslow, man is basically "good" or "innocent"; at worst, man is born neutral. Having escaped the yoke of traditional sin and evil with which the Protestant ethic has so vigorously condemned us, man is free to pursue his potential. He posits that man has a certain instinctual nature; an Aristotelian "entelechy." Individuals travel through certain predictable stages in a need hierarchy with a prepotency dominating the hierarchy. These stages represent potentialities that are both possible and exist at the same time. This dichotomy of "being and becoming" (Ard, 1966, p. 245) is the crux of the dynamic of life for man. In order to develop an adequate theory of the nature of man, according to Maslow, only "healthy" individuals should be used as subjects. Certain values will be apparent only to healthy individuals and these values need to be identified. With man's basic drive toward self-actualization, the dilemma of potentialities and actualization is theoretically resolvable. Nurturance by the environment is the key. The relation of man to his environment is symbiotic in that man may actualize his potentialities because of the environment but that they are not provided by
the environment. Maslow equates "evil" to the pathological situation of man when man has ceased growing. Helping an individual gain self-knowledge and self-acceptance is a way of combating "evil." Self-knowledge is a phenomenological concept which Maslow uses to explain personal experience as the "reality" of its epistemology (Maslow, 1968).

In a similar vein, Rogers has developed a philosophical model that allows axiological concepts to be pursued (Rogers, 1961). Rogers posits a goal of "being" for man that echoes Maslow's notion of actualization. The process of becoming a person has certain necessary conditions that facilitate an individual's growth. The key to actualization for Rogers is the development of open and honest (authentic) relationships with others. The existential premise of individual freedom and choice powers the Rogers model. Applicability to the model of student development is described in his later work Freedom To Learn (Rogers, 1969).

Both Maslow and Rogers outline a basic notion of man as an individual with an inherently "healthy" predilection to fully developing his potentialities. This difficult blend of existential freedom and rationalistic determinism presents a unique and creative approach to the philosophical grounding of college student personnel work. Others have described this growth process and actualization stage as well. Dewey's "consummatory experiences" (Frankena, 1965, p. 161) is a variation of the self-actualization theme. These experiences are achieved when full knowledge of the conditions and consequences of an experience are considered. Growth is defined, by Dewey, as the
acquisition of dispositions (skills) that allow one to seek good experiences and avoid bad ones. Within the Christian framework, Chardin (1968) details a stage in the development of mankind that is akin to the individual "actualization" of Maslow and Rogers. Perhaps a weakness in Chardin's paradigm is the lack of a pure existential notion of freedom as well as the more generic nature of his stages of development. Reich (1970) popularized Chardin's final stage of development with "Consciousness III." Most important in this stage of development, says Reich, is the "choosing of a new life style"; a new style of life completely altered from the mode of "Consciousness II" (Reich, 1970, p. 380). In this mode there is an assertion of the power to choose one's way of life. The growth of understanding, sensibility and the capacity for love are the touch stones for the development of Consciousness III.

In what milieu do we find these epistemological assumptions? The phenomenological sense of Maslow, Rogers, and Dewey is that of fully knowing one's own experiences. Reich describes for us a final developmental stage that implies a different balance between nature and technology in the world, but admits that "Consciousness II," where technology is supreme, is with us at present. Toffler (1970) offers us change as the true reality in our existence. How men and social systems change, grow and develop is perhaps the crucial paradigmatic question facing the student development specialist. It is the "life-stuff" of change that we must come to know if we are to fully understand the nature of development. One's own philosophical assumptions must temper those of the "experts." Perhaps, in the Maslowian notion,
each man is an expert and therefore need adhere to no philosophy other than one's own. Kelly's model of man ordering his experiences by developing "personal constructs" suggests a uniqueness for each individual that might still encompass thoughts and assumptions prescribed by those "experts." How each man constructs these notions and makes sense out of them is the key (Kelly, 1963).

Throughout philosophical history there has been a procession of models explaining what is true and real that turn to an irrationality for explanation. Descartes turned to God as did Kant when his categorical imperatives were extended to logical conclusions. Nietzsche produced a "Superman" and Kierkegaard a Christian theology asking for a metaphysical "leap of faith." Russell, and later Wittgenstein, called for an end to metaphysical questions and for the utilization of language as the tool for pursuing the real questions of epistemology. Camus and Sartre led the existentialist movement to recognize the basic reality man faces is an irrational one and that what is most important is awareness of self, of personal risk in choosing and of the need to choose one's own directions (values). My notion of the nature of man is still uncomfortably undecided. Part of this difficulty comes from an inexact derivability of my philosophical assumptions concerning the nature of man and the applicability of those assumptions to a model of human development. Perhaps the dichotomy posed by Jaspers sums it the best.
Of the two approaches to Being as the Encompassing, the most usual and most natural way for every beginning philosopher is toward Being in Itsd, conceived as Nature, World or God. However, we shall approach it from the other, and since Kant innavoidable, way: we shall search into the encompassing which we are. Although we know, or at least take into account, the fact that the Encompassing which we are is in no wise Being itself, still this can be seen in critical purity only after we have gone to the end of the path opened by Kant.

(Jaspers, 1955, p. 54)

That man grows and changes is not a new notion. The most notable early description of this phenomenon may well have been Plato's when he described the three classes of society: the workers, soldiers and philosophers (Jowett, 1949). However, the earliest comprehensive description of the human development model was Freud in his description of a dynamic model powered by the interrelationships between physiological and psychological elements (Freud, 1938). Freud's model was pathological. Its utility was, and is, for the diagnosis of the sick. As opposed to Maslow's method, Freud studied the sick and drew conclusions from his examinations. Most familiar, however, to those concerned with the student development field is Erikson (1950) and his model of human development. He posits a series of predictable life stages that each individual will typically encounter. Each stage has unique tasks that must be mastered before reaching the next step. Unlike Maslow's prepotent hierarchy, Erikson accommodates partial success and permits progress on to the next level.

The strength acquired at any stage is tested by the necessity to transcend it in such a way that the individual can take chances in the next stage with what was the most vulnerably precious in the previous one.

(Erikson, 1950, p. 263)
The age of "Identity versus Role Confusion" occurs at the normal age of the college student. At nearly the same time, the Intimacy versus Isolation stage may occur (Erikson, 1950, p. 261). At this stage, a struggle for developing an adequate self-concept and true awareness of self is dominant. Bramer and Shostrom (1960) offer a similar model.

As the adolescent approaches the age of adult responsibility, there are numerous and increasing demands and restrictions from without which complicate his struggle to find himself and his role in life . . .

(1) He must select his life work.
(2) He must choose and secure an education.
(3) He must break emotional ties with his family.
(4) He must choose a life mate.

(Bramer and Shostrom, 1960, p. 26)

Bernard (1968) lists two critical tasks for the "youth" stage: choice of one's occupation and choice of one's marriage partner. He argues that the justification of a "youth" stage lies in the beginning of stability in the physiological, emotional, social and intellectual development of individuals.

Keniston (1970) outlined a new stage of development he feels has been previously unrecognized called the "youth stage." Rapidly changing societal conditions have produced this "new" stage that became recognizable simply by virtue of the large number of young people entering it. This stage is characterized by a conscious conflict between the individual and society. The process of reconciling personal priorities and values to that of society's is the paramount dynamic for this stage. Rejection of societal norms produces a feeling of estrangement. Roles specific to this life stage are developed
with adulthood being equated with stagnation. Students move from a position of "epistemological dualism, to an awareness of multiplicity and to the realization of relativism" (Keniston, 1970, p. 10).

This ability to think about thinking involves a new level of consciousness ... consciousness of consciousness ... It provides the cognitive underpinning for many of the characteristics and special disturbances of youth, for example, youth's hyperawareness of inner processes ... (Keniston, 1970, p. 10)

With significant numbers in our society developing more autonomous positions in relation to society, Keniston posits the likelihood of new organizational models developing based on conscious commitment and understanding as opposed to our present institutional models where loyalty and cooperation are requirements without question.

The concept of human development has become well entrenched in the literature. Knowledge of the developmental tasks confronting the college student can be used to facilitate the student's interaction with this environment. In addition, student development examines individual growth and change that are unique to the college experience.

Parsons and Platt (1970) coin the term "studentry" to describe a new stage of socialization in our society. Higher education is beginning to have the same socializing effect that the public school system has had with a significant number of our youth now attending colleges. The result of this movement to attend college is to increase pressure on the young adult. The authors posit that the effects of this newly significant socialization are the development of a greater capacity for higher levels of achievement for self and others and the
ability to navigate a highly differentiated environment. They analogize college to the family with the student having the same relationship to faculty as a child to his parents.

Wheelock (1971), in presenting a model that he feels would defuse the current violent opposition to authority on college campuses, assumes a developmental model to explain the dynamics of this youthful resistance. Wheelock suggests that our present system of higher education suspends the development of individuals unnaturally. He suggests waiting for three or four years before starting college. As a result, says Wheelock, students will "appreciate" college more and get more benefit from it. A critical analysis of this argument might result in the suggestion that the goal of student development would be to help students through the precise difficulties that he suggests would warrant a three or four year delay in order to "outgrow" them.

The most comprehensive elaboration of the student development model to date is presented by Chickering (1969). Because of the changing nature of the students attending college, he suggests that our institutions of higher education must revise their goals in order to become relevant to students. Relevancy is defined by dealing with issues crucial to students. Strong support for this notion is given by Taylor (1969) who suggests that there may be such a great difference between students and faculty about what the crucial issues are that much of the college experience has become irrelevant. Taylor's remarkable conclusion is that students may no longer need teachers.
At a certain point it became clear that the texture and quality of the rational life had altered within itself, and in such a way that the institutions designed to support it . . . became incapable of responding to the deepest needs of its citizens . . . Then something started to happen. The students and those whom they admired entered into a common perception . . . The enemy was seen to be within . . .

(Taylor, 1969, pp. 3-4)

Bruner (1970) presents a similar definition of relevancy and asks a further question at the same time: Are the skills of relevance or the relevance of skills most important? Bruner suggests that different kinds of individuals would choose differently. "Knowers" would give priority to gaining "how to" knowledge and perpetuating the traditional values. "Seekers," on the other hand, would disdain unquestioning acceptance of "the facts" and would inquire fully into the nature of all questions. The process of inquiry then takes on as much importance as the information sought.

Chickering (1969) posits seven vectors of development that would allow students to successfully traverse the stage typically defined by the 18-25 year old group.

1. Developing competence
2. Managing emotions
3. Developing autonomy
4. Establishing identity
5. Freeing interpersonal relationships
6. Developing a purpose
7. Developing integrity

(Chickering, 1969, pp. 9-19)

These vectors represent a significant conceptualization of the literature and research dealing with developmental dynamics for college students. Again, Erikson's developmental model is the major source.
Heath (1959), in an earlier study, offered a similar argument to support attention to the notion of individual identity and the developmental process in higher education. In his study, he revealed some students with very similar characteristics that seemed to set them apart from other students. A well-functioning, integrated ego, future orientation and tolerance of ambiguity were the common factors uncovered for what Heath labeled the "Reasonable Adventurer."

Kohlberg and Gilligan (1971) expand upon the life stage notion for the adolescent. The theme of extreme relativism argued by Keniston (1970) is repeated. The authors suggest this relativistic life stage can be, and is, threatening to education as we know it. However, they quickly add that if a new focus for education is realized, one that deals with the rapidly changing values and attitudes of adolescents, then the threat may well become promise.

Sanford (1969) writes that the individual development of each student is the major responsibility of the institution. Development is defined as "... the organization of increasing complexity" (Sanford, 1969, p. 47). This means that the university must reorganize its resources in order to accomplish this goal in the same sense that Chickering called for a new relevancy for the goals of higher education. Erikson's model of stages of development is central for Sanford as he attempts to differentiate growth and change from development. Growth is an expansion of the personality while change encompasses both growth and development. Sanford suggests that the meaning of work is changing for the college student in that the world of work must be relevant and give satisfaction.
Further elaboration of the student development model is offered by Axelrod, et al (1969). These authors repeat the call for a re-ordering of the structure of higher education to account for the uniqueness of individuals and to facilitate the development of each student.

Black (1967) in a Presidential address to the American College Personnel Association defines student development.

"... Development involves a change from one situation to another in which there is more adequacy to meet a situation. Adequacy includes the development of ideas, emotions and skills."

(Black, 1967, p. 149)

Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

Nearly twenty years ago Lloyd-Jones (1954) asked about the "how" and the "who" and the "why" of student personnel work. Recently, attempts are being made to ask these questions once again (COSPA, 1971). This document represents an attempt to re-focus student personnel work as was done with the original statement published in 1937 by the American Council on Education. The current statement lists four (4) basic assumptions:

1. Each individual student must be considered as a whole, with central concern given for all aspects of his well-rounded development.

2. Each student is recognized as unique and must be treated as an individual.

3. The total environment of the student is educative and must be utilized for his fullest development.

4. The major responsibility for a student's growth in personal and social wisdom rests with the student and his own personal resources.

(COSPA, 1972, p. 1)
In this report, a three-dimensional matrix is developed with three subdivisions of three variables along each axis: Clientele, Competencies and Role. The intended purpose of the matrix is to investigate all possible combinations for combining variables in building an instructional program for the preparation of college student personnel workers. The sub-divisions of the matrix are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>goal-setting</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>change processes</td>
<td>administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(COSPA, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the matrix represents only a beginning point for further conceptualization, it is significant in that several variables are included that are relative newcomers to student personnel work, namely, organizations, change processes and consultants. *

The new COSPA statement is not unexpected nor unrequested. Many have been calling for a reconceptualization of the student personnel point of view while many have attempted to conceptualize some of the variables they felt were central. O'Banion (1971) developed a questionnaire incorporating sixteen goal statements for student personnel work from the 1964 COSPA statement on college personnel work. He found that five were given a high or essential rating. Hodgkinson

* The COSPA Commission on Professional Development, charged with preparing the new statement of purpose for student personnel, met in a working session at Columbus, Ohio on the 4th and 5th of May, 1972. The author was able to discuss the model with several of the committee members. For the value of a matrix system for planning, see Monaghan's, "A Systematic Way of Being Creative," Journal of Communication, 1968, Volume 18, No. 1, pp. 47-56.
(1970), on the basis of results obtained from interviews and questionnaires with nearly 4,000 respondents, offers several penetrating questions about the Dean of Students position and, indirectly, student personnel work. He compares Deans of students to business managers and indicates a trend toward increasing influence of the business manager on the direction of the university; i.e., the institution is becoming more bureaucratized which would probably be opposite to the direction a Dean of students would espouse.

Few if any complaints were voiced about the dean of students being devious, manipulative, power hungry or vicious . . . The complaints fall in the other direction—less fear and more sneer.

(Hodgkinson, 1970, p. 50)

Hodgkinson follows with a series of questions he developed from the results of his interviews with over 900 faculty, administrators, department chairmen and students. He offers a pessimistic prediction for the dean of students position. However, he offers two hopeful directions for the future of student personnel work: first the need for persons with human development skills (counseling and assessment) to work with the entire university community. Secondly, an advocacy model for human values, someone with political clout whose mission would be ecological. Hodgkinson concludes that there will be an even greater need for the values associated with college personnel work but that the role for the individual must be reconceptualized.

McConnell (1970) in an article closely associated with Hodgkinson's (1970), suggests that for student personnel services to become an important part of the structure of higher education, it will have
to respond to profound changes occurring in the organization and governance of our institutions. This echoes Hodgkinson's (1970) suggestion of the need for new roles for the college student personnel worker. McConnell reasons that student personnel work is not central to many of our institutions because of its failure to be considered educationally necessary. Being "peripheral" moreover, is as much the fault of student personnel workers as anyone. The profession has accepted missions that are nearly always extra-curricular. Brown (1972) emphasizes the same argument in that personnel workers have perpetuated their own plight of university non-acceptance by doing all those tasks that faculty did not want to do or were created by curricular weaknesses but to which remedies were attempted outside of the curriculum. McConnell concludes with the warning that "student personnel work and student personnel workers will be far more peripheral than they are now if they play no part in redesigning the structure and processes of institutional governance" (McConnell, 1970, p. 63).

In a somewhat different vein, Tripp (1966) suggests that "value-making" is the essential purpose of the college experience and, as such, ought to be the proper focus of the student personnel work. In related articles (Tripp, 1970 and 1968), he outlines relationships within the university and their meaning for the student personnel worker. He calls for a collegial relationship between students and faculty with the common goal being the pursuit of truth. Tripp defines the task of student personnel workers to be the "creation and maintenance of an educational environment calculated to serve the total development of each student . . . " (Tripp, 1970, p. 5).
Hedlund (1971) sardonically comments on the 1937 ACE statement of the Student Personnel Point of View.

Few statements of professional purpose have been so long-lived, and at the same time so little practiced.

(Hedlund, 1971, p. 324)

Hedlund also cites the centrality of "value-building" in higher education. He feels the framework of humanistic education will enable the student personnel point of view to become obtainable.

O'Banion, Thurston and Gulden (1970) present a model for student personnel work that is consistent in its call for attention to "humanistic values" and to the individual student and his growth. They define the student development point of view as,

... a behavioral orientation in which educators attempt to create a climate for learning in which students have:
1. Freedom to choose their own directions for learning
2. Responsibility for those choices
3. Interpersonal interaction with the learning facilitator...

(O'Banion, Thurston and Gulden, 1970, p. 3)

A very recent attempt at conceptualization of student development is the systematic program being implemented at Ohio Wesleyan University (Birch, 1972). Birch has designed a four-step system for a student development program that asks for four definitions:

1. Behavioral development objectives
2. Description of objectives
3. Implementing units
Although not made explicit, the assumption is the organization develops a list of behavioral development objectives. Once this is accomplished, the system takes over.

This process of conceptualization and re-conceptualization for student personnel work is reflected in the research that has been attempted. The unsettled nature of the definition of student personnel work has resulted in the spurious nature of the variables being examined. Witness the difference between Jacob's (1957) statement that the college experience has no significant effect on students and Feldman and Newcomb's (1968) observation that there is a significant impact on the individual by the college experience and that, in large measure, the impact is a result of peer influences. Feldman and Newcomb offer a comprehensive array of research to support the student development argument. For example, in examining the variable of authoritarianism, studies by Plant using the Rokeach Dogmatism scale for 282 men and 449 women over their four-year stay at San Jose State College, indicated a significant reduction in dogmatism by the senior year for both men and women (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969, Vol. II, p. 5).

Katz (1968) reported results from a large scale study of students at Berkeley and Stanford. A check list of values was administered to Stanford freshmen as well as the Omnibus Personality Inventory. The OPI was repeated four years later. Katz noted a consistent pattern of change over the four years toward greater openness and tolerance, a more unrestricted view of life and a more humanized conscience. Results also showed a greater willingness to experiment and
to accept a wide range of human behaviors as well as an increased capacity for feeling close to one another and increased appreciation of aesthetic experiences (Katz, 1968, pp. 167-168).

The need for research to aid in planning for the student personnel worker is urgent and necessary according to Hardee (1962). She decries the fact that personnel workers are making pronouncements about students and the college environment with less than adequate research. Although this observation is ten years old, it is still relevant even though significant research has been accomplished. Hardee cited the need of evidence in four areas:

1. Constructing well-founded premises for altering traditional student personnel programs.
2. Making explicit the bases for initiating student personnel services in new collegiate institutions.
3. Recognizing new direction in the exploration of student characteristics.
4. Utilizing the results of research in on-going student personnel programs.
   (Hardee, 1962, p. 132)

Hardee concludes that a systematic research program is the only way to ensure quality and excellence of the profession.*

Two somewhat different directions have been taken in establishing research paradigms for college student personnel work. One approach has been the "perceptual" model. Stern (1970) recently defended this approach by insisting that the proper questions be directed to "process and purpose rather than appearances" (Stern, 1970, p. 3). People must be studied in relation to their environment.

* Hardee (1962) borrows the terms "quality" and "excellence" as used by Brumbaugh (1960) and Gardner (1961).
Their attitudes and values are important variables. Stern developed his conceptual model by adapting the need-press theory of Murray (1938) which was a taxonomy for interpreting individuals in light of the integration and organization of their personal needs. Stern applied this principle to the college environment (Pace and Stern, 1958) by inferring that the inferences students make about their environments are in part based on sharing common events and common interpretations as well as their internal individual need-press arrangement. Therefore, students are able to make inferences about events that other students experience since their environment is shared. Pace (1963) further developed the concept of measuring college environments with the construction of the College and University Environment Scale (CUES). There are significant differences between the College Characteristics Index, developed largely by Stern and this later instrument by Pace. CUES makes no attempt to refer to individual personality measures. Scores on the CUES are in the form of group scale scores as opposed to the CCI score of individual agreement with items (Linn, Davis and Cross, 1965).*

The second major direction of research in student personnel has been given leadership by Astin. He defines environmental stimulus as any behavior or event that is observable, can be independently verified and is capable of changing a student's sensory input. Astin does not agree with Stern that perceptions are a legitimate stimuli since perceptions are internal and not capable of changing another's

* This is an excellent source for an overview of research models in student personnel work.
behavior (Astin, 1968). Reporting on a study designed to measure important differences among college environments, Astin found indications that the differences in environmental characteristics are representative of the fact that changes in students during college may be a function of the type of institution he attends (Astin, 1968).

Astin (1970) examines current research methodology and proposes a three-part design for researching college impact:

1. Student inputs
2. Student outputs
3. College environment.

(Astin, 1970, p. 225)

The work of Feldman and Newcomb is criticized for ignoring the student input variable. Research, according to Astin, cannot assume that impact and change are identical if student input has not been controlled. He would ask, "If one simply measured change of students over time, can the conclusion be drawn that the same 'change' would occur at a different institution?" Astin and Panos (1969) found that a college environment does have the "ability" to produce changes in student attitudes. A sample of 246 institutions was used in finding the environmental effects of colleges were a function of peer influence more than any other factor.

McConnell (1972, p. 9) has concluded that "higher education has failed to touch the pervasive elements of young people's character, personality and intellect." An index of intellectual disposition was developed from scores on selected scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory which has been used successfully to examine changes in students' characteristics (i.e., Chickering, 1969). This study, carried
out by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, assumed Astin's principle of student input being a variable in a proper research design. The research question asked, as a result, was,

How did students from institution to institution change in relation to their characteristics at entrance—initial characteristics which in varying degrees were indicative of their educability and potentialities for development along significant dimensions of intellect and performance? (McConnell, 1972, p. 9)

The author interpreted results by using the "anchoring," "accentuation" and "conversion" effects outlined by Feldman and Newcomb (1969). McConnell's results indicated "accentuation" and "conversion" as the major effects in several of the participating institutions. For example, students at the University of Portland, with a religion orientation, typically, as freshmen, tended to retain that orientation or to become even more conservative. He noted "accentuation" to be the most consistent influence at Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore. These three schools had freshmen entering averaging in the highest categories of the intellectual disposition scale and four years later, results indicated these students rose appreciably on the same scale. McConnell concludes with the suggestion that the "conversion" or change effect occurs most typically in an environment of dissonance. This might mean a student has little in common with the commonly held values of the campus community. He cautions of the excesses of the diversity of a large university and the homogeneity of the small, liberal arts college. He suggests a combination of the best of both would provide the greatest nurturance for change.
Chickering (1972) concurs with McConnell that most colleges operate "in loco uteri." They offer environments that protect most students from differing values and goals. This is accomplished by recruiting those qualities the institution desires in its graduates. As a result, the college interested in graduating highly competent intellectuals will admit only those high school students who have demonstrated high intellectual potential. Once admitted, they are nurtured by an environment that offers little dissonance. Chickering concludes these colleges neither encourage or retard development. They simply allow it to occur. He agrees with McConnell that those whose potential for change is the greatest are those who "fit" the least in their college environment. He offers some reasons for these changes and why they differ among institutions.

If these groups that deviate from the norm within different colleges are examined, then not only do they turn out to change in different ways but the changes that occur are related to differences in educational practices, student-faculty relationships, general atmosphere and student characteristics, and the nature of relationships among friends and acquaintances.

(Chickering, 1972, p. 50)

Finally, Chickering notes that the most productive institutions for individuals are those that are non-selective. This, in turn, creates a high proportion of "misfits," who, if recognized and assisted, are most likely to show the greatest effect of their college experience.

Cross (1972) warns of a "New Student" comprising the college population in the next decade. Student personnel workers must adapt to the egalitarian era developing in our society or become irrelevant.
Priorities must be changed if student personnel workers are to be accepted as educators. Cross' plea for a change in priorities in higher education is relevant to the entire university community. The goals of higher education need constant examination and the process of developing these goals needs more understanding as well.

Silverman (1971) calls for men with a recognized capacity for integration to make sense out of the multitudinous goals higher education is pursuing. He suggests a more narrow focus on institutional goals in order to operate effectively in our "goal heterogeneity." Diverse elements of the faculty create institutional dysfunction and suggests men who have "put it all together personally" are needed to bring effectiveness to our campuses (Silverman, 1971, p. 67).

**Higher Education Goals**

Developing a set of organizational goals for Student Affairs at Ohio State is the central task of this project. How roles are defined and developed is crucial to any organization. Gaining commitment to those goals can be a function of the process of development. Higher education is currently going through a period of re-evaluation of its goals (Chronicle, 1971). Buck defines organizational goals as "the desired end states on which the resource controllers reach agreement." These goals are not necessarily static but adapt to new organizational needs in terms of best use of resources (Thompson, 1963). Buck adopts Argyris' (1957) notion that dissonance between individual goals and organizational goals creates conflict and that this conflict is distinctive since it results in inefficiency and
higher costs. Perrow (1969) concludes that if something is known of the major tasks of an organization and the characteristics of its controlling elite, its goals generally can be predicted. He adds there are two general types of organizational goals: official goals that are listed on the Charter and operative goals that reflect ends sought through actual policies of the organization.

Katz and Kahn (1966) define organizational goals in terms of the organization as a "human organization" and in terms of a systems model. They reiterate Argyris' theme of goal dissonance between individuals and organizations. The significance of defining organizations in terms of systems theory is the inclusion of "process or organizational functioning" as a dynamic.

Our [Katz and Kahn] theoretical model for the understanding of organizations is that of an energic input-output system in which the energic return from the output reactivates the system. Social organizations are flagrantly open systems in that the input of energies and the conversion of output into further energic input consist of transactions between the organization and its environment.

The concern, in systems theory, is with interdependence of parts as opposed to the traditional notion of constant relationships between organizational parts (von Bertalanffy, 1956 and 1968). Katz and Kahn stress the open-system model as the most satisfactory in describing social organizations. The advantage of the open-system approach is that the organization has the ability to seek inputs (fuel) from outside its boundaries and therefore sustain itself. This characterizes organizations with a negative entropy property that requires importing of energy from a system other than its own. "Through-put" (process or
organizational functioning) affects input in a significant way. The whole may not be the sum of its parts in a social organization nor even more or less than its sum. The notion of equifinality explains the inability to account for these variances in an open system. Equifinality assumes that the output of an organization may be achieved through different processes and/or inputs. The reverse is also assumed, namely, that the same output might be achieved from different inputs and/or through-puts. The interdependence of the parts of the system over time is the key ingredient. Assuming equifinality in human organizations (e.g., a university) means that the stable point of a system has the constant potential for changing and, in fact, changes regularly. This process is called adaptation and is the dynamic that combats the assumption of negative entropy for the survival of an open system. Astin's (1968) model for research assumes an open-system approach in that all three parts are included: Input (student characteristics at admission), Through-put (college environment) and Output (student characteristics at graduation).

Thompson (1967) describes two organizational models with an accompanying strategy for studying them. The rational model is a bureaucratic model. Actions are determinate which indicates a closed system strategy. This strategy assumes everything is functional and determinate. Human resources are a controlled part of the organization. Scientific management, in the traditional sense (Weber, 1947 and Taylor, 1911), is how the organization is planned and studied. The natural system model assumes that the organization is composed of a set of interdependent parts which have direct relationships with
the environment of the organization. Survival is the goal and adaptation to other parts and to the environment is the crucial dynamic. This model requires an open system strategy of investigation since variables are not subject to predetermined control as in the rational model.

Bennis (1966) outlines a similar model for studying organizations. With tremendous increases in the complexity of society the bureaucratic model of organizations is becoming obsolete. Man is seeking ways to gain fuller satisfaction from his work thus contradicting strict internal controls of bureaucratic functions. The new organizations will be highly adaptive, utilizing temporary systems to solve problems.

Adaptive temporary systems of diverse specialists, solving problems, linked together by coordinating and task-evaluative specialists, in organic flux, will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it.

(Bennis, 1966, p. 12)

Cyert and March (1963) developed a paradigm to explain organizational functioning as essentially a bargaining process where goals are developed through informal bargaining and evolve as membership changes. This was later expanded by Walton and McKersie (1965) to deal specifically with the labor negotiation process. Carter (1971) field tested the Cyert-March conceptualization and criticizes their model for not being a pro-active strategy. He suggests that goals can be closely related to the degree of uncertainty in a particular project's forecasts. Therefore,
The greater the uncertainty of outcome in the total environment the greater the number of criteria (goals) will be sought to guide strategic decisions.

(Carter, 1971, p. 423)

Studer (1971) attempts to devise models to design a human system. The first step, according to Studer is to identify goals. He suggests there is no empirical way of doing this since model building is an "ideal" process and "ought to be" goals are not observable. Two kinds of goals exist, individual and collective and they are usually not compatible. Studer outlines two issues involved in goal setting in a social system.

The first is that of externalizing and communicating goals in order to act on them. The second is that of analyzing these to detect inimical aspects, gross violations of constraints and their projected implication.

(Studer, 1971, p. 136)

Although goal-setting is the first step in modeling a system, argues Studer, goals cannot be translated into solutions directly. What is needed is an operational definition of empirically accessible behaviors. The system attempts to operationalize these behaviors through dynamic interaction with its environment. This is an incremental process that can be plotted with some variance. This insight allows planning for change to occur in social systems.

Amid predictions of change and turmoil in the next decade (Sernas, 1971), many are turning their attention to a reconceptualization of the goals of higher education as well as the creation of new goals. Clark Kerr, in keynoting the 1971 Meeting of the American Association of Higher Education contended,
Higher education in the United States is entering a great climacteric—a period of uncertainty, of conflict, of confusion, of potential change . . . One thing is certain and that is that the answers are not all predetermined, that the final outcome will depend on the quality of our decisions as we move along.

(Senas, 1971, p. 1)

Knowles (1971) describes the decade of the 60's as the Decade of Violence for Higher Education. He laments the destructiveness this has had on higher education and hopes that the 70's will be a decade when the questions raised in the 60's will be encountered and resolved. He sees that the stage for change has been set, albeit negatively, by disruptions and riot and now calls for reason and constructive approaches to change. Cordier (1971) emphasizes the effect of social and technological advances on higher education. He observes that this significant change has not been paralleled with changes by man. The net result of this incongruity is confusion and alienation. To attack this dilemma, to once again make "man the master of his society" (Cordier, 1971, p. 88), Cordier challenges higher education to take the lead in extending its intellectual resources. Toynbee (1968) reflects on the accelerating pace of change in society and ponders the implications of this "dynamism." The chronological relationship between the "educational stage" and the "practicing stage" (Toynbee, 1968, p. 8) has been altered. Today, education is a life-long venture. He proposes that postgraduate education be a mode of preparation for life rather than a specialization process.

In the introductory article to a special issue of The Journal of Higher Education devoted to restructuring governance of higher
education, Ikenberry (1971) signals a basic restructuring of the organization and governance of higher education. He cautions that "those who wait for a return to the campus quiet of the fifties probably wait in vain" (Ikenberry, 1971, p. 429).

Bolman (1970) reiterates that the theme of change has become crucial to the structure of higher education. He calls for a recasting of the university back to the learning process, or else "our experimenting with learning will remain just tinkering" (Bolman, 1970, p. 590). Beyond this immediate reaction to change, he points out changes that must accompany the first level of change, namely, new and motivated faculty and well conceived curricula in the arts and sciences at undergraduate and graduate level. Bell (1967) encourages a new realization; a realization that man can consciously direct change and that this direction is the product of a normative commitment. He asks for fewer predictions and more alternatives to assist in planning for the accelerating amount of change being encountered by our social institutions.

There is a historical difference, according to Ikenberry (1972), between institutions of a higher education and other social organizations in our society. Although the similarities are much greater than the differences, it is the differences that are creating the current unrest within the academic structure. One significant factor is the seeming inability of higher education, as organizations, to define goals and objectives. Ikenberry suggests that a major reason for this may be the intangible nature of the task as well as the perishable state of the product. Secondly, since most colleges and universities
are decentralized, goals are promulgated in the various organizational loci of the institution; therefore a wide diversity of institutional goals. Finally, the high proportion of professional personnel employed assumes a concomitant array of professional goals. He suggests new avenues for accommodation be opened in the college and university organization to escape what he calls the organizational dilemma of higher education.

Clark Kerr credits Hodgkinson with the "most comprehensive study ever made of changes in higher education in the United States . . ." in Hodgkinson's recent book, Institutions in Transition (1971). Longitudinal data gathered from two decades of information kept by the U.S. Office of Education was developed into a questionnaire focusing on changes that had occurred on selected campuses. The questionnaire was administered to college presidents with 1,230 responding. Finally, five institutions were examined via case studies to examine their change processes indicated by the other data sources. He offers several stimulating conclusions of his study. The central conclusion is most efficient to offer at this juncture.

Taken as a whole, the amount of institutional diversity in American higher education is decreasing. This is due partially to the pervasive existence of a single status system in higher education, based on the prestigious university offering many graduate programs and preoccupied with research. There are few alternative models to this system now functioning.

(Hodgkinson, 1971, p. XV)

In a more recent article, Hodgkinson (1972) summarizes this conclusion by suggesting that the net affect of the great amount of change in
higher education in the 60's "was to homogenize institutions. --The more they changed the more they became alike" (Hodgkinson, 1972, p. 35). In that same article, he quotes David Reisman as having argued that one of the most radical schools in the United States is St. John's of Annapolis since it never changes. Another of the major conclusions of the 1971 study is that students have changed significantly: There are more of them, they are more diverse in terms of socio-economic background, they are more involved in seeking power over institutional functioning and have greater control over social regulations. With this conclusion in mind, Hodgkinson suggests, in the 1972 article mentioned above, that what is needed is a greater diversity of institutional goals in higher education in order to meet the changing needs of a much more diverse population of students.

Peterson (1971) offers several definitions of terms being used interchangeably in higher education when goals are being discussed. He differentiates functions, purposes, goals and objectives. Functions are the operations of higher education performed in its role in society, i.e., socialization. Purposes connotes the public mission of the institution. Objectives are somewhat akin to goals but deal specifically with the ends or outputs of various sub units (departments, etc.) of an institution. Goals are defined as "the particular, possibly unique pattern of specified ends, outputs and priorities established for a single college or university" (Peterson, 1971, p. 3). It is this definition of goals that guided this author in the project to assist in developing goals for the Student Affairs Department at The Ohio State University.
Two significant research projects that examine goals in higher education are presented here because of their special relevance to this author's research being reported. In one of the most comprehensive studies of higher education goals reported, Gross and Grambsch (1968) enlisted the aid of sixty-eight (68) universities and over ten-thousand (10,000) faculty and administrators to help in developing and prioritizing a list of institutional goals. Two kinds of goals are suggested by the authors as present in any complex organization: "output" goals which define some kind of product and "support" goals which represent maintenance activities of the organization. A list of forty-seven (47) output and support goals was developed from statements of goal intentions defined as "what participants see the organization as trying to do: what they believe its goals to be, what direction they feel it is taking as an organization" (Gross and Grambsch, 1968, p. 10). For a goal to be present, two kinds of evidence are needed: intentions and activities (observable acts of individuals in the organization). The questionnaire developed consisted of goals developed solely from institutional intentions since it seems unfeasible to sort out "activities" in the very large sample that was used. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not a given goal was important at his university. Secondly, they were asked whether the goal "should" be an important one at their universities. Finally, the subjects were asked to rank on a 1 to 5 scale how important they perceived each goal to be on their campus. The mean score for each institution on each goal was then computed. If the standard deviation was greater than one, the authors concluded that spurious results had been obtained from that institution. They
felt that there should be significant consensus on the importance of a
goal at a given university since all administrators and ten percent of
all faculty were included from each sample university. The list of
goal intentions that comprised the questionnaire had several sub-
categories of goals. Output and Support goals were the major classi-
fications. The following represents the basic classifications with
those categories.

OUTPUT GOALS

1. Student-Expressive--involves the attempt
to change the student's identity or
close character in some fundamental way.

2. Student-Instrumental--involves the stu-
dent's being equipped to do something
specific for the society which he will
be entering or to operate in a specific
way in that society.

3. Research--the production of new knowledge
or the solution of problems.

4. Direct Service--the direct and continuing
 provision of services to the population
outside the university.

SUPPORT GOALS

1. Adaptation--the need for the university
as an organization to come to terms with
its environment.

2. Management--decisions on who should run
the university.

3. Motivation--goals that seek to ensure a
high level of satisfaction on the part
of the staff and students and emphasize
loyalty to the university as a whole.

4. Position--helps to maintain the position
of the university in terms of the kind
of place it is compared with other
universities.

(Gross and Grambsch, 1968, pp. 12-17)
Results indicated a high degree of agreement among institutions with only six of the goal statements having standard deviations above .90. Five of those six goals were support goals indicating significant disagreement about these kinds of goals and conversely, significant agreement about output goals. Of the top seven goals, in terms of perceived actual importance, five were support goals. The highest ranked goal for the entire project was one dealing with safeguarding faculty academic freedom. Only one of the top seven goals had anything to do with students and that was related to training students for research which has importance for the professional role and research emphasis of today's faculty. The authors indicate that eighteen (18) of the forty-seven (47) goals in the questionnaire refer directly to students. It is a startling result indeed to find that only one of these is given any prominence at all. They conclude that "the complaint that universities give little attention to the interests of students has considerable basis in fact" (Gross and Grambsch, 1968, p. 36). Of the four lowest ranked, preferred goals, three deal directly with students. This reinforces the observation obtained by examining the top-ranked goals. The least preferred goal, ranked forty-seventh (47), was "Cultivate student's taste."

In the examination of the perceived goals, the academic freedom statement again received top billing. Several student-related goals were ranked highly in this category although they were concerned only with the intellectual and academic development of students. The lowest ranked, perceived goal was concerned with preserving institutional
character. Three of four of the lowest ranked, perceived goals dealt with students. Gross and Grambsch summarize their conclusion based on the rankings:

Students as a group were not felt to be particularly important when respondents were asked about the actual goals of the universities, nor is there evidence of any strong feeling that this state of affairs is unfortunate . . . . . . the Renaissance concept of cultivating the whole man is apparently no longer esteemed as an ideal.

(Gross and Grambsch, 1968, p. 33)

Examining congruence between faculty and administrators, the study revealed little disagreement at the high and low rankings in both the preferred and perceived categories. Some disagreement between faculty and administrators on professional values for faculty lend support to the Jenck's and Reisman (1968) argument that higher education is rapidly becoming a meritocracy. A goal statement dealing with providing student activities received a perceived rank of 27 indicating that even though this goal is perceived to have only moderate importance, at best, on most campuses, most faculty and administrators would prefer that it have much less importance. Four of the goals having a discrepancy between perceived and preferred rankings were adaptation goals. Administrators gave lower preferred rankings to all four of these goals. In light of earlier comments in this paper about the adaptive element in an open system organization, these data are indeed discouraging. The import these conclusions have for the student development model cannot be overlooked. Those goals that would seem to be central to the definition of student personnel work are relegated to relatively unimportant concerns for the majority of faculty and
administrators. What is even more disconcerting, most would prefer even less emphasis on these goals. These data were gathered in 1964 and 1965, prior to the major student movements of the past few years. Might this have caused a new priority for institutional goals and even the creation of new goals? To that end, Gross and Grambsch are currently replicating this study.

One further kind of data examination by Gross and Grambsch was the nature of the congruence or dissonance toward goals on individual campuses and among institutions. The among-institution examination tends to support the homogeneity argument of Hodgkinson (1971) to some degree. Twenty-five (25) of the goals had statistically significant congruences among institutions.

The within-institution study of congruence shows twenty-one (21) of the goals have statistically significant agreement among the preferred/perceived variables. An examination of these kinds of data lends itself to identifying possible areas of conflict within an institution. By examining the congruence, or lack thereof, between subgroups in the organization, valuable data can be obtained concerning conflict issues. In the subsequent description of the data obtained by this author about the preferred goals of student affairs at The Ohio State University, it will be shown how identifying subgroup disagreement on goals can be a valuable insight in organization development projects.

Uhl (1971) utilized the Delphi method to gather data from nearly one thousand (1,000) members of the academic community of five institutions. Included were students, staff, faculty, administrators, trustees, alumni, parents and community groups. Establishing the goal
statements was accomplished by using a preliminary form of the Institutional Functioning Inventory (Peterson, 1970) instead of the usual step I of a Delphi which is an open-ended questionnaire. The second step of the Delphi was composed asking the participants to indicate the importance of each of the 105 goals. As in the Gross and Grambsch (1968) study, there were "actual" and "preferred" categories so that each goal was ranked twice, once in each of the categories. For feedback in the Delphi process, the most frequent response in each category for each goal was used. The next step was to ask participants to respond to the same list of goal statements again. The only change was that the feedback mechanism in the form of the most frequent response in each category from the previous round, was circled in red. Further instructions were to include an opinion if the response to an item was in the minority. In a variation of the usual Delphi procedure, Uhl did not feedback a participant's own responses from the previous round. He was concerned that this feedback would create defensiveness in the respondent who was in the minority on an item. The final Delphi round repeated the process of the previous round but included summaries of the minority opinions that had been submitted.

Results indicated support for Gross and Grambsch's evidence of high agreement between faculty and administrator. Uhl found r's of .86 to .98 in the five institutions between faculty and administrators on preferred goals. Since the five institutions were of different types (small vs. large; state vs. private, etc.) the data of this study are useful mainly in obtaining a profile of each institution. This, in fact, was Uhl's purpose, to develop a means of assisting an institution
in defining its goals. The utility of the Delphi process is borne out by examining the similarity of rankings at an institution on the first questionnaire and on the third questionnaire. The median rho for the first round was in the .60's while the median rho for round three was over .90. Thus, Uhl concludes,

Convergence of opinion occurred through the use of the Delphi technique among both individuals and groups participating in the study.

(Uhl, 1971, p. 34)

Winstead and Hobson (1971) suggest a model for developing institutional goals. Reflecting on the Delphi process of Uhl's study, the authors point out that the convergence on goals obtained by the Delphi represents only the first step in the goal-setting process. Their process includes setting the goals (Delphi), translating these goals into measurable behavioral objectives, and providing resources needed to increase the chances of obtaining these goals. The process must include all segments of the institution in a participatory governance model. Follow-up workshops were held in the Uhl project and the results of using the data as a communication device between groups was, according to Winstead and Hobson, successful.

The process of organizational goal setting has been dealt with only peripherally in favor of the product or specific goals. However, this process has many dynamics that have significant impact on the end product. In particular, differences in status, prestige and authority play a large part in organizational decision making.
Status differences restrict the participation of low status members, channel a disproportionate amount of communication to high status members, discourage criticism of the suggestions of the highs, encourage rejecting criticism of the lows and reduce the work satisfaction of the lows and their motivation to make contributions. (Blau and Scott, 1962, p. 5)

Delphi

The Delphi technique, originally developed by Rand Corporation in the 1950's to assist Defense Department planning for future defense needs, is uniquely designed to serve as an effective method of organizational communication. Through a systematic gathering of expert opinions with anonymous questionnaires, full participation in the input process is obtained. Delphi avoids the dangers of specious persuasion that group confrontations for decision-making often produce. Delphi allows for an anonymous response to questions and reception of anonymous feedback as to how others in the group have responded.

Olaf Helmer (1967) cites an experiment that attempted to use Delphi to predict the capabilities of computers in the future. A panel of computer experts was asked to estimate the year when a computer would be able to score above 150 on a standard IQ instrument. The first round of responses ranged from 1975 to 2100. The second round summarized the opinions of the first round by using the median and interquartile range of the expert's responses. Each panel member was asked to consider that summary and respond to the question once again. If his new response fell outside the interquartile range, a written response was requested explaining the "minority" opinion. The second round produced a smaller range of responses. The third round repeated
the process of the second with the addition of the comments asked for on Round two. Round four repeated the process again with the experts given a final chance to revise their opinions. Helmer concluded that the median of Round four represented group consensus.

Another Rand study using Delphi attempted to process expert opinion on the subject of weapons systems needed by the Soviet Union to successfully attack the United States. Over a series of rounds, estimates of the number of atomic bombs needed were placed in an increasingly smaller range. They concluded that the Delphi method was effective in encouraging independent judgments of experts (Dalky and Helmer, 1962).

Judd (1970) discusses the use of Delphi to accelerate goal convergence within organizations. He describes a project in which a department chairman used Delphi in developing a curriculum for a branch campus. He reports success in developing a highly creative and innovative academic program with essentially a conservative faculty. In the same article, Judd offers some criticisms of the Delphi. One criticism is that Delphi is dependent upon the good will of the participants to honestly answer the questions. Another is the unwieldy and time-consuming nature of the Delphi process. A fundamental criticism, suggests Judd, is that Delphi predictions are no better than those of an ouija board. He reports a Rand control study that showed a panel of non-experts were able to develop fairly accurate estimates to several easily substantiated questions. A further weakness, according to Judd, is that the results of Delphi are only as good as the participants.
Again he cites a Rand study in which experts were asked to rate their own ability. Results indicated that the higher the group rated itself, the more accurate the answer.

Anderson (1970) reports a project using Delphi to develop objectives for an intermediate school system in Ohio. The participants were asked to respond to an open-ended questionnaire using the following question stem:

In the decade ahead, the ___________ County School District should concentrating its energies and resources.*

(Accounted, 1970, p. 4)

Participants were asked to give up to ten responses. The responses were reviewed independently by the four members of the research team. They developed items independently that proved to match each other quite closely. After four Delphi rounds, Anderson reports success in identifying high priority, organizational objectives and in influencing decisions on the basis of this data.

Emons (1971) used Delphi to develop criteria for selection of secondary school principals. His conclusion, and the conclusion of a later paper (Emons and Kaplan, 1971), was that Delphi is an effective tool for generating criteria and promoting consensus.

In a project designed to develop goals for the School of Education at the University of Virginia, Cyphert and Gant (1970) used Delphi to gather data from individuals within and outside the school of education. Using the model response as the feedback mechanism as well as

* This author had several conversations with Dr. Anderson concerning his work with Delphi. He was most helpful in the development of the Round I question as well as in offering suggestions for the sorting of Round I data.
the definition of consensus, the authors report the Delphi was effective in helping them develop goals for their organization. They also footnote their conclusions by adding that it was a "pleasant change" to be able to be planning for the future with data to assist them.

In the study mentioned earlier, Uhl (1971) used Delphi to develop institutional goals for a consortium of colleges and universities in the southeast. Uhl's modification of the Delphi technique offers support for this author's use of the Delphi. In traditional Delphi studies, small panels (5-7) of experts were asked for intuitive judgments or predictions in their field of expertise. Uhl changed the definition of expert to mean those individuals who had a stake in the organizations being examined. Further, he had over 1,000 participants. Both of these significant departures were crucial to the nature of Uhl's project and contributed to its success greatly. The Delphi technique used by this author incorporates these two modifications.

Weaver (1972) offers a comprehensive compilation of literature dealing with Delphi. He questions some of the fundamental assumptions of the Delphi and is particularly critical of naive interpretations of Delphi data. Weaver reports evidence that indicates individuals who conform under group pressures will do so in a Delphi. Additionally, conforming behavior is closely related to personality patterns so that the use of feedback information becomes a function of one's motivational system and not necessarily a function of the technique.
Within the Delphi procedure individuals who 'swing' in from wide ranges to more narrow ranges do so less on the basis of rational argument, examination of evidence, or review of assumptions, than because decision-making strategies of certain persons are subject to change as the task is perceived to be less ambiguous, and on account of certain personality factors such as fundamental needs and integrative complexity.

(Weaver, 1972, p. 39)

Weaver suggests that using the Delphi to develop organizational goals and priorities is a normative exercise since the focus is on what is desirable rather than on speculation of probable dates of events. Feedback represents normative choices on the part of the other participants. Rankings and consensus in this type of Delphi can be a function of many different things for the participants and therefore are, by themselves, spurious. Weaver offers possible modifications of Delphi that would help to make it a more effective tool in educational forecasting. One of these offers to avoid the criticism of the spurious nature of Delphi data.

Convergence or divergence which occurs after feedback ought to be taken as an indicator of the force of arguments and clarifying of points of view; in this view it is assumed to have nothing to do with the accuracy of events in question.

(Weaver, 1972, p. 48)

Organization Development

It was with this strategy in mind that this author gathered Delphi data for the Student Affairs department at The Ohio State University. Trying to develop goals was only partially the purpose. Uncovering significant differences of opinion that might represent
conflicts within the organization and using these data to facilitate a decision-making process on its future was intended as well. Using research information to assist in organizational planning requires careful attention to individual and organizational communication and behavior. Organization development is a concept that offers a methodology to facilitate effective planning for the future.

When faced with the need for systematic changes in values and objectives, both individually and organizationally, scientists and administrators have attempted rationalistic programs of information and re-education to effect change. There is little evidence indicating their success (Etzioni, 1972). Etzioni suggests that social scientists need to re-examine the basic concept that man can be taught nearly anything. An alternative to the rationalistic approach is offered by Etzioni.

What is becoming increasingly apparent is that to solve social problems by changing people is more expensive and usually less productive than approaches that accept people as they are and seek to mend not them but the circumstances around them. (Etzioni, 1972, p. 46)

Organizational development is a concept that deals with organizational change. The difference between organization development programs and rationalistic ones is the emphasis on "people technology" (Bennis, 1969). Benne and Chin (Bennis, 1969) discuss this notion as being crucial to the strategies of planned change. They posit that whether the task is to introduce new thing technologies or more sophisticated people technologies, the introduction of these changes is a function of the organization as people and is based on behavioral knowledge.
Argyris (1957), attempting to provide a framework for understanding the individual in an organization, offers the concept that "organizational behavior develops from the interaction of the individual and the formal organization" (p. 175). He suggests the need to apply behavioral science to the study of formal organizations in order to truly understand them.

Katz and Kahn (1966) agree that the social structure of an organization needs to be examined in behavioral science terms. The adaptive nature of social organizations as well as the importance of applying behavioral science techniques and knowledge is central to a description of organization development.

Shepard (March, 1965) describes a "secondary mentality" for organizations. This level is based on genuine interpersonal relationships between individuals in an organization. The organization fosters personal growth and development while, in turn, adapting and change are more easily facilitated. Collaboration and consensus, rather than coercion and threat are the mode in this "mentality." Organizational goals are sought because of the congruence between individuals and organizations in terms of needs.

Argyris (1965) describes organizational adaptation as a function of the interpersonal competence of top management. He argues that, "Changes in interpersonal relationships, values and norms must begin at the top if they are to be effective" (p. 3). Results of Argyris' research lead to the hypothesis that a low degree of interpersonal competence is a major cause for reduced innovativeness in organizations. There is a basic difference in what people know and
The incongruency between intellectual competence and interpersonal competence is a crucial finding for organizational development theory since it confronts the "rational man" argument used for so long which says that, given enough right information, any intelligent (rational) man will make the best decision.

Nadler (1969) argues that a relationship exists between productivity and human involvement. One enhances the other. He offers a matrix system for integrating these two elements and producing a creative approach to organizational planning.

Many OD projects reported in the literature describe laboratory training as the selected strategy for change. Bennis (1969b) emphasizes the centrality of group interpersonal behavior and training in OD work. Lippit (1958) traces the work of the National Training Laboratories (NTL) in developing the concept of group dynamics used to facilitate changes in organizational settings. Collins and Guetzkow (1964), in describing relationships between task obstacles and interpersonal relations, suggest that where the focus is on the task only, there is no group identity. Individuals would be as effective sitting in their own offices. The group product is still equal to the sum of its individual products. Collins and Guetzkow describe the concept of "assembly effect" to develop the notion of group productivity being greater than its parts.

The assembly effect is a 'potential' present in a collection of individuals which is realized only when the group members have the skill to build an interpersonal relation effective enough to outperform the sum of individual productivities.

(Collins and Guetzkow, 1964, p. 60)
Once the assembly effect has been accomplished, theoretically the groups' problem-solving capabilities are significantly enhanced. The potential of this concept for organization development cannot be overstated. Utilizing group dynamics in laboratory settings for organizational interventions is an effective method of increasing organizational effectiveness if the conclusion of these authors is accurate. "Performance increases significantly from before to after the development of a stable interpersonal organization" (p. 68).

Organization development has its origins in these concepts. Bennis offers the best definition of OD in *Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins and Prospects* (1969). Organization development is an educational strategy designed to change organizational attitudes and values as well as structures and to assist adaptation to the tremendous amount of change in their environments. Assuming a high rate of change in our society, planning to anticipate and cope with change is necessary rather than reacting to it. Bennis lists three basic propositions in defining organization development.

1. Assume an evolutionary hypothesis. Every age develops a unique form of organizations. This process is happening now and demands for great changes in organizational process are taking place.

2. The best way to change organizations is to change their culture--the system where people live and work.

3. A new social awareness is required by people for the organization as well as personally.

   (Bennis, 1969, p. V)

Bennis also provides the significant core problems most likely to be encountered in an organization development project.
1. Integration of individual needs and organizational needs.

2. How is power used and distributed? The notion of social influence.

3. Managing and resolving conflicts.

4. Adapting to the changing environment.

5. Identity - How clear and committed is the organization toward its goals.

6. Revitalization - Is the renewal process a conscious evolution?  
   (Bennis, 1969, p. 28-32)

Beckhard (1969) further elaborates in defining OD. It is a program, managed from the top, whose purpose is increasing organizational effectiveness. Behavioral science techniques are implemented through planned interventions into an organization. OD programs are typically a long-term effort with definite behavioral outcomes as goals. Commitment to the planned changes by those in authority is crucial to success.

Argyris (1970) recognizes the need for behavioral science techniques to help an organization achieve "health" or effectiveness. He presents three basic elements that are required for any intervention project.

1. Generation of valid and useful data.
2. Client system must have free, informed choice concerning the intervention.
3. An internal commitment to the choices made.
   (Argyris, 1970, p. 17)

Bennis (1969c), in an article discussing some unresolved problems of organization development work, lists three such problems. First, OD usually avoids the problem of power. Secondly, structural
and technological changes are typically ignored, the main reason being change in the organizational climate. Finally, he suggests that organization development, as a profession, still falls far short of other, established professions.

Greiner (1969) examined eighteen studies of organizational change in an attempt to uncover characteristics of successful projects. He found that the most effective change programs effected the entire organization. Positive changes were produced in employee attitudes. More effective problem-solving behavior and interpersonal relationships were noticed as well. Organizational performance and the use of shared power complete the characteristics Greiner's survey uncovered. He concludes with two basic concepts for change: successful change requires a redistribution of power and, secondly, power distribution is a developmental process.

Harrison (1970) offers an important variable in selecting the proper change strategy. He suggests that the depth of individual emotional involvement in the change process is crucial in selecting strategies. The author attempts to develop ways of matching intervention strategies to the particular organizational problem. This would require an intervention at a level no deeper than needed to effect lasting solutions to the stated problems. Harrison gives the example of an organization manipulating salaries to increase effectiveness without success. The conclusion must then be that a deeper intervention is needed, one that will successfully link organizational goals to an individual's needs. He concludes that the criteria for the depth of an intervention are the client's norms and values.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

This project describes an organizational intervention process utilizing the Delphi as the major data gathering model. The project described was designed to fit the requirements of Argyris' successful intervention paradigm. These requirements are:

1. Generation of valid information
2. Client system has free informed choice
3. Clients have internal commitment to choice made.

(Argyris, 1970, p. 15)

Certainly an intervention is not a complete project in itself. With the decision to pursue a design of organization development, the Task Force chose Delphi as an appropriate intervention tool. The Delphi, as the first step in the organization development project, would be used to gather data about organizational goals and objectives. It was not intended as the change agent itself, although the author does explore this question in this study. This section describes the design of the intervention as well as the specifics of building the data gathering instrument.

By definition, an organization development project is introspective. One of the major tasks is to gather data that is a valid description of the organization being studied as well as relevant to
organizational members (Argyris, 1970). The data is then used as feedback to the organization for decision-making. For this reason, the author has selected a case study paradigm as the method of gathering and presenting the data for this study. A case study deals with interrelationships (Van Dalen, 1962). By gathering pertinent data, in this case concerning organizational goals, potential relationships can be uncovered and examined by the researcher. This study gathered information from members of an organization that sought data for planning decisions and examined those data in light of the organization, seeking relationships for further description and understanding.

The overall strategy, mentioned earlier, called for the Task Force to intervene in the Student Affairs division at The Ohio State University in such a way as to gain relevant data for planning its future and at the same time, develop commitment to the planning process. The first step in the strategy was to communicate with and gain the commitment of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Once the Delphi had been selected as an appropriate device for the intervention and as a way of developing organizational goals, a full presentation was made to the Vice President. It was made clear that the intent was to involve him in every step of the planning process and that his commitment to the outcome was crucial. Once he had agreed to the proposal, development of the Delphi instrument began. At this juncture, the author resigned from the Task Force and became its consultant for the Delphi project. Since members of the Task Force were to be involved in the Delphi, it was necessary to change the relationship between the author (the Delphi consultant) and the organization being examined by the Delphi. Lois
Kaplan Leubitz and James Seguin, both graduate students in the Speech Communication Department at The Ohio State University, assisted in building the Delphi items and in implementing the rounds.

The original Delphi procedure, described earlier, was modified for this study. However, it is useful to present a general description of the process here. Pfeiffer (1968) offers a generally accepted outline of the Delphi process.

1. The first questionnaire may call for a list of opinions involving experienced judgment, say a list of predictions or recommended activities.

2. On the second round each expert receives a copy of the list, and is asked to rate or evaluate each item by some such criterion as importance, probability of success, and so on.

3. The third questionnaire includes the list and the ratings, indicates the consensus, if any, and in effect asks the experts either to revise their opinions or else to specify their reasons for remaining outside the consensus.

4. The fourth questionnaire includes list, ratings, the consensus and minority opinions. It provides a final chance for the revision of opinion.

(Pfeiffer, 1968, pp. 152-157)

Building the Delphi Items

It was crucial to develop a question for Round I of the Delphi (open-ended questionnaire) that would evoke the widest range of responses possible while at the same time maintaining the focus on developing goals for the future of the Student Affairs department at Ohio State. As part of the strategy of organizational commitment to
the process, the author decided to utilize the original Task Force in
the development of the question to be used for Round I. The plan would
be, once Round I was administered, to construct items for the Delphi
questionnaire. Round I was to be a process that was as projective as
possible so that the participants would have a greater sense of involve­
ment in the succeeding rounds.

In order to fully develop a proper question for the Delphi, a
pilot study with the Dean of Student's staff (a part of the Student
Affairs department) was planned. A study designed to solicit response
to a question concerning future organizational goals for the Dean of
Student's office was planned with a Q-sort to be devised from the
responses. Q-methodology is essentially the study of correlations
between persons responding to items or questions. This differs with
typical correlational analysis or R-methodology which deals with corre­
lations between tests. (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 583. For a complete
description of Q-methodology, see Cattell, 1966, Chapter III.) The
Q-sort would then be administered to the Dean of Student's staff in
order to gather preliminary data that described a part of the organiza­
tion to be studied later and its opinions about future goals. The
Q-sort was chosen for this pilot project for its heuristic values
(Kerlinger, 1964, p. 597). The pilot project would allow the researcher
to examine the appropriateness of the question being developed for
Round I of the Delphi. Additionally, preliminary data could be obtained
about interrelationships of a part of the target organization concerning
future goals for student affairs. Several suggestions for the open­
ended question were proposed by the Task Force to the author. After
some discussion, it was decided to use the following in order to evaluate its effectiveness in eliciting responses.

If you had the ability to devise the ideal student affairs program at Ohio State University--- Describe the goals and objectives that you would include.

This question supported the purpose of building an ideal model by placing no limits on the brainstorming of responses to it. The question was given to the seven members of the Task Force. The responses were rich and varied. There was one consistent criticism of the question, namely, that the notion of having unlimited funds should be explicit in the question. As a result the question ultimately used by the author for the Q-sort study with the Dean of Student's staff was as follows:

If you had the opportunity and a blank check to devise the ideal student affairs program at OSU--- Describe the goals and objectives that you would include.

This question was distributed to all members of the Dean of Student's staff. (N = 24) Sixteen (16) returned responses that included nearly 100 separate suggestions and comments. From those responses, three general categories were developed: Roles, goals and functions. The individual statements were separated according to the three categories and key words and phrases were developed. The result of this sorting and categorizing process was twenty (20) phrases or key words that represented some goals, roles and objectives of an ideal student affairs program. Although the mixture of roles and goals was somewhat confusing, these items became the items to be sorted by the Dean of Student's staff in a previously explained and scheduled Q-sort session. Staff was informed that this project was part of the task force planning process
and would assist in developing procedures for more comprehensive data gathering at a later date. There was enthusiastic willingness to participate. Appendix I lists the items as they appeared in the Q-sort. Two factors were selected for the sort with the instructions to sort according to the priority ranking. The two factors were the actual and ideal situation. In other words, participants were asked to rank the twenty items as they would prioritize them in an ideal situation and, secondly, to rank them as they perceived the items to exist in the actual organization. Analysis of data from the Q-sort with the Dean of Student's staff will be presented in the following section on data analysis. The procedure for analyzing the data is presented here to indicate its impact on procedures selected for the Delphi study. The data were to be analyzed three ways. First, a simple compilation of how many times each item of the sort was ranked at a given level for both the ideal and actual situation. Tables 1 and 2 in the following section show this format. Secondly, correlations were computed for several matrices:

- people (r) people (ideal)
- people (r) people (actual)
- items (r) items (ideal)
- items (r) items (actual)

From the correlation matrices, a McQuitty's linkage analysis was developed (Kerlinger, 1964).

With the encouraging results of the Q-sort, work began on the development of the Delphi questionnaire. The first decision was to delineate what part of the university community was to be involved in the Delphi. A two-fold decision was arrived at by the Task Force.
First, in addition to members of the Student Affairs organization*, a cross section of the faculty, students and administrators was to receive Round I of the Delphi. Secondly, selected members of Student Affairs would become the Delphi panel that would be responding to the items built from Round I responses.

Soliciting responses to Round I from a wide cross section of the university community would provide the broadest possible pool of data with which to build the Delphi items. Restricting the actual Delphi rounds to Student Affairs would allow the organization to develop its own priorities for goals rather than being forced to accept goals toward which it had no commitment.

The author suggested the following population to the Task Force to be the recipients of the Round I questionnaire. After brief consideration the Task Force agreed that the list was appropriate. The population included:

1. The President of the University
2. Vice-Presidents of the University and Executive Deans
3. Faculty of College Student Personnel Work and Department Chairman
4. Faculty of Counseling Psychology
5. Ten (10) members of University Faculty Council

* The Student Affairs Division of The Ohio State University was composed of the following offices in addition to the Vice President for Student Affairs and his administrative staff: Financial Aids, Dean of Students, Health Services, Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation.
6. 145 students including members of the Council of Governments which is the board of elected leaders of campus governments, chairman of Ohio Union Activities Board, chairman of Traditions Board, randomly selected men and women from the undergraduate residence hall population, randomly selected men and women from the off-campus student population and randomly selected men and women selected from the Black Student Directory.

7. Student Affairs cabinet including Dean of Students, Director of Financial Aids, Director of Health Services, Director of Recreation and Director of Athletics.

8. Members of Student Affairs including: All of the Dean of Students staff, Director of Mental Hygiene, four Assistant Directors of Financial Aids and the Director of the Student Personnel Assistant Program.

The total number that received Round I of the Delphi was 218.

Anderson (1970) had completed a large scale Delphi project with school administrators in the State of Ohio. His Round I question format served to strengthen the question that had been developed to date. As a result the Round I question became:

If you had the opportunity and the funds to create the ideal Student Affairs program at OSU— Describe the goals and objectives upon which you would concentrate your energies and resources.

Appendix II is a replica of the actual questionnaire distributed. It should be noted that accompanying Round I was a printed letter signed by the Vice President for Student Affairs encouraging completion of the questionnaire and explaining the Task Force project to non-student affairs members. A cover letter also accompanied the questionnaire to student affairs members (Appendixes III and IV) explaining the Delphi process in detail. In both cases, this was consistent with the strategy
of involving the chief decision-maker at every step of the data gathering process. Participants were given two weeks to respond to Round I and mail the response in the addressed envelope provided with Round I to the Vice President's office.

Nearly 60 individuals returned the Round I questionnaire. The main focus was the Student Affairs department and 27 of 34 Round I questionnaires were returned that had been sent to Student Affairs. 10 faculty and 21 students returned Round I as well. Over 400 separate comments were included in the Round I returns. Although the return from faculty and students was disappointing, it was not crucial to the study since there were sufficient comments received and a strong representation of opinions from Student Affairs.

With Round I completed, the author, with the aforementioned assistants, began the arduous task of building the prime statements to be incorporated into a Delphi procedure. There was a tremendous variety to the responses received along several variables: specificity vs. generality; content vs. process and role vs. function. A sample of actual comments received from Round I is presented here to illustrate the divergent nature of the responses.

1. Perform in an ombudsman's role in the University
2. Build in a sense of community
3. Expansion of the Health Service to have more physicians available so that complete outpatient care could be offered
4. To enhance the individual personality development of students
5. Provision for work with special groups of students (e.g., physically or emotionally handicapped; culturally different; foreign born

6. Adequate student profile research to assist in designing staffing patterns and functions

7. The area of student affairs could pull upon the University Recreation and Intramural Sports Program to learn more of how the students feel about campus needs and desires

8. Additional tennis facilities

9. Serve as intermediaries and liaisons among all elements of the campus

10. Continuous interaction with the President to insure his understanding and support

11. Forcefully represent student concerns to the administration

12. To facilitate learning.

The procedure devised to build items for the Delphi process was essentially one of categorizing and subcategorizing. Emons (1971) in using the Delphi to develop consensus on the characteristics needed for inner city school administrators, describes the item building process. He used a categorizing process by which key words are identified in the Round I data and used as categories to sort the responses. Tallies were kept so that a frequency count for each category could be used to decide which categories deserved representation by an item in the Delphi. With slight modification, this was the process used in this project. Anderson (1970), in building items for his Delphi project, was assisted by two others in separately examining Round I data to identify key statements. After independently examining Round I responses and developing category names, they compared the categories and found a great
deal of similarity. The categories were then refined to include all areas delineated by the researchers. This same procedure was used in this study. Each assistant received a copy of all Round I comments. We examined the returns independently and attempted to develop broad categories that characterized the Round I comments. Once this was accomplished, the results were compared in a joint session to examine the similarities. Very similar categories had been developed independently. This allowed the author to pursue the next step in the item building process which was to collate the categories developed independently and develop final, key-word categories. Again, in joint session with the two assistants, these final categories were created. They were:

1. Administration-Organization-In-Service Training-Professional Decision-Making
2. Change Agent
3. Communications
4. Counseling and Advisory Roles
5. Dormitories
6. Facilitator-Ombudsman-Advocate
7. Student Development
8. Student Needs
9. Research
10. Miscellaneous.

Each of the major categories was further divided into subcategories that delineated the responses even further. Appendix V is the complete set of categories and subcategories. As the reader will note, there is a letter-number code in the left-hand margin. This is the coding of each respondent and the letter of the response on his Round I questionnaire. For example, "D-3-I means Delphi participant 3, response I. "F" represented the faculty and administrator respondents and "S" the student respondents. It is important to note at this juncture that
Appendix V was considered important information by itself and, as such, it was decided to include this information in the feedback package to be presented to the Student Affairs organization. This includes all the Round I responses, somewhat abbreviated and edited, and how they were categorized. By using the code identifiers, it is easy to see what loadings the various groups had in certain categories. Available to the researcher, but not to the organization, was the identity of the respondents. This allowed a further interpretation of Round I responses; i.e., being aware of where the comments from Financial Aids office were categorized as opposed to those of the Counseling Center participants.

The next step was to develop the actual items to be used in the Delphi. Two basic premises were the only guidelines for this task. First, no items would be built that did not truly represent the data received from Round I. Secondly, for an item to be included, there had to be a minimum of five comments from Round I in that subcategory. The only exception would be to include the concept in a complex item. This decision was to develop into a source of conflict during the feedback session since no independent item appeared on the Delphi dealing specifically with black students. The researcher received criticism for not including such an important topic in a study of future goals and objectives of Student Affairs. The author's response to this criticism was to refer to the document of categories and responses (Appendix V) which clearly showed that the organization itself had not given enough emphasis to this issue for it to appear on the Delphi. Rather than accepting a negative outcome from this conflict, it was noted to the organization that the data had uncovered this problem and that it might now be dealt with positively.
The items were built by trying to express each subcategory developed from the Round I responses. Because of the nature of the Round I responses, it was clear that a wide range of specificity would need to be represented by the Delphi items. However, this would not create an inconsistency since respondents would be asked to prioritize the items. As a result, participants would have to choose between general goals and specific, immediate goals.

Twenty-eight items were finally completed to comprise the Delphi questionnaire. Once again, these items represented important data, by themselves, to the organization being examined and were presented as such at the feedback session. The items are presented below with the question stem:

An ideal Student Affairs Program at O.S.U. should:

1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (Throughout these statements "community" refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)

2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.

3. recognize the demand for increased leisure time activities by providing sufficient recreational programs and facilities.

4. be accountable for the evaluation of programs to determine if the programs meet the objectives of student affairs.

5. be organized to allow similar functions and services to fall into the same administrative office.

6. approach mental and physical health care from a preventive and educational point of view.
7. facilitate agreement among the differing perceptions of students, faculty and administrators as they work toward common objectives.

8. provide information based on research of student life to facilitate planning and decision making.

9. provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.

10. communicate information about University services to all students.

11. provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets the needs of the students.

12. foster living-learning opportunities in residence halls to provide continuity between classroom and out of classroom life.

13. create a sense of mutual trust and openness among all segments of the University community.

14. delegate decision-making as well as responsibility.

15. develop open and easily attainable avenues of communication among students, faculty and administration.

16. encourage each student to develop self-understanding as well as understanding of others through a wide range of activities.

17. work with students to establish an equitable system of discipline that insures student rights and responsibilities.

18. identify special needs of students (i.e., minority groups, handicapped students, international students) and provide staff and services to meet their unique needs.

19. provide a program of ongoing student orientation and academic advising.
20. be responsible for residence hall operations in order to more easily facilitate student affairs programs in the residence halls.

21. offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

22. make available diverse opportunities for financial aid (such as scholarships, job placement, work study programs, loans, etc.) to students based on need.

23. assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his stage of human development.

24. describe and interpret student life styles to the University community.

25. establish health services to meet current needs and create new services to meet developing needs such as birth control and drug education programs.

26. hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel and provide opportunities for their continuing educational and professional development.

27. mediate and arbitrate conflict via an ombudsman's role.

28. publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University.

The Delphi Rounds

The instructions on Delphi Round II asked the respondents to rank the priority of each item on a "1-4" scale, "1" being top priority. Additionally, participants were asked to distribute the rankings equally so that there would be 7 items ranked in each category. The purpose of this instruction was to insure a distribution of responses. Conceivably,
since the items were all worthwhile goals, they might all receive top
priority rankings. If that were to happen, the Delphi process would be
unnecessary and no information as to differences within the organiza-
tion would be uncovered. The required distribution was for Round II
only. Appendix VI is the completed Round II questionnaire. Included
in Appendix VI is the cover letter from the Vice President of Student
Affairs.

Because of vacations and other responsibilities, the final
Delphi panel consisted of 31 members of the Student Affairs Department
at The Ohio State University. In order to keep the panel limited in
size, not all of Student Affairs was chosen. All major offices were
represented by the Director and Assistant Directors of that office. All
of the Dean of Student's staff was included as well. Original Delphi
panels were small (5 to 7) and consisted of "experts" in the field being
examined. There is support in the literature for changing the defini-
tions of "expert", in the sense of the early Delphi studies, to mean
someone aware of and part of the system being examined (Uhl, 1971;
Cyphert and Cant, 1970). In this definition expertness means knowledge
of the task or organization under scrutiny as well as expertise.

The Delphi operates on a feedback mechanism. The results of
Round II were to be fed back to the participants in Round III. For
feedback, the group modal response was selected. The modal response
was selected for several reasons. First, it is easily understood and
makes few assumptions about the statistical sophistication of the par-
ticipants. Secondly, it is an ordinal measurement which the small size
of the Delphi panel suggested would be appropriate. Also it allowed
the use of non-parametric statistical procedures for analysis which was of interest to the author. Use of the modal response avoided the confusion that the use of the means might have created. Since the intent was to encourage choices on "1" or "2" or "3" or "4", the mode fed back data in the same restricted categories. A mean score of "1.3", for example, would have not been as strong an encouragement as a modal response of "1". Round III was a repeat of the 28 items but with new instructions (see Appendix VII). Round III showed each participant how he had answered each item on Round II and the group's modal response for each item from Round II. The instructions were to assign a 1-4 priority to each item again. There were no restrictions on distributing the rankings. Round III had one further instruction. If the respondent did not agree with the modal response and ranked a Round III item differently than the modal response for that item, he was asked to provide a written comment, in the margin, as to the nature of his disagreement.

Round IV repeated the twenty-eight prime statements once again. The instructions were identical to Round III (see Appendix VIII). Further feedback was provided by including a summary of all minority opinions from Round III (Appendix IX). These comments provided the "expert" judgments of those participants who did not agree with the modal responses of certain items on Round III. Since Round IV would
be the last round before the feedback session, a form asking for any final comments was included\(^*\) (Appendix X).

In order to explore the nature of the Delphi itself as a change agent, Round V of the Delphi (Appendix XI) was designed to be administered several months after the completion of Round IV. The purpose was to examine the overtime effects of the Delphi in order to draw interferences about Delphi's ability to "change" attitude and behavior by itself. Round V would be a repeat of Round IV with the added opportunity to list areas of concern that might have been included on the Delphi questionnaire. The plan for Round V was introduced at the feedback session in August just prior to a planned retreat at which the Delphi data would be utilized to confront possible organizational conflict and begin the operational planning stage.

A feedback session was planned to present data gathered from the Delphi rounds to date. The author indicated to the Vice President for Student Affairs that the feedback session data was prepared. He proceeded to request all of the Student Affairs department to attend. The data presented will be dealt with later in this presentation. The procedure was consistent with the outline adopted from Argyris (1970)

\[^*\] The next three rounds of the Delphi project were completed in approximately one month from the time Round I was completed. Approximately one week to ten days were allowed between rounds. The actual time for each round was usually three (3) days. Each questionnaire was personally delivered by the author or his assistants as well as collected. This seemed to increase the sense of participation or "ownership" in the data gathering project. Many began to show marked interest in the week's results and continually asked about how well "their" items had done in the current round. Returns were 100% for Rounds II, III, and IV.
as mentioned earlier. It was a major step in attempting to establish validity of the data and prepare the organization for the retreat which would deal with commitment toward decision-making with the data received.

The Round V data, to be gathered several months after the retreat, was to be forwarded to the Vice President's office and would be interpreted if necessary in a final feedback session. As will be seen, it was not necessary to complete this final step because of progress made by the organization.

With the conclusion of the feedback session, my official role as consultant concluded. Although available for future data interpretation and advice, I no longer played an active role in the Student Affairs planning project.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data gathered by the Delphi technique in this project can be carefully examined in order to describe several facets of the organization it represents. The case study approach is utilized for its value in creating a comprehensive picture of the organization being studied and the interrelationships within the organization as it attempts to build future goals. In a study of this nature, written data as well as statistical is valuable (Van Dalen, 1962). Accordingly, this section gives attention to written material that was gathered during the Delphi as well as a statistical analysis of the interrelationships between rounds of the Delphi, among participants in each round and among participants between rounds. An organizational subgroup analysis is presented as well that offers insight into possible conflict areas for organizational decision-making.

Q-Sort Study

However, prior to the Delphi project, a pilot study, utilizing a Q-sort device with the Dean of Students staff at The Ohio State University, was completed. Its purpose was to test the effectiveness of the
open-ended questionnaire that was to be first step of the Delphi as to its ability to generate sufficient comments for the item building process. The items developed from responses to the question,

If you had the opportunity and a blank check to devise the ideal student affairs program at OSU--describe the goals and objectives that you would include.

were a result of over one-hundred individual comments from the twenty-four participants in the Q-sort study. These items appear in Appendix I. It was then concluded that the question would be more than satisfactory for our purposes. In addition to this satisfying outcome, some interesting patterns developed from a correlational analysis of the Q-sort items. Participants were asked to sort the twenty items from highest to lowest priority as they perceived them in the present Dean of Students organization. Secondly, they were asked to rank the items as they preferred them in an ideal Dean of Students office at The Ohio State University. Pearson r's were computed to develop correlation matrices for several combinations. Table 1 is a simple frequency table showing the number of times each item was placed in each rank on the perceived sort.

Item 13, "Provide traditional services," received the highest number of top rankings with centralized decision-making the second highest. 19 members of 24 on the Dean of Students staff perceived the role of providing traditional services such as financial aid, student activities, and admissions in the top five ranks. Centralized decision-making was seen to be in the top five ranks by 14 of the 24 participants.

Conversely, Item 4, "No rule enforcement" received the greatest number (seven) of low rankings. Fifteen Dean of Students staff members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Each Item Was Placed in Each Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsive to parental concerns</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decision-making based on research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate student life styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No rule enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Higher salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resolving conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individual development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Humanness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Centralized decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Willingness to compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Strong identification with OSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provide traditional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ombudsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach moral responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teaching new professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Facilitate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. React quickly to crises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Provide buffer between students and society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Facilitate interaction among campus factions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ranked this item 16th or lower. Thirteen people perceived that Item 5, "higher salaries," was a low priority item, ranking it 16th or lower. Item 2, "Decision-making based on research," was to be an important indicator for the Delphi project and for planning in Student Affairs for the future. On the actual sort, this item received two rankings in priorities 1-10. 22 of the 24 participants ranked this item 14th or lower, indicating the perception of almost no concern for research on the variables about which decisions were being made. This fits nicely with the high importance perceived by the organization for centralized decision-making. If decisions were being made based on student life research then it is apparent that a majority in the organization were unaware of it. "Individual development" (Item 7) received nearly an even distribution of ratings as did Item 8, "Humanness." Although the normal spread of opinion is not startling, it is somewhat surprising that in a student personnel organization, two terms typically used in student development jargon, did not receive a more concentrated rating in the higher priorities. Combined with the perceived rankings of the centralized decision-making and research items, a picture emerges of a traditional, bureaucratic organization as seen by its members. Item 11, "Willingness to compromise," is perceived to be important to the organization with 17 ratings of 10 or higher. The ombudsman item (14), reflecting a new role at The Ohio State University, received little support at either extreme. Item 17, "Facilitate change," received a preponderance of low rankings. With the planning of an organization development project, organizational response to this type of variable
would be under close scrutiny. The last item (20) on the Q-sort, dealing with the role of facilitator for the university community, received no ratings in the top four ranks. Most saw this item to be relatively unimportant to the Dean of Students staff at present.

Distinct differences in priorities became apparent when the Dean of Students staff was asked to rank the twenty items in order of their importance in an "ideal" Dean of Students organization at Ohio State. "Individual development" (7) received the highest rankings of any item with 19 out of 24 possible ratings in the top two ranks. The results for this item on the actual sort were widely spread. Obviously, the participants felt strongly that individual development should be important but perceived that it wasn't at the present time. Similarly, frequencies consolidated for Item 8 (Humanness) at the high end of the scale. Opinion had been scattered for this item on the actual sort. Apparently, these two variables became much more important to the organization in a preferred setting. Why the significant differences between the actual and ideal settings on this item is a crucial question for this organization. "Providing traditional services," the item (13) that received the greatest number of "1" rankings on the actual sort, had a much lower preferred priority for the Dean of Students office with 18 of 24 ranking this 11th or lower. Items 2 and 10, dealing with decision-making and research reversed their priorities from the actual sort. Decision-making based on research received 11 ratings in the top five ranks as opposed to none on the actual sort. More significant was the move away from the lower quarter of the continuum. Two people rated Item 2 in the lowest five ranks on the ideal sort compared to 16 people
### TABLE 2
**FREQUENCY TABLE--DEAN OF STUDENTS Q SORT--IDEAL SORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Times Each Item Was Placed in Each Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsive to parental concerns</td>
<td>1 1 3 2 1 3 2 3 5 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decision-making based on research</td>
<td>4 2 2 2 1 1 3 3 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate student life styles</td>
<td>1 4 2 2 4 2 3 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No rule enforcement</td>
<td>2 1 1 3 1 2 2 2 4 2 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Higher salaries</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 3 4 1 2 1 4 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resolving conflict</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 3 5 2 2 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individual development</td>
<td>9 10 1 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Humanness</td>
<td>6 6 1 1 2 1 2 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational specialist</td>
<td>1 3 2 5 3 2 1 4 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Centralized decision-making</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 3 3 3 5 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Willingness to compromise</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 3 3 3 5 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Strong identification with OSU</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 3 3 3 4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provide traditional services</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2 1 2 1 1 5 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ombudsman</td>
<td>4 2 3 3 1 1 4 3 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach moral responsibility</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 3 1 1 4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teaching new professionals</td>
<td>2 1 3 2 4 3 2 2 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Facilitate change</td>
<td>3 2 8 2 2 3 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. React quickly to crises</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Provide buffer between students and society</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 3 2 3 3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Facilitate interaction among campus factions</td>
<td>1 1 4 2 2 5 2 1 3 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the actual sort. Item 10, "Centralized decision-making," received a much lower priority on the ideal sort with 15 ratings in the lowest quarter of rankings as opposed to 14 ratings in the highest quarter on the actual sort.

Item 4, "No rule enforcement," remained essentially the same between the two sorts. The organization apparently feels that enforcing rules is an important function for the Dean of Students Office at Ohio State. However, if the item were changed to indicate rule enforcement by some other office other than the Dean of Students, it might change the nature of the organization's response. The item dealing with compromise (11) lost importance when viewed ideally. Compromise may be being viewed negatively as an avoidance of conflict by the organization, thus ideally, conflict would be met more directly. If it were being viewed positively, then it is possible the lower priority on the ideal sort reflects an organizational willingness to "stick to its guns."

Item 19, "Provide a buffer between students and society," reflects the in loco parentis issue. On the actual sort, opinion seems evenly divided as to how important this item was perceived. However, the ideal sort shows a great deal of organizational consensus on the in loco parentis issue. Only one rating higher than tenth (19th) was assigned by the Dean of Students staff indicating an organizational distaste, ideally, for the "buffer" role. This issue is dealt with directly in Item I as well. The consensus of Item 19 on the preferred sort is supported, although not as strongly. Item I ratings nearly reversed themselves on the ideal sort with a much lower priority being assigned.
Item 17, "Facilitate change," dealt with the role of change agent in the university community. The ideal sort clearly shows a preference for this role with all but one individual ranking this item in the top seven categories. There is a distinct difference in the way the organization perceived this role versus its preference for it. The actual sort indicates little priority for acting as a change agent.

An item dealing with a role similar to that of the change agent is Item 20, "Facilitate interaction among campus factions." Again there seems to be a clear distinction in the importance the organization perceives this role to have versus the importance it ought to have. Items 17 and 20 may be considered to represent risky roles and the actual sort is reflecting a reluctance to attempt change or take the initiative with other campus groups. Again, as will be shown later, this reflection of conservatism on the part of the Dean of Students staff, is a significant variable in the Delphi project.

Q-methodology is a design comparing the interrelationships of people. By developing a matrix, correlating the twenty-four (24) participants in the Q-sort with each other, it is possible to obtain insights as to areas of agreement and disagreement within the organization. Because this Q-sort was, in essence, a pilot study to test the open-ended questionnaire and to rehearse the examination of the data, a close review of how individuals agreed or disagreed in this study will not be presented. Care must be taken as well to protect the identity of individuals involved. However, one example of the power of this type of data analysis is offered here to demonstrate its utility in organization development programs. It is possible to examine the general
picture of agreement and disagreement for an individual's perceived and preferred views for the goals and objectives with others in his organization. The following is an example of the communicative ability of such an analysis. An administrator on the Dean of Students staff was compared to all others participating in the Q-sort study. A review of the correlations on the actual sort shows that, of the 23 other participants to be compared with, this individual had negative correlations with 21 of them. Table 3 shows correlations for this person with all other participants.

| TABLE 3 |
| Actual Sort - Correlations of one participant with all others |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-.24</th>
<th>-.03</th>
<th>-.39</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>.77</th>
<th>-.19</th>
<th>-.32</th>
<th>.11</th>
<th>-.45</th>
<th>-.10</th>
<th>-.30</th>
<th>-.39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe person used as the example.

Examining the ideal sort shows the same pattern. Only 2 of 23 staff members positively correlated with the same individual on how they preferred to see the items in the organization. As can be seen, the strength of the correlations increased in the same direction in nearly all cases, indicating an even stronger disagreement between the organization and this person on the 20 items they had developed as goals and objectives.
TABLE 4
IDEAL SORT - Correlations of one participant with all others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.35</th>
<th>-.28</th>
<th>-.32</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>.82</th>
<th>-.23</th>
<th>-.21</th>
<th>.20</th>
<th>-.31</th>
<th>-.34</th>
<th>-.18</th>
<th>-.44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The person used as the example.

One final example of data analysis is provided. Using the correlation matrix as the source, it is possible to develop a diagrammatic analysis of factors in operation. This elementary method of factor analysis was developed by McQuitty (Kerlinger, 1964) to provide a quick method of developing factor clusters. The simple procedure is to select an arbitrary cut-off point for the size of the coefficient, then, for each variable, identify all r's with other variables above the arbitrary cut-off, in both a positive and negative direction. In the ideal sort, item to item matrix of this Q-study, an example of a cluster developed would be:

Centralized Decision Making
No Rule Enforcement
Willingness to Compromise

When diagrammed, it would look like this:

Centralized Decision Making
- .56
No Rule Enforcement
.51
Willingness to Compromise
An interpretation of this cluster might be an indication of the bureaucratic nature of the organization. Rule enforcing may be a "legitimizing" function for the Dean of Students office and to eliminate the function would be a serious blow. Compromise and centralized decision-making seem to be complementary in a bureaucratic organization.

**Delphi - The Categories**

With over 500 responses from the Round I questionnaire, a rich pool of data was available to build goal statements. A perusal of the summary of these responses also offers some insight as to the nature of organizational priorities even before the Delphi begins. Appendix V shows the comments from Round I (edited) in the categories to which they were assigned in the item building stage. Over sixty comments were assigned to the "student needs" category, indicating an interest in providing service to meet these needs. The "recreation" and "social" sub-category had the largest frequency of comments within the student needs category. In light of the fact that only two of the respondents to Round I were from the Recreation Department or Athletic Department, it appears this category has widespread support. From the importance this category has already received from the Student Affairs organization, it might be predicted that items reflecting this sub-category would receive high priorities on the Delphi. As will be seen, this was not the case.

Six comments were categorized into a "change agent" group. This is a relatively small category and one that might be expected to have been larger. This may be a first hint of the organizational stance
toward change and the risks inherent in that process. Examining the progress of the change item on the Delphi and comparing the way subgroups of the organization prioritize the change agent role provides a crucial insight into a possible conflict topic.

Another category receiving a large number of comments was "dorms." Responsibility for residence halls had recently been moved from the Dean of Students office, out of Student Affairs completely and into another division of the University. Several members of the Dean of Students staff had been residence hall staff members. The reorganization and a subsequent feeling that an important part of the student affairs program had been taken away may account for the number of comments in this category.

A conglomerate category headed "Administration-Organization-In-Service-Professional Decision-Making" contains many "in-house" functions. Notably large is the "Qualifications and Professionalism" sub-category as well as the "Organization" sub-category.

The "Facilitator-Ombudsman-Advocate" category reflects many of the new roles being discussed for the field of student personnel. In particular, the role of student advocate might be viewed as being extreme. Members of student affairs and one student offered comments about advocacy as a student affairs objective. The "Facilitator" sub-category received thirteen comments. Eleven were from members of student affairs while the other two were faculty. The "Facilitator" sub-category represented an organizational viewpoint for a possible role for student affairs. Expanding its constituency to include all of the University community would make student affairs a more legitimate office
as well as make it more effective in working with students. "Student Development" received twenty comments. Most were very general comments that reflected current literature in student development. Possibly, this category represents the type of topic about which participants feel they "ought" to comment since it is expected to be an important topic. A problem created by the very general nature of the responses in this category is that the items built for the Delphi, in order to accurately reflect them, were general as well. Prioritizing general versus specific items became an important variable in the ranking of the items.

The "Research" category had many comments also. Most of the comments spoke to the need for establishing an on-going research capability for the organization. At the time of these comments, there was no specific office or individual in student affairs whose assignment was to carry out research. There were no funds allocated for research.

"Counseling and Advisory Roles" was a large category: the "personal" sub-category in particular. The obvious importance of the counseling function is reflected in the items on the Delphi and the organizational consensus on those items. This emphasis prompted one Delphi participant, after receiving one of the Delphi rounds and observing the importance of the counseling items, to say, "There's too damn many counselor-types up there (Dean of Students Office) anyway!"

The "Communications" category may be another topic that participants feel they "ought" to include in their comments. The high frequency of comments in this category indicates a felt need for improving communication. As a consultant, this category indicated a need and an opening for further facilitating organizational growth.
The "Special Students" grouping in the "Student Needs" category created a dilemma for the researcher. Four comments mentioned black students or racial discrimination. Following the arbitrary guideline set earlier, five comments in a sub-category are required to produce an item on the Delphi. It was obvious that not including an item on blacks would miss the opportunity to help the organization deal with this question. However, in order to be true to the responses received, an item could not be written. As a result, this topic appears as part of an item dealing with needs of special students. It was decided that it would be more powerful feedback to the organization if this omission were dealt with squarely. When the question arose, as it did with acrimonious overtones, the response was to ask the organization to review the comments that created the items and to observe that it was the organization itself, not the researchers, that omitted this topic. This strategy was, in part, successful. Many participants noted their responsibility for this conflict and made commitments to deal with the question of race in another way. However, the only black member of student affairs participating in the Delphi refused to continue. As a result, the Delphi process would not be able to reflect his very strong and articulate views that might have been included in the minority opinion mechanism of Rounds 3, 4, and 5.

Twenty-eight (28) items were developed for the succeeding rounds of the Delphi.

1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (Throughout these statements "community" refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)
2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.

3. recognize the demand for increased leisure time activities by providing sufficient recreational programs and facilities.

4. be accountable for the evaluation of programs to determine if the programs meet the objectives of student affairs.

5. be organized to allow similar functions and services to fall into the same administrative office.

6. approach mental and physical health care from a preventive and educational point of view.

7. facilitate agreement among the differing perceptions of students, faculty and administrators as they work toward common objectives.

8. provide information based on research of student life to facilitate planning and decision making.

9. provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.

10. communicate information about University services to all students.

11. provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets the needs of the students.

12. foster living-learning opportunities in residence halls to provide continuity between classroom and out of classroom life.

13. create a sense of mutual respect and openness among all segments of the University community.

14. delegate decision-making as well as responsibility.

15. develop open and easily attainable avenues of communication among students, faculty and administration.
16. encourage each student to develop self-understanding as well as understanding of others through a wide range of activities.

17. work with students to establish an equitable system of discipline that insures student rights and responsibilities.

18. identify special needs of students (i.e., minority groups, handicapped students, international students) and provide staff and services to meet their unique needs.

19. provide a program of ongoing student orientation and academic advising.

20. be responsible for residence hall operations in order to more easily facilitate student affairs programs in the residence halls.

21. offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

22. make available diverse opportunities for financial aid (such as scholarships, job placement, work study programs, loans, etc.) to students based on need.

23. assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his stage of human development.

24. describe and interpret student life styles to the University community.

25. establish health services to meet current needs and create new services to meet developing needs such as birth control and drug education programs.

26. hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel and provide opportunities for their continuing educational and professional development.

27. mediate and arbitrate conflict via an ombudsman's role.

28. publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University.
Before moving on to results of the Delphi, it is important to emphasize the significance of the items themselves. They represent, in general terms, the individual and organizational goals of the Student Affairs department at The Ohio State University. How they are prioritized is the next step, but as a consultant, I viewed the items themselves as extremely important data for the organization. The process of building the items was designed to create a sense of ownership in the items as "goals." This, I believe, was accomplished.

Delphi Round II

Thirty-one members of the Student Affairs staff were finally identified for the Delphi panel. All elements of Student Affairs were represented including the Vice President. Table 5 lists the mode for each item, the frequency of that mode and the standard deviation for each item. Table 6 gives the distribution of rankings for each item. As can be seen, several items received bi-modal or tri-modal responses. The item having the largest frequency for a mode was Item 28, "publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University." 17 respondents ranked this goal as a fourth priority. Items 20 and 24 had the next highest modes with frequencies of 16. Both of these items, one dealing with the return of residence halls to Student Affairs control, the other with interpreting student life styles to the University community, received fourth priority ratings. The largest frequency in a modal response for an item ranked as a top priority was 15. Two items, 2 and 18 obtained this modal response. These items deal with establishing a research office and
TABLE 5
MODES, FREQUENCIES OF MODE AND STANDARD DEVIATION DELPHI ROUND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RANKING DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 6 4 13 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 5 9 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 7 8 12 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 10 4 7 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 9 6 11 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 14 5 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 10 8 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12 9 6 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 3 7 15 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 7 8 8 1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14 11 5 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 8 13 8 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 8 8 8 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 7 8 8 1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13 13 3 2 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10 5 8 8 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8 10 11 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15 7 4 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 10 14 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 6 6 16 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 11 11 7 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9 7 13 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 7 7 9 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 3 8 16 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8 9 10 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13 8 9 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4 5 10 12 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4 5 5 17 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identifying special needs of students. Since participants were asked to evenly distribute their rankings in Round II, it is difficult to assign great significance to modal responses for each item, although certain trends may be apparent: i.e., the residence hall items have low rankings while the counseling services items have high rankings. The reader should note frequencies in each cell of priority for each item in order to ascertain the strength of the priority assigned as well as locations of apparent minority opinions.

An example is Item 23, "assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his stage of human development." Item 23 has a mode of four. The frequencies of that item were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the modal response is the fourth priority, nearly an equal number assigned a top priority to this item. While succeeding rounds will serve to further clarify the direction of those individuals in the second and third priorities, it seems that two significant opinions exist in the organization toward this kind of goal. Again, caution is indicated in interpreting reasons for the nearly bi-modal response for Item 23. Rounds III, IV and V will offer further insight with minority opinions being offered. However, the first response to this item is somewhat surprising. Item 23 might be viewed as the type of item toward which most student personnel professionals would have a positive response since it is a typical reflection of student development literature. Perhaps an issue will be uncovered in succeeding rounds that deals with the basic acceptance of the student development model.
Using the standard deviation as an indicator of diversity of responses within an item, it is possible to begin to judge agreement and disagreement on certain goals. Item 1, "chief advocate for change" had the largest standard deviation, 1.21, suggesting a wide range of opinion as is borne out by reviewing the frequencies for the item. The mode for Item 16 is 10, yet priorities three and four had a frequency of 8 (see Tables 5 and 6).

Item 11, concerned with increased counseling facilities and staffed with professionally trained counselors, had the lowest standard deviation, .84, of all items on Round II. Item 12, a residence hall item, with a modal response of three, had a standard deviation of .88.

Few patterns are legitimately developed from Round II data. Goals dealing with counseling functions, facilities and staff appear to be important. Conversely, concern for residence halls has a low priority. Research is a high priority concern. In succeeding rounds, the ability of the Delphi to produce consensus can be examined. Round II merely outlines what the organization's array of priorities are for the twenty-eight goal statements.

A factor analysis, requesting six factors was computed for items and people on Round II responses. Table 7 shows the six factors with all those items having a loading of +.50 or greater and their corresponding factor coefficient. The item clusters reflect a great diversity. This could be attributable to the forced distribution of items on Round II. Factor II seems to have some congruence. The counseling functions (11 and 21) and the change agent role (1) might be viewed as complementary
TABLE 7

FACTOR ANALYSIS - ITEMS--DELPHI
ROUND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.54 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only coefficients of .50 or greater are shown.*
items with the "publishing student affairs" item (28) as the vehicle to provide information to the community about these resources.

The factor analysis for "people" is presented in Table 8. Identities are not disclosed to protect the anonymity of the responses. Titles and offices are offered to give a general notion of how various parts of the organization group together in prioritizing the twenty-eight goal statements. Only coefficients of +.50 are shown. Factor I includes all members of the counseling staff participating in the project as well as the Vice President for Student Affairs. A total of seven people are involved in this factor. All but the Vice President are members of the Dean of Students staff. This indicates like concerns on the part of the leadership of the counseling center and the Vice President. It also begins to offer some evidence of the cohesiveness of opinion within the Dean of Students staff. As can be seen, the coefficients range from .60 to .77.

Of the eight individuals loading on Factor II, six are non-student-personnel trained. This factor includes the Director of the Foreign Student Office, Director of Intramurals, Director of Publicity, Director of Ohio Union, Director of Financial Aids, Associate Director of Counseling Center, Director of the Student Health Center and the Director of the Student Personnel Assistant program. This factor represents individuals in the significant responsibilities, including in many cases, a great amount of administrative and managerial duties. All but two members of this group are well advanced in their careers, having been at work for a number of years. Two of this group will reach mandatory retirement within two years. This factor might be tentatively
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.77^a</td>
<td>M, DOS, Couns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>M, DOS, Admin., Couns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>F, DOS, Admin., Couns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>F, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>M, DOS, Admin., Couns., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>F, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>M, Admin., St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids, Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>F, Admin., Couns., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>M, Admin., St. Org., Top Ech., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>M, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>M, Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>M, Admin., Couns., Top Ech., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>M, St. Org., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>M, Admin., St. Org., Top Ech., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.77^b</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech., DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>M, Admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Only coefficients of .5 or greater are shown.

^b Male = M
Female = F
Dean of Students = DOS
Counseling Center = Couns.
Administrative = Admin.
Top Echelon = Top Ech.
Student Organizations = St. Org.
Financial Aids = Fin. Aids
characterized as the traditional student personnel worker factor. Providing specific services that faculty have delegated (Brown, 1972) and having a wide variety of training is a traditional mode for student personnel work. Factors III through VI offer little for characterization. It will be useful to compare the clusters in succeeding rounds of the Delphi to observe movement of individuals or groups of individuals.

Another way of examining differences within the organization is to devise a series of subgroups for comparison of similarities or differences in how they respond to each item. The following subgroups were devised:

1. **Student Organizations** - Those members of Student Affairs advising/assisting student organizations. N=8

2. **Dean of Students' staff.** N=19

3. **Administrative** - Those in the sample that held Assistant Director positions and above (i.e., Assistant Director of Financial Aids), including the Vice President. N=14

4. **Counseling Center** - The Director, Associate Director and Assistant Directors of the Counseling Center. N=4

5. **Financial Aids** - The Director and Assistant Directors of the Financial Aids office. N=5

6. **Top Echelon** - The Vice President for Student Affairs, Directors of Financial Aids, Health Center, Intramurals and Recreation, Counseling Center, Dean of Students and Associate Dean of Students. N=7

In order to examine differences between the subgroups, a Mann-Whitney U test was used. This is a non-parametric statistic used with ordinal data that tests whether or not two groups have been drawn from the same
population. The program used is designed for overlapping groups. Several of the subgroups have members in common, i.e., administrative and top echelon. The program identifies common elements and holds them constant while computing the test of significance on the balance of the two groups. Secondly, those individuals in common are compared against both groups. An example would be Financial Aids versus Upper Echelon. The Director of Financial Aids is assigned to both of these groups. The program removes his score from consideration and computes levels of significance between the groups on each item. Secondly, levels of significant difference are provided for each item for the Director of Financial Aid versus Top Echelon and then versus Financial Aids. Finally, the subgroup is compared to the rest of the sample. As a result, differences can be shown between a subgroup and the rest of the organization and between subgroups within the organization.

The purpose of this analysis for this project is to identify possible conflict areas within the organization. The later Delphi rounds will be more profitable for subgroup examination since Round II is a forced distribution. However, once again, an initial picture of how parts of Student Affairs relate to each other is useful.

The amount of data available as a result of all the possible combinations of subgroups is not manageable for this presentation. Table 9 shows each subgroup compared to the rest of the Delphi panel on each item with only those items having a level of probability of .05 or less listed.
TABLE 9
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF
SUBGROUP VS REST OF ORGANIZATION--DELPHI ROUND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=7</th>
<th>N=24</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>REST</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=14</th>
<th>N=17</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE REST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=5</th>
<th>N=26</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL AID REST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=4</th>
<th>N=27</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING CENTER REST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=8</th>
<th>N=23</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS REST</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=7</th>
<th>N=24</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP ECHELON REST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N=19</th>
<th>N=12</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STUDENTS REST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aHigher priority.
bProbability that the difference is by chance. Only probabilities at .05 or less are shown. Computed by Mann-Whitney U test.
The "administrative" subgroup showed significant differences with the rest of the organization on six items (1-tail). Lower priorities were listed for:

12 - Residence hall item
14 - Delegating decision-making
20 - Residence hall item

Higher priorities for the Administrative subgroup were:

3 - Recreation and intramural
6 - Health services
21 - Counseling services.

Significant differences exist between those people in decision-making positions on the residence hall issue. The difference of opinion expressed in Item 14 portrays a point of conflict in the organization. With nearly half of the Delphi panel in the Administrative subgroup (N=14), an issue on decision-making authority seems likely to exist.

The "counseling" subgroup significantly disagreed with the rest of the organization on four items (1-tail). It had higher priorities than the rest on:

2 - Research
21 - Counseling services

Lower priorities were chosen by the "counseling" subgroup on:

1 - Change agent
25 - Health services.

Not surprisingly, counseling center staff were consistent in ranking Item 21 highly. The lower priorities for Items 1 and 25 may represent a defensiveness on the part of the counseling center. The traditional
model of a counseling center, with a client given appointments for remedial work, study skills and vocational guidance is very much ensconced at Ohio State.

With five items showing a significant difference (1-tail) with the rest of the organization, the Dean of Students had four items ranked higher than the rest of the Delphi as a group:

8 - Research item
12 - Residence hall item
23 - Assist individual development
24 - Interpret student life style.

Although not necessarily related by content, these items do reflect current emphasis on research and human development. Item 23 received a mode of fourth priority indicating that the Dean of Students staff represented much of the minority opinion that gave fifteen (15) responses in priority 1 and 2 for Item 23. The one item ranked significantly lower by the Dean of Students staff was Item 7, a facilitator role item.

Curiously, this item seems to fit with the items ranked highly by the Dean of Students staff.

By examining how certain of the subgroups compare with each other, a closer examination of the nature of conflict over organizational goals is possible. Table 10 presents items of significant differences between subgroups as computed by the Mann-Whitney U test. In this analysis, those individuals having common membership in the two groups being compared are deleted from the computation. Those individuals in common are then compared for differences against the two subgroups being
TABLE 10

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF SUBGROUP VS SUBGROUP\textsuperscript{a}--IN DELPHI ROUND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs STUDENT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs COUNSELING</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs STUDENT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs ADMINISTRATIVE</th>
<th>STUDENT ORGANIZATION vs TOP ECHelon</th>
<th>STUDENT ORGANIZATION vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs TOP ECHelon</th>
<th>TOP ECHelon vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.004\textsuperscript{b} .009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.019 .039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Higher Lower</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.018 .034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Higher Lower</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.022 .047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Higher Lower</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.007 .007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.039 .039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.026 .045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Higher Lower</td>
<td>.016 .026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower Higher</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Higher Lower</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Only selected subgroup vs subgroup combination are shown.

\textsuperscript{b}Probability that subgroups differ by chance. Only probabilities at .05 or less are shown. Computed by Mann-Whitney u test.
examined. This part of the analysis will not be presented for Round II. This analysis will be offered, where appropriate, in succeeding rounds.

When compared to the "Administrative" subgroup the "Dean of Students" variable produces eight items where opinions differ significantly. Items with higher priority by the Dean of Students staff were:

3 - Recreation item
8 - Research item
12 - Residence hall item
20 - Residence hall item
23 - Individual development.

The residence hall issue surfaces again in this comparison. Many members of the Dean of Students' staff had held residence hall positions prior to the reorganization. Their commitment to the importance of residence halls in Student Affairs seems consistent. Conversely, the author, both as the research consultant and former member of the Student Affairs staff, heard repeated comments by members of the Top Echelon subgroup suggesting relief at being rid of the burden of residence halls. Items ranked lower by the Dean of Students' staff than the Administrative subgroup were:

6 - Preventative health care
9 - Intramural facilities
21 - Professional counseling.

Excluding Item 6, the data seem contradictory since a counseling item (23) and an intramural item (3) were also ranked highly by the Dean of Student's staff. The forced distribution of Round II as well as wording of the items could easily create this incongruity. For example, Item 3
asks for recreational programs to provide leisure time activities while Item 9 simply calls for a larger intramural program and better facilities. The Administrative subgroup may be reacting to the concept of leisure time activities as being a central concern. Minority comments on Rounds III, IV and V should be examined for possible clarification.

A possible conflict over the role of student life research may be developing between the Financial Aids group and the Counseling Center group. Both research items, 2 and 8, are ranked significantly lower by Financial Aids than by the Counseling Center. This may be a function of differences in professional training since both groups have had significant amounts of work experience and are of similar ages. All members of the Counseling Center subgroup hold Ph.D.'s in an area related to counseling. No such advanced training existed in the Financial Aids subgroup, although one individual was in the process of completing an advanced degree. Training was quite varied for members of the Financial Aids' office with one participant being a retired, high ranking Naval officer.

Several differences on Round II items occurred between the Financial Aids' office and the Dean of Students' staff as well. Items 8 and 23 were given significantly lower priority by Financial Aids. These items dealing with research and individual development represent a similar disagreement with the Counseling Center. Since all members of the Counseling Center subgroup are included in the Dean of Students' staff, this is predictable. The discipline item (17) was ranked higher by Financial Aids indicating a possible dissatisfaction with the student discipline system, a function located in the Dean of Students' staff.
Financial Aids had no significant differences with the Administrative subgroup.

Analysis of Round II of the Delphi has served to outline basic areas of agreement and disagreement in the organizations' present opinion toward the goal statements. Examination of subgroups has offered insight on possible sources of conflict within the organization.

Delphi Rounds III and IV

Rounds III and IV of the Delphi were completed with 100% participation. Round III instructions asked respondents to offer a written comment if they disagreed with the modal response for an item. Round IV repeated the same instructions. Respondents were not required to evenly distribute responses on III and IV. All other instructions were the same as for Round II.

Table 11 gives the mode, frequency of mode and standard deviation for items in Rounds II, III and IV. The most obvious difference between Rounds II, III and IV is the absence of any bi-modal or tri-modal responses on III and IV. Round II had six items with multi-modal responses. Additionally, frequencies of the modal response for each item on Round III is larger than Round II. All modes of Round II were increased on Round III with no changes in the priority. The item showing the greatest amount of agreement was Item 11, "provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets the needs of the students," with twenty-nine (29) participants giving it a top priority rating. Although a dramatic change from Round II, a close examination of the frequency distribution of Item 11 on Round II (Table 6) will show that most of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Round II</th>
<th>Round III</th>
<th>Round IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
movement occurred between Ranks 1 and 2. The nearly unanimous consensus of the organization on this goal as a top priority in both Rounds III and IV offer strong feedback to Student Affairs for planning purposes. Item 26, with a mode of 1 had twenty-seven (27) respondents agree that this too was a top priority goal for the organization. Items 26 and 11 have much in common. The organization is indicating that counseling staff and facilities need improving as well as other professional staff. It is possible these items represent true organizational goals rather than an evaluation of the current situation. One can only speculate where these issues are separable within the organization.

The research items, 2 and 8, gained considerable strength in the modal response of "top priority." This movement continued for Round IV. Student life research and decision-making based on that research represent legitimate, high priority goals for Student Affairs. Very little minority opinion exists for these items.

Item 15, a communication item, has no minority opinion with the entire Delphi panel ranking it as either a 1 or 2 priority item. Item 28, also a communication item, was given a fourth priority ranking in Rounds II, III and IV with the frequency increasing from seventeen (17) to twenty-one (21). Some minority opinion does exist for this item with eight people giving this goal a first or second priority. Appendix IX gives a summary of the written comments received on Round III. One respondent in the minority on Item 28 asked if publicity wasn't necessary to "carry out the other priorities?" Another stated, "If we really know our business then we should let others know that we know it."
The author interprets the low priority given to this goal as an indication that many were interpreting this item to be a "public relations" goal which has strong negative connotations to a staff already overly-conscious of the university's strong emphasis on public relations.

Item 10, "communicate information about University services to all students," while receiving a top priority modal response, had a diversity of opinion expressed. Fourteen people gave this item a third or fourth priority. Most of the respondents who disagreed felt that it was asking too much for Student Affairs to be responsible for communicating all University services. This feeling was summarized by the individual who said that "we haven't time . . . ."

Item 16 developed a strong consensus as a top priority goal with the modal frequency more than doubling between Rounds II and III. This item was developed from the "student needs" category and is directed at the traditional mode of student personnel work in student activities; i.e., fraternities, sororities, college unions, etc. The minority opinion is clearly separated from the modal response with no rankings in priority 2 for Item 16. Strong statements of disagreement are noted for this item in Appendix IX. One respondent indicated that the notion of Student Affairs helping students to develop self-understanding was "ludicrous."

Item 18, dealing with special groups of students and their unique needs, developed a strong, high priority. This was the only item mentioning minority students. Although only three people ranked this as a third or fourth priority, some interesting minority comments were offered which suggest that the second, third and fourth priority
responses may represent like opinions. Basic differences were reflected in how minority students ought to be treated. One individual felt that there was "too much cuddling and special privileges now . . . ." Another seemed to feel that undue attention to needs of special students would "tend to overshadow the needs of the majority . . . ." Finally, in an adroit avoiding of the issue, a respondent reasoned, "those students who have a special need will not need someone to identify them."

The items dealing with residence halls (12 and 20) were ranked third and fourth priorities, respectively, on Rounds II, III and IV. Opinions unified somewhat in each succeeding round; however, substantial minority opinion was offered. This was to be expected, as mentioned earlier, with many participants having been former residence hall staff members. Low priorities on these items may indicate that the organization does not want responsibility for residence halls or the potential educator's role in devising living-learning programs. Again, the conflict arises as to the proper role of Student Affairs: traditional extra-curricular or educational. Two of the minority comments to Item 12 indicate a "hands off" policy with the academic experience of students with one person concluding, "Let the kids learn for themselves."

Results on these two items seem to indicate a lack of commitment to a traditional Student Affairs responsibility, residence halls. The failure to offer a successful residence hall program and the subsequent reorganization that removed residence halls from Student Affairs control may well be a function of this lack of commitment. It should not be forgotten, that even though items are given low priorities, the subject was important enough to the organization initially to warrant items
being written about it. A channel must be developed within the organization that allows this minority opinion to be dealt with seriously.

Two items dealing with individual development and the counseling role, 21 and 23, received conflicting responses. Item 21 had a modal response of two with little minority opinion while Item 23 was given a fourth priority but with significant minority opinion. Several of the comments for Item 21 were from those who wished a higher priority. One respondent, reflecting the re-occurring theme of "hands off," felt this goal would represent too much "spoon-feeding" of students. Close attention should be given to the comments made on Item 23. Those individuals interested in the "student development" model for Student Affairs seem to be represented in the substantial minority opinion. (First priority had 11 responses versus 13 for fourth priority for Item 23.) One commenter asked cryptically, "What is our purpose as educators if we don't strive to assist individual's human development?" Another comment by an astonished participant wonders, "Are we not here to help students?" Items 21 and 23 represent the core of the conflict over acceptance of the student development model. Examination of subgroup data will offer more precise boundaries of the conflict.

Item 24 achieved the strongest agreement of any item in the fourth priority with twenty-three (23) responses in that category. Comments on this item indicated confusion of interpretation as well as redundancy. The goal could conceivably be considered a risky one since the danger exists that if Student Affairs attempts to interpret student life styles to the University community, the organization may become identified with those life styles.
As can be seen from Table 11, no items changed modes between Rounds III and IV. Some frequencies changed slightly, in both directions. A subsequent section will examine the ability of the Delphi to develop convergence and to maintain it over time. With little change in item rankings between Rounds III and IV, factor analysis and subgroup data is presented for Round IV only. This represents the data that the author, as consultant to Student Affairs, presented to the original Task Force charged with devising and operationalizing organizational goals.

Factor Analysis of Round IV data is presented in the form of a McQuitty linkage analysis. Linkage analysis is an elementary form of factor analysis and is the format that was used as feedback to the Student Affairs organization. People clusters (factors) were not used by the author as feedback to Student Affairs. It was felt that revealing how individuals related to each other in responding to the goal statements would be quite threatening to many individuals involved and would, in fact, break assurances given of anonymity. The existence of factor analysis data for the participants was explained to the Task Force in the event it might be used at a later date.

Q-Analysis - Round IV

With the Delphi process designed to develop grouping of opinions and with the need to give the Student Affairs Task Force data reflecting relationships for both items and people, a factor analysis was computed on the items for feedback to the Task Force. An orthogonal factor-analytic solution is presented here in addition to the
linkage analysis. Thurstonian factor analysis has strength not available in the linkage analysis (Kerlinger, 1964). Both methods have similar failings of any factor analytic process. Cattell suggests (in McQuitty, 1957, p. 209) that both methods of dealing with the correlation matrix are useful and might be offered simultaneously.

Table 12 gives the Q factors for Round IV as computed by the varimax solution. Six factors were called for by the author. Over 76% of the total variance is accounted for in the first six factors.

Eight participants cluster on Factor I. All but one are members of the Dean of Students staff although the Dean of Students is not one of them. Five of these individuals are former residence hall staff members. Three are new to the staff this past year. This cluster might be characterized as the "Young Generalists." Person 15, from the financial aid subgroup appears to be in this cluster by nature of his disagreement with Student Affairs in general. General criticism and negativism toward the Student Affairs office would characterize these individuals well. The functions performed by the members of Factor I are general in nature as opposed to specific functions such as health services or financial aids. Factor I represents 43% of the total variance in the matrix.

Factor II is entitled "The Specialists." The Directors of Financial Aids, Intramurals, Health Services and Student Union are

---

* Factor Analysis Computer Program, BMD03M, available at the Health Sciences Computing Facility, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. For original construction and explanation see H. H. Harmon, "Factor Analysis," Chapter 18, Mathematical Methods for Digital Computers.
TABLE 12
FACTOR ANALYSIS--PARTICIPANTS--DELPHI ROUND I
Q ANALYSIS - ROUND IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Factor Coefficient</th>
<th>Subgroup Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63(^a)</td>
<td>F, DOS(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>M, DOS, Couns., Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>M, Fin. Aids, Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>M, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>M, DOS, St. Org., Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>F, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>F, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>M, Admin., St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>M, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>M, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>M, Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>F, DOS, St. Org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>M, Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>M, DOS, Admin., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>M, DOS, Admin., Couns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>M, DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>M, Admin., Fin. Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>F, DOS, Admin., Couns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>M, DOS, Admin., Couns., Top Ech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Only coefficients of ± .50 or greater are shown.

\(^b\) Male = M  Administrative = Admin.
Female = F  Top Echelon = Top Ech.
Dean of Students = DOS  Student Organizations = St. Org.
Counseling Center = Couns.  Financial Aids = Fin. Aids
present as well as several of their staff members. Included in this factor is the Vice President for Student Affairs. Three members of the Dean of Students staff load on Factor II as well. Their functions are quite specialized: i.e., Student Auditing, Public Relations and Foreign Student Advising. This factor represents administrative opinion as well. None of the people in Factor II have formal training in Student Personnel work or related areas except the Vice President. Two members of this factor are physicians. The disagreement exposed in the subgroup data on the acceptance of the student development theme could well be represented by Factors I and II with I being pro student development and II con. This is supported by tracing the counseling and student development Delphi items which indicates the Dean of Students subgroup gave higher priority to those items than did the Administrative or the rest of the Delphi panel in general.

A McQuitty's cluster analysis is offered along with Factor IV as a methodological comparison. The primary cluster produced by the McQuitty's is the following:

(Fin. Aid, Admin. M.)* (M., Fin. Aid, Admin.)

(M., Fin. Aid, Admin.)

(F., DOS, St. Org.)

(M., St. Org.)

14
.91
23
.70
21
.69
7

* Names and titles of individuals are not given. The subgroups in which they are located are used in abbreviated form.
The four people in this cluster are quite isolated, in terms of function, from the Student Affairs organization. Most of their interaction is with people outside of their department. Therefore, I call this factor "The Independents." These people have little investment in Student Affairs as an organization since their legitimacy is independent of Student Affairs. The varimax solution produces a similar factor although membership is slightly changed with person 14 removed and person 29 included (see Table 12). The factor is still easily identifiable and the slight change in membership from the cluster analysis is more in the direction of the characterization.

Factors III and V are not easily characterized as a result of sparse membership. No apparent relationship is available for the three members of Factor V. Using observations as the consultant, the author is aware of significantly different values and interests among the three individuals in Factor V. Factor VI includes the Director and Associate Director of the Counseling Center as well as an Assistant Director of Financial Aids. Representation of this factor is tenuous, at best, since background and interests are quite disparate for these three. They did express mutual interest in reorganization of Student Affairs to obtain autonomy. This may be the cement of this factor and as such is titled "The Reorganizers." Factor VI represents only 3% of the cumulative variance. Table 13 gives the cumulative proportion of total variance for the six factors requested.
Factor Analysis - Items - Round IV

As a method of using data for feedback, factor analysis of the items and their rankings on Round IV was used. This, in turn, was presented to Student Affairs as feedback in the goal building project. The item factors were looked upon as summary statements of organizational goals and objectives. Feedback to the organization came in the form of linkage analysis. The varimax solution is presented in Appendix XII.

The primary cluster for the Round IV item analysis is:

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

Literally interpreted, this cluster suggests that the highest goals of Student Affairs are to hire and train professional staff capable of providing counseling services that will meet the needs of all students. These three items received the highest number of top priority rankings.
at the end of Round IV. This cluster was presented to Student Affairs as their top priority goal. The cluster reflects two general concerns crucial to student personnel work and to higher education in general. Meeting the needs of all students, particularly identifying the unique needs of special groups of students, is a fundamental goal being examined at all levels of education. Despite organizational oversight in giving attention to this category in Round I, the Delphi did allow this minority opinion to develop into a top organizational priority. Student personnel academicans have long pondered the proper areas to study in order to produce a professional product. While professionalism is still quite undefined, this cluster does describe an organizational concern at upgrading their work and to become legitimate participants in the academic community. The low correlation, .38, between Item 11 and 18 raises a question of motives for making Item 11 a top priority. In order to operationalize this goal cluster, confrontation of this issue must occur. The administrative subgroup ranked this item lower than the rest of the organization as did the financial aids subgroup.

The second cluster produced by the McQuitty's analysis is:

The author judges this cluster to be the most introspective one for the Student Affairs organization at The Ohio State University. Item 13 calls for the creation of trust and honesty throughout the University
community. The modal response for Item 13 on Round IV was 2 with a frequency of 16. However, reference to Appendix XIII will show a diversity of opinion on Item 13 as an organizational goal. The subgroup comparison shows no significant differences between any groups indicating that minority opinions are scattered throughout the organization. The relationship of Item 13 to Item 14 seems to suggest that first, decision making is not typically delegated within the organization and, secondly, the reason for this is being interpreted as a matter of trust. Again no significant differences occur among the subgroup comparisons. Item 15 has strong support as a top priority goal. Developing open and accessible avenues of communication is related to 13 and 14 as the implementation process for obtaining decentralized decision-making and feelings of trust and openness. As in the first cluster, this cluster is a complete one in that it can be translated into operational goals with the statements provided. Each cluster has a process item included that provides a way of operationalizing the goal cluster.

The third structure developed by linkage analysis clearly paralleled one of the original categories dealing with student needs.

All four of the items refer to specific services provided by Student Affairs. All of these items received fourth round modes of 3 or 4.
This cluster is not necessarily in opposition to the first cluster. Many people in the Student Affairs staff define counseling as a very specific service as opposed to a process to facilitate interaction and development in many settings. Cluster 3 is characterized by special services and represents a conflict in priorities between the generalist and the specialist within Student Affairs at The Ohio State University.

Continuing with linkage analysis produces a fourth cluster that includes several items that may be viewed as either unpopular or risky by the organization.

Items 12 and 20 are residence hall items. Both received low rankings throughout the Delphi although the Dean of Student's subgroup gave them higher priority than most others. Item 19 represents a function being ignored by Student Affairs presently. To become active in academic advising would mean being legitimized by many faculty who guard this function jealously at The Ohio State University. It would be a risky attempt as well since the organization may not feel it is competent. This is evidenced by the primary linkage cluster which indicates a need for more professionally trained staff. Item 24 may be risky as well for it is possible that the University community would identify Student Affairs as sympathetic to certain life styles. The presence of Item 1 in this cluster is the prime evidence that this cluster is
characterized by "risk" items. To assume the chief advocacy for change in a major university, recently recoiling from a major disruption, is indeed a great organizational risk. Interestingly, the subgroup data will reveal no group ranking Item 1 significantly higher than another but does show the Administrative subgroup ranking Item 1 significantly lower than the rest of the organization on Round IV of the Delphi.

The student development model may be represented by the following cluster:

```
8 -- .49 -- 16
  .40
  23
```

Both Items 8 and 16 received strong top priority rankings in Round IV. Curiously, Item 23 had a mode of 4th priority, although the frequency in the top priority category was nearly as great (see Appendix XIII). Again the Dean of Students staff ranked Item 23 higher than the rest of the organization and represents the bulk of the minority opinion for Item 23. The research item, 8, seems to fit well in this cluster. Again it is a process item for this cluster.

Subgroup Analysis - Round IV

Table 14 gives the various subgroup comparisons for Round IV of the Delphi with the chance factor obtained by the Mann-Whitney U Test. Only levels of probability significant at the .05 level or less are shown.
### TABLE 14
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES
SUBGROUP COMPARISONS -- DELPHI ROUND IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs REST</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.044 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs REST</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>STUDENT ORGANIZATION vs REST</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TOP ECHELON vs REST</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>DEAN OF STUDENTS vs REST</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.0096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs STUDENT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>1 Tail</th>
<th>2 Tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs COUNSELING</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs STUDENT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID vs ADMINISTRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tail</td>
<td>2 Tail</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tail</td>
<td>2 Tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only selected subgroup vs subgroup combination are shown.

Probability that subgroups differ by chance. Only probabilities at .05 or less are shown. Computed by Mann-Whitney U test.
In comparing the "administrative" subgroup with the rest of the participants, a definite pattern of disagreement emerges. The "administrative" subgroup ranked six items as having significantly lower priority when compared with the rankings of the rest of the Delphi panel:

1. Change agent  
2. Research office  
7. Facilitator role  
8. Research office  
12. Living-learning in the Residence Halls  
20. Operation of Residence Halls.

This subgroup is composed of all those in decision-making positions within Student Affairs (N=14). A clear disagreement exists on the role of an office for student life research and how research might be used. Both research items (2 and 8) received a strong top priority consensus at the end of Round IV. With very little minority opinion indicated by the frequencies for these two items, it appears that nearly all the minority opinion represents administrative subgroup opinion. Strong disagreement is apparent between administrative and all others on the residence hall category as well. Items 12 and 20, both residence hall items, are ranked lower by the administrative subgroup. These items were third and fourth priority items in terms of modal responses.

When comparing the counseling center subgroup against all others, some surprising differences appear. The counseling-center group ranked the following items significantly lower than the rest of the organization:

1. Change agent  
7. Facilitating agreement in University community  
25. Establish health services for current and future needs.
Items 1 and 7 represent functions that would mean a change from the traditional intake, medical model to an outreach model for the counseling center. Apparently, the counselors in the Delphi were apprehensive about that kind of role. The counseling center subgroup treated Item 25 as a low priority as well. Of the three people giving Item 25 a fourth priority, two were counseling center staff. Higher priority was given by the counseling center subgroup to:

5. Reorganization of Student Affairs
19. Ongoing orientation and advisement
21. Counseling for personal development
23. Assist in problems of human development.

As might be expected, counseling items were given high priority. The difference of opinion over Item 5 represents an expression of need on the part of counseling center staff. The counseling staff would prefer autonomy with the Director being equal to the Dean of Students. This is the apparent reason for their ranking this item significantly higher than did the rest of the organization.

When the Dean of Students office is compared to the rest of Student Affairs, an even larger list of significantly different opinions occur. This subgroup seems to represent the most significant potential for conflict with the rest of the organization in agreeing on goal priorities. The research and residence hall categories are sources of disagreement, with the Dean of Students staff prioritizing those items significantly higher. With the counseling center as part of this subgroup, counseling items gain high priority as well. The residence hall and research issues are clearly dichotomized when administrative is compared with student organization staff. The administrative
The Round IV subgroup analysis presents little that is unexpected. Clarification of differences has occurred since Round II of the Delphi. There seems to be substantial disagreement between those in Administrative and Top Echelon Administrative positions as opposed to subordinate staff. Interestingly, more of the disagreement comes from the lower level administrators since the Top Echelon versus rest comparison shows only two items of disagreement whereas the Administrative versus rest comparison produces seven items at .05 probability or less. The two research items (2 and 8) are in common. It appears that high level administrators may be more sympathetic to the goals of
staff members than the "middle managers." Consistent disagreement occurs in relation to the counseling and individual development items with those participants in generalists positions, i.e., Dean of Students staff, giving higher priority to these categories than those in offices providing special services such as Financial Aids.

Final Priorities - Round V

The original promise of the Delphi project to the Task Force on the future of student affairs at The Ohio State University was to develop a set of goals that could be operationalized and to encourage organizational agreement on those goals. The final priorities of Round V are shown in Table 14. Table 15 shows the modes, frequencies modes and standard deviations for all Delphi rounds.

The highest priority items, by virtue of number of "1" rankings, were 11 and 26 both with a modal frequency of 29. The thrust of these two items reflects the direction the student personnel profession is moving: meeting student needs with high caliber, well trained staff. As important is the priority that continued professional growth received. Professional training and development is a vital goal for the development of student personnel work as a profession. To the members of the Student Affairs department at The Ohio State University, these goals represent a reflection of needs in their own organization. Item 23 moved into a top priority ranking for the first time. This item has been disputed throughout the Delphi. Table 16 shows that a strong minority opinion still exists. The contradiction of a significant item on human development being a fourth priority item is seemingly resolved.
TABLE 15
FINAL PRIORITIES OF ITEMS - DELPHI ROUND V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish an office for research that continually and systematically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examines student needs, problems and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information based on research of student life to facilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning and decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate information about University services to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the needs of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate decision-making as well as responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop open and easily attainable avenues of communication among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students, faculty and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage each student to develop self-understanding as well as understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of others through a wide range of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify special needs of students (i.e., minority groups, handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students, international students) and provide staff and services to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet their unique needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage of human development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel and provide opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for their continuing educational and professional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be accountable for the evaluation of programs to determine if the programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet the objectives of student affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach mental and physical health care from a preventive and educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate agreement among the differing perceptions of students, faculty and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators as they work toward common objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create a sense of mutual trust and openness among all segments of the University community.

Offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

Establish health services to meet current needs and create new services to meet developing needs such as birth control and drug education programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster living-learning opportunities in residence halls to provide continuity between classroom and out of classroom life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with students to establish an equitable system of discipline that insures student rights and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a program of ongoing student orientation and academic advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make available diverse opportunities for financial aid (such as scholarships, job placement, work study programs, loans, etc.) to students based on need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (Throughout these statements &quot;community&quot; refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the demand for increased leisure time activities by providing sufficient recreational programs and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be organized to allow similar functions and services to fall into the same administrative office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be responsible for residence hall operations in order to more easily facilitate student affairs programs in the residence halls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe and interpret student life styles to the University community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediate and arbitrate conflict via an ombudsman's role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bi-modal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Round II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Round III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Round IV</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Round V</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
albeit there is strong disagreement. However, Item 16, also a development item is ranked a strong top priority making Items 16 and 23 a strong vote for the student development model. Item 21, also a development item, has a second priority ranking in Round V. Only six participants gave this item a first priority seemingly contradicting organizational support for both the student development model and the two top goals, Items 11 and 26.

Both research items, 2 and 8, received strong top priority support continuously through the four Delphi rounds. Table 16 shows very strong top priority rankings in Round V for both research items. Strength increased continuously as well in the modal responses through the four rounds. As will be discussed later, this apparently very strong organizational goal of student life research is being operationalized.

Item 14, "delegate decision-making as well as responsibility," gained in strength as a top-priority goal throughout the Delphi rounds. This represents the conflict of opinion shown in the Q-sort study of the Dean of Students staff. With the majority of Delphi participants being Dean of Students staff members, the ranking of Item 14 seems to indicate their dissatisfaction with decision-making process in their department.

Examining the fourth priority items shows that the organizational reticence, represented by Items 1, 24 and 27, still exists at the end of Round V. However, some erosion of consensus did occur toward a higher priority. The specialist versus generalist conflict remains as well with Items 3 and 9 receiving fourth priority modes but
with strong minority opinions existing for both items. Viewing these two items as specific goal statements, intramural and recreation programs seem to have little priority for the Student Affairs organization. Little explanation is available for this outcome other than a balancing of priorities for funds would allocate a lower priority for funds to increase intramural facilities. Also, there has been little interaction between the intramural office and others in Student Affairs.

The residence hall issue, represented by Items 12 and 20, ended as a low priority goal. This low priority showed consistently throughout the Delphi. Strength did gather in the modal responses for these items indicating a lowering of organizational commitment to student housing as a legitimate concern of the Student Affairs department at The Ohio State University. Lack of success with the residence hall program while it was the responsibility of Student Affairs may be the motivating factor for the low priority these goals have received.

As was noted in Chapter III, this author considered the 28 Delphi items as highly significant data by themselves. This emphasis is repeated here. The job of the Delphi was to develop organizational goals for Student Affairs. This was accomplished. Secondly, a profile of organizational opinions about these goals was requested. The final priorities and the distribution of the rankings for each item meet this goal as well.
Thus far, data developed by the Delphi process in the study has been shown as information that describes possible organizational conflicts and as feedback in a systematic change project. Several have asked what effect the Delphi has by itself (Weaver, 1972; Winstead and Hobson, 1971). Is it, in fact, a change agent and does consensus developed by Delphi continue over a significant period of time? This section describes an examination of the Delphi in an attempt to deal with these questions. The organization development project for which this model was built used data from Rounds I through IV of the Delphi. This was completed in approximately one month. In order to test the effect of time on Delphi consensus, a fifth round on the same Delphi was completed nearly three months after Round IV was completed. Ideally, behavioral evidence should be offered as to the efficacy of Delphi to change behaviors. This study used a statistical analysis to examine the significance of change for each item between rounds. The Wilcoxin Matched-Pair, Signed-Rank test was used to indicate the probability of changes between rounds happening by chance. The Wilcoxin accounts for direction and magnitude of differences within pairs and is specifically utilized with ordinal data. Its efficiency as a statistic is comparable to the parametric T test. It offers more power than a sign test since it utilizes more information (Siegal, 1956).

Table 17 gives the Wilcoxin t's for Rounds II, III, IV and V and indicates whether probability level is .05 or less in a one-tail test. Sixteen of the twenty-eight Delphi items showed a significant
**TABLE 17**

WILCOXIN T SCORES  
Change Between Rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rounds II and III</th>
<th>Rounds III and IV</th>
<th>Rounds IV and V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>8.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>16.5*</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Connotes \( P \geq .05 \) (one tail).
change between Rounds II and III. Examining Table 16 shows that all movement in the Delphi was in the direction of original consensus. In other words, changes between Rounds II and III do not represent a scattering of responses but rather a convergence. Those items that had bi-modal or tri-modal responses on Round II changed to uni-modal responses on Round III. Two possible explanations exist for the seemingly unpatterned array of items that did significantly change versus those that did not for Round III. First, the forced distribution for Round II responses may be a factor. Those items that are changing significantly between Rounds II and III may be ones that respondents were forced to rank higher or lower than they might have had the distribution been free. This would indicate an arbitrary nature to the rankings and the clusters for Round II. Round III rankings may be more indicative of the organization's opinions toward these goal statements. The second possible explanation is that those items not changing significantly between Rounds II and III represent areas of conflict that Delphi cannot resolve. Nearly all of the specific services items are included in the list of items that did not change significantly between the first two rounds. Earlier data analysis has shown the generalist versus the specialist to be a major dividing line in the Student Affairs staff and it appears to be represented in the change study as well. It appears that the Delphi process is not capable of creating consensus within an organization but has great utility for strengthening existing consensus. Further, Delphi establishes areas of conflict quite clearly by showing minority opinions even though it is not capable of moving a strong minority opinion toward consensus.
The examination of change between Rounds III and IV clearly emphasizes Delphi's inability to create consensus or to "unfreeze" minority opinions. Since Round III asks for written minority opinions it is possible to make inferences about the efficacy of that part of the Delphi feedback system by observing how many items on Round IV change significantly from Round III. Four items showed significant changes on Round IV. Of those four items (3, 10, 14 and 21), three of them had significant changes between Rounds II and III. These items, 10, 14 and 21, are quite general in nature. It might be concluded that organizational opinion was not firm about these items and that changing opinions in succeeding rounds did not represent a crucial decision for individuals nor would the change be incongruous with the way individuals ranked other items. In this explanation, the Delphi process can help to solidify opinions around a topic that does not represent a specific organizational commitment or opinion but rather a generalized statement of purpose; i.e., Item 21, "offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving." Item 3 is the only evidence to indicate the utility of the minority statements. No significant change is noted between Rounds II and III but does occur between Rounds III and IV for this item. Since the only difference in procedures for these rounds is the request for written comments on Round III, it is inferred that the significant change for Item 3 on Round IV is a result of the written comments. Even though a statistically significant change is recorded for this item, the essential distribution from Round II is approximated in Round IV. Strong minority opinion is suggested both in the frequencies for this item and in the
comments made (Appendix IX). Thus, it appears that the minority comment feature of the Delphi does little to affect the way individuals respond to items. The value of the written comments lies in their use in discussion about the items. They can be used as topics and to introduce conflict without the individuals responsible for the comments having to reveal themselves if they so choose.

Rounds II, III and IV were completed by the Delphi panel in quick succession, the three rounds taking less than one month. It is difficult to define the meaning of consensus as a function of Delphi. The paper and pencil process may produce intellectualized responses that lack behavioral or attitudinal commitment. Some evidence will be offered in the following section that behaviors were affected by the Delphi. It was hypothesized that time might be a factor in determining the effectiveness of Delphi as a change agent itself. Accordingly, a fifth and final Delphi round was planned and completed by the same Delphi panel* nearly three months after the completion of Round IV. No evidence was found in the literature that examined the time factor in relation to the power of Delphi to change opinion.

Eight items show significant changes between Round IV and Round V. Two of these items changed modes (9 and 25). Of the items showing change in Round V, Items 9, 24, 25 and 28 had fourth round priorities of 3 and 4, while Items 10, 14, 15 and 16 were top priority items. The four low items (9, 24, 25 and 28) showed change in the direction of higher priorities indicating a loosening of majority opinion within the

* As in Rounds II, III and IV, 100% return was achieved.
organization about these goal statements. The changes in the four high priority goals (10, 14, 15 and 16) were in the direction of the mode from Round IV, representing a further convergence of opinion and loosening of minority opinions. It appears that, generally, convergence developed through the first three Delphi rounds is maintained over time. Twenty-four (24) of the twenty-eight (28) items showed the same direction of consensus after Round V. The two items that did show erosion of convergence by changing modes (9 and 25) are both specific services items, reflecting once again, the dynamic nature of the generalists versus specialists conflict. The four items showing change away from their previous modes can be interpreted two ways. It is possible the feedback mechanism within the Delphi was the major factor for the changes indicating that the effectiveness of the Delphi and its feedback systems in affecting opinions may be related to the time between rounds. The other possible interpretation is that Delphi may be more effective in maintaining positive agreement toward items than negative agreement.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This project has demonstrated a role for the student personnel worker in developing organizational goals for Student Affairs at The Ohio State University. The Delphi technique was used as the intervention method in an organization development process. The data developed by the Delphi was used as feedback to facilitate the development of organizational goals for the future of Student Affairs at The Ohio State University. An examination of the differences of opinion within the department was utilized as a positive mode for drawing attention to conflict situations.

A case study approach has been taken to give the reader an intimate insight into the Student Affairs division as an organization. Certain conclusions can be made as a result of the data developed although they are limited to the organization that has been examined. The top priority goal selected by the organization reflected a sincere commitment to a need that is surfacing in all of higher education, namely, to meet the unique needs of all students. This is seen as being accomplished through the traditional counseling mode. This may be, however, the bane for the future of student development as a
profession (Tripp, 1972). The organization gave low priorities to those goals suggesting role changes: i.e., change agent, facilitator - ombudsman. An organizational reticence is apparent toward any goal that connotes significant changes in structure or authority. The same is true for goals that involve organizational risk taking. The value of the Delphi was to present these conclusions in a non-threatening way to the organization. Lewin's notion of "unfreezing" or influencing an organizations motivation to change is important to the discussion of the success of this Delphi project. The Delphi, by itself, failed to significantly sway firmly held opinions as represented by minority opinions on the Delphi. The Change with Rounds analysis showed that items changing over time seemed to have in common the fact that they represented divided organizational opinions. However, the organization development project was carried on beyond the feedback of Delphi data. There have been behavioral outcomes of the Task Force that indicate that the Delphi was successful as an intervention tool and as a method of "unfreezing" Student Affairs at The Ohio State University. The high priority given to hiring highly trained staff to meet counseling needs of all students has been operationalized by the appointment of a new Director of the Counseling Center along with a planned re-direction of center resources for outreach programs. The research priority has resulted in a position being funded for a student life researcher to assist the organization by providing data pertinent to student development. Most importantly, several individuals, initially reluctant to support the development project have become enthusiastic participants in the on-going self-study
that has evolved from the original task force that launched this Delphi study. Thus, there seems to be evidence that some attitudes and values have been changed within the organization.

Conclusions

Several specific conclusions are also available. There was a consistent conflict of opinion between the Dean of Students staff and most of the Student Affairs organization. This is partially a result of the "specialist versus generalist" conflict that reoccurred regularly in the data. However, the student development model is being argued here as well. There appeared to be no capability on the part of the Dean of Students staff to adequately communicate its concerns to the rest of the organization. In addition, its boundaries were relatively impermeable. As a result the rest of Student Affairs was not being influenced by arguments in support of adopting a student development philosophy. The Q analysis for Round IV indicates essentially the same conflicts as did Round II of the Delphi. Numerous subgroup differences for all Delphi rounds suggest little conflict resolution potential for the Delphi itself although follow-up to the Delphi data can be effective in facilitating resolution of differences.

The factor analysis of the Delphi Round II indicated that the original categories that generated the statements were, for the most part, valid. The Round II factor analysis showing a generalist cluster and a specialist cluster offers support for this conclusion. The top priority cluster for the organization defines, in part, the student development model. Items dealing with structural change and decision
making processes clustered around low priority rankings. Q analysis helped to pinpoint disagreement in terms of people rather than issues. This was powerful feedback to an organization concerned with identifying barriers to achieving the ideal Student Affairs program at The Ohio State University.

A picture of an apprehensive organization has resulted from this Delphi project. Important differences of opinion are portrayed between decision makers with each other and with their staff. A legitimate concern for their future at The Ohio State University apparently has resulted in a strong aversion to risk and change on the part of administrators within Student Affairs. The first step in considering the process of change within Student Affairs has been to consider its future goals. The "generalists" versus "specialists" issue represents a boundary dispute that indicates, for Student Affairs at The Ohio State University, that student development proponents are not being successful in embracing the best of the traditional student services model. It appears the zealousness of their argument may be antagonistic to those in the organization whose goals have evolved into maintenance values.

The Delphi project has focused the organization on these major questions: What is the student development model and should we embrace it? Can Student Affairs develop ways to legitimize and expand its role at The Ohio State University? What kind of leadership is desired and what kind is being offered? As in the best of Socratic dialogues, questions are answered with questions. The difference is that the questions developed
by the analysis of the Delphi data represent "real-life" situations. People and places are involved in the questions with a significant amount of personal investment.

The Delphi technique has been examined for its utility in an organization development project. The results indicate that Delphi can be an effective method of intervention. However, important limitations are evident and must be considered in using the Delphi. As suggested by Weaver (1972), Delphi is at its best as a prognosticator. Using Delphi to develop organizational goals brings it into the effective domain, where its data, are not easily interpretable. The differing reasons for individuals to rank order items in similar ways can only be uncovered in face-to-face settings. In a goal-setting activity, Delphi can most profitably be used as the catalyst for confrontation of the issues and conflicts that exist. The Delphi does seem to possess the ability to define areas of opinion differences and conflict within an organization.

As shown in the analysis of the change with rounds data in Chapter IV, Delphi is able to strengthen organizational opinions. Its weakness stems from its apparent inability to create consensus from disparate opinions within an organization as well as an inability to change strong minority opinions. Table 16 shows that those items which had weak modes and strong pockets of minority opinions on Round II remained essentially unchanged through Round V. Those items with strong modes in Round II gathered further strength in succeeding rounds, supporting the conclusion that Delphi encourages but does not create consensus.
The Round V data provides a further analysis of Delphi. Most items that were in strong consensus on Round IV continued to be so on Round V suggesting that Delphi data does represent a legitimate picture of organizational opinion as opposed to a temporary, intellectualized reaction to a paper and pencil instrument. It cannot be concluded, however, that Delphi is a change agent by itself. Clearly, Delphi did little in this study to create new opinions and attitudes. It was the feedback of the Delphi data as a first step in an announced plan for change that was the most important use of the Delphi.

The process used in developing the Delphi items for this project is integral to whatever success can be claimed. A projective method of gathering original opinions in the Round I questionnaire gave creative responses opportunity for inclusion. The twenty-eight Delphi items created from these original comments represented the unique characteristics of the organization that had offered them. Most importantly, a sense of ownership was cultivated in the Delphi data and particularly in the twenty-eight items. This proprietary interest in the data meant that the data would be most valid as material for a successful intervention as suggested in Argyris' first condition for a successful intervention, that of providing valid data (Argyris, 1970).

Another important limitation when utilizing Delphi in goal-setting projects with a professional organization is Judd's (1970) caution that Delphi is only as good as its participants. The study reported here recognizes that fact in not attempting generalizations of the goals statements. This limitation is avoided by maintaining the perspective of an organizational analysis when using Delphi in
this setting. It is capable of portraying unique qualities of an organization and that is its precise value. Delphi studies such as Uhl's (1971) that use a standardized instrument for the Delphi items may be imposing on the organization being studied. It assumed that the items are the most important to that organization and will be understood. The power of the participants' investment in Delphi may be drastically reduced if the original Delphi items are not created from data the organization itself has provided. It is true that Delphi may be only as good as its participants, however, in an organization development plan, that is precisely the feature that must be examined.

The nature of consensus as reported by Delphi is a further limitation and concern. The agreement of the majority of a Delphi panel cannot necessarily be interpreted as a simplistic accordance of opinion. Unless the purpose of the Delphi is a predictive one and the problem is an objective one, consensus is difficult to interpret. Further, it is doubtful that consensus of opinion is, or should be, an organizational goal. Peterson (1970) offers this same concern in his discussion of the development of the Institutional Goals Inventory. Agreement on general principles or "processes" may be more likely a proper goal for organizational consensus. Encouraging consensus would foster like-mindedness on substantive issues. It has been suggested that the most viable organizations are ones whose widely disparate inputs are allowed and where the mastering of the conflict resolution process allows an organization to grow and prosper as a result of those very disparities creating the conflict (Walton, 1969; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969). This author suggests that Delphi can be profitably used
to facilitate the conflict resolution process, not as an agent itself, but as part of a systematic effort to deal with organizational behaviors.

Limitations

Any examination of higher education today must account for the role of students as a legitimate constituency of the university community. This project is limited by the absence of significant student input, in either the item building stage or the actual Delphi itself. Since the conclusions from this study have been utilized as feedback to the Student Affairs division at The Ohio State University, this limitation can be corrected at the next stage of the planning process. The next step is to formulate operational plans and present them to the campus community for discussion.

The Delphi technique, as mentioned earlier, has significant limitations. The chief concern of this study is the nature of the consensus formed through Delphi. Goal-setting seems to involve normative processes. Delphi data cannot be specifically interpreted when used for goal development projects since the motivations of each participant for ranking a goal a certain way are not readily understood from the Delphi output. Understanding may be gained through group discussions based on the issues developed by Delphi data. Secondly, defining "expert" to mean member of the organization being studied, limits the potential of the Delphi. Substantive conclusions must be closely examined for quality of development. This limitation is balanced, however by the applicability of Q-analysis to Delphi data. Substituting items developed by experts, as normally defined, in the first round of
a Delphi may be the most practical solution. That would allow the most cogent thought in the field to be considered. The outcome would be an analysis of the opinions of a group of individuals or an organization concerning the best thinking of experts in that field. Uhl's Delphi study approximates this solution (Uhl, 1971).

The role of the consultant must be considered when examining the limitations of this study. As a former member of Student Affairs at The Ohio State University, various relationships between the researcher and the Delphi participants predated the project. It must be assumed that these relationships affected the consultancy to some degree. Management of conflict between the consultant and members of Student Affairs was crucial to the success of the Delphi study. The fact that the data from the project were to be utilized for the consultant's ensuing Ph.D. program was made clear at the very outset of the Task Force's conversations about a Delphi study. Resigning from the Task Force as well as no longer holding a position in the Student Affairs department eliminated major sources of conflict from the consultant's role for the author.

**Implications**

College student personnel work has been severely restricted by its lack of research paradigms. The profession has relied heavily on parametric assumptions within groups of college students. Use of analysis of covariance greatly enhanced the legitimacy of research on college student life but still continued to produce inconsistent results with similar variables. What is needed are new paradigms, grounded in social-psychological theory, that will produce more consistent data (Kuhn,
Avoidance, until recently, of interpreting student behavior, growth and development in light of organizational values has been a serious error for the student development field. How student development is affected by organizational development is crucial to real understanding of today's higher education. The emergence of more open systems in higher education institutions has geometrically increased the divergent inputs into the university community. Attempting to take a cryogenic slice of student life from a university and drawing conclusions about students' intellectual and moral development seriously misses the mark. The crucial data, both in terms of individual and organizational development, are the interrelationships viewed in a dynamic setting. A partial solution to this failing of higher education research is the potential of Q-analysis for providing more accurate pictures of attitudes and behaviors. Coupled with the motivations of organization development, Q-data offers valid, insightful information that can be used by the student life researcher as practical information for planning and decision-making. The attention Q-analysis gives to the individual and his relationships with his environment is a needed tool if student personnel workers are to become effective student development specialists. Q-methodology immediately focuses on the specific individual or the specific organization and treats it uniquely. The nearly overwhelming pace of change our society is presently experiencing dictates closer attention to individual differences and unique qualities rather than normative data generalized from restrictive samples. Dressel (1971) cautions of the widening gap between the everchanging values and demands of our society and higher education. If the student development
model is to become a viable one then attention to the development of the individual's environment is a necessary corollary. Student development workers must acquire new and different skills, in addition to the traditional ones, if the student development model is to be operationalized. The skills of intervention must be learned to apply beyond the remedial counseling approach. Morrill, Oetting and Hurst (1971) outline a matrix providing for several intervention settings but particularly contrasting outreach and traditional program areas. This is a crucial difference for the student development specialist. The passivity of the traditional counseling role used by student personnel workers has served the wrong ends. Students and organizations, must be viewed proactively, and their growth facilitated accordingly. Facilitating individual development and developing organizational goals are both axiological processes. The student development specialist must learn to take a proactive role in both processes. Attention to individual growth has resulted in a neglect of organizational development. No longer will the remedial-medical model suffice for the student personnel worker. The greater complexities of the campus, new roles for students and demands for accountability will force student personnel to expand its constituency from individual students to all areas of the university community.

The literature discussed in this study represents widely varied fields of study. There are few examples of research that provide avenues to integrate this literature. This study provides an example of applying organization development concepts to a higher education organization. Literature reflecting similar attempts is sparse and reflects the need to clarify models of research and organization development that are
applicable to the unique organizations that comprise higher education. Several have discussed the unique qualities of higher education as an organization (e.g., Ikenberry, 1971). How this uniqueness would affect the possibility of significant organizational development needs to be explored.

Research should be devised exploring the utility of developing consensus, as part of an organization development plan, in functional organizations (such as student affairs at The Ohio State University) as opposed to non-directed organizations such as research and development companies. Gaining organizational consensus on goals and objectives may prove to be an effective method of resolving conflict. Data needs to be provided for this question as well. Further information is needed concerning the effect of gaining consensus on organizational goals on productivity. The amount of conflict over organizational goals may be a negative variable in productivity in functional types of organizations while being a positive variable for more loosely-bound organizations such as research and development groups. The question of whether organization development should be pursued in certain types of organizations should be explored. The definition of what constitutes a healthy organization may well vary significantly among organizations. With the changing of attitudes and behaviors of organization members along a predetermined direction being the concept of organization development, it would be useful to explore the effects of OD efforts on different categories of organizations to examine applicability, success in meeting goals and productivity. The use of Delphi to encourage organizational consensus
must be explored beyond the study presented here with hypotheses that ask not only about the effect of Delphi but the effect of the consensus gained.

This study raises the question of the relationship between student development and organizational development. Although many, in particular Argyris (1957), have suggested a direct relationship between an individual's interpersonal relationship skills and organization development, little is known of the effect of college student development on the institution itself. Research questions dealing with this relationship would provide important data in the study of higher education.

The process of organization development must be examined by observing behavioral outcomes. Present models for organizational growth lack this capability beyond a subjective level. The research model presented in this study has some utility in meeting that need. What is needed are methods of correlating goals and objectives representing organizational consensus to the operationalizing of those goals and objectives. This would allow a more valid indicator of change than is presently available. Further, a systematic renewal process would include repeated data gathering that would serve to reinforce opinions and to record progress. The Delphi model used in this study has implications for both of these concerns.

This study has been presented as a model of a change process in an organization. Consideration of the possible impact that graduate student research might have on higher education is necessary. Attention should be given to the purposes of graduate student research and its
strong potential for effecting change in higher education. Studies examining the role of graduate student research as a systematic renewal process for the academic community should be explored. The role of graduate student research in maintaining certain values in higher education needs to be examined as well. This study suggests that developing criteria for graduate research that would encompass the traditional goal of contributing to knowledge and the goal of effecting change is important to the future of higher education. The possible impact of this added criterion toward developing true learning communities in higher education can no longer be ignored.
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APPENDIX I

ITEMS ON Q-SORT STUDY OF DEAN OF STUDENT'S OFFICE

1. Responsive to parental concerns
2. Decision-making based on research
3. Communicate student life styles
4. No rule enforcement
5. Higher salaries
6. Resolving conflict
7. Individual development
8. Humanness
9. Organizational specialist
10. Centralized decision-making
11. Willingness to compromise
12. Strong identification with OSU
13. Provide traditional services
14. Mediator
15. Teach moral responsibility
16. Teaching new professionals
17. Facilitate change
18. React quickly to crises
19. Provide buffer between students and society
20. Facilitate interaction among campus factions
APPENDIX II

NAME: ________________________________

If you had the opportunity and the funds to create the ideal Student Affairs program at OSU—-Describe the goals and objectives upon which you would concentrate your energies and resources.

A.

B.

C.

D.

E.

F.

G.

H.

I.

J.

Please return to: Vice President of Student Affairs,
464 Ohio Union, 1739 North High Street
To: Members of Student Affairs  
From: Dean of Students Task Force: Lois Kaplan, Jim Segula, Al Lipsitz, Delphi Consultants  
Re: Future Planning for the Student Affairs Area

Vice President Robinson has appointed a task force to develop statements of philosophy, goals and objectives and roles and functions for the Student Affairs area. The task force needs to gather opinions regarding the nature of a desired Student Affairs area. An effective way of doing this is found in the Delphi Technique. The Delphi Technique was developed by Olaf Helmer and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation in the early 1950’s to obtain group opinions about urgent defense problems. About five years ago, an unclassified description of the Technique was published and this procedure is now being employed presently in a number of settings including education.

The Technique is intended to get informed opinion--your opinion--without involving a face-to-face confrontation. Contact is generally made with the experts through successive questionnaires and feedback with each round of questions being designed to produce more carefully considered group opinions. Pfeiffer presents the following variation of the procedure. (John Pfeiffer, New Look At Education, (Poughkeepsie, New York: Odyssey Press, 1968), pp. 152-157):

1. The first questionnaire may call for a list of opinions involving experienced judgment, say a list of predictions or recommended activities.

2. On the second round each expert receives a copy of the list, and is asked to rate or evaluate each item by some such criterion as importance, probability of success, and so on.

3. The third questionnaire includes the list and the ratings, indicates the consensus, if any, and in effect asks the experts either to revise their opinions or else to specify their reasons for remaining outside the consensus.

4. The fourth questionnaire includes list, ratings, the consensus and minority opinions. It provides a final chance for the revision of opinion.

We feel it can be used to advantage in encouraging convergence of opinion as a basis for formulating a Student Affairs Philosophy Statement.

We are asking you to participate in this process. Please list as many items as you can think of to complete the statement on the next page. Your responses throughout the rounds will be anonymous. We ask for your name on the questionnaire only as a way to keep track of which questionnaires we have received.

It is crucial that you return your questionnaire quickly. Since the Delphi questionnaire is sent to a limited number of people, your response is very important.

You have just completed Round 1. The remaining 2-3 rounds will take less time. We will be in touch with you soon.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by June 14.

Ted R. Robinson  
Vice President for Student Affairs
We are soliciting information in order to assist us in the planning for the future of the Student Affairs area at The Ohio State University. This questionnaire is being distributed so as to reflect the entire continuum of opinions within the campus community. Your help will be appreciated as we continue the crucial job of planning for the future.

We ask that you include your name on the questionnaire for record-keeping purposes only. All data will be kept anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Ted R. Robinson
Vice President for Student Affairs
APPENDIX V

COMMUNICATIONS

1. PROVIDE INFORMATION

- D 4 B: Provide services and information for orderly and confidence-producing adaptation to campus and college life (also #4)
- D 7 H: Better methods of informing students of significant developments in many areas of the university
- D 14 A: Better communication; written and personal publications to students, parents, faculty, administration and general public (also #2)
- D 15 E: Information and referral center—24 hours daily
- D 16 E: Provide students with sufficient information about nature, goals and objectives of institution
- D 18 G: Make all student groups aware of proficiency and services available to them (also #3)
- D 20 E: Regular staff meetings
- D 24 F: Disseminate information about non-academic careers—financial aids, housing alternates, family planning, health

2. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN

- D 6 A: Open and easily attainable communication between students, staff, faculty and administration and legislature
- D 8 D: Development of good communication between student affairs' branches and other departments of University
- D 14 A: Better communication; written and personal publications to students, parents, faculty, administration and general public (also #1)
- D 24 C: Help students develop effective channels by which to communicate with faculty and administration of University
- D 1 J: Involve all elements in business of University (see facilitation)
- D 22 B: Establish communication lines with faculty and put more academic emphasis on student life
- D 24 C: Help students communicate with faculty and administration
- F 4 C: Improve communication between students, faculty and administration
3. PUBLIC RELATIONS

D 18 G Make all student groups aware of proficiency and services available to them (also #1)

D 22 B Campus reach-out program to establish what Student Affairs stands for

F 5 D Positive publicity for each student affairs office

F 8 J Development of public relations program educationally based

4. COMMUNICATION FOR IMPROVEMENT

D 4 B Provide services and information for orderly and confidence-producing adaptation to campus and college life (also #1)

D 8 D Coordinate communication to define and construct mutually beneficial relationship

F 2 Communicate goals in behavioral objective terms

F 2 D Central office to disseminate information
1. **FAST**
   
   D 1  Develop a change system which can be rapid and developmental
   
   D 5  Train staff to be change agents

2. **CHIEF ADVOCATE**
   
   D 3  Establishment of change agent role in community
   
   D 5  Be change agents on campus
   
   D 16 Serve as bridge between academic environment outside community
   
   S 1  Chief advocate of change on administrative level

   D 2  Provide atmosphere conducive to change
   
   D 18 Develop system of change which can be fast and complete as needed for student change
ADMINISTRATION - ORGANIZATION - IN-SERVICE - PROFESSIONAL DECISION-MAKING

1. IN-SERVICE TRAINING

   PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

   D 3 I  Responsible for the training of new professional staff
   D 20 H  Staff attendance on regular basis at national conferences
   D 20 J  Expose staff to outside speakers for new ideas
   D 21 A  Establish manpower team to establish proper staffing of
            Student Affairs
   F 3 B  Expand in-service training
   F 7 B  Improve promising staff—effectiveness—through educational
           programs and experience
   F 8 G  Development of in-service curriculum for the continuous
           education of staff

2. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONALISM

   D 5 C  Provide training for young professionals
   D 5 F  Be organizational development specialist
   D 5 J  Obtain faculty appointments for most of the staff
   D 8 A  High caliber personnel
   D 11 B  Staff expertise to provide for student needs
   D 11 C  Improved salaries for staff commensurate with faculty
   D 8 G  Staff availability
   D 11 D  Cross appointments with academic departments
   D 12 E  Increased contact with wide range of students
   D 20 B  Select and organize an able staff
   D 23 G  Develop approach consistent with student life styles
   D 23 E  Professional salaries must be approved
   F 7 A  Get good people—those who can make a difference in University
           and get rid of deadweight

3. ORGANIZATION

   D 8 D  Relative autonomy between various branches of student affairs
   D 9 C  Work from task force orientation
Focus on 4 divisions—health, financial aids, etc.

More funds for student life program

Realign line and staff structure to include functions that are student affairs under Student Affairs Office

Centralize related services into fewer subdivisions

Establish Assistant Vice President responsible for subdivisions

Design a system utilizing the 16 colleges to help serve the mission and the purpose of the Office of Student Affairs

Assume management of Ohio Union

Make original structure as flexible as possible

Establish regular staff meetings

Maintain liaison with other colleges for innovation and staff fellowship

Encourage staff social meetings

Flexibility in staffing to meet peak load positions

Adequate staff for liaison visits to other colleges

More use of full time staff

Coordinate referral agencies to eliminate redundancy

Establish office for future planning to meet student needs

Administrative decision-making should be decentralized

Centralize Student Affairs offices

Establish fresh blood from other universities

Centralized offices

Evaluations of accountability (effectiveness) of Student Affairs

Develop student involvement in decision-making and hold students accountable

Student decision-making and hold them accountable for their decisions

Program of practicum and internship training
6. INVOLVEMENT

D 5 E  Staff be involved in policy making at all levels

D 3 E  Involvement in a primary role in the decision-making process of University

D 6 C  Decision-making power held equally by representatives of community, students, staff, faculty, administration, legislators

D 17 E  Functional system where students and parents have input into Student Affairs Office

F 8 F  Acquisition of adequate staff and facilities

F 9 F  Athletic Department should be under Student Affairs

D 11  Adequate student profile research to assist in design staffing patterns and functions.

F 9 G  One division concerned with campus community and its problems. Include fraternities and sororities
MISCELLANEOUS

1. EVALUATION
   D 5 B Evaluation of Student Affairs program
   D 12 G Development of long range goals and reasonable means of meeting these goals (also #3)
   D 17 J Design a system of evaluation to show Student Affairs effectiveness and accountability
   D 20 D Check system of accountability
   F 8 H Develop program of evaluation that would provide continuous feedback

2. COMMUNITY
   D 3 C Attempt to maximize a mutual trust atmosphere in the University community
   D 6 B Build in sense of community
   D 10 A Facilitate a climate that encourages and facilitates academic achievement
   D 12 B Creation of greatest good for University community at least cost to individuality
   D 13 E Serve families of faculty and staff as part of responsibility recreational opportunities
   D 23 A Student Affairs should develop and maintain appropriate relationship with other disciplines (also #3)

3. DEVELOPING GOALS
   D 3 A Development of Student Affairs program consistent with goals and objectives of University
   D 12 G Development of long range goals and reasonable means of meeting these goals (also #1)
   D 13 A Whole man and woman
   D 16 H Teach values, to create social consciousness and concern for fellow man
   D 20 Establish goals and objectives for Student Affairs section
   D 22 A Establish philosophical foundation based on premise of student rights and responsibility
   D 23 A Student Affairs should develop and maintain appropriate relationship with other disciplines (also #2)
D 26 A  Develop achievable goals and objectives and identify agencies within Student Affairs to accomplish this

D 26 D  Hold students accountable for their decisions
D 26 F  Student participation in decision making
D 8  Pervasive attitude in Student Affairs and University that student is customer and consumer—should have rights of such
D 17 H  Flexibility to overcome bigness
D 26 G  Establish a Legal Aid service for students
D 17 B  Crisis center
### STUDENT NEEDS

#### 1. RECREATION AND SOCIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 2 D</td>
<td>Provide for basic student needs—health, financial aids, recreational (also D 1, D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4 H</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4 I</td>
<td>Provide for social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5 I</td>
<td>Maintain services such as: financial aids, health, housing centers, orientation, international (outreach) (also D 1, D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7 E</td>
<td>Variety intramural athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11 H</td>
<td>Better recreational services for staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 13 B</td>
<td>Emphasize importance of leisure time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 13 C</td>
<td>Emphasize recreational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 14 C</td>
<td>Increased recreational areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 19 F</td>
<td>Require social and recreational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 25 A</td>
<td>Additional recreational facilities: handball, swimming, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 26 E</td>
<td>Expand recreational and intramural opportunities and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 25 F</td>
<td>Improve track and fields facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 25 G</td>
<td>Better tennis lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 10 B</td>
<td>Expand facilities for recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 2 D</td>
<td>Provide for basic student needs—health, financial aids, recreational (also D 1, D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4 E</td>
<td>Provide for medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5 I</td>
<td>Maintain services such as: financial aids, health, housing centers, orientation, international (outreach) (also D 1, D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7 B</td>
<td>Coordinate educational efforts on preventive medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7 A</td>
<td>Expansion of health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 9 D</td>
<td>Determine what student needs require the unique expertise of health specialists, social workers, psychologists, counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-2-

D 15 A  Provide health care and education
D 19 G  Free health service: emphasizing booze, drugs, disease, abortion and contraception
F 6 D  A health service with an educational approach to individual health problems as well as illness treatment
D 26 D  Expand counseling services and mental health needs of students

3. SPECIAL STUDENTS
D 10 I  Provide services for handicapped
D 10 I  Provide services for special groups
D 11 I  Improved International Students' Office
D 12 B  Make institution responsive to individual needs
D 15 H  Help town students who have difficulty in involving themselves in activities
D 19 A  Develop black student leadership
D 19 B  Develop social and political potential for black students
S 1 C  End discrimination in universities against blacks, Mexican-Americans and women
D 26 J  Develop program for disadvantaged students
D 27 D  Elimination of racial and sexual discrimination

4. FINANCIAL SUPPORT—WORK AND JOBS
D 2 D  Provide for basic student needs—health, financial aids, recreational (also #1, #2)
D 4 C  Provide for financial needs
D 5 I  Maintain services such as: financial aids, health, Housing centers, orientation, international (outreach) (also #1, #2)
D 7 G  Enlargement of work-study program
D 10 D  Coordinate job-placement program
D 15 B  Financial aids needs
D 19 D  Develop financial program based totally on need
D 19 E  Real world work experience for each student
5. (LEADERSHIP ITEM)

D 18 D  Provide leadership training for students
D 24 A  Help students recognize and develop leadership
D 24 F  Emphasize supportive services
D 26 F  Agency to consult with student organizations on planning leadership

6. INCREASE AND IMPROVE ACTIVITIES

S 3 C  Increase student activities around campus
S 3 F  More student involvement to represent wider range of interests
D 27 A  Provide community center for students; interpret student life styles, needs
D 22 B  Establish new services as needed—drugs, planned parenthood
F 3 C  Outreach programs in all services
F 10 H  Programs should be based on realities and coordinated with Mershon

7. PROVIDE SUPPORTIVE

D 1 A  Provide relevant services for students
D 4 A  Determine needs common to most students for services that they would not be expected to provide for themselves
D 9 E  What student needs are perceived to be obligation of the University by students, parents, staff, faculty, legislators
D 18 A  Provide non-academic services to meet student needs
D 24 A  Support (financial and personnel) for campus activities

All 7  Provide supportive services: financial aids, counseling, health, housing, remedial programs

D 16 F  Student Union programs increased
D 7 F  Pre-admission counseling—counseling orientation
D 10 E  Information and referral center—24-hour plan—facilitate student and office contact
Establish office for future planning to meet student needs

Counseling and guidance for student activities, organizations and administration

Program planning by needs of entire community
1. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

D 1 B Actualize philosophy of human development
D 2 A Develop skills of students--social, intellectual, vocational, artistic, etc.
D 3 B Establish an emphasis on student development
D 5 A Develop staff and programs to implement student development
D 6 H Build in philosophy of individual responsibility
D 9 A Enhance individual personality development of students
D 10 B Facilitate student development in personal values, mental and physical health
D 11 G More funds to support programs that would enhance human development of students
D 12 C Goals for individual students--increase personal maturity through experience; increase effectiveness in interpersonal relationships; deepen sensitivity to human needs; clarify long range objectives for careers and personal life
D 12 D On-going effort to understand trends in student thinking and behavior as they are developing
D 16 A Individualize college experience
D 16 B Integrate cognitive and effective development of students
D 16 C Identify and remove barriers that inhibit learning and human development
F 1 A Overcome obstacles to learning such as personal adjustment, motivation, etc.
F 6 A Development of groups to allow interpersonal interactions, to develop understanding of self and others (also #3)
F 6 C Contact individuals in leadership positions who might assist students in developing valuing systems
D 2 A Develop social, intellectual, vocational, artistic skills of students
D 2 1 Study student development to more effectively meet growth needs
F 7 A Individualization of educational experiences of all students
2. DISCIPLINE

D 1 F  Negate philosophy of in loco parentis
D 17 F  Self-discipline of student body
D 22 G  Equitable system of student discipline
D 22 G  Ensuring student rights
D 24 H  Envolve students in development and revision of rules
         (also #3)
D 24 H  Develop and administer certain rules and execute discipline
         function for University
F 4 E  Use student determined rule setting, hearings and penalty
        settings (also #3)

3. PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL ACTIVITIES--SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

D 2 G  Provide avenues to experience and learn from success in
       problem solving
D 4 I  Development of social interests
D 7 D  Facilitate--encourage student participation in student
       activities
D 8 C  Student participation in the delivery of student services
D 16 G  Prepare students to be problem solvers
D 24 H  Envolve students in development and revision of rules
         (also #2)
F 4 E  Use student determined rule setting, hearings and penalty
       settings (also #2)
F 6 A  Development of groups to allow interpersonal interactions,
       to develop understanding of self and others (also #1)
F 6 B  Develop heterogeneity of experiences to help students
       cope with pluralistic society
D 8 D  Student participation in the development of needs
F 4 A  Facilitate student activities which lead to student
       development
F  C  Clear difference of individual students developing purposes and programs in University context

F 10 H  More student participation on Athletic Council to make it more responsive to student needs
RESEARCH

1. ESTABLISH OFFICE

D 5  Develop an area of student life research (also #2)
D 15 Establish an office for survey and research that would be responsible for a continuing survey of student needs, problems, attitudes. Feed research back to the system. Research impact of University on student's development. (also #2, #3 and #4)
F 3 A Full scale research division--systematic and regular collection of information (also #3)
F 1 Research division to do applied studies to facilitate learning and educational progress
P 22 C Coordinate all research pertaining to student life outside classroom (also #2, #3)
D 25 B Develop research agency to identify and anticipate student needs (also #3)

2. STUDENT LIFE

D 1 Conduct research on student needs
D 2 Study students and their environments
D 3 Development of research studies regarding student life
D 5 Develop an area of student life research (also #1)
D 15 Establish an office for survey and research that would be responsible for a continuing survey of student needs, problems, attitudes. Feed research back to the system. Research impact of University on student's development. (also #1, #3 and #4)
D 17 Research impact of college press
D 18 C Research and needs of students; research student life styles
D 12 Pursue an active aggressive effort to understand trends in student thinking and behavior as they are developing
P 22 C Coordinate all research pertaining to student life outside classroom (also #1, #3)
D 26 I Identify attitudes and opinions of students regarding campus policies and issues (also #4)

3. SYSTEMATIC

D 10 Coordinate a program of research on: student characteristics, student life, design and evaluation of student personnel programs and functions. Include provision for graduate students to write theses and dissertations using facilities of this research program
D 15 Establish an office for survey and research that would be responsible for a continuing survey of student needs, problems, attitudes. Feed research back to the system.
- Research impact of University on student's development. (also #1, #2 and #3)

D 12 Pursue an active aggressive effort to understand trends in student thinking and behavior as they are developing (also #2)

F 3 A Full scale research division--systematic and regular collection of information

F 22 G Coordinate all research pertaining to student life outside classroom (also #1, #2)

D 25 B Develop research agency to identify and anticipate student needs (also #1)

4. DECISIONS

D 15 Establish an office for survey and research that would be responsible for a continuing survey of student needs, problems, attitudes. Feed research back to the system. Research impact of University on student's development. (also #1, #2 and #3)

F 7 D Conduct investigation and research for valid information and make decisions upon this data

F 10 G Space utilization study--old and new Union

D 23 Vigorous research based on "body of knowledge"

F 9 A In depth study to redesign residence hall program with expert advice from off-campus expert

4. (Addition)

D 26 I Identify attitudes and opinions of students regarding campus policies and issues (also #2)
FACILITATOR - OMBUDSMAN - ADVOCATE

1. INTERPRET LIFE STYLES
   D 1  Interpret student life styles and needs
   D 3  Interpret life styles and values to community (campus and outside
   D 16 Interpret student character needs and concerns to outside public and academic community
   D 18 Work to keep community aware of changes in life styles, needs of students and interpret these changes

2. STUDENT ADVOCATE
   D 1  Fulfill role of student advocate--excluding discipline
   D 2  Interpret students and Student Affairs objective to rest of campus
   D 3  Staff viewed as professional advocates of student development
   D 12 Improvement of image, increase contact with faculty, clarify goals, purposes and methods of information (also 44)
   D 22 I Fulfill advocate role by representing Student Affairs in all policy areas representing student life.
   D 18 Fill role of student advocate
   S 1  Forcefully represent student concerns to University

3. OMBUDSMAN
   D 3  Perform in ombudsman role in University
   D 5  Mediate and arbitrate conflicts and complaints via ombudsman role
   S 3  More ombudsman, student grievance to ombudsman

4. FACILITATOR
   D 1  Work with members of faculty and high administration in every possible way
   D 1  Involve all elements in University in on-going business of University
   D 2  Develop tolerance and understanding and acceptance between people of differing backgrounds, ideas and values
   D 2  Integrate faculty experiences and knowledge in Student Affairs context
D 11 Development of cross department appointment with academic departments to help staff relate with academic faculty in teaching and research programs

D 12 Improvement of image, increase contact with faculty, clarify goals, purposes and methods of information (also 92)

F 8 1 Continuous interaction with president to insure understanding and support

F 7 C Serve as intermediaries and lissisons among all elements of campus

D 22 F Commit time and training to be mediators coordinating effects, living situation and student goals

D 2 C Provide broad experiences in working with understanding people, institution and organization

D 18 Work at involving all elements of University in business of Student Affairs

D 18 Serve as interpreter for students in explaining operation of University and community and reasons for these operations

D 16 Act as consultant to faculty, administration, parents
DORMS

1. LIVING-LEARNING

   D 5 H  Develop living-learning units on campus
   D 10 A  Faster academic achievement through living-learning programs and facilities
   D 10 B  Facilitate student development through residence halls
   D 12 F  Humanization of residence hall settings--respect individual privacy and dignity
   D 16 F  Facilitate students' academic development through housing
   D 17 G  Note closely related living and learning
   D 19 H  Develop comprehensive residence hall program that would direct social development of student
   D 24 G  Maintain contact with residence hall staff; provide funds for programs in hall (also #2)
   F 4 D  Operate dorms and other facilities with emphasis on student development rather than cost-accounting and behavior
   F 10 A  Expand staff in residence halls--improve quality of life (also #3)

2. PUT DORMS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

   D 22  Establish responsibility for residence halls
   F 5 E  Place dorm operation under Student Affairs Office
   D 24 G  Maintain contact with residence hall staff; provide funds for programs in hall (also #1)
   F 2 A  Student housing in Student Affairs area
   S 1 D  Get dorms out of office of Business & Finance
   S 1 E  Beer in dorms, 24-hours open house, reduced occupancy in dorm
   S 2 H  Room and board--raise for increases through increased funds
   F 9 A  Student housing in Student Affairs area

3. FACILITIES

   D 7 I  Complete restructuring of dorm life
   F 10 A  Expand staff in residence halls--improve quality of life (also #1)
F 9 A  Redesign residence hall program
F 9 I  Establish contracts with off-campus catering services for operation of food facilities
COUNSELING AND ADVISORY ROLES

1. PERSONAL

D 2 B Assist students in developing self-concepts
D 4 D Counseling for financial problems
D 4 D Counseling for clarifying goals
D 4 D Counseling for personal problems
D 4 E Counseling for medical problems
D 4 G Counseling for discipline
D 9 B To help students understand the 'system'
D 12 A Help individual cope with individual nature
D 12 A Help individuals cope with institution
D 15 A Physical and mental health counseling: Preventative and Education
D 15 B Counseling for management of student's finances
D 15 C Counseling for personal problems
D 15 G Coordinate student activities. Help students find activities interested in (i.e. town students) (see #6 also)
D 22 C Help students understand and deal with personal problems
D 24 B Help students understand and deal with personal problems
D 24 F Help to achieve career objectives

2. IMPROVE FACILITIES AND STAFF

D 5 I Need for counseling center
D 9 F Develop office of counseling and orientation
D 11 E Improve facilities--space, quality and amount for counseling service
D 11 F Upgrade Counseling Center staff
D 12 I Substantial increase in counseling and study skills services
D 14 B Crisis center: off-campus assistance center
D 14 D Satellite counseling centers
F 3 E Better space for Counseling Center
F 3 F Recruit fresh blood from other schools for Counseling Center
More effective counseling and testing center

3. **TECHNIQUE**
   - **D 8 G** Staff availability to and associated with students in all areas and at all levels
   - **D 10 I** Provision for work with special group of students (physically handicapped)
   - **D 18 H** Deal with students in honest, forthright manner
   - **F 4 B** Provide professional counseling services

4. **CONTINUING ORIENTATION**
   - **D 10 C** Coordinate an initial and continuing orientation program
   - **D 15 C** Continuing summer orientation
   - **D 16 D** Provide students with sufficient information about university nature, goals and objectives

5. **LEADERSHIP TRAINING**
   - **D 18 D** Provide leadership training
   - **D 19 A** Develop black student leadership

6. **ADVISING GROUPS AND ACADEMIC ADVISING**
   - **D 1 G** Advise student groups
   - **D 15 G** Coordinate student activities. Help students find activities interested in (i.e. town students) (see #1 also)
   - **F 1 G** Facilitate education placement
   - **F 1 J** Maximize educational experience through a variety of educational experiences
   - **F 3 D** Expand programming in education counseling to include g and r collaboration with college offices, especially UVC
   - **F 4 A** Facilitate student activities to develop self awareness
   - **F 9 C** Set up more permanent bureaucracy that would insure nuts and bolts efficiency for student government

---

**D 10 F** Coordination of counseling and advising functions under one umbrella
Memorandum

TO: Participants in the Student Affairs Research Project

FROM: Ted R. Robinson

RE: Delphi Project on Student Affairs Goals and Objectives

The results of the first round of our Delphi project have given us an excellent list of statements. The researchers have tallied and interpreted your responses to our first questionnaire and have prepared a list of items that comprise the questionnaire for the remainder of our study.

To complete this questionnaire you are asked to assign priorities to the items. Detailed instructions are included on the questionnaire.

This questionnaire was delivered to you personally and will be picked up on the date indicated. It should take only 10-15 minutes to complete this questionnaire. I sincerely appreciate your willingness to take time from your busy schedule to participate in our study.

You should be receiving the third round of our Delphi project sometime next week.

Again, thanks for your help.

6/21/71
Name ________________________________

Student Affairs Questionnaire
Round II

Using the following key, indicate the priority you would attach to the statements listed below.

Priority Key
1 = Top Priority
2 = Second Priority
3 = Third Priority
4 = Fourth Priority

In order to discriminate among the items, distribute priorities in such a manner that no level of priority will be used more than 7 times (in other words, you will 7 "1's", 7 "2's", 7 "3's", and 7 "4's").

Please prepare your responses individually. As mentioned before, your responses will continue to be anonymous. The questionnaire will be picked up in your office on Thursday, June 24.

An ideal Student Affairs Program at O.S.U. should:

1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (Throughout these statements "community" refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)

2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.

3. recognize the demand for increased leisure time activities by providing sufficient recreational programs and facilities.

4. be accountable for the evaluation of programs to determine if the programs meet the objectives of student affairs.

5. be organized to allow similar functions and services to fall into the same administrative office.

6. approach mental and physical health care from a preventive and educational point of view.

7. facilitate agreement among the differing perceptions of students, faculty and administrators as they work toward common objectives.

8. provide information based on research of student life to facilitate planning and decision making.
9. provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.

10. communicate information about University services to all students.

11. provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets the needs of the students.

12. foster living-learning opportunities in residence halls to provide continuity between classroom and out of classroom life.

13. create a sense of mutual trust and openness among all segments of the University community.

14. delegate decision-making as well as responsibility.

15. develop open and easily attainable avenues of communication among students, faculty and administration.

16. encourage each student to develop self-understanding as well as understanding of others through a wide range of activities.

17. work with students to establish an equitable system of discipline that insures student rights and responsibilities.

18. identify special needs of students (i.e. minority groups, handicapped students, international students) and provide staff and services to meet their unique needs.

19. provide a program of ongoing student orientation and academic advising.

20. be responsible for residence hall operations in order to more easily facilitate student affairs programs in the residence halls.

21. offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

22. make available diverse opportunities for financial aid (such as scholarships, job placement, work study programs, loans, etc.) to students based on need.

23. assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his stage of human development.

24. describe and interpret student life styles to the University community.

25. establish health services to meet current needs and create new services to meet developing needs such as birth control and drug education programs.
26. hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel and provide opportunities for their continuing educational and professional development.

27. mediate and arbitrate conflict via an ombudsman's role.

28. publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University.

Thank you,

Ted R. Robinson

6/21/71
Accompanying each statement is the modal response (Column b). The modal response represents the priority level most frequently selected for each item. Your previous (Round II) response is located in Column c. After considering the group modal response, place your new response (see key) in Column d. If your new response does not agree with the group’s modal response, place your reason for differing in Column e. In this round, there is no restriction to the number of times any priority level may be used. Enter only one number in Column d.

The questionnaire will be picked up in your office on Friday, July 2. Thank you again for your continuing participation.

**KEY**
1. = Top priority  
2. = Second priority  
3. = Third priority  
4. = Fourth priority

An ideal Student Affairs Program at O.S.U. should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Your Modal Response</th>
<th>Your Previous Response</th>
<th>Your New Response</th>
<th>Reason for variance between (b) and (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (throughout these statements “community” refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT AFFAIRS DELPHI QUESTIONNAIRE IV

Each of the statements below is followed by the groups' most frequent response (modal) in Column B and your previous response from Round III in Column C. Accompanying the Round IV Delphi is a summary of the respondents' comments from Round III. After examining the groups' modal response to each item as well as the summary of comments, please indicate your final response in Column D. Column E may be used for any final opinions you may have for each of the items. Please be sure to respond to each item.

This questionnaire will be picked up in your office on Tuesday, July 13. Thank you again for your continuing participation.

Please use the following key for making your responses.

KEY

1 = Top priority
2 = Second priority
3 = Third priority
4 = Fourth priority

An ideal Student Affairs Program at O.S.U. should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Modal Response</th>
<th>Your Previous Response</th>
<th>Your New Response</th>
<th>Reason for variance between (b) and (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (throughout these statements &quot;community&quot; refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were a large number of comments made to the items in Round III. To have included everyone's comments would have been both repetitious and unwieldy. The comments below are representative of the total statements received.

1. Be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (throughout these statements "community" refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)

"If the change concerns student welfare (as opposed to curriculum development, research priorities, etc.) then the Office of Student Affairs should be recognized as the chief advocate of change."

"Many of Student Affairs' jobs should revolve around a change agent position."

"Student Affairs might more appropriately be "an" chief advocate instead of "the" chief advocate. If student development is important, then change programs to create the kinds of environments and programs that maximize development are also important."

"Since the student is the customer and Student Affairs should be his administrative agent, Student Affairs is the logical change agent."

"By training and experience, Student Affairs is best to accomplish change."

"I felt that I had misinterpreted the remarks."

2. Establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.

"Is very important but don't see how it can replace any present functions."

"Important but useless unless something isn't done with all the data that is collected."

"We can't fund the offices we have now."

"Should do this in each of our areas."

"I feel open communication across levels will do much better than research."

3. Recognize the demand for increased leisure time activities by providing sufficient recreational programs and facilities.

"It is critical for the health and welfare of students and subsequently, their academic performance."

"Administration in all areas should study closer what the real needs of students are—not what they personally want."

"This is of major significance to most students."
"Who will do this if Student Affairs does not? If Student Affairs is concerned with the quality of student living this should be part of its concern."

"I feel that much of the unrest follows leisure time with no interesting activities to occupy it."

"Over 3,000 students, faculty, staff and families take part—some as many as 300 times a year."

"In a stressful community such as OSU, this seems very inept and should be a high priority—supports and promotes mental health."

"Opportunity for constructiveness, release of energy and healthy competition are important and deserve attention."

4. Be accountable for the evaluation of programs to determine if the programs meet the objectives of Student Affairs.

"Primarily a departmental responsibility."

"I assumed evaluation would be a part of the Office of Research of Evaluation."

"Important—but not at level indicated in consideration of other items."

"Must have evaluation—can be viewed as a part of research."

"Not enough higher priorities in last round."

5. Be organized to allow similar functions and services to fall into the same administrative office.

"On a campus the size of OSU, there is danger of excessive costs and red tape hurdles which result from duplication of programs and services."

"Eliminates duplication and waste."

"Success of organization depends upon its members...Efficiency is lost without proper organizational planning."

"This item saves a separate listing of all the individual service offices and functional areas that should be part of Student Affairs--areas such as admissions and residence halls would not be left out of Student Affairs as is the case now."

"This kind of organization is needed for greater consideration of related services dealing with similar functions. Greater administrative efficiency must also be considered."

6. Approach mental and physical health care from a preventive and educational point of view.

"Mental and physical health care are probably the first concern for all of our students. If we are a progressive university we should certainly put this very high on our agenda."
"Emphasis must be more on preventive and educational point of view."

"Makes health care more than corrective. Expansion of education into a practical area (i.e., oneself)."

7. Facilitate agreement among the differing perceptions of students, faculty and administrators as they work toward common objectives.

"Ideal—Wow!"

"For cohesion of services."

"Too vague to implement."

"Agreement may not be possible—trust, respect for differences, and development of common goals may be that which is pragmatically possible."

"Who else in the campus community would perform this function?"

"Very important in terms of keeping in touch with each group."

8. Provide information based on research of student life to facilitate planning and decision making.

"Ran out of l's"

"An office of research and evaluation ought to be doing it."

"I feel this should be routinely done—ongoing."

"I am in favor of this but I am too cynical about the validity of research to rate it top priority."

"I just don't see research, important as it is, as top priority in this operation oriented Student Affairs program. It is important but staff, counselling, communication and facilities must come first."

9. Provide optimum intramural opportunities and facilities.

"I feel that this is important or there would not be over 15,000 students taking part in the program...Do any of the other areas have this many students taking part in their programs?"

"I interpret "intramural" to include all provisions for physical culture...provision of opportunities for physical development are important enough to assign it higher than the lowest priority."

"I believe in healthy mind—healthy body."

"Crowded campus—inadequate recreation facilities..."

"This is a student need and a service they should have. It definitely adds to the mental health facilitators in the community."
10. Communicate information about University services to all students.

"...we haven't time to deal with informing students about all of the university services as a top priority...we concentrate on information about Student Affairs services and perform other information tasks as time and need dictate..."

"This should be one of the main functions of Student Affairs."

"Mixed-bag! Why have services if people aren't aware of them."

11. Provide counseling facilities and professional staff that truly meets the needs of the students.

"This is now being done and is certainly a great service but what percentage of the student body really uses it?"

"It is imperative that qualified staff and adequate facilities be provided in order to meet the needs of students..."

"When a student needs a professional in the counseling area, this seems like a critical time for the student and certainly the very best facilities and staff seem indicated..."

"I think I underestimated the importance of this item in the first go-around."

"Competent staff is important but facilities to meet student needs less so. In fact, counselors should work away from the center more frequently."

12. Foster living-learning opportunities in residence halls to provide continuity between classroom and out of classroom life.

"Residence halls should be places where academic learning is facilitated (not hindered). Well conceived living learning arrangements might help in this...I believe that academic learning should have fairly high priority."

"Living is a continuous learning process. To tap the students' creative potential we must focus on creating the environment which will best nurture his development, i.e., outside the classroom."

"I do not think that organized classroom learning should be taken into the residence halls...If students want to get together they can do it without university organization."

"I'm not sure continuity is necessary or even a good thing. Let the kids learn for themselves."

"How can we back down in this area just because here at OSU we have been so impotent in making a dent in the formulation of living-learning situations..."
13. Create a sense of mutual respect and openness among all segments of the University community.

"Without respect and openness, what have you got?"

"Incorporated and assured in everything we're discussing here."

"Will the 3's on items 13 and 14 please explain?"

"Our efforts should have an effect on the faculty and administration through a facilitating approach centered on students."

"In the process of service to students and in assisting them in improving their experience at OSU, the statement refers to a necessary ingredient.

14. Delegate decision-making as well as responsibility.

"Especially important for students."

"Big problem at OSU; very important."

"I don't see this as needing top priority nor am I willing to say its a low priority matter."

15. Develop open and easily attainable avenues of communication among students, faculty and administration.

"Easier said than done."

"More emphasis must be put on open channels of communication; however, it will be useless unless there is mutual trust and respect between the parties."

"Obviously important."

16. Encourage each student to develop self-understanding as well as understanding of others through a wide range of activities.

"This is a counseling center matter, work of Student Affairs staff. Could become inhibited if this is a #1 priority."

"Statement too general to mean much of anything."

"An important aspect of education."

"I recommend a wide range of activities; however, it should be noted that insight as accomplished through introspective measures is not necessarily the result of many activities."

"The Office of Student Affairs will help you develop self understanding" sounds ludicrous to me."
17. Work with students to establish an equitable system of discipline that insures student rights and responsibilities.

"In Loco Parentis is well on the wane. The alternative will have to involve either students or public courts."

"I'm placing emphasis on student rights and responsibilities--two very important concepts."

"If Student Affairs cops-out in this area it will be taken up by others in the University...who will not be as committed to working with students or to the concepts of rights and responsibilities..."

"This should be worked out by persons or organizations directly responsible for student discipline--probably with law school faculty serving as consultants."

"Basic concept of law--we are a people of laws granting freedom to the individual--not individuals granting freedom to others."

"A vital experience that is all too frequently overlooked by students and staff. This is the major avenue for developing awareness of community responsibility--emphasis should be placed on discussion of responsible behavior pertaining both to students and staff."

"This area is very important as it relates to today's student--should be high priority to ameliorate campus unrest."

"This is "1-AAAA"--I could talk hours on this."

18. Identify special needs of students (i.e., minority groups, handicapped students, international students) and provide staff and services to meet their unique needs.

"I see this as meeting high priority...But I think my top priority items would benefit special groups of students as well as 'students-in-general'."

"I feel we need to identify special needs of our students and attempt to meet them. However, this question is pointing toward special groups. We treat all the same..."

"Too much cuddling and special privileges now..."

"May tend to overshadow needs of majority..."

"Especially Black Students and Women..."

"Those students who have special needs will not need someone else to identify them."

"I just do not feel it is practical to expect a student affairs program to have specialists for each student with a 'unique' need."
19. Provide a program of ongoing student orientation and academic advising.

"Ongoing orientation at an institution of this size seems an important goal."

"Not becoming an academic advisory--others (faculty) can do it better."

"I favor continued small-group counseling (probably broader than traditional 'orientation' for at least the freshman year) on a voluntary basis after the basic traditional orientation topics have been covered."

"In conjunction with other university areas--prime place for inter-cooperation in the name of student needs."

20. Be responsible for residence hall operations in order to more easily facilitate student affairs programs in the residence halls.

"Residence halls should be run from a student personnel philosophy with managerial aspects secondary."

"I guess the question is what do we mean by 'operation'?"

"Both operations and so called program and personnel aspects of residence halls need consistent coordination."

"Student Affairs people are trained for this; why not use them for this?"

"Poor reason in statement. Important function in student life."

"Feel if we don't it will become a business arrangement--which is OK if followed through completely."

21. Offer professional counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

"Encourage initiative--discourage 'spoon-feeding'."

"There needs to be a place where a student can come with the assurance of confidentiality without reprisals."

"Professional counselors to do direct counseling with students and to train and assist others (faculty, staff, students) to do direct counseling with students."

"Part of the educational process and should have top priority in the Student Affairs area, particularly the counseling center."

22. Make available diverse opportunities for financial aid (such as scholarships, job placement, work study programs, loans, etc.) to students based on need.

"This is an imperative need for many students and seems to be a legitimate resource that should be provided by Student Affairs."

"Must continue to provide more diversity in financial aids based on need."
"One purpose of a land grant college is equitable accessibility. This is not possible if financial aid services to students do not have a high priority to serve needy students."

"Failure to give this priority fails to be realistic about the present and future."

"For many students the possibility of attending the University is determined by financial aid available."

"No special privilege programs like item #18"

"If Student Affairs people can lessen the chances of drop-out due to financial problems, this should be done—providing the student is worthy of such assistance."

23. Assist the individual student as he copes with problems unique to his stage of human development.

"...this is a preventive manner of dealing with the counseling needs of the students."

"Still need focus on individual and helping students work through developmental stages."

"This is the best statement available (a poor one though) of the paradigm of student development. Since I believe student development is the heart of our tasks, priority "1" seems mandatory."

"This just comes so naturally in daily contact with students that I feel that it should have a high priority."

"What is our purpose as educators if we don't strive to assist individual's human development?"

"Are we not here to help students? This can establish communication and rapport."

"I strongly feel that the major thrust of Student Affairs ought to be 'human development,' therefore I cannot agree with a 'modal response.'"

24. Describe and interpret student life styles to the University community.

"This is more appropriately taken care of in items 2, 8, and 15."

"Because Student Affairs is most intimately involved with student life styles, it is appropriate that Student Affairs should take some responsibility for interpreting life styles to those less involved."

"We're on the 'firing line.' Who can do a better job than we? It needs to be done."

"Redundant."
25. Establish health services to meet current needs and create new services to meet developing needs such as birth control and drug education programs.

"Health of our students is important. High levels have been voted for counseling--students involved in drugs need plenty of counseling and medical service."

"This seems more important than a '3' in light of current concerns."

"Loaded question--how far does birth control and drug education programs go?"

"...teenage health is currently a more serious problem than most realize."

"...these are important aspects of the student's personal education which will not be provided elsewhere."

"If we have a health service (and we have an excellent one!) then this item should have a relatively high priority."

"If this is a need of students, it should be top priority."

"Without proper health care all these other things don't blossom. An area of particular concern..."

"to me this is simply one of the least necessary expansions needed."

"Student Affairs should provide services--this is a clear service."

26. Hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel and provide opportunities for their continuing education and professional development.

"I agree with the first part of this statement "hire high caliber, professionally trained personnel," more than I agree with the remainder of the statement."

"Believe there is a high degree of personal responsibility in professional development."

"Too many professionals trained in traditional ways will turn out a highly stereotyped staff. What is high caliber?--do they shoot 45's? Yes to continued educational and professional development."

"The caliber of the professional staff has to be the key to the entire program. I should have rated it as "1" the first time."

27. Mediate and arbitrate conflict via an ombudsman's role.

"One of the major areas which I see Student Affairs operating is in the role of an ombudsman."

"If the University were doing its job properly (staff, faculty, administrators) there would be no need for an ombudsman."

"Provides an opportunity for better understanding between individuals."
"At least '2', the promotional aspects cannot be ignored, especially in a state with the mentality of Ohio and a school as political as O.S.U..."

"Very important in personalizing a large institution—also in improving environment."

"Too vague a statement."

"The ombudsman's role at least means the following:
1. to receive and attempt to solve student grievances
2. to recommend procedural or policy changes aimed at keeping grievances to a minimum
3. improving and opening channels of communication
4. information center for students who haven't tried to solve their problems and referral to correct office

These are important personnel functions and are similar to other items we have given high priority...

"We needed an ombudsman type statement on this list, but this wasn't it. Where can we bring in student advocate's role?"

"Student Affairs is the administrative champion of students—ombudsman's role fits well."

28. Publicize the professional expertise and services of Student Affairs to all elements of the University.

"Image building—what does Student Affairs do? Necessary to carry out other priorities."

"If associates know we are good, can help relations, cooperation, etc."

"This has been lacking for too long. If we really know our business then we should let others know that we know it."
APPENDIX X

July 7, 1971

Now that you have participated in the Delphi process we would appreciate your reaction to this method of gathering opinion;
Each of the statements below is followed by the group's most frequent response (modal) in Column B and your previous response from Round IV in Column C. This will be the last round of our Delphi project. On the sheet attached please add those subjects or items that you feel should be included in the study of goals and priorities for Student Affairs at Ohio State University that the Delphi does not cover. Column E is used to list reasons for changing your response and for any final opinions on the 28 items. Please be sure to respond to each item.

This questionnaire will be picked up in your office on Thursday, November 4th. Thank you for your continuing participation.

Please use the following key for making your responses.

**KEY**

1 = Top priority  
2 = Second priority  
3 = Third priority  
4 = Fourth priority

An ideal Student Affairs Program at O.S.U. should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Your Modal Response</th>
<th>Your Previous Response</th>
<th>Your New Response</th>
<th>Reason for variance between (b) and (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be recognized as the chief advocate for change within the University community. (throughout these statements &quot;community&quot; refers to the campus and others who are interested in the University.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. establish an office for research that continually and systematically examines student needs, problems and attitudes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XII
Rotated Factor Matrix - Items - Round IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>