

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-12,431

DOBBS, John Wesley, 1931-

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF EXTERNAL
INFLUENCE ON POLICY DECISION MAKING AS PERCEIVED
BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD
CHAIRPERSONS AT SIX SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES
IN MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1975
Education, community colleges

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

**A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCE
ON POLICY DECISION MAKING AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY
COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRPERSONS AT SIX
SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN**

By

John W. Dobbs

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1975

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCE ON POLICY DECISION MAKING AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRPERSONS AT SIX SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN

By

John W. Dobbs

Problem

The problem was to adapt a theoretical model using a conceptual framework of decision making in an open systems environment, to determine community college leadership perceptions of influence from external sources. The focus of the analysis, then, was the individual perceptions of six community college presidents and six board of trustee chairpersons relative to the impact of external influences upon their decision-making responsibilities.

The model:

1. served as a means of providing information about decision making in the community college, and gained more insights into the nature and motivation of decision making by community college presidents and board chairpersons;
2. showed to what extent, if any, the desires and concerns of the students and local community influence impacted upon decisions of the community college presidents and board chairpersons; and
3. discussed whether the community college, as it functions today, can or should fulfill the role of change agent within the community.

Procedure

The study was exploratory and descriptive in nature, two approaches being utilized:

1. Relevant literature was studied in the areas of decision-making models, open systems theories, theories of power and influence, and organizational and administrative literature; and
2. An adapted questionnaire instrument--Research Design Questionnaire on External Influences--was developed to determine perceptions of external influences as interpreted by six community college presidents and six board chairpersons. Conclusions and major findings were based on analyses of the questionnaire responses and dialogue from the personal interviews.

Results

In this study, the community colleges were viewed as open systems that interact with the environment in an adaptive manner to sustain their existence. Environmental influence is felt from specific external sources as well as internal. Such external influence was considered as multidimensional in nature. The conceptual model used to determine perceptions of influence from external sources had five dimensions: strength, frequency, basis, direction, and favorableness; and three thrust levels: national, state, and local.

This multidimensional conceptual scheme provided clarification and greater understanding of the nature and characteristics of influence from the three levels and various sources of influence. The interrelationship of the dimensions used in this study tended to support much of the theory and literature on power and influence.

This multidimensional approach also provided the groundwork for interpreting the perceptions of the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons as to the influence of the external environment.

Essentially, the data revealed that the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons perceived the local level as being most influential in their decision-making processes.

There was general consensus on the following organizations or groups within the three levels as being most influential:

National Level--Accreditation associations

State Level --The state legislature

Local Level --Community college advisory committees

Finally, the community college was perceived by a consensus of the respondents as a change agent during a period of rapid change.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Mildred; my son, Kiley; and my daughter, Kelly, all of whom represent the essence of my life, and my love.

To my mother, Mrs. Bertha B. Dobbs, who has provided, with Christian love and family devotion, unremitting faith and motivation to my being and ambition; my foster father, Mr. Collins Dobbs, who has dedicated his ideals and his life to his family; and to my father, John Wesley Dobbs, Jr., whom I never knew, but I'd like to think that he would feel rather proud at this moment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is much to be said about many individuals who assisted the writer in collecting the information, compiling and analyzing the data, and the process of writing and rewriting this dissertation.

Initially, the writer extends gratitude and thanks to Dr. James Nelson, chairman of my doctoral guidance committee, whose sagacious counsel and acute perceptions provided immeasurable understanding and invaluable assistance during the crucial developmental stages of this study.

The writer would also like to recognize and commend the members of the guidance committee: Dr. Richard Gonzalez, who so graciously filled in for Dr. Winston Oberg; Dr. Dale Alam, a constant source of reassurance; and especially Dr. Lloyd Cofer, who is always available to provide wisdom, professional expertise, and friendly advice.

Dr. Calvin Moore, a man for all seasons, whose scholarly advice, statistical assistance, commitment, and invaluable dependability were crucial to the completion of this study.

A special note of appreciation to: Ms. Evelyn Haynes, who was instrumental in typing the original proposal; Dr. Robert Royal and Ms. Fran McMullen, for their early assistance in editing; Ms. Claudette Nelson, for her typing and editing assistance in the final stages; and Mrs. Sue Cooley, for her sacrifice and assistance during a period of

need. And many thanks to those too numerous to mention, for their contributions.

Finally, to my best friend, Dr. Charles W. Townsel, for his continuing inspiration and faith, and for his friendship, in the Emerson tradition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background Information	1
Brief Historical Notes	2
1963 Constitution Provides State Control	2
Statement of the Problem	5
Need for the Study	7
Definitions of Terms	10
Limitations of the Study	12
Overview	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Studies on College Decision Making	16
The Helsabeck Model	17
Systems Theory	22
Theories of Power and Influence	25
Organizational and Administrative Literature	27
Summary	32
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	34
Introduction	34
The General Procedure of the Study	35
Description of the Sample Employed	36
Instrumentation Employed and Methods Used to	
Collect Data	37
Survey Questionnaire	37
Validation of the Questionnaire Instrument	39
Personal Interviews	39
The Six Selected Community Colleges	40
The Role and Function of the Community College	
President	42
The Role and Function of the Community College	
Board of Trustees Chairperson	43
Summary	44

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	45
Questionnaire Responses	48
Table Series 1-6--Most Influential Levels	49
Summary	57
Table Series 7-11--National Sources of Influence	57
The Most Influential National External Sources	62
Table Series 12-16--State Sources of Influence	64
The Most Influential State External Sources	68
Table Series 17-21--Local Sources of Influence	71
The Most Influential Local External Sources	75
Summary	77
Table Series 22-26--Narrative Responses to Questionnaire	78
Results of the Personal Interviews	84
Perceptions of External Influences as Related by Two Rural Community College Presidents and Two Board Chairpersons	85
National Sources of Influence	86
State Sources of Influence	86
Local Sources of Influence	87
Some General Perceptions of the Purpose and Function of the Community College at the Rural Level	87
Perceptions on External Influences as Related by Two Suburban Community College Presidents and Two Board Chairpersons	88
National Sources of Influence	89
State Sources of Influence	90
Local Sources of Influence	92
Some General Perceptions of the Purpose and Function of the Community College at the Suburban Level	93
Perceptions on External Influences as Related by Two Urban Community College Presidents and Two Board Chairpersons	94
National Sources of Influence	95
State Sources of Influence	96
Local Sources of Influence	98
Some General Perceptions of the Purpose and Function of the Community College at the Urban Level	100
Summary	101
V. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	103
Summary of Major Findings	104
Findings Related to the Seven Questions Posed Under "Need for the Study"	105

Chapter	Page
Implications of the Study	110
Recommendations for Further Research	111
Conclusion	113
Some Personal Observations	114
APPENDICES	118
A. APPENDIX TABLES	119
B. LETTER TO COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS	129
C. LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRPERSONS RELATIVE TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND PERSONAL INTERVIEW; PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE	131
D. RESEARCH DESIGN QUESTIONNAIRE ON EXTERNAL INFLUENCES .	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. <u>How Much Influence</u> Has Each of the Following Levels-- National, State, Local--Had on Your College's Goals, Methods, and Programs During the Past Year?	49
2. <u>How Frequently</u> Have the Following Levels--National, State, Local--Exerted Influence on Your College During the Past Year?	50
3. In Thinking Over Your Responses, What Has Been the <u>Nature of Influence</u> on Your College From Each of the Following Levels--National, State, Local-- During the Past Year?	51
4. What Have Been the <u>Mechanisms Used</u> by Your College to Handle Influence From Each of the Following Levels--National, State, Local--During the Past Year?	53
5. For Each of the Following Levels--National, State, Local--What Do You Think Has Been Its <u>Predominant</u> <u>Direction of Influence</u> Upon Your College's Goals, Methods and Programs During the Past Year?	55
6. How Would You Characterize the <u>Predominant Basis or</u> <u>Form of External Influence</u> From Each of the Following Levels--National, State, Local--During the Past Year?	56
7. <u>How Much Influence</u> Has Each of the Following National Sources Had on Your College's Goals, Methods and Programs During the Past Year?	58
8. How Frequently Has Each of the Following National Sources Exerted Influence on Your College During the Past Year?	59
9. In Thinking Over Your Responses, What Has Been the <u>Nature of Influence</u> on Your College From Each of the Following National Sources During the Past Year?	60
10. For Each of the Following National Sources What Do You Think Has Been Its <u>Predominant Direction of</u> <u>Influence</u> ?	61

Table	Page
11. How Would You Characterize the Predominant Basis or Form of External Influence From Each of the Following National Sources During the Past Year? . . .	62
12. <u>How Much Influence Has Each of the Following State Sources Had on Your College's Goals, Methods and Programs During the Past Year?</u>	64
13. How Frequently Has Each of the Following State Sources Exerted Influence on Your College During the Past Year?	65
14. In Thinking Over Your Responses, What Has Been the Nature of Influence on Your College From Each of the Following State Sources During the Past Year?	66
15. For Each of the Following State Sources What Do You Think Has Been Its Predominant Direction of Influence?	67
16. How Would You Characterize the Predominant Basis or Form of External Influence From Each of the Following State Sources During the Past Year?	68
17. <u>How Much Influence Has Each of the Following Local Sources Had on Your College's Goals, Methods and Programs During the Past Year?</u>	71
18. How Frequently Has Each of the Following Local Sources Exerted Influence on Your College During the Past Year?	72
19. In Thinking Over Your Response, What Has Been the Nature of Influence on Your College From Each of the Following Local Sources During the Past Year? . . .	73
20. For Each of the Following Local Sources What Do You Think Has Been Its Predominant Direction of Influence?	74
21. How Would You Characterize the Predominant Basis or Form of External Influence From Each of the Following Local Sources During the Past Year?	75
22. What Specific Issues in Your College Have Brought the Most Influence From Sources at the National, State, and Local Levels?	79

Table	Page
23. Do You Perceive Your Community College as a Change Agent, Beneficial to the Study Body and the Community Which the College Serves?	80
24. List the Major Areas of Change Resulting From Your Role as President or Board Chairperson That Have Had Some Measurable Impact Upon the Community and/or the Student Population	81
25. Identify the Positive Factors in Your Relationship With External Sources of Influence	82
26. Identify the Negative Factors in Your Relationship With External Source Representatives	83
27. In What Ways, If At All, Would You Do Things Differently in the Future in Responding to External Sources of Influence?	84
28. How Much Influence Has Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources Had on Your College's Goals, Methods, and Programs During the Past Year? . .	120
29. How Frequently Has Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources Exerted Influence on Your College During the Past Year?	121
30. In Thinking Over Your Responses, What Has Been the Nature of Influence on Your College From Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources During the Past Year?	122
31. What Mechanisms Have Been Used by Your College to Handle Influence From Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources During the Past Year?	123
32. For Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources, What Do You Think Has Been Its Predominant Influence Upon Your College's Goals, Methods, and Programs During the Past Year?	124
33. How Would You Characterize the Predominant Basis or Form of External Influence From Each of the Following National, State, and Local Sources During the Past Year?	125
34. In General, How Do You Feel Your College Views Its External Environment?	126

Table		Page
35.	In General, What Part Have External Sources Played in Influencing Your College's Goals, Methods, and Activities?	127
36.	In General, How Much Influence Do You Feel Your College Has Felt During the Past Year From External Sources of Influence at the National, State, and Local Levels?	127
37.	Personal Data for Presidents and Board Chairpersons . . .	128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

A majority of the general public views going to school today--whether elementary, secondary or college--primarily as an interaction between student and teacher in the classroom. This is a simple view of a complex situation. Education in contemporary society is much more than this singular interaction; it is a major and pervasive social institution, subject to the relentless pressures of other forms of power and influence in society. For example, the direction and destiny of modern public education has been significantly guided, shaped, and influenced by the political sector of society.

A study is needed of one particular aspect of the community college movement in Michigan and of the reactions of these institutions to informal external influences on their policy-making roles, accruing from political, business, and governmental sectors.

In this study, an attempt is also made to determine external influences upon decision making to the extent that such influences have resulted in major policy change that has either benefited or failed to benefit the student body and/or the immediate community.

Brief Historical Notes

Grand Rapids Junior College was Michigan's first extant publicly supported two-year college, established in 1914 as part of the Grand Rapids school district. Eight other "junior" colleges were established before 1940, but it was not until after World War II that the tremendous growth period in establishing community colleges occurred in Michigan, as it did throughout the country. Since that time, twenty-one other colleges of this type have been founded in Michigan. The earliest legislation specifically pertaining to Michigan community colleges was passed in 1955. This act also provided that local K-12 school systems could set up community colleges in their districts upon approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

1963 Constitution Provides State Control

Probably the most significant milestone in the development of higher education in Michigan was the adoption of a new state constitution in 1963. This act entrusted to a newly constituted State Board of Education leadership and general supervision over all public education, including adult education. This Board was expected to serve as a general planning and coordination body for all public education, including higher education, and was instructed to advise the legislature on the financial requirements of such education. The only exceptions to this budgeting requirement were the baccalaureate-degree-granting institutions.

The Constitution also provided means for the legislature to establish and provide financial support for public community and junior

colleges. It directed the legislature to provide for a State Board of Public Community Colleges, which was to advise the State Board of Education concerning supervision and planning of community colleges. Almost as an addendum, the State Board of Education was granted authority to define full-time enrollment and full-time equated or fiscal enrollment for purposes of state reimbursement.

The local boards of trustees of community college districts (some community colleges are formed according to intermediate [secondary] school district lines) had the power to acquire property for the college buildings, to erect buildings and facilities, to budget funds for purposes of hiring administrators, and to pass on other decisions that, in their judgment, were necessary for the proper functioning of the community colleges (Morsch, 1971).

The placement of the overall planning and coordination function by the 1963 Constitution in the State Board of Education has led to a marked increase in the quality and detail of planning for the state's institutions of higher education. The Board of Education is responsible, for example, for providing institution-by-institution projects of enrollment, thus forcing all into a coordinated planning framework (Morsch, 1971).

There is widespread interest in the community college because it is one of the few social organizations, since the establishment of public schools, that attempts to respond directly to the needs of the citizen and community. The initial phases of any noble idea are often suffused with outward sincerity and high purpose. But the reality of social organizations is that they must function in and respond to an environment of varying and often conflicting pressures and influences.

A major impetus for the study was provided by the work of Ensign (1972), who developed a conceptual scheme for understanding how

administrators in twenty-five New York community colleges perceived and responded to influence from sources in their external environment.

Viewing community colleges as open systems, Ensign followed the suggestions of Katz and Kahn (1966) in deciding that the study

. . . should begin by determining the nature and characteristics of the environment in which community colleges exist. This was accomplished by determining how community college administrators perceive potential sources of external influence. The dimensions of influence from sources in the college's external environment set limits on the variance of behavior a college may exercise. The second stage of the study moved from the environmental level to that of the system level and to the subsystems of institutional response. Various dimensions of institutional response in different environments were explored to determine how they related to variations in perceived environmental settings (pp. 259-60).

Although Ensign's study provided the conceptual scheme for this study, there are some basic differences between the two research efforts.

1. Ensign used twenty-five community colleges for one study, and eight of those for his second phase. This study concentrated on only six institutions.

2. The Ensign study did not distinguish among institutions. This study selected two community colleges, each in three geographical and socio-economic levels--rural, urban, and suburban.

3. Ensign interviewed all top-level administrators from deans up, and various state and federal officials. This study was limited to eliciting the perceptions only of the college presidents and board chairpersons.

4. The Ensign study was divided into two separate and distinct parts:

- a. administrators' perceptions of influence from external sources (twenty-five colleges) and
- b. institutional response pattern to influence from external sources (eight colleges).

This study combined the two, assuming that the perceptions of the presidents and board chairpersons would be reflective of the institution.

5. Finally, determining the community college as a change agent was not an objective of the Ensign study. This study was particularly interested in gathering data on the perceptions of the community college leadership regarding whether the college represents a channel for change.

The area of organizational development and change, although itself an emerging movement, denotes the significance of external influence in bringing about change in an organization. Greiner (1967), in reviewing successful and unsuccessful change attempts, noted that certain environmental factors are important for initiating a successful change program in an organization. Other exponents of change, including Bennis, Blake and Morton, and Schein, also have stressed the response and adaptive actions taken by an institution in dealing with its environment. These concepts are valuable in arriving at operational terms for describing the response patterns of community colleges to external influence.

Statement of the Problem

In the view of some observers, people tend to serve American institutions instead of these institutions serving people. If people

are important, then it would seem that the purpose of establishing, developing, and perpetuating institutions would be for the functioning institution to serve people! If the two-year college is truly a community-oriented institution, it must continually interact with its environment in responding to community attitudes and needs (Blocker, Plummer and Richardson, 1965).

The problem is to adapt a theoretical model using a conceptual framework of decision making in an open systems environment, to determine community college leadership perceptions of influence from external sources. The focus of the analysis, then, was the individual perceptions of six community college presidents and chairpersons about the impact of external influences upon their decision-making responsibilities. The emphasis of this study was exploratory; the study is descriptive in nature.

The model will serve as a means of providing information about decision making in the community college and gaining more insights into the nature and motivation of decision making by community college presidents and board chairpersons.

Second, the model will show to what extent, if any, the desires and concerns of the students and local community influence had an impact upon decisions of the community college board chairperson and president.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to separate education from politics in the highly competitive and materialistically oriented activities of contemporary American society. "Historically, education and politics have been mixed, [the two being] realities of American life" (Iannacone, 1967, p. 6). But is it possible to set the politics

of education aside so that primary consideration can be accorded the goals of education and the needs of the community? The conclusions resulting from this study should provide information about and greater insight into decision making for community college policy makers.

Third, the model will be of interest to that segment of the educational community that must come to grips with the fundamental question of whether the community college, as it functions today, can or should fulfill the role of change agent within the community. If this assumption holds true, then the purpose and actions of the community college must transcend self-interest groups and political biases to focus on providing its student population and community citizenry with bold, insightful leadership that endeavors to prepare individuals for living and succeeding in a technological world under humanistic guidelines.

Need for the Study

In their textbook on governing American schools, Campbell et al. (1965) stated: "Educational policy making at all governmental levels is immersed in politics and by definition educational policy making is political action" (p. 404).

The documented studies expounding the direct and tremendous influence of elected governmental officials on educational institutions in general are widely acknowledged. Although this form of control and influence must be duly noted in any study of an American educational institution, it is also necessary to include a variety of considerations beyond these very obvious and constitutionally responsible

sources of power and control. For example, the question to be considered is the degree to which the will of the legislature prevails on decisions made by individual community college administrators compared to the will and desires of external and informal sources of influence, such as community action groups, business and commercial interests, educational organizations (AAJCC, MEA, MFT, AASA), the governor's office, the State Board of Education, U.S. Office of Education, student groups, and citizens.

If the community college is to be responsive to the community, there is a tremendous need to recognize and understand the influences from sources in its external environment and a need to understand how the college responds to such influences. A study is needed to:

(1) determine the nature and characteristics of external influences perceived to be exerted on the community colleges in Michigan from national, state, and local sources; (2) understand in what ways the community colleges respond to such influences; and (3) determine the relationship between the perception of and response to external sources of influence and resulting changes in college policy.

The growth and expansion of the community college are probably the most phenomenal and exciting experiences in education today. The community college movement is taking place throughout the country, but with a more pronounced impact here in Michigan.

However, as is the case when any new and dramatic program unfolds in these fast-changing times, uncharted problems and unsure approaches appear. The whole question of governance for whom and for what demands sensible and sound answers. A basis should be provided

for new and improved administrative and organizational techniques that will result in the community college existing for and responding to the needs of the community.

According to Richardson, Blocker, and Bender (1972),

In order to understand the internal dynamics of an organization, it is necessary to understand the external forces to which the organization must respond. The total societal environment can be viewed as being comprised of four systems: (1) ecological, (2) biological, (3) individual, and (4) social. The explicit content of each system and the sum of their various interactions make up the total environment, which creates demands for political action through a process of information feedback; such demands are converted into specific outputs, such as legislative enactments or decisions by administrative agencies. The political process is the avenue for the conversion of needs into governmental responses or solutions to problems.

As one continues to contemplate the sources of influence and power, and the extent to which these external sources persuade educational leaders to act or not to act, a series of questions comes to mind. Some such questions might be:

1. What influential outside groups or persons at the national, state, and local levels influence the decisions of the Michigan community college presidents and boards of trustees?
2. What primary considerations are entertained by community college presidents and trustee chairpersons as they consider courses of action?
3. What are the major current educational policy problems perceived by twelve educational leaders in six Michigan community colleges?
4. Are the traditional procedures effective for bringing about major policy changes within the community college?

5. Is the community college a change agent?
6. Do the Michigan community college presidents and trustee chairpersons interviewed for this study perceive the role of their institutions to be that of a change agent?
7. To what extent have external influences deterred or enhanced the thrust for change in community colleges?

In the analysis of this study, some interesting answers for these questions are provided, based upon the literature reviewed and the perceptions of the presidents and board chairpersons interviewed.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study.

Change agent--An organization or institution which, by initiating and implementing innovations, attempts to gain relative advantages to the degree that formulated change results in improvement.

Community college--A two-year, post-secondary institution; a functioning segment of the community designed to provide education for the young student, continuing education for older citizens, and general improvement of the community through beneficial and appropriate educational and cultural services.

Coordination--The orderly arrangement of group effort to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose.

Decision-making process--The means by which the forces of change and stability interact, as formulated by individuals within the organizational structure.

Formal organization--Those organizations that have been consciously planned to coordinate the efforts of people to accomplish some objectives.

Influence--The potentiality for inducing others to act or change in a given direction through persuasion.

Influence structure--The interpersonal influence relationships that develop through the formal structure or through the dimensions of communications, reliance, and attributed influence of the informal structure.

Informal organization--Organizations that are not formally planned but spontaneously evolve from the needs and interactions of people working in an organization.

Leadership--The potential social influence over or in a group.

Open system--A patterned sequence of events; repeated cycles of input; transformation; output creating a demand for action through a process of information feedback, designed to achieve an organized objective.

Organization--A design to bring together a variety of persons, integrating their specialized efforts, and soliciting their cooperative efforts to accomplish a defined objective.

Power--The ability of an individual or group to carry out his or its will despite resistance.

System--Many different interdependent parts forming a whole, each distinct part functionally dependent upon every other part. Intimate components of a social system are the individuals within the system.

Limitations of the Study

By its very nature, any attempt to deal with external influences upon decision making at the community college level could easily meander and expand to include all aspects of the community college movement. To avoid this, the present study was limited to analyzing the perceptions of twelve community college leaders--the presidents and board chairpersons--in six selected community colleges. To insure a broad perspective of the environmental setting of the institutions, two colleges representing each of the following categories were selected--rural, suburban and urban.

Many viewpoints on the impact of varied influences upon decision making in community colleges could have been recorded, from the governor down to the lay citizen. But the intent of this study was to view the external power relationship only from two perspectives: those of the college president and the board chairperson.

The study was also limited in scope in that only community colleges were examined, not universities and other post-secondary institutions, and analysis was restricted to the six Michigan community colleges described above.

Overview

The study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter contained an introduction to the issue and background information, with particular emphasis on the 1963 Michigan Constitution revision, which entrusted constitutional authority for community colleges to the State Board of Education. The Statement of the Problem section

described the need and purpose for a model on external influences. With the increase in community college attendance and popularity, generating intense interest in this institution, the need for the study was examined and a series of questions raised. Finally, certain key terms were defined and study limitations highlighted.

Chapter II takes a critical and inquiring look at the literature and research resulting from or initiated by college administrative decision making. Particular attention is centered on the Helsabeck model, which describes the effectiveness of decision making using various approaches. The open system approach of Katz and Kahn is discussed, along with some theories on power and influence based on the concepts of Max Weber. The community college as it operates within its external environment is reviewed. A concluding reference is made to the role of the State Board of Education and its responsibilities for coordinating post-secondary education in Michigan.

Described in Chapter III are: (1) the general procedures of the study, (2) the sample employed, and (3) the instrumentation used and methods employed to collect data.

In Chapter IV the data collected are analyzed and interpreted. Responses to the survey questionnaire are grouped in the three categories of local, national, and state influences. Responses are tabulated separately for college presidents and board chairpersons, each represented by a table with accompanying comments. In addition, the results of the personal interviews are considered and interpreted.

The study is summarized in Chapter V in terms of the major findings, including responses to the questions posed in the Need for

the Study section. Implications are drawn, along with some personal perceptions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Organizational theorists have recently become increasingly concerned with the impact of the external environment on complex organizations. For decades, the prime focus has been on the internal operation of bureaucracies, but in the last few years more attention is being paid to the social context within which an organization functions. Nowhere is this more pronounced than among sociologists who study academic organizations, for in colleges and universities throughout the nation it is increasingly obvious that many of the life and death decisions for the organization are being made outside in the halls of Congress, in the meetings of the new left radicals or right-wing extremists, in the Pentagon, and in the Governor's office. Anyone who has watched academic decision-making in the last decade can see that powerful external forces are impinging on the university from all sides, tearing at the fabric of the academic community, and threatening to destroy much of the autonomy that academic institutions have so painfully built up over the years (Baldrige, 1971, p. 507).

In substance, Baldrige's statement summarized the purpose of this study and its many possible ramifications. Although he was referring specifically to the "autonomous" university, the community college is also subjected to many of the same forces. More than any other educational institution, except K-12 public schools, the present-day community college in Michigan is a creature born of state constitutional power. In this sense, it is more a captive creature than is the traditional university. Being an offspring of the state, the community college, as previously discussed, is constitutionally indebted to the State Board of Education and its community college advisory committee. This is not necessarily a bad arrangement; in fact, such planning and

coordination at the state level has proven and is proving to be quite beneficial for the ongoing educational programs within the various schools. But this fact is still another dimension that the community college administrators and trustees must deal with, and it is a very powerful and unavoidable one. The dilemma for many community college people is that the eight state board members are often guided in their decisions not by program priority but by political persuasion. So, in addition to being confronted with this formidable constitutional obstacle--one with which the universities in Michigan do not have to deal--the community colleges must contend not with only these political forces, but with a variety of other external exigencies, including county politics and millage elections.

Studies on College Decision Making

Riess (1970) provided an insight into the degree of California junior college faculty participation in decision making. Each faculty member and administrator in the survey responded to a questionnaire containing twenty-three decision-making items by numerically indicating relative differences between current and recommended levels of participation. Returns were received from about 70 percent of the personnel contacted at eighty-one colleges throughout the state. A comparison of responses from the two groups suggested the following conclusions: (1) both groups supported greater faculty participation in community college decision making on all items, although the faculty saw greater differences between existing and requisite levels; (2) the faculty senate was seen by a majority in both groups as the vehicle for

the most significant increases; and (3) both groups felt the principles of participative management should characterize the decision-making process.

Locklin and Stewart (1970) attempted to look at differences between the views of students and those of "faculty-administration." Their study also sought to determine whether each group misunderstood the amount of control desired by the other group. To investigate the problem, questionnaires containing questions about thirty-eight campus issues were distributed to a sample of students, faculty, and administrators at four different types of institutions in the West. Respondents were asked to indicate how decisions should be made regarding either policy formulation or rules and regulations in each of the areas. In addition, students and faculty-administrators reported their perceptions about the degree of control desired by each other. Responses indicated that the students wanted more control over decision making than faculty-administration found desirable. Misunderstandings of the desires of the other group complicated the situation and led to intensification of problems. On many issues, especially those related to individual student behavior, dominant norms in student desires did not exist. Faculty-administration responses varied on most items.

The Helsabeck Model

Robert Helsabeck (1972) established a model and key concepts for "effective decision-making" at the college level. The basic question, according to Helsabeck, was the relationship between decision-making arrangements and organizational effectiveness. It was in this

formal and informal pattern of decision-making capabilities among members of a political system.

Decision structure variance.--To conceptualize the variations in decision-making structures, it is necessary to make a distinction among types of decisions. The most basic distinction in the literature is between strategic (goal-setting and other long-term) decisions, and tactical (operational, everyday) decisions. However, it is necessary to make even finer distinctions among certain types of decisions. For example, based on the recent AAUP study (1971), recent writings in political economics (Zald, 1970), and researcher intuition, the following types of decisions were distinguished:

Type 1. Overall Resource Allocation Decisions

These decisions pertain to the high-level distribution of institutional resources among the various units. This distribution probably reflects the actual ordering of institutional priorities better than any other measure. These high-level decisions include long-range budgeting, short-range budgeting, the ordering of building priorities, and personnel allocation among units.

Type 2. Authority Allocation Decisions

These decisions are the constitutional decisions of an organization and bear on the question: Who decides who decides? They include formal allocation of authority as in a constitution and the informal allocations as they occur between the Board and the President.

Type 3. Personnel Selection Decisions

These decisions involve the process of selecting persons to conduct the affairs of the institution. Decisions of this type should be distinguished from the decisions regarding selection of the raw material to be processed, the student.

Type 4. Lower-Level Resource Allocation Decisions

These are resource allocation decisions dealing with the distribution of resources within a unit or functional area, rather than overall allocation among units as in Type 1 decisions. They include the assignment of faculty members to college committees, to their classes and to departmental chairmanships, the assignment

larger theoretical context that the governance structure allowing student participation was viewed.

Helsabeck approached these theoretical and practical questions by (1) distinguishing several key concepts, (2) reviewing the literature in political science and sociology that bears on institutional decision making and effectiveness, and (3) posing an optimum model based on the literature.

A major failing in the construction of analytic models for decision making in colleges and universities has been the lack of carefully developed concepts. Key concepts in the Helsabeck model defining dimensions of decision making and organizational effectiveness follow.

Decision-making structure.--Many studies of decision-making structure have concentrated primarily on the centralization of decision making (amount of participation of members in group decisions) as the only dimension of the decision-making structure. The concept of decision-making structure to be used in this study requires a broader definition of centralization, as well as the inclusion of other organizational factors (Helsabeck, 1972, p. 5).

Centralization is here separated into the number and the autonomy of decision-making groups, as well as the amount of participation in any one group. In addition, decision structure variance and a system of concurrent regimes are included as equally important concepts for a total understanding of the decision-making structure.

Decision-making structure, inclusive of the various dimensions, is equivalent to the written and unwritten constitution, i.e., the

formal and informal pattern of decision-making capabilities among members of a political system.

Decision structure variance.--To conceptualize the variations in decision-making structures, it is necessary to make a distinction among types of decisions. The most basic distinction in the literature is between strategic (goal-setting and other long-term) decisions, and tactical (operational, everyday) decisions. However, it is necessary to make even finer distinctions among certain types of decisions. For example, based on the recent AAUP study (1971), recent writings in political economics (Zald, 1970), and researcher intuition, the following types of decisions were distinguished:

Type 1. Overall Resource Allocation Decisions

These decisions pertain to the high-level distribution of institutional resources among the various units. This distribution probably reflects the actual ordering of institutional priorities better than any other measure. These high-level decisions include long-range budgeting, short-range budgeting, the ordering of building priorities, and personnel allocation among units.

Type 2. Authority Allocation Decisions

These decisions are the constitutional decisions of an organization and bear on the question: Who decides who decides? They include formal allocation of authority as in a constitution and the informal allocations as they occur between the Board and the President.

Type 3. Personnel Selection Decisions

These decisions involve the process of selecting persons to conduct the affairs of the institution. Decisions of this type should be distinguished from the decisions regarding selection of the raw material to be processed, the student.

Type 4. Lower-Level Resource Allocation Decisions

These are resource allocation decisions dealing with the distribution of resources within a unit or functional area, rather than overall allocation among units as in Type 1 decisions. They include the assignment of faculty members to college committees, to their classes and to departmental chairmanships, the assignment

of students to committees, and the allocation of funds within units; e.g., department, administrative areas, student groups.

Type 5. Institution-Level Production Decisions

These decisions bear on the production of the institutional product; i.e., the graduates. They include the selection of the raw material (the students), the manner of processing the material (the curriculum), the standards for acceptance of the finished product (degree requirements), and the limits of acceptability of the product (grounds for academic dismissal).

Type 6. Unit-Level Production Decisions

These are production decisions relevant to specific activities, such as conducting classes, operating an administrative office, conducting research, and planning student activities (Helsabeck, 1972, p. 5).

Given these distinctions among the types of decisions, one can then imagine an organization that has little variation among ways in which the different types of decisions are made. For example, in one organization the president may make virtually all decisions of all types. In another, everyone acting together may make all types of decisions, as in a "town meeting" form of decision making or in a commune. Both the autocratic and pure democratic examples vary little across types of decisions, and can be thought of as simple systems.

In contrast, organizations may have a mixture of decision-making structures for different types of decisions. The president and board of trustees may make some types of decisions, the faculty other types, and the students still other types. This system has more variation in decision-making structures across decision types, and is labeled a compound system.

Dimensions of effective decision making.--The effective organization is one that can successfully gain resources, arrive at collective goals, and convert the resources into goal attainment without

disregarding the interests of individual members. Four types or dimensions of effectiveness are resource acquisition, goal formation, goal attainment, and membership satisfaction. Each of these is described below.

Yutchman (1967, p. 898) defined organizational effectiveness in terms of the organization's capability, in either absolute or relative terms, to acquire scarce and valued resources from the environment; i.e., an effective organization is one that is a good bargainer in dealing with external sources. It is clear that for any organization to accomplish its goals, it must have resources. Among, colleges, for example, one can expect differences in their capabilities to acquire the scarce and important resources of money, good students, and good faculty. This type of effectiveness is referred to as "effective resource acquisition."

When an organization can translate control of the college through power into building consensus through the use of information, such an organization has the capacity to effect action in its own behalf. This type of effectiveness in decision making refers to the capacity both to set and to attain goals--"effective goal formation" and "effective goal attainment."

The absence of systematic bias against the values of any group is a fourth type of effectiveness, labeled "membership satisfaction" (Helsabeck, 1972, p. 6).

As it is practiced today, the decision-making process is highly centralized from the top down. Richardson et al. (1972) disagreed with this approach, contending that effective decision making is a

process that includes true involvement, whereby the participants agree to be bound by the results. They stated:

The crucial nature of the decision-making process becomes immediately apparent as we analyze the nature of authority. Our problem is to make certain that the values of the individual are consistent with the purposes of the organization. We must consider that in the decision-making process no one individual or group exercises absolute authority (p. 89).

Systems Theory

According to Richardson et al. (1972),

The total societal environment can be viewed as being comprised of four systems: (1) ecological; (2) biological; (3) individual; and (4) social. The explicit content of each system and the sum of their various interactions make up the total environment, which creates demands for political action through a process of information feedback. . . . The political process is the avenue for the conversion of needs into governmental responses or solutions to problems (p. 6).

Viewed as a system, the community college becomes "a set of interdependent parts existing to accomplish one or more goals, which takes in certain inputs and transforms those inputs into outputs" (Callahan and Labe, 1973).

Although community colleges as open systems are exposed to many sources of influence in their interaction with the external environment, not all such inputs are absorbed. The general term for the selective mechanisms by which external influence is rejected or accepted is called coding. Through the coding process the world is simplified into a few meaningful and simplified categories. The nature of the functions performed by the system determines its coding mechanisms, which in turn perpetuate this type of functioning (Emery and Trist, 1960, pp. 22-23).

The writings of Buckley (1967) supported this concept. He suggested that the behavior of complex, open systems is not a simple and direct function of impinging external forces, but rather, as open systems become more complex, more independent, or autonomous, more determinative behavior develops within them. Older and/or larger community colleges could perhaps be characterized in this way. Such systems, he stated, come to perform the operations of (1) temporarily adjusting the system to external contingencies, (2) directing the system toward more congenial environments, and (3) permanently reorganizing aspects of the system itself to deal more effectively with the environment.

The ability of a community college to have self-determination within its environment was also suggested by Weick (1969). He conceptualized the external environment as being totally derived from what man chooses to perceive. His phrase "enacted environment" caught the distinction he made; i.e., man "creates" the environment to which the system then adapts. The human actor does not "react" to an environment, he "enacts" it.

In this study, the theoretical basis for examining external influence on community colleges relies upon an open systems approach to organizations, as outlined by Katz and Kahn in The Social Psychology of Organizations (1966). Open systems are viewed as those that accept and respond to inputs (e.g., resources, support, etc.) and closed systems as those that are assumed to be self-sufficient and can function within themselves (Berrien, 1968, p. 15). Traditional organizational theories have tended to view human organizations as

closed. This approach has led to an over-concentration on principles of internal organizational functions, with consequent failure to develop and understand the processes of coping, adapting, and feedback, which are essential to survival (Katz and Kahn, 1966, p. 29).

The open systems approach as discussed by Berrien, Buckley, Easton, and Katz and Kahn suggests that it is the system's recognition and handling of influence from external sources that allows the system to continue to exist within its environment. It was concluded that the notion of an open system as one that is related to and makes exchanges with its environments is more relevant to the study than that of a closed system, although components, subunits, or processes of a specific system may be "closed."

Emery and Trist in "Socio-Technical Systems" (1960) viewed influence as a normal condition of an institution's existence within its environment. Community colleges, in interacting with their external environment, make exchanges that are based on their administrators' perceptions of influence from external sources.

These authors and others have developed models of systems theories that can be developed into a framework of explaining and predicting how community colleges perceive and respond to sources of influence in their external environments. The insight these theories provided about the relationships of open systems with their environments paved the way for understanding concepts of power and influence as particular subsets of interrelationships.

Theories of Power and Influence

According to Polsby (1962), "power is conceived . . . as one dimension of social life along which people may be stratified; hence, power is of central interest to those engaged in mapping social structure and social change" (p. 11).

Until recently, attempts to study and explain the action of the social, economic, and political environment on subsystems of the environment by analyzing relationships of power and influence have been concerned solely with outcomes and have not been holistic in approach. Max Weber (1947) first opened the way for new developments in the study of theoretical treatment of power. Although he viewed power primarily in institutional terms, his focus on the structural sources and distribution of power into typologies allows one to distinguish between the basis and instruments of power. Weber's special emphasis on legitimate power or authority has greatly increased understanding of formal organizational relationships. As such, these concepts are helpful in understanding the relationship between community colleges and external sources that have superior-legal power over them. However, Weber's works do not fully explain all the relationships encountered in the operation of a community college. His theoretical model and typology of power do not deal with nonformal kinds of influence and power, adaptive abilities of institutions, or the process of institutional response to external sources of influence.

Later theorists, building upon the Weberian paradigm, expanded their framework to include a fuller range of power relationships that might be useful in analyzing a community college. Among those who

contributed broader typologies of power are Simon (1957), Kelman (1958), Franch and Raven (1959), Etzioni (1961), Cartwright (1965), Katz and Kahn (1966), and Gamson (1968). Although the terms of these various typologies differ, they substantially overlap so that a single conceptual scheme can be developed for describing the dimensions of perceived influence from external sources.

Another blend of theories of power and influence is found in the literature and studies on community power. These studies represent an attempt by sociologists and political scientists to chart the complex interaction by which various groups in the community influence governmental policy. Such studies have provided methodological and conceptual assistance in designing this research. Dahl's study of New Haven, Connecticut (1961), presented one of the most comprehensive efforts to develop an empirically based theory of pluralistic influence as it operates within a community. He proposed that there are usually, although not always, multiple centers of power, none of which is completely sovereign. In addition, these centers of power do not overlap or coalesce consistently from issue-area to issue-area; i.e., the environment is pluralistic. The power and influence of leaders are significantly limited by other leaders and by those whom they lead (Dahl, 1961). These theories are in agreement with the conceptualization of open systems and their environmental relationships. They will be drawn upon later in this study, particularly as community college local environmental relationships are mapped out and analyzed.

Kimbrough (in Richardson et al., 1972) described two studies of rural counties that exhibited a monopolistic structure. He found

that whether the pattern of power is competitive or monopolistic may not ultimately prove to be a major consideration in establishing a theory of power. The one thread that appears to run through power analysis is that predominant power exists in variations of informal structures. This esoteric, informal nature of power may, in the final analysis, be the common base for a concept of social power that accounts for all of the big decisions and projects at the local school district level (Kimbrough, p. 39).

The theoretical writings and empirical studies that have dealt with the influence relationship among individuals and groups offer understanding for interpreting the problem at the micro-level of analysis. Research in social psychology and group dynamics has assisted in understanding the interaction occurring in human relationships.

Organizational and Administrative Literature

A general understanding of how community colleges operate within their external environment is provided by those writers and researchers who have taken an open systems approach in considering organizations. Seiler's (1967) scheme for analyzing organizations with regard to the environmental penetration of systems has a useful application for community colleges. His view was that the degree of openness of a system is critical to its survival and stability of growth. Seiler stated:

If an organization is so open to the events occurring around it that it responds to every shifting wind, it cannot develop any internal stability and momentum. Conversely, if a system

is not responsive to external events, the results of its internal stability eventually become marketless (pp. 24-25).

Several studies that have dealt with the point Seiler made about institutional-environmental relationships have been used to devise dimensions for measuring the response patterns of community colleges. Emery and Trist, in "Social-Technical Systems" (1960) and "Causal Texture of Organizational Environments" (1965), suggested that the cumulative effect of coping with the environment, mainly by internal elaboration and differentiation, is generally to make the system independent of an increasing range of the predictable functions in its inputs and outputs. At the same time, however, this condition renders the system less able to cope with newly emergent and unpredicted changes that challenge its primary ends. Furthermore, the environmental context in which organizations exist is itself changing at an increasing rate and toward increasing complexity (Emery and Trist, 1965).

Aguilar (1967), in Scanning the Business Environment, presented an empirical view of these theoretical concepts. He found that the businesses studied had potentially boundless amounts of influence and, typically, such organizations would seek information by scanning the environment. Several articles on interorganizational relations also suggest structural and adaptive mechanisms (for example, Litwak and Hylton, 1962). These writings provide a framework for describing the interaction of community colleges with their external environments.

Most of the literature of higher education related to the study is composed primarily of case studies and descriptive writings of the

administrative process and institutional interaction with specific external sources. Many books, articles, and dissertations deal with a single relationship between the environment and institutions of higher education. They encompass such subjects as trustees, accreditation, federal funding, sponsored research, and state coordination, and are generally limited to exploring and describing a single relationship, especially with respect to the institution's historical development. A limited number of writings are somewhat more integrative in approach, but deal essentially with the administrative aspects involved rather than the dimensions of influence. Two excellent books that clarify the relationship between the two-year college as an institution and the society it was created to serve are Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson's The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (1965) and Clark's The Open Door College: A Case Study (1960).

In their popular discourse on the two-year college, Blocker, Plummer and Richardson probably best conceptualized the thrust of the present study when they observed that:

The environment of the two-year college includes, in the broadest sense, a wide range of individuals, groups and agencies--all impinging, in varying ways, on the college's organization and operation.

The parents of college students influence programs by their close association and willingness to provide financial support. On a higher level, the state government may require all two-year colleges to be branches of the state university. Federal legislation can put special emphasis on one part of the curriculum, or may insure an abundance of instructors in one area while creating shortages in others.

The interactions of these groups with the college and among themselves make up the environment in which the college functions as an organic social institution.

Misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the functions and needs of the institution by one or more such groups can create

dislocations in college programs and policies that complicate the whole course of institutional development. On the other hand, widespread support and understanding by these groups can stimulate rapid and healthy growth of the college and its services to the community.

As mentioned earlier, the works by Baldrige, using a political model and sociological analysis in looking at an institution of higher education, were also of considerable help in understanding the relationships to be studied. These were Power and Conflict in the University and "Environmental Pressure, Professional Autonomy, and Coping Strategies in Academic Organizations." The case studies provided a variety of insights, as did his generalizations about internal power and influence and his analysis of external environmental pressures.

Some of the studies dealing with the internal decision-making structure of colleges and universities have questioned respondents about the involvement of specific sources of potential external influence in specific decision areas. A major limiting factor of some of these studies is their tendency to view the institution as a closed system with a finite power potential. Thus, the conclusion of many of these studies that the external environment has little influence is not surprising.

Several recent research efforts have provided valuable information about specific external sources of influence and community colleges in New York. Two surveys on collective bargaining in New York State community colleges--William McHugh's New York Community College Collective Negotiation Contract Survey and George Angell's "Collective Negotiations in Upstate New York"--provided descriptive

information on this aspect of external involvement. The formal relationships of process and structure between community colleges and the state were described in several other sources: M. M. Chambers, Higher Education in the Fifty States; William Morsch, State Community College Systems; Usdan, Minor and Hurwitz, Education and State Politics; and Ensign's comprehensive study of twenty-five community colleges in New York State and their external environments.

In its document entitled "The Coordination of Post-Secondary Education Services," the Michigan State Board of Education adopted five basic responsibilities:

1. To engage in comprehensive and continuous planning and coordination at the post-secondary level, involving both long-range and short-range goals.
2. To develop a state-wide system for collecting appropriate information from both public and private institutions, as well as government agencies.
3. To approve or disapprove all proposals for the establishment of new public institutions, and to approve or disapprove the establishment of new programs or the discontinuance of existing programs at public institutions.
4. To review and make recommendations concerning operating and capital budgets of public institutions.
5. To administer or coordinate state and federal programs resulting in grants to post-secondary institutions or students attending those institutions.

In effect, the document described a means for "planning and coordination of post-secondary education in Michigan in the form of the State Board of Education, which has adopted a State Plan, and has clearly defined its basic responsibilities." But, in essence, the State Board of Education's "planning and coordination" responsibilities relative to community colleges represent the most graphic and potentially the most powerful manifestation of external influence and control.

Summary

In this chapter, the research and literature on the external pressures surrounding an open systems organizational structure were reviewed and discussed. Politics, it was determined, is a very real and even necessary part of the college scene. Various organizational decision-making models, designed to achieve the objectives of the institution, were reviewed. For the most part, it was determined that the traditional hierarchical decision-making process is still mostly operational today but a more broadly participative one is gaining ground.

The impetus for a more democratically run institution seems to be the "open systems" approach to organizations, whereby the system accepts and responds to information feedback from various sources. This makes for a more open and adaptable organization.

But power and influence are still major and persuasive factors in any decision-making process. Power was examined from the standpoints of Weber's legitimate authority, Dahls' community power, and Kimbrough's monopolistic power, with the informal nature of power being of major significance.

Higher education case studies and books on external influences were also discussed. The writings of Blocker, Plummer and Richardson most effectively examined the relationship of the community college specifically to its external environment. In addition, valuable works of Baldrige on power and conflict, and of Chambers, Morsch, and Ensign, upon whose work this study was based, were reviewed.

Finally, the role of the Michigan State Board of Education was defined in terms of its constitutional responsibility for the coordination of post-secondary education in Michigan.

In Chapter III, the research design is explained, along with the general procedures of the study. In addition, the role and function of the community college president and board chairperson are described.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Man, being the quixotic and facile animal he is, has always been--and still is--a most difficult and unpredictable subject of research and experimentation. The problem is compounded when one attempts to probe his personal feelings and perceptions in an effort to establish some validity for a particular occurrence or dramatize in some scientifically significant fashion certain trends and directions. The dilemma faced in this instance was made more difficult because of the small sample and complexity of the questionnaire inquiries.

In structuring the questionnaire, the purpose was to pose questions and situational statements that would elicit from the respondent his perceptions or judgmental reactions of how his college had been influenced by selected sources at the local, state, and national levels.

As the community college movement gains greater momentum each year, evolving quite distinctly from its junior college designation and inclusion in local school district structures, a similarity of administrative and governance requirements weaves a common thread throughout all of the institutions. In many respects, except for geographical location, a person could not tell one pragmatically conceived and modernly built community college from another. But,

there are distinctions among community colleges in Michigan, as elsewhere, although such distinctions are often subtly designed and not easily identifiable. Among other things, "the college movement has historically shown an unusual willingness to change its character to respond to new types of students and new educational needs" (Belts, 1973).

The present study was designed to explore the influence of perceived external sources upon selected Michigan community colleges.

The General Procedure of the Study

The following steps were taken to implement this study:

1. Selecting a topic and developing crucial questions to be research and answered.
2. Adapting the questionnaire instrument--Research Design Questionnaire on External Influences--and establishing construct validity.
3. Selecting a representative cross-section of Michigan community colleges.
4. Contacting the president and board chairperson of each community college selected and obtaining their commitment to participate in the study.
5. Collecting questionnaire and personal interview data.
 - a. Questionnaires were mailed to each participant following a personal telephone call.
 - b. Participants were contacted and visited in a personal interview.

- c. The questionnaire items were used as a basis for interview discussions and data collection.
6. Questionnaire results were recorded, analyzed and interpreted; these results and interview discussions were summarized.

Description of the Sample Employed

The present study was limited to six (Glen Oaks, West Shore, Oakland County, Schoolcraft, Grand Rapids, and Wayne County) of the twenty-nine community colleges in Michigan. These institutions were selected from the standpoint of geographical location, population density, and socio-economic levels. Two of the community colleges were chosen to represent each of the following categories: rural, suburban, and urban.

In contemplating the task of interpreting perceptions of Michigan's community college presidents and board chairpersons on various external influences impinging upon their decision-making roles, it was considered essential to provide for an examination of the differential effect of the college's geographical location and socio-economic setting upon these perceptions.

Michigan is a densely populated state; and it is economically variegated from heavy industry in urban areas, to extensive farming in rural areas, to primarily bedroom communities in the suburbs. The socio-economic levels range from poverty-welfare incomes in urban ghettos, to modest minimal incomes in rural agricultural communities, to above-average incomes in middle-class, affluent suburban areas.

Because of the vast differences in life styles, outlooks, and incomes, and the possible impact such factors might have on the community college modus operandi, two rural, two suburban, and two urban community colleges were selected to provide source data. The community college president and board chairperson were chosen as the institutional participants for this study because they are the pivotal individuals in the college structure and must possess the force of character and leadership skill to inspire and guide board members into effective and positive decision making for their college.

Instrumentation Employed and Methods Used to Collect Data

Survey Questionnaire

The literature revealed some conceptual models for determining the environmental influences acting upon community colleges and for understanding the patterns of responses to external influences. The instrument chosen for adaptation and use in the present study was based upon a conceptual model, Research Design Questionnaire on External Influence, designed by Ensign (1972) for his study of a similar nature in New York state. The instrument identified three sources of external influences--local, state, and national--and eight probable perceptions of influence. The Ensign instrument was selected because the referral groups and organizations with potential influence were similar in makeup to the various sources in Michigan. The Michigan groups that were included in this study, because of their assumed influential positions in the state, were the Michigan Education Association, the State Board of Public Community and Junior Colleges, and

the Michigan Association of School Administrators. No additional source group on the local and national levels were included other than those suggested by Ensign. In addition to adapting the Ensign instrument, ideas found in the research and literature on open systems, institutional-environmental relations, and power and influence were embodied in the development of the research model for this study on the perceived personal and institutional responses of six Michigan community college presidents and board chairpersons.

This adapted survey questionnaire (see Appendix), as discussed in Chapter II, was used to collect data from the college presidents and board chairpersons about their perceptions of the influence from sources in the external environment. Before collecting the data, of course, it was necessary to gain institutional cooperation and approval. First, the community college president and trustee chairperson of each college were contacted to obtain their permission and support. A personal letter was sent to each of them explaining the study, followed by a personal phone call and the mailed survey questionnaire, and culminating in a personal interview.

The questionnaire contained a total of thirty-six questions or situational statements to which the presidents and board chairpersons were asked to respond. All questionnaires (100 percent) were returned following the personal interview.

The responses of the presidents and chairpersons were recorded, collated, and analyzed in a series of tables. In addition, many direct quotations were transcribed from the personal interview

notes and analyzed in terms of the different levels of influence--national, state, and local--along with some general perceptions.

Validation of the Questionnaire Instrument

In establishing construct validity of the questionnaire instrument and determining those items that should be modified or eliminated, the instrument was tested with six scholars directly involved in the community college and higher education movement--two associate superintendents with the Michigan Department of Education, Dr. Robert Huxol and Dr. Ferris Crawford; two Michigan Department of Education community college consultants, Dr. Curtis Murton and Dr. David Bland; and two community college administrators, Dr. Calvin Moore of Oakland Community College and Dr. Roy Philips of Wayne County Community College. Each of these individuals made significant contributions in the form of written critiques on the instrument and made suggestions about the direction of the study which were incorporated in the research model of this study.

Personal Interviews

Although the hard data for this study, as presented in the series of tables, emanate from an analysis of the survey questionnaire, the personal interviews were most revealing and seemingly more "down to earth." As outlined in the Interview Guide (Appendix D), a series of structured questions was asked of each individual, with the interviewee given wide latitude to expand upon his responses. The interviewer used the previous response as a lead-in to the next question.

The Six Selected Community Colleges

Glen Oaks is a small, rural agricultural community college located in the southern part of the state--Centreville, Michigan, St. Joseph County. As of September 1974, enrollment at Glen Oaks was about 1,154. The entire county population is approximately 47,400. The community is rural, and median income is about \$9,643 per year.

West Shore Community College is located in the western part of the state near Lake Michigan and situated just outside of Scottville, Michigan, Mason County. The college district is comprised of the Mason Intermediate School District and the Manistee, Walkerville, and Weare-Crystal School Districts. In September 1974, enrollment at the community college was about 761. The total population of Mason County is about 22,600 and is primarily rural and agricultural. The median income is about \$7,685 annually.

Oakland Community College, with its four far-flung campuses, is located throughout Oakland County in southeastern Michigan, suburban Detroit: The Southeast Campus in Royal Oak and Oak Park, Auburn Hills Campus in Auburn Heights, Highland Lakes Campus in Union Lake, and Orchard Ridge Campus in Farmington comprise the Oakland Community system. As of September 1974, the combined enrollment of these four campuses was 16,264. Oakland County, one of the most affluent counties in the United States, with an assessed valuation of \$5.1 billion, has a population of about 907,870. Each campus is located in a comfortable, modern, suburban bedroom community, the median income of these communities being upward of \$14,000 per year.

Schoolcraft Community College is located in Livonia, the largest Detroit suburb, northwest Wayne County. The college district is composed of five public school districts: Clarenceville, Garden City, Livonia, Northville, and Plymouth. The college enrollment in September 1974 was 6,922. The county comprises 124 square miles with a population of about 250,000. The median annual income is about \$11,350.

Grand Rapids Junior College, the oldest junior college in Michigan, is located in the western part of the state, in the city of Grand Rapids, Kent County. Administratively, it is still operated by the Grand Rapids Board of Education and Superintendent, from whom the president of the college receives his authority. Located in downtown Grand Rapids, the college primarily serves the city. In September 1974, Grand Rapids Junior College had an enrollment of 5,916. The median income of Kent County is around \$10,692 yearly, and the population is approximately 411,044.

Wayne County Community College system is located in the largest urban center in Michigan--Detroit, Wayne County, in the southeastern part of the state. The college carries out its functions and activities in numerous public high schools, some churches, and various public buildings within the city of Detroit. The combined enrollment in September 1974 was 13,836. The population of Wayne County is about 2,669,604; and the median income of this heavily saturated automobile and industrial center is around \$11,351 annually.

The Role and Function of the Community College President

The president is the top administrative officer for the board of trustees and implements the policies they establish. He is responsible for establishing an institutional philosophy and for managing, coordinating, and leading the college in its efforts to attain the college's goals and objectives. As Richardson et al. (1972) stated, "A central responsibility of the president which relates to everything else he undertakes is the establishment of an institutional environment conducive to learning" (p. 127).

Other essential functions of the president include: keeping the board of trustees informed and up to date, raising money, balancing the budget, recruiting, and maintaining a high-quality staff. The president acts as a vital link between the community and the college. Harper (1974) stated: "The president must be committed to the 'people' college concept of a comprehensive institution--which includes the three areas of programming--the academic, the continuing education, and the vocational-occupational-career" (p. 22). Richardson et al. (1972) explained, "The effectiveness of the executive officer depends upon his ability to distribute dissatisfaction evenly to the end that all constituencies, both internal and external, retain confidence in his impartiality and judgment" (p. 134).

Of course, the individual assuming the position of the community college president brings to the role his own personality, shaped by his own experiences and philosophy and by the expectations of those around him. Blocker (1972) stated,

The interaction of personality characteristics with external variables and expectations determines the contour of the role the president will play in his organization. These variables may be economic, social, political, or personal. Thus, both internal and external factors impinge upon behavioral outputs and the well-being of the organization (p. 254).

A presidential responsibility that is becoming increasingly important as the significance of the community college grows is that of communicating and interpreting institutional purposes and programs to external constituencies. Blocker further stated,

The understanding of institutional roles and responsibilities by legislators (state and federal), the state and federal bureaucracies, local community leaders, and the general population is essential for institutional well being and support (p. 255).

The Role and Function of the Community College Board of Trustees Chairperson

A continuing and ever-perplexing problem in college administration is the delineation of authority and responsibility between the office of the president and the board of trustees. What is the difference between policy making and administration?

In Michigan, as in most states, the community college board of trustees is the elected body that is legally responsible for the direction and guidance of the college. The trustees establish the goals and objectives of the college. To carry out objectives and achieve stated goals, the board of trustees hires a president and delegates this responsibility to him and the administrative staff. Since the board of trustees is a policy-making body, it is responsible for making sure the president manages and operates the institution within the framework of those policies (Harper, 1974, p. 22). Hence,

the major responsibility of the board of trustees is the selection of a president, who runs the college and is accountable to the board of trustees. The board of trustees, in turn, is accountable to the community. Its primary functions are to translate the needs of the community into policies that will meet those needs and to insure the integrity of the college in the face of external demands (Blocker et al., 1965, p. 181).

Summary

Chapter III included a discussion of the research design and procedures of the study. Instrumentation used in the study and methods used to collect the data were explained. The rationale for choosing the six community colleges for the study was given, as were descriptions of each of the selected colleges. The role and function of the community college president and the board of trustees were outlined.

Chapter IV contains an analysis and interpretation of the data gleaned from the questionnaire and interview responses.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The areas investigated in the present study pertain to selected aspects of external influence on community colleges from national, state, and local levels. In providing answers to the questionnaire, each respondent was requested to base responses on his experiences and perceptions of situations in his college during the past year.

For purposes of analyzing the data, responses were grouped and interpreted according to the nature of the question and the area of concern in Tables 1 through 16. The frequency of responses was recorded on a standard of $N=6$, with six community college presidents and six board chairpersons responding in two categories of six each. The responses were then tabulated in individual tables in percentages ranging from zero to 100 for six respondents: 0 percent = no response, 17 percent = one response, 33 percent = two responses, 50 percent = three responses, 67 percent = four responses, 87 percent = five responses, and 100 percent = six responses. Question number 12 combined three sets of responses of both presidents and board chairpersons with $N=12$.

The series of questions at all three levels of external influence--national, state, and local--attempted to elicit the perceptions of the respondents primarily from eight perspectives:

1. How much external influence is exerted by each level upon the community college in general.
2. How much external influence is exerted by the various sources identified, specifically upon the goals, methods and programing of the college.
3. What is the predominant direction in which external influence is exerted.
4. What is the frequency with which external influence is exerted.
5. What is the predominant form taken by that external influence.
6. What is the nature of external influence exerted.
7. What are the various mechanisms used by the college to handle external influences.
8. In what way does the college attempt to handle external influence.

Following are the analyses of Table Series 1-6 and 7-21, representing the major findings regarding the perceptions of six community college presidents and board chairpersons in Michigan on external influences. A key to abbreviations used in the tables follows.

National Sources of Influence:

USOE = United States Office of Education

AACJC = American Association of Community Junior Colleges

Accr. Assoc. = American College Accrediting Association

UNION = AFL-CIO, MEA

Acad. Assoc. = Academic associations

FOUND = Philanthropic foundations

State Sources of Influence:

GOV = Governor or Executive Office

LEG = State Legislature

MBE = Michigan Board of Education

SBPC&JC = State Board for Public Community & Junior Colleges

MDE = Michigan Education Department

MCCA = Michigan Community College Association

MASA = Michigan Association of School Administrators

MEA = Michigan Education Association

SP Int = Special interest groups

PP = Political parties (individuals or groups)

CC = Community colleges

UNIV = Four-year colleges and universities

Local Sources of Influence:

ADV-COMM = Advisory committees

VOTERS = Community voters

PARENTS = Community parents

STUDENTS = Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)

SEC-SCHS = Public and private secondary schools

UNIV = Local four-year colleges and universities

BUS-CORP = Business and corporate groups

UNIONS = Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)

PP = Political parties (individuals or groups)

SP Int = Ethnic and special interest groups

CIV-ORG = Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)

ALUMNI = Alumni

MEDIA = News media

Questionnaire Responses

The Research Design Questionnaire on External Influences contained a series of thirty-six questions about evenly divided among the three influence levels--national, state, and local. In analyzing the results and categorizing the various responses emanating from the original set of tables (Appendix A, Tables 28-33), three additional significant sets of tables were developed:

1. Table Series 1-6--This set of tables determined the level exerting the greatest external influence--national, state, local--in each of six categories as perceived individually by the six community college presidents and board chairpersons.
2. Table Series 7-21--This second set of tables determined, in rank order, the organizations or groups (source) within each level exerting the greatest external influence as perceived individually by the six community college presidents and board chairpersons.
3. Table Series 22-27--This third series of tables, part of the original set, is based upon interview data and summarizes the perceptions of the presidents and chairpersons on specific issues at each level commanding the most attention, the community college as a change agent, the positive and negative factors relating to external sources of influence, and ways they would do things differently in the future.

In Table Series 1-6 responses are tabulated for each of the choices ("No Influence," "Moderate Influence," etc.) for each level (national, state, local) separately for the presidents and board chairpersons. The responses were tabulated and this total divided by the number of responses to determine the percentages.

In Table Series 7-21, to determine the degree of influence exerted by the various groups and organizations (source) within each level as perceived by the presidents and board chairpersons, each choice was given a numerical value from one to four: 1--No Influence; 2--Moderate Influence; 3--Considerable Influence; 4--Major Influence. This number value was multiplied by the number of responses which, when added together, equal the total as indicated separately under president or board chairperson. To gain immediate impact as to the convergent or divergent perceptions of the presidents and board chairpersons, and the relative influence of the group or organization, the tabulated outcomes are rank-ordered from the most to the least influential external group or organization at the national, state, and local levels.

Table Series 1-6--
Most Influential Levels

Determination of the most influential level--national, state, local--impacting upon decision making of the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons.

Table 1.--How much influence has each of the following levels--national, state, local--had on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

Presidents

	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	10	28	8	11	10	13
Moderate influence	17	47	44	59	39	50
Considerable influence	6	17	12	16	17	22
Major influence	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	36	100	74	100	78	100

Board Chairpersons

	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	11	31	12	17	12	15
Moderate influence	17	47	40	56	43	55
Considerable influence	8	22	16	22	20	26
Major influence	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

Comment: Of the three levels of external influence researched--national, state, and local--both the community college presidents and board chairpersons perceived the local level as wielding the greatest overall impact on the college during the past year. The combined totals of "considerable" and "major" influence for presidents at the local level

equal 37 percent compared to 30 percent at the state level; similarly, for board chairpersons "considerable" and "major" equal 30 percent for local compared to 28 percent for the state level. This is an interesting finding in light of or in spite of the growing trend toward increased state dominance of the community college. The national level appeared to exert modest influence throughout.

Table 2.--During the past year, external levels have, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently have the following levels--national, state, local--exerted influence on your college during the past year?

<u>Presidents</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	11	29	12	17	13	17
Occasionally	20	53	31	43	37	49
Almost constantly	4	11	17	23	16	22
Continuously	3	7	12	17	9	12
Total	38	100	72	100	75	100

<u>Board Chairpersons</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	7	19	11	15	11	14
Occasionally	20	56	39	54	50	64
Almost constantly	6	17	15	21	14	18
Continuously	3	8	7	10	3	4
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

Comment: The state level is perceived to be most influential when determining how often the college has to respond or react to influence.

This finding is expected, given the statutory and regulatory authority of the state in relation to community colleges. This relationship becomes readily apparent when you consider budgetary requirements and the related contacts necessary between the community college, the state legislative bureau, and the governor's office.

Table 3.--In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following levels--national, state, local--during the past year?

Presidents

	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	9	25	10	14	14	16
Strongly favorable	0	0	12	17	14	16
Favorable	23	64	40	55	48	56
Unfavorable	4	11	9	13	9	11
Strongly unfavorable	0	0	1	1	1	1
Total	36	100	72	100	86	100

Board Chairpersons

	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	11	32	11	14	12	16
Strongly favorable	5	15	4	5	7	10
Favorable	18	53	51	68	52	71
Unfavorable	0	0	6	8	2	3
Strongly unfavorable	0	0	4	5	0	0
Total	34	100	76	100	73	100

Comment: With few exceptions, it appears obvious that the nature of influence from all three levels is generally favorable. Board

chairpersons perceive more favorable influence at the state and local levels, less from the national level. The greatest degree of unfavorable influence perceived at all levels is registered by presidents. This is understandable, inasmuch as it is the president who is always on the "cutting edge" of funding cutbacks, accreditation decisions, and faculty negotiations.

Table 4.--An institution has various means available for dealing with external levels of influence. What have been the mechanisms used by your college to handle influence from each of the following levels--national, state, local--during the past year?

National Level

	<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No mechanisms	16	44	10	28
Informal contacts	9	25	16	44
Lobby groups	9	25	10	28
Media	0	0	0	0
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	36	100	36	100

State Level

	<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No mechanisms	10	14	11	15
Informal	22	31	35	49
Public relations	7	10	9	13
Advisory	3	4	4	5
Other--formal	<u>30</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	72	100	72	100

Local Level

	<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No mechanisms	5	6	7	8
Open meeting	13	17	24	29
Advisory committee	2	3	0	0
Org. membership	3	4	4	5
Public relations	9	11	4	5
Formal contacts	22	28	10	12
Informal contacts	10	13	25	30
Information system	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	78	100	83	100

Comment: Overall it appears that both presidents and board chairpersons perceive utilizing informal contacts at all levels to handle external influences. However, analyzing each source closely, some significant differences are revealed between the two educational leaders. At the national level a surprising 44 percent of the presidents' responses indicated "No Mechanisms" employed. Board chairpersons registered 28 percent "No Mechanisms" at the national level. One possible explanation for this disparate perception is that presidents have minimum contact with national sources as compared with greater concentration on local and state sources. Board chairpersons may not be as cognizant of this minimum contact.

Both the presidents and chairpersons agree on state source mechanisms--"Informal Contacts" followed by formal procedures. The category "Other: Formal Contacts" was not included in the questionnaire, but most interviewees added "Formal." Although the public relations person is considered a formal contact, much of what he does is executed in an informal way. A difference appears at the local level, however, with the presidents preferring formal contacts followed by "Use of Information Systems" and "Open Meetings." Board chairpersons, consistent throughout, perceived "Informal Contacts" as the most prevalent mechanism followed by "Open Meetings."

Table 5.--The various levels of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources at different levels support the actions of the college, others protest actions of the college, demand that action be taken or not taken. For each of the following levels--national, state, local--what do you think has been its predominant direction of influence upon your college's goals, methods and programs during the past year?

<u>Presidents</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Supported college	20	56	36	50	54	69
Protested	1	3	4	6	6	8
Demanded action	5	13	13	18	9	12
Demanded inaction	1	3	3	4	1	1
Not sure	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

<u>Board Chairpersons</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Supported college	12	33	39	54	53	68
Protested	2	6	1	1	4	5
Demanded action	8	22	8	11	6	8
Demanded inaction	1	3	3	4	1	1
Not sure	<u>13</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

Comment: Support for the decisions of the college was perceived at all levels by both presidents and board chairpersons. Uncertainty as to whether groups support or fail to support the college at all levels was more pronounced among board chairpersons, possibly because they are not exposed daily to the various positions taken, as are the presidents. The "Action Demanded" at both the national and state levels

reflects regulatory and budgetary requirements of these two sources. Both the presidents and board chairpersons perceived the local level lending greatest support to the college.

Table 6.--Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following levels--national, state, local--during the past year?

<u>Presidents</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	11	31	12	17	16	21
Rational use of information	9	25	27	38	43	55
Formal/legal requirements	6	17	20	28	11	14
Reward for compliance	8	22	6	8	4	5
Threat for non-compliance	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

<u>Board Chairpersons</u>						
	<u>National</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Local</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
No influence	10	28	12	17	19	24
Rational use of information	10	28	30	42	45	58
Formal/legal requirements	7	19	19	26	5	6
Reward for compliance	5	14	4	6	7	9
Threat for non-compliance	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	36	100	72	100	78	100

Comment: The purpose of this item was to determine the predominant form of external pressures, prompting the college to react in a certain way. The predominant form through which influence was exerted at all levels as perceived by the presidents and chairpersons was the "Rational

Use of Information," persuasion and/or expertise. Essentially, the understanding between the community college, the three external levels, and the many organizations and groups within them appears to stem from cooperative working relationships. It is at the local level where the use of information and persuasion is most pronounced, as it is applied to the presidents and chairpersons.

Summary

In analyzing the preceding six tables to determine the most influential level--national, state, or local--as perceived by six community college presidents and board chairpersons, it appears that the local level is foremost in four of the tables and comparable to the state level in one (Mechanisms Utilized). Only in "Frequency of Influence" is the local source less influential and the state prominent. In all tables, national influence is perceived as being less than either local or state. Although state agencies possess constitutional and budgetary authority over Michigan community colleges, the positive and substantial consideration accorded local sources such as advisory councils, unions, universities, and voters reflects the growing importance of accommodating local concerns and requests. Ideally, this is the essence of the community college, meeting the needs of those closest to it--its constituent citizens.

Table Series 7-11-- National Sources of Influence

Determination of the most influential organization or group (source) within each of the three levels--national, state, and local. Responses are rank ordered separately for presidents and board chairpersons.

Table 7.--How much influence has each of the following national sources had on your college's goals, methods and programs during the past year?

1. No influence
2. Moderate influence
3. Considerable influence
4. Major influence

National Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Accreditation Association	20	Accreditation Association	18
U.S. Office of Education	12	U.S. Office of Education	14
American Association of Community Colleges	12	Unions	12
Unions	11	American Association of Community Colleges	11
Academic associations	11	Academic associations	10
Foundations	8	Foundations	8

Table 8.--During the past year various external sources, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following national sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

1. Not at all
2. Occasionally
3. Almost constantly
4. Continuously

<u>National Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Accreditation Association	16	Accreditation Association	19
Unions	15	Unions	15
U.S. Office of Education	12	U.S. Office of Education	12
American Association of Community Colleges	11	American Association of Community Colleges	11
Academic Associations	11	Academic Associations	11
Foundations	8	Foundations	9

Table 9.--In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following national sources during the past year?

1. No influence exerted
2. Strongly favorable
3. Favorable
4. Unfavorable
5. Strongly unfavorable

National Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Accreditation Association	19	Accreditation Association	16
U.S. Office of Education	19	U.S. Office of Education	15
Unions	16	American Association of Community Colleges	15
Academic Associations	16	Academic Associations	13
American Association of Community Colleges	14	Unions	8
Foundations	10	Foundations	8

Table 10.--The various sources of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources support the actions of the college, others protect action of the college, while others demand that action be taken, or not taken. For each of the following national sources what do you think has been its predominant direction of influence?

1. Has supported the actions of the college
2. Has protested the actions of the college
3. Has demanded actions be taken by the college
4. Has demanded actions not be taken by the college
5. Not sure

National Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Unions	17	Unions	17
Accreditation Association	16	Accreditation Association	16
U.S. Office of Education	14	American Association of Community Colleges	14
American Association of Community Colleges	12	U.S. Office of Education	13
Academic Associations	12	Academic Associations	13
Foundations	7	Foundations	7

Table 11.--Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following national sources during the past year?

1. No influence was exerted
2. Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
3. Use of formal or legal requirements
4. Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
5. Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

<u>National Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
U.S. Office of Education	21	Unions	22
Accreditation Association	21	Accreditation Association	19
American Association of Community Colleges	12	U.S. Office of Education	15
Unions	12	American Association of Community Colleges	14
Foundations	12	Academic Associations	12
Academic Associations	11	Foundations	9

The Most Influential National External Sources

The various national accrediting associations are perceived both by the presidents and board chairpersons as possessing the most pervasive overall influence as a national organization. With cursory examination one might question such a prominent position accorded the accreditation associations but upon closer examination, including knowledge of the community college functions and goals, a more thorough understanding emerges. Community colleges in Michigan are geared to two primary functions:

1. preparing students for transfer to four-year universities, and
2. providing students with opportunities to acquire functional skills and knowledge to proceed directly into employment.

In both instances, the universities and employing firms are essentially concerned with the quality and accreditation status of the preparatory courses of study. Acceptance or rejection of the student usually is predicated on whether or not the courses taken have been evaluated and the institution accredited (or not accredited) by recognized national accreditation associations in the various fields. The community college is particularly sensitive to this procedure due to its programming in technical courses (often federally funded) coupled with the curriculum innovation and expansion often taking place, and the constant search by the community college for qualified and knowledgeable instructional personnel.

Following a distant second to the accrediting groups is the U.S. Office of Education, the presidents' choice, and national unions for the board chairpersons. The two switch the above around for their third choices, presidents indicating unions and board chairpersons the U.S. Office of Education. Selection of the U.S. Office of Education by the presidents somewhat follows the pattern above for the accreditation associations given the regulatory and evaluative authority of the U.S. of Education for program funding. It is extremely significant, however, that board chairpersons recognize the powerful potential of national union organizations.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges seems to exert moderate influence as do the academic associations. It is interesting to note here that academic associations, once the focus of faculty organizing, appear to be giving way to the more teacher-centered faculty unions.

Finally, in all instances except one, national foundations, with their low profile and non-directive approach, are perceived as exerting the least influence upon the community college.

Table Series 12-16--
State Sources of Influence

Table 12.--How much influence has each of the following state sources had on your college's goals, methods and programs during the past year?

1. No influence
2. Moderate influence
3. Considerable influence
4. Major influence

<u>State Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Community College	22	Legislature	21
Universities	22	Governor's Office	16
Legislature	20	Universities	15
Special Interest Groups	16	Mich. State Board of Educ.	14
Michigan Community College Association	15	Michigan Community College Association	14
Governor's Office	14	Mich. Department of Education	13
Mich. Department of Education	14	Community Colleges	13
Michigan Education Association	14	State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	12
Michigan State Board of Education	13	Political Parties	12
State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	12	Michigan Education Association	10
Political Parties	10	Special Interest Groups	9
Michigan Association of School Administrators	8	Michigan Association of School Administrators	7

Table 13.--During the past year various external sources, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following state sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

1. Not at all
2. Occasionally
3. Almost constantly
4. Continuously

<u>State Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Legislature	21	Legislature	20
Michigan Community College Association	20	Governor's Office	16
Universities	19	Mich. Board of Education	15
Community Colleges	16	Universities	15
Government	16	Mich. Department of Education	14
Michigan Education Association	14	Michigan Community College Association	14
Mich. Department of Education	14	Community Colleges	14
Mich. Board of Education	13	Special Interest Groups	13
State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	13	Political Parties	12
Special Interest Groups	11	Michigan Education Association	11
Political Parties	11	State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	11
Michigan Association of School Administrators	6	Michigan Association of School Administrators	7

Table 14.--In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following state sources during the past year?

1. No influence exerted
2. Strongly favorable
3. Favorable
4. Unfavorable
5. Strongly unfavorable

State Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Mich. Department of Education	20	Mich. Board of Education	20
Governor's Office	19	Governor's Office	18
Michigan Education Association	19	Legislature	19
Legislature	18	Community Colleges	18
Mich. Board of Education	18	Universities	18
Universities	17	State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	18
State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	15	Mich. Department of Education	17
Special Interest Groups	15	Political Parties	17
Community Colleges	15	Michigan Community College Association	15
Michigan Community College Association	15	Special Interest Groups	15
Political Parties	14	Michigan Education Association	14
Michigan Association of School Administrators	8	Michigan Association of School Administrators	8

Table 15.--The various sources of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources support the actions of the college, others protect action of the college, while others demand that action be taken, or not taken. For each of the following state sources what do you think has been its predominant direction of influence?

1. Has supported the actions of the college
2. Has protested the actions of the college
3. Has demanded actions be taken by the college
4. Has demanded actions not be taken by the college
5. Not sure

State Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Governor's Office	20	Legislature	16
Mich. Department of Education	19	Governor's Office	15
Universities	19	Michigan Education Association	15
Legislature	18	Universities	14
Michigan Education Association	16	Mich. Board of Education	13
Michigan Community College Association	15	Mich. Department of Education	13
Community Colleges	12	Michigan Community College Association	13
Mich. Board of Education	11	State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	11
State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	11	Special Interest Groups	11
Special Interest Groups	10	Community Colleges	11
Political Parties	10	Political Partey	9
Michigan Association of School Administrators	6	Michigan Association of School Administrators	8

Table 16.--Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following state sources during the past year?

1. No influence was exerted
2. Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
3. Use of formal or legal requirements
4. Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
5. Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

<u>State Sources</u>			
<u>President</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Legislature	21	Legislature	22
Governor's Office	20	Governor's Office	21
Mich. Board of Education	19	Political Parties	19
Michigan Education Association	19	Mich. Board of Education	17
Mich. Department of Education	17	Mich. Department of Education	15
Universities	15	Michigan Education Association	15
State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	15	Universities	14
Michigan Community College Association	13	State Board, Community and Junior Colleges	13
Political Parties	13	Michigan Community College Association	12
Community Colleges	12	Special Interest Groups	12
Special Interest Groups	11	Community Colleges	12
Michigan Association of School Administrators	10	Michigan Association of School Administrators	8

The Most Influential State External Sources

Both the presidents and board chairpersons consider the state legislature to be the most influential source at the state level. Simply stated, the legislature is "where the money is." And although the governor recommends, the legislature statutorially has final

authority for providing state funds to match with local funds for Michigan's community colleges.

The next most influential source for presidents is universities, undoubtedly due to the considerable influence the four-year schools have over student transfer and admission matters. Board chairpersons perceive the governor's office and the Michigan State Board of Education as wielding greater influence than universities. But presidents perceive the Michigan Department of Education as more influential than the State Board of Education. These perceptions seem to follow a pattern throughout this study. That is, policy-making bodies tend to give greater deference to each other (i.e., State Board of Education and Community College Trustee Board; and administrative agencies likewise--State Superintendent A, Department of Education and College President A, Community College).

Next in order of influence for the presidents, but less so for the board chairpersons, is the expanding organizational efforts of the Michigan Education Association. The presidents, coming into direct contact with this organization at the negotiations table, are acutely aware of its expanding power in the state.

Quite important in perceived influence by both the presidents and board chairpersons are other community colleges in Michigan, the bond of common objectives exerting considerable influence on the actions of each individual college.

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges is a constitutional body but exerts far less influence than the State Board

of Education or the Michigan Department of Education (Superintendent of Public Instruction).

Moderate influence is exerted at the state level by the Michigan Community College Association, its primary function being to disseminate information and keep member colleges informed on legislation. Political parties and special interest groups were also identified as having moderate influence but the implications here seem to be that most presidents and board chairpersons declined to identify with either of these groups.

Finally, the Michigan Association of School Administrators, an educational organization dominated by K-12 small-town superintendents, appeared to be the least influential.

Table Series 17-21--
Local Sources of Influence

Table 17.--How much influence has each of the following local sources had on your college's goals, methods and programs during the past year?

1. No influence
2. Moderate influence
3. Considerable influence
4. Major influence

<u>Local Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Advisory Committees	21	Advisory Committees	21
Universities	18	Voters	15
Business Corporations	18	Students	15
Secondary Schools	16	Secondary Schools	14
Parents	14	Universities	14
Students	14	Business Corporations	14
Unions	14	Unions	14
Political Parties	14	Political Parties	13
Alumni	14	Media	13
Voters	13	Special Interest Groups	12
Media	13	Parents	11
Special Interest Groups	11	Civic Organizations	11
Civic Organizations	9	Alumni	7

Table 18.--During the past year various external sources, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following local sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

1. Not at all
2. Occasionally
3. Almost constantly
4. Continuously

Local Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Advisory Committees	22	Advisory Committees	17
Voters	17	Voters	15
Universities	17	Universities	15
Unions	14	Students	14
Media	14	Media	14
Secondary Schools	13	Secondary Schools	13
Political Parties	13	Unions	13
Students	12	Parents	12
Business Corporations	12	Business Corporations	12
Civic Organizations	11	Political Parties	12
Alumni	10	Civic Organizations	11
Special Interest Groups	9	Special Interest Groups	10
Parents	7	Alumni	10

Table 19.--In thinking over your response, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following local sources during the past year?

1. No influence exerted
2. Strongly favorable
3. Favorable
4. Unfavorable
5. Strongly unfavorable

<u>Local Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Unions	20	Civic Organizations	18
Business Corporations	18	Media	18
Voters	17	Voters	17
Parents	17	Business Corporations	17
Universities	17	Unions	17
Political Parties	16	Political Parties	17
Media	15	Students	16
Advisory Committees	14	Universities	16
Secondary Schools	14	Advisory Committees	15
Civic Organizations	14	Parents	15
Students	13	Secondary Schools	14
Special Interest Groups	12	Special Interest Groups	13
Alumni	11	Alumni	10

Table 20.--The various sources of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources support the actions of the college, others protest action of the college, while others demand that action be taken, or not taken. For each of the following local sources what do you think has been its predominant direction of influence?

1. Has supported the actions of the college
2. Has protested the actions of the college
3. Has demanded actions be taken by the college
4. Has demanded actions not be taken by the college
5. Not sure

Local Sources

<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Unions	17	Advisory Committees	16
Advisory Committees	16	Universities	15
Voters	15	Political Parties	15
Parents	15	Voters	14
Universities	15	Media	14
Media	15	Students	12
Political Parties	13	Business Corporations	12
Students	12	Unions	12
Secondary Schools	12	Special Interest Groups	12
Business Corporations	12	Parents	11
Alumni	12	Secondary Schools	11
Civic Organizations	11	Civic Organizations	11
Special Interest Groups	10	Alumni	6

Table 21.--Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following local sources during the past year?

1. No influence was exerted
2. Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
3. Use of formal or legal requirements
4. Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
5. Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

<u>Local Sources</u>			
<u>Presidents</u>		<u>Board Chairpersons</u>	
Unions	19	Unions	17
Students	15	Voters	16
Political Parties	15	Universities	16
Advisory Committee	14	Political Parties	15
Universities	14	Media	15
Parents	13	Business Corporations	14
Secondary Schools	13	Parents	13
Business Corporations	13	Advisory Committee	12
Voters	12	Secondary Schools	11
Civic Organizations	12	Civic Organizations	11
Media	11	Special Interest Groups	10
Special Interest Groups	10	Students	9
Alumni	10	Alumni	6

The Most Influential Local External Sources

Again the presidents and board chairpersons both agree as to the primacy of local community college advisory committees as exerting the greatest influence at the local level. The general assumption made relative to the importance of advisory committees is that a broader base of citizen participation is assured. As indicated by the presidents

and board chairpersons, advisory committees' input is earnestly sought as to the nature and direction of the college program and objectives. In a more realistic vein, the feeling was also expressed that broad citizen support is only needed when bonds are issued or during millage campaigns. This feeling, however, is quickly evaporating as advisory committees become stable and valuable sounding boards and review panels for community college policies and programs.

Although the presidents and board chairpersons form a consensus on their perceptions of many groups throughout this study, the areas where they differ follow a general pattern. Presidents have a tendency to acquiesce more toward the structured element--the bureaucracy, established agencies such as the universities and the corporate world. Board chairpersons, on the other hand, being representatives of the electorate, lean more toward the unstructured element--citizens, community representatives, and local organizations.

The second choice of influential local sources perceived by the presidents are teacher unions, a response to the increasing importance of negotiations and faculty unionization. Although the difference is slight, board chairpersons identified voters as next in influence, with universities for both presidents and board chairpersons holding a strong third position as an influential source.

Political parties held a middle position throughout, along with roughly equivalent moderate influence exerted by parents, students, secondary schools, and business corporations. Civic organizations were highlighted in one isolated instance but remained of modest influence throughout, as did special interest groups and the media.

It is an interesting observation to note the apparent decline of civic organizations such as the Rotary, Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce, etc., at one time of more considerable influence locally, and still are in certain rural communities. But membership today appears to be for social purposes only, their influence giving way to a more people-oriented approach.

Finally, the alumni element was perceived as an insignificant source of influence locally, probably because community college alumni, generally a "no nonsense," job-oriented group, fail to identify with the community college as alumni and certainly not comparable to the university "old time" tradition.

Summary

Considering the various organizations and groups exerting influence upon the community college within each of the three primary levels--national, state, and local--the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons interviewed were in general agreement as to which of these sources appeared to be the most influential.

At the national level, accreditation associations were considered the most prominent external influence by virtue of their program evaluation and approval authority.

The state legislature, holder of the purse strings, prevailed as most influential at the state level with the state universities, the governor's office, the Michigan Board of Education, Department of Education, and the Michigan Education Association close behind.

At the local level, by an impressive margin, community college advisory committees were deemed most influential. The pace and complexity of modern society is such that the many and myriad viewpoints of the community can no longer be adequately voiced by the representative college board of trustees; hence the need and increasing importance of broad-based advisory committees reacting to and impacting upon the community college leadership.

Table Series 22-26--
Narrative Responses to Questionnaire

The following tables are based upon interview data and summarize the perceptions of the presidents and board chairpersons on specific issues at each level commanding the most attention, the community college as a change agent, the positive and negative factors relating to external sources of influence, and ways they would do things differently in the future.

Table 22.--What specific issues in your college have brought the most influence from sources at the national, state, and local levels?

National Level	
<u>Presidents:</u>	
Program funding	3-50
Accreditation	2-33
Sex discrimination	1-17
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>	
Program funding	6-100
Accreditation	--
Sex discrimination	--

State Level	
<u>Presidents:</u>	
Millage campaign	3-50
Deficit financing	1-17
State aid appropriations	1-17
Community college curriculum and accreditation	1-17
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>	
State control of funding	4-83
New program approval	1-17
Community college redistricting	1-17

Local Level	
<u>Presidents:</u>	
Career education program	2-33
Orientation of board members	1-17
Communication with the community	1-17
Student-teacher relationship	1-17
Extern-outreach programs	1-17
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>	
Adequate funding	3-50
Capital outlay for construction	2-33
Teacher strikes	1-17

Comment: At the national level, the allocation of dollars is undoubtedly the most potent influence wielded by federal officials.

Although both the community college presidents and board chairpersons considered funding essential, presidents appeared more acutely aware of the recurring and arduous task of mounting a millage campaign among the citizenry.

At the local level, even though the presidents listed a wide range of major issues facing their schools, a majority of the chairpersons were concerned primarily with funding sources for programs and buildings.

Table 23.--Do you perceive your community college as a change agent, beneficial to the student body and the community which the college serves?

Presidents:

Definitely yes	1-17
Yes	3-50
Somewhat	2-33
No	--

Board Chairpersons:

Definitely yes	1-17
Yes	4-67
Somewhat	1-17
No	--

Comment: It is quite apparent that institutions of learning are now being recognized by their leaders as institutions of change.

Table 24.--List the major areas of change resulting from your role as president or board chairperson that have had some measurable impact upon the community and/or the student population.

Presidents:

Overwhelmingly, the area of change identified by five of the six presidents was: Expanded services provided citizens and students in the community by the community college. Some examples of these services listed by the presidents were: library services, citizen involvement in enrichment and cultural programs, adult education, day-care centers, flexible school programs, and out-reach programs.

In addition, some of the presidents felt the following factors generated beneficial change for students and the community: the open-door policy, increased and improved industry-school relations programs, system approach to management and budgeting, and cognitive-style learning methods.

Board Chairpersons:

The board chairpersons tended to agree somewhat with the perceptions held by the presidents. The slight difference was that the board chairpersons merely interpreted expanded services to mean increased educational opportunities in post-secondary training for many students who had heretofore been denied this privilege.

In addition, the board chairpersons cited career education and cultural enrichment as being significant change factors.

Table 25.--Identify the positive factors in your relationship with external sources of influence.

Presidents:

There was a range of answers depicting the positive impact of external influences, including:

Working closely with surrounding industries in training and on-the-job programs.

The generally healthy working relationship with federal, state, and local governmental agencies. (This factor is clearly evident in the analysis of the questionnaire results.)

Accrediting agencies and governmental monitoring programs have tended to keep the community college administration alert and responsive to needed program and service modifications and upgrading.

Relations with and continuing support of the press was listed as a positive outside factor.

The cooperation and assistance provided by the baccalaureate colleges in the state.

The assistance and support afforded, for the most part, by the governor and legislature.

Board Chairpersons:

The expressions of the board chairpersons were not as precise and definitive as those factors identified by the presidents. Most of their statements concerning positive factors were generalities and bland pronouncements, listing such factors as:

Community support for the community college, as reflected in donations, gifts, and re-election of incumbent board members.

Goals and objectives of the college shared with the community.

One chairperson mentioned the mutual understanding established with governmental agencies.

The chairpersons were identifying the positive and supportive feedback they received from the community for their programs, service activities, and overall goals.

Table 26.--Identify the negative factors in your relationship with external source representatives.

Presidents:

The presidents registered deep concern on two major issues generated by outside influence, which they felt negatively affected the community college:

The unpredictable and often negative expression of voters on needed millage support during election time.

The increasing unionization of faculty.

Board Chairpersons:

Again, no clear-cut or consistently agreed upon pattern emerged among chairpersons, as it did among the presidents.

Two of the chairpersons cited highly critical and biased media reporting of the college programs and proposals as a definite negative factor.

One individual was concerned about the fact that too much business and contact with external sources was conducted privately, hence was not open to public scrutiny and knowledge.

Another said the size and location of the college--rural, small town--tended to negate recognition and appreciation for its problems.

Table 27.--In what ways, if at all, would you do things differently in the future in responding to external sources of influence?

Presidents:

Again, the vein of agreement running through most of the presidents' perceptions regarding ways they could improve their administrations seemed to be:

Long-range planning and coordination.

Constantly improved communication with all facets of the community, especially including the black and minority elements.

Board Chairpersons:

As indicated in previous assessment of the results of these five narrative questions, no single pattern was endorsed by the chairpersons.

The following were identified as events to which the chairpersons would take a different approach:

Be more flexible to union demands.

Request increased millage support.

Institute an effective public relations program to communicate purposes and programs of the school to the community.

Results of the Personal Interviews

Along with the survey questionnaire, personal interviews with each of the six presidents and six board chairpersons were a primary source of information and ideas. Following is an analysis and interpretation of these interviews, which lasted from an hour to three and

one-half hours. The interviews are approached and reported not from the standpoint of identifiable personalities, but rather from positions and roles of a rural, suburban, or urban community college administrator and policy maker.

The purpose of the personal interview was to:

1. Clarify ideas and discuss points of view regarding external influences upon the community college.
2. Validate information in a personal, informal, face-to-face setting.
3. Attempt to better understand the personality and motivations of the respondents and hence their responses.
4. Enhance or expand upon technical and narrowly defined information secured by means of the questionnaire.

Perceptions of External Influences as Related
by Two Rural Community College Presidents
and Two Board Chairpersons

It is a widespread stereotype that rural or country people are suspicious of outsiders, and generally do not trust them. This carries more significance if the outsider is in their territory for any reason. Government or state officials are especially suspect.

Because of these factors, compounded by the researcher's position with the State Superintendent's office, the personal interviews with the rural college presidents and board chairpersons were not enthusiastically received. This was not true in all cases, but in those instances of caution and uncertainty, the interviews did not provide as much information as expected.

The presidents were extremely reticent, responding only to direct inquiries, and rarely volunteering information or personal perceptions. The board chairpersons were less reserved and, in fact, engaged in prolonged and critical discussions on issues they felt were important.

Following is a series of perceptions and ideas about the impact of local, state, and national influence exerted on the decision-making processes of rural community college presidents and board chairpersons.

National Sources of Influence

Except for program funding, grants, and contract guidelines, the influence of the federal government and other national sources was modest at the local level; it was too far away and involved.

State Sources of Influence

According to Zoglin (1974): ". . . Government from afar has certain intrinsic drawbacks that cannot be overcome by even the most intelligent and well meaning of public servants. Some aspects of any situation can only be understood by those who are on the scene."

The crux of extensive external influence as perceived by these respondents overwhelmingly was the statutory and regulatory position of the state, especially the governor, legislature, and the state board of education. One respondent said, "Department of education influence was mostly negative prior to John Porter becoming superintendent."

The constant search for stable and sufficient funds to operate the school program was by a wide margin the primary concern and consideration of both presidents and board chairpersons:

The various regulations and interpretations of the Bureau of the Budget have a drastic effect on community college budgets.

Ninety percent of the revenue comes from the state, about ten percent from local and other sources.

[Many individuals at the local level are] afraid of legislators, State Board of Education members and Department staff; but more than these three concerns, they fear the encroaching power of the teacher union organization movement.

There is a place for the community college [in our society] if the state legislature would define the function and goals of the community college.

Local Sources of Influence

The rural community college presidents and board chairpersons perceived local sources of influence in terms of citizen support and approval, expressed as follows:

1. Needed support in millage campaigns.
2. Local people tend to coalesce around critical or controversial issues.
3. Some community leaders of stature tend to give credence and moral support to community college programs and goals.

Some General Perceptions of the Purpose and Function of the Community College at the Rural Level

Community colleges should not concentrate entirely on academics and the college transfer student.

The community college must serve the purpose and meet the needs of people in the community. It needs more definite recognition of its basic functions.

Vocational-technical programs should be accorded prime consideration.

[Conversely], I questioned the amount of money being poured into vocational-technical projects.

[I am a] firm believer in education for children, not training. Emphasis should be on career exploration. Not much fun in studying math if you cannot see some application.

If the high school is failing, then the community college should work to remedy the deficiencies of these institutions.

Education is something for those with the desire and will.

Society is based on pragmatic intellectualism not idealism.

America thinks only in terms of bigness, hence big cities have more clout with legislators. The influence of the big community college and universities is tremendous.

Political and social influence plays a large part in the operation and direction of community colleges.

Trustees are supportive but not too involved in political infighting; they should become more active in this respect.

There is an often thinly defined line of demarcation between policy development and policy administration; hence many trustees tend to administer.

All board of trustee members, upon election and as a condition to serve, should be required to participate in preparatory and orientation sessions designed to inform and expand their scope of rules, issues and ideas.

Perceptions on External Influences as Related
by Two Suburban Community College Presidents
and Two Board Chairpersons

The suburban community college exemplifies the current community college movement--modern buildings and facilities and sculptured and pleasant surroundings, diversified curriculum utilizing the latest

gadgets and equipment, and a variety of community-oriented and culturally enriching activities. Kiester (1974) stated: "Community colleges have been denounced for trying to be all things to all men, and yet the Carnegie Commission has suggested their future lies in being more comprehensive, not less."

National Sources of Influence

Here again, throughout the course of the various conversations with these presidents and board chairpersons, rarely did they mention any pressures brought to bear by national sources of influence. Their primary focus, by necessity, was on state and local sources.

The suburban contingent pretty much agreed, but with some significant differences in perception of the federal government and other sources of national power as compared with the rural college presidents and board chairpersons. The suburban representatives were not as disdainful and suspicious of national institutions and organizations, and were more cognizant of possible favors and potentially favorable and unfavorable influences of such groups.

One suburban college president admitted that the potential power of national sources of influence was tremendous in many respects; for example, the "U.S. Office of Education would have a lot to say about the financial aid program," and "HEGIS would pass on all building planning." He also stated, "Private donations from some national foundations are important to us in many ways, especially in what little experimental research we do."

One president noted that national groups were recognized only in cases of "specific and unique influences and issues." He cited as

examples the recently enacted Title IX legislation, the wide influence of organizations like NOW (National Organization of Women), and federal guidelines such as those published by the U.S. Department of Labor and National Health Institutions.

In contrast, neither suburban board chairperson perceived sources of influence at the national level to be quite as significant as expressed by the two suburban presidents. This is understandable because college presidents are constantly and directly involved in seeking and securing needed funds. On numerous occasions this entails trips to Washington to confer and consult not only with the U.S. Office of Education, but the various educational and commercial organizations and lobbyist groups headquartered there. As one of the presidents succinctly stated: "I use as many dollars as I can get my hands on to provide educational opportunities for citizens in this county."

State Sources of Influence

Similar to the perceptions expressed by the rural presidents and board chairpersons, the suburban representatives also felt sources of state influence had considerable impact, especially the legislature, governor's Bureau of the Budget, State Board of Education, and the Michigan Education Association. More so than the rural interviewees, the suburban presidents were highly critical and even fearful of this power and means of control. The suburban board chairpersons expressed this view also, but to a lesser extent.

The legislator tells you what you can do but also what you cannot.

The most influential factor at the state level is the appropriations committee. The Bureau of the Budget only administers legislative mandates.

The president quoted above continued with an example of how problems developed:

Let's say a parent, not satisfied when her son or daughter is not admitted to a certain program, calls or writes her representative or senator. He in turn calls me or contacts a board member. From here on in the problem can become real sticky.

Another president stated that because the legislature has us "on 'controlled growth'--no flexibility is allowed in Student Credit Hours, which controls the budgetary dollars. . . . The legislature should pay for 'service credit education,' but they consistently refuse to do so."

The board chairpersons concurred with the presidents that the appropriations committee held a vital position because "anyone who allocates the money has tremendous power."

The legislature is the prime influence on a college and local legislators can be extremely helpful in getting the college what it wants.

Particularly significant were the viewpoints expressed in the suburban interviews relative to other state sources of influence:

Since the MEA [Michigan Education Association] has organized the faculty there is a vast difference in management of an institution --more complex, more involved, slows decision-making and siphons off power of the president.

[This change has had a] dramatic effect on how a president and staff spend their time. Labor relations has thrown in a great new configuration. A disappropriate amount of time is spent on faculty considerations as opposed to student concerns which is what college should be about.

The strike issue tended to polarize board members from faculty because it is an adversary situation--the issue of negotiations.

The State Board of Education has little influence on this college.

I am opposed to their coordination-planning role and approval of programs. They have their hands full with K-12 supervision.

The State Board is the inappropriate agency to coordinate post secondary.

[I was] not aware of the State Board of Education as a tremendous force but more aware of the community Junior College Board because of its purpose and its influence in redistricting.

The smaller colleges in the state dominate the Michigan Community College Association [MCCA]. Although we have more than one campus, outstate we have only one vote.

Primarily through its lobbyist services, the MCCA has tremendous influence although it is an independent organization.

At one time all budget hearings were coordinated through the MCCA, but one president indicated, "I demanded and received a personal hearing." Since that time all community colleges have received personal hearings.

Local Sources of Influence

The suburban presidents and board chairpersons perceived external influence by local sources as extremely important, especially advisory committee feedback and voter support for millage and expansion.

One chairperson stated that there was "little direct contact with the 'man on the street.' Mostly I relied upon organizational viewpoints, and media information." Another said: "Not very many people come to me personally with an 'axe to grind.' Some channels for the people to be heard are: letters to board members, phone calls and requests to appear on agendas."

One of the presidents indicated that he had "little contact with the executives of business because of the large businesses in the

community. I belong to the Chamber of Commerce and the Economic Club of Detroit for the contacts, politically and socially." Another commented, "The community college citizen advisory committee has developed into a major source of local influence."

Some General Perceptions of the Purpose
and Function of the Community College
at the Suburban Level

One suburban community college president stated:

Education is a process of searching for meaning, and this is done formally and informally.

We must plan now for tomorrow's society. We are here to help people search for meaning, and prepare them for new or even "more" jobs.

In this post-industrial and highly technological society, the two greatest areas of need and hence employment will be human services and communication.

One board chairperson indicated:

[There is] a lot of politics in community colleges. Politics seems to get in the way of much administrative effort.

One reason we are here is to satisfy the needs of people.

I don't see lack of money as the number one problem. There are too many other issues. This college operates with money being functional, the budget meeting the needs.

Another board chairperson emphasized these factors:

If you are fulfilling the "community college mission" you provide three essential services: (1) transfer curriculum, (2) vocational-technical curriculum, and (3) life-long education.

Although we must prepare students in liberal arts more emphasis should be expended on the vocational-technical field.

The community college provides a unique kind of service as a sort of "dry run" for those students seeking professional careers. It acts as a sieve, sifting potential professional careerists and leaders from ordinary workers and followers.

One of the suburban presidents conceptualized the present-day community college as either "crisis-oriented or issue-oriented, one centered around personalities and the other around current issues."

Perceptions on External Influences as Related
by Two Urban Community College Presidents
and Two Board Chairpersons

The state exerts the greatest amount of formal influence upon the community college at the urban level; it is also at this level, the cutting edge of the metropolitan, people-impacted city, that sensitivity to people achieves its most essential thrust.

For the most part, the urban community college today lacks the simplicity and unfettered tempo of the plainly constructed rural college; nor does it possess the dramatic flair and kaleidoscopic activity of the ultramodern suburban community college. Rather, in the swirling and unpredictable vortex of the urban scene, it maintains an unsure and often chaotic pace, confined to ancient buildings and shackled in a legacy of societal neglect.

But in a more definitive and assertive way than any other type of community college, the urban community college appears to be closer to people, closer to "where the action is" and hence to those needs, providing a service and fulfilling the purpose of what the

community college is all about--helping people to achieve and improve educationally and socially.

Zoglin (1974) stated,

The special essence of the public two-year college is found in the name by which it has come to be known: the Community College. This means just what it says: this college will reflect the values, the needs and the aspirations of the people it serves. It will be ultrasensitive to their wants and capable of changing as rapidly as they change.

National Sources of Influence

Of the three levels of external influence researched--local, state, and national--the urban sector also rated the impact of local and state influence as more significant than national. However, they were acutely conscious of the regulatory and potential funding power of the U.S. Office of Education and the regional leadership of the curriculum accrediting association.

One urban college president was very much concerned about the possible ramifications of Title IX legislation on sex discrimination: "It will change [our] whole approach in the treatment of women, especially in athletics. The basic dual organizational structure will soon change to one athletic program."

In reference to accrediting agencies, he commented:

The various accrediting agencies in this country, especially North Central Review teams, exert extensive pressure and are instrumental in shaping program content. In the past eighteen months no less than five national accrediting organizations conducted periodic reviews of various programs in our college for program content and compliance. Some examples were: The North Central American Dental Association reviewed our newly developed Dental Hygienic Association Program; the American Radiological Association took a close look at our Radiological Program; and the National Institute of Health conducted a program review on our curriculum development grant related to nursing programs. If we failed to meet acceptable standards then we are no longer

eligible for federal funds. And the periodic reviews conducted by the professional associations could severely affect student credentials if the programs fails to receive accreditation.

The other urban college president indicates his involvement with national groups was minimal except for financial aid and veterans' benefits: "I prefer personal contacts with congressmen and senators. If I have a problem or concern I usually give one of them a call and go over to talk things over with them."

This approach was suggested by the board chairperson of the same college. Otherwise, he commented, they had little contact with national organizations or institutions.

State Sources of Influence

The fact that the state--through the offices of the legislature, the governor, and the State Board of Education--is gaining greater control and authority over the community college today is accentuated in the metropolitan areas. Historically, the urban junior college has been a part of the K-12 school district structure, and hence has been included within that framework for funding and administrative purposes. Except for a few instances, all of that is changing and the urban community college is in a fiercely competitive battle for the constitutionally mandated state dollar.

As one urban college president declared, "We must competitively and effectively defend our budget before various legislative and executive agencies because roughly about 50 percent of our funds are received from the state appropriations committee."

Community college operating funds come primarily from three sources: local citizen millage assessed by the college, student

tuition, and state aid. Funds for capital outlay are an additional and separate appropriation.

Another urban college president stated that "although the appropriations committee determines the amount of funds granted, the executive bureau of the budget generates almost as much influence in its restrictive administering of legislative funds.

Both urban board chairpersons agreed with the above-stated perception.

Regarding the State Board of Education, the urban college president stated that

Although the State Board constitutionally oversees all education within the state, we have relatively little contact with them. I perceive them primarily as a body that deals with K-12 matters. I prefer to relate to a separate entity whose sole responsibility would be to deal with higher education. Otherwise the community college received second-class attention.

When it was mentioned that such a group existed in the Community College State Board of Education, he replied that they carried no "substantive" influence, and there was little liaison between this group and the schools.

One of the urban board chairpersons revealed that "influence or assistance from the State Board of Education on the Community Junior College Board is negligible. . . . We have been too busy trying to survive financially. Rumors of what the State Board is going to do come from MCCA meetings, such as the redistricting controversy, but nothing ever happens."

The other board chairperson voiced some serious concerns in that he felt there was

. . . substantial lack of in-depth thinking on community-junior college matters on the part of the State Board of Education and the Department. The State Board is unwilling to tackle difficult and controversial problems, for instance--school integration. The Community Junior College Board is not effective because it follows the dictates of the State Board of Education.

One urban board chairperson elected to the Executive Board of the Michigan Community College Association admitted that it provided useful services but was primarily "an informational group."

Local Sources of Influence

As implied above, this level of influence appeared to assume greater significance among urban community college presidents and board chairpersons than among those from the rural and suburban colleges. However, it is not that local groups and organizations hold so much power, but that the community college accords greater significance and credence to the needs of these elements of the community.

One urban college president indicated he considered his most important task was to "keep a finger on the needs pulse of the community." As an example, he continued:

We conduct seminars intended to upgrade industry personnel in ten industries in the area. Industry assumes 50 percent of the instructor's salary and in some instances, the cost of mobile classrooms. We have the urban school serving rural areas in our "outreach program" in fourteen rural and suburban communities.

Another urban president stated that

The Citizen's Advisory Committee meeting monthly is a cross-section of the community and is recognized by the Board of Trustees as an organ reflecting community feelings and viewpoints.

An urban board chairperson continued:

There are some key, unsung, but essential individuals out there [in the community] upon whom I rely a great deal. If something comes up and I want to get some feeling for it, I contact someone outside of the college for their opinions and viewpoints. I hold regular periodic meetings with the president. I am concerned only with changing the structure to accommodate people.

Another urban board chairperson admitted that "citizen concerns have a tremendous effect on [my] decision-making. Colleagues have little if any influence upon my decision-making."

A decidedly stronger factor at the local level, as indicated in the questionnaire tables, was the impact of organized labor on the faculty. In one instance an urban college president expressed that he could appreciate the AFL-DFT or MEA position because this was a union town, and having grown up in it, he himself had once been a part of that union movement. He explained that the union at his school had developed:

. . . a small clique, who runs the union. For purposes of a show of power, unions might prefer a strike, however brief, to immediate settlement. Also, understanding with the AFL-CIO is essential in terms of any cooperative technical-vocational programs. The strength of the union and the reality of faculty strikes is an overriding factor in many union-oriented urban centers. The master contract is the guiding force.

But where there are strong unions, there are large and powerful industries and corporations. One of the urban chairpersons expressed some disgruntlement because "corporations provide money to those established institutions whereby they can gain advantages. However, they do tend to support [the community college] in terms of legislation." He continued,

Why is it that [the community college] had to be born of strife and turmoil? Why a six-million dollar store monument [downtown] serving no purpose but an impoverished ego, rather than a movement serving and benefiting people?

Some General Perceptions of the Purpose
And Function of the Community College
at the Urban Level

Students tend to "prefer a change from the traditional lockstep process of learning to a more flexible schedule."

The K-12 schools in the state are ahead of the community college in many respects, especially in the area of classroom management, the writing of performance objectives. This has led to [our] community college now converting to developing performance objectives for all classes. Teachers have to change and readapt their styles when necessary.

One of the urban college presidents characterized his board of trustees as from "middle of the road to liberal. They are relatively naive about educational issues and politics." He continued:

As president I personally provide in-service training for board members through workshops and retreats but I certainly feel more intensive and systematic orientation for board members is necessary and desirable. The board is fragmented with no sense of unity. They are a "react" board, not creative, and tend to maintain an adversary relationship with the administrative staff. I have to sell the school to them [the board].

One of the urban board chairpersons, in response to the fact that most members of trustee boards represented wealth and education in the community, replied that the trustee position "was a negative income factor, hence it fails to attract low income individuals." He added, "From a business standpoint, the Board position hurts because he cannot do business with the board."

"Why serve then?" he was asked. "Because of the civic and societal responsibility. I personally feel a need to serve the community I live in and grew up in by means of some worthwhile endeavor other than work and play."

Summary

The two rural community college presidents and two board chairpersons were not too much concerned with national sources of influence. They were suspicious but respectful of state sources, and felt comfortable and secure with their local contact sources of support and referral.

The two suburban presidents and two board chairpersons indicated a greater awareness of the potential of federal funds and an equally greater willingness to seek such funds for their colleges.

They also recognized the extensive influence at the state level by the legislative and executive branches but appeared even more preoccupied with the increasing presence of the Michigan Education Association and its state-wide organizing efforts.

At the local level, both the presidents and the board chairpersons emphasized the significant roles of the advisory committees and de-emphasized the influence of most civic clubs and organizations.

The two urban community college presidents and two chairpersons appeared more conscious and considerate of urban funding and accreditation sources than the other two types of educational leaders. However, they too perceived state and local sources as foremost. In particular the urban community college was concerned with competing with its many more outstate sister community colleges for state dollars.

At the local level, unionization is a way of life for the urban school, followed by the felt need to effectively respond to the many concerns of a very large and varied community.

Chapter V summarizes the study, pinpoints the major findings, iterates some implications of the study and areas of further research along with some personal impressions and observations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The impetus of this study was the writer's interest in the community college as a social organization, responsive to the needs and desires of the community; but influences and power dictate policy in most institutions in this country. A basic objective of the study was to examine perceptions of the decision-making process, paying particular attention to the degree of influence exerted upon community college presidents and board chairpersons by sources outside of the institution.

A review of the literature in the areas of power and influence and open systems theory revealed that a conceptual scheme could be devised for understanding how administrators and officials in community colleges perceive and respond to influence from sources in their external environment.

In this study, the community colleges were viewed as open systems that interact with their environment in an adaptive manner to sustain their existence. Environmental influence is felt from specific external sources; such influence was considered as multi-dimensional in nature. The conceptual framework used to determine perceptions of influence from external sources had five dimensions: strength, frequency, basis, direction, and favorableness, and three

levels--national, state, and local. The first two dimensions--strength and frequency--provided a global measure of perceptions of influence from external sources. The last three of these dimensions were intended to provide greater insight into and discrimination among external sources.

Summary of Major Findings

1. It was assumed at first glance that the state source would be perceived as the most influential, due to its budgetary controls and statutory mandates. However, upon closer examination of the data it appears that the presidents and board chairpersons are also very cognizant of the local constituency and its support, especially advisory committees, unions, surrounding universities, and voters.

Although the state, constitutionally and legislatively, served as the instrument of its creation, the community college is beginning to test its own strength as it establishes its status and solidifies its locally based power, building up a healthy resistance to statutory sources of power--the legislature, governor, and the State Board of Education. Hence one of the major conclusions of this study is that local sources, as perceived by the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons, tend to exert the greatest degree of external influence upon their decision making.

2. Sources of external influence were not perceived as sinister or bothersome by the college presidents and board chairpersons. Except for the regulatory powers of the state and the teacher organizing efforts of the Michigan Education Association, many external sources

were considered as positive and vital aspects of the decision-making process. Frequently the counsel of outside organizations and institutions is sought and their positions on critical issues highly regarded.

3. In line with the above finding, the community college presidents and chairpersons interviewed perceived most external sources as important and necessary links in the open systems approach enhanced by their institutions. Hence such organizations and individuals exchange information and ideas with the college, providing for inputs and subsequent outputs.

4. The aspect of power associated with external influences was quickly recognized and respected by the presidents and chairpersons, but they perceived dealing with it in an informal and indirect way. Most of them seemed to prefer personal contacts and informal get-togethers over golf or cocktails.

Findings Related to the Seven Questions Posed Under "Need for the Study"

It was decided that the most appropriate way to explain the major findings of the study would be to see to what extent these findings could be developed into reasonable responses to the seven questions originally posed in the "Need for the Study" section. The questions are restated below, followed by a summary of responses based on the personal interviews and questionnaire surveys of the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons.

1. What influential outside groups or persons at the national, state, and local levels influence the decisions of the Michigan community college presidents and boards of trustees?

Most of these "sources of influence" were authority-based, structured institutions, reflecting Weber's (1947) findings that these "legitimate" groups wielded the greatest degree of formal power. Needless to say, countless groups, individuals, and organizations tend to sway a community college president or board chairperson one way or another. However, as revealed by this study, the most prominent sources of influence at each level appeared to be:

- National--National accreditation associations
 U.S. Office of Education
 National faculty unions
 American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
- State --The state legislature
 State universities
 The governor's office
 The Michigan Department and State Board of Education
 The Michigan Education Association
- Local --Community college advisory committees
 Faculty unions
 State universities
 Voters

2. What primary considerations are entertained by community college presidents and trustee chairpersons as they consider courses of action?

The president seemed to be primarily concerned about budgetary problems, hence to what extent he could receive sufficient funds, especially from the state and millage elections, to operate the college program successfully and plan for the future.

Board chairpersons were also primarily concerned with budgetary problems--not so much how to secure funds, but rather in what manner the funds should be expended and the results achieved. Board members are the representatives of the community and must respond to it.

The role expectations entailed in the president's emphasis on inputs and the board of trustee chairperson's emphasis on outputs were well defined by Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965).

3. What are the major current educational policy problems perceived by the presidents and chairpersons in six Michigan community colleges?

As indicated in the questionnaire and succeeding interviews, the presidents and board chairpersons identified the following major educational policy problems at their community colleges: millage campaign, program funding, accreditation, sex discrimination, career education programs, and capital outlay for construction.

It is interesting to note the similarity between major issues identified by Harris (1975) as a result of a Higher Education summer session and a thirty-state tour of community colleges, and those outlined throughout this study by Michigan educational leaders. In the March 13, 1975 Innovator publication, Harris related:

Everywhere there was discussion of issues facing postsecondary education and, specifically, the public community college. Out of these consultations there emerged [the following issues]:
 Finance and [State] Control
 State Coordination--Promise or Peril?
 An Eleventh Hour Look at 1202
 The Future of Voluntary Regional Accreditation
 Career Education
 The Community College and Life-Long Learning
 Impact of Faculty Unionism
 Classification of Missions and Goals
 How Can Excellence and Standards Be Maintained?

4. Are the traditional procedures effective for bringing about major policy changes within the community college?

The traditional junior college, that is, the college that only selects, sorts and prepares students for the university, will not effect change as long as the institution refuses to adapt to the needs

of the community. If the community college is to be open to all members of the community, then its programs and procedures must be realigned so that such an accommodation can take place.

Conceptually, the open systems approach advanced by Katz and Kahn, Berrien, Buckley and Weick is structured to respond first to the human need, as it reacts to and interacts in its external environment. But this is an ideal state that is rarely reached by most institutions. Tradition and power are formidable or overcome.

5. Is the community college a change agent? Should it be one?

The community college, more than any other educational institution, should be a change agent. It is one of the few educational agencies that is people oriented. It is young, aggressive, and often brash. There is still time to mold its structure so that flexibility is built into a stable foundation. Because of its "openness," its acceptance of all students, and variety of technical-associate career choices, the community college can make a difference in the life choices and job directions people have to make. This difference is especially true for the have-nots in this country--the Blacks, Latinos, Indians, and other ethnic, racial, and sexual minorities.

6. Do the Michigan community college presidents and trustee chairpersons interviewed for this study perceive the role of their institutions to be that of a change agent?

In response to this question, the presidents and board chairpersons felt the community college should be somewhat of a change agent. Two of them said "definitely yes," seven responded "yes," and three responded "somewhat," so the consensus seems to be "yes!"

Being a "change agent" is not a familiar or easily accepted role of public education in this country. Historically, the schools have been conservative by nature and tend to maintain the status quo. The "public" preferred it this way, and community colleges have generally followed suit. However, as pointed out by Greiner (1967) and substantiated by the presidents and board chairpersons interviewed, there is an emerging trend toward organizational change among community colleges in response to certain external environmental factors, such as the "open door" concept, equality of access, life-long learning, and total community services.

7. To what extent have external influences deterred or enhanced the thrust for change in community colleges?

As interpreted by both the presidents and board chairpersons, the lack of support by the voters in millage elections often is a deterrent to efforts to change or improve the college. It is not only voter refusal, but voter apathy as well.

Many of the presidents felt state control and "interference" tend to hamstring their efforts to obtain funds for program change and/or the addition of needed buildings. However, the possibility for change is still very strong because of the overall positive relationship most community colleges have with federal, state, and local government agencies. This same understanding exists between the community colleges and the press, other universities, and community civic groups.

Implications of the Study

It is extremely difficult and hazardous to generalize research results from a limited number of community college representatives in one state; however, certain clear implications of this study have surfaced. In particular, it provided conceptual and practical understanding of how community college presidents and board chairpersons perceived and responded to influence from various sources in their college's external environment.

The multidimensional conceptual scheme used in this study provided clarification and greater understanding of the nature and characteristics of influence from the three levels of external sources of influence. The interrelationships of the dimensions used in this study tended to support much of the theory and literature on power and influence.

A multidimensional approach to determining the nature and characteristics of external sources of influence provided the basic groundwork for interpreting a college president or board chairperson's responses to the external environment.

The usefulness of an open systems approach for understanding the response and interaction of community college leaders with sources of influence in their external environment seems to be implied by the findings of this study. The characteristics of an open system and its adaptation and coping mechanisms provide a conceptual structure for studying how environmental perceptions affect and relate to institutional dimensions.

Two dimensions of institutional response (responses by the presidents and board chairpersons) to external sources of influence deserve further study by community colleges--modes of response and orientation to the external environment. The colleges need more data on how effective their modes of response are with the various external sources. The orientation of the president and especially board members to the external environment also seems worthy of more research. Each of them needs to be skilled in dealing with both people and facts. Their abilities to comprehend and effectively decide on the myriad and critical issues presented can be enhanced considerably if some effort is made to provide initial and on-going training designed to assist them to receive and assimilate information, and to translate it into viable community college programs and practices.

Recommendations for Further Research

Since this study was limited primarily to probing the nature and characteristics of external influence as perceived by community college presidents and board chairpersons, it seems important to mention first several suggestions from this vantage point for further research.

1. A study of the effectiveness of community colleges in adapting to and coping with their environment would be relevant. The approach and criteria used in such a study might consist of opinion surveys of the various external sources with regard to their attitudes toward the college. In this study, the attitudes of the college administrative cabinet members and all trustee members could also be obtained.

2. Studies of internal and external sources of influence interacting to determine the decisions and courses of action by an institution would be significant. The results of such research would be useful for understanding how such colleges adapt and change. More specifically, this type of knowledge could provide better tools for adapting, reorganizing, and developing community colleges in a changing environment.

3. More than any other question, answers should be sought to this one: Does it make a difference, in the long run, how an institution perceives and responds to its environment? Longitudinal data should be gathered. Hypotheses regarding the persistence of the perceived influence from sources in the external environment need to be formulated and tested. The general notion that community colleges indeed are more receptive and open to community concerns than is the traditional university needs to be observed and analyzed over a period of time.

4. It appears much knowledge could be gained by substantially increasing the sample size for the study. All community colleges in Michigan or a multi-state study of leaders' perceptions of external influences would certainly increase the insight and understanding of perceived environmental differences.

5. A second approach to studying perceived environmental influence is an in-depth case study of one community college. Such a study would involve analyses of administrator, staff, and student attitudes and behavior patterns in relation to the college's perceived environmental state and institutional response. At the same

time, this type of research could allow a single researcher, as a participant observer, to explore the institution and community in more detail. In effect, this would use the college as a focal point in a community-influence type of study.

Conclusion

This research effort focused on six community colleges in Michigan and the data were collected by means of a dual approach--a survey questionnaire and personal interviews with the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons.

The study revealed that state agencies were perceived to exert the most regulatory influence, by statute. But a significant finding of the study pointed up the major impact of local sources upon college decisions, determining local spending (millage), and generating support for change, thereby gaining increased attention from the community college leadership.

The perceptions of the presidents and board chairpersons tended to coincide in many instances. In fact, in all interview situations, a healthy working relationship and professional respect between the two institutional leaders was discerned.

The presidents tended to be more protective of the institution, less student oriented, knowledgeable about how to cope with various sources of power and influence, and specific in their responses about the function and objectives of the college. Board chairpersons tended to respond in broad, general terms relative to the direction of the college; they were more citizen and student-concerned, less

cognizant about the sources of external influence, and prouder of the college (as a sort of civic duty), but also more critical of its functioning.

Some Personal Observations

As a result of the writer's efforts in preparing this study, certain personal observations and perceptions have been noted concerning the community college leadership, and the present and future role of the community college in Michigan. In its newly emergent position as a recognized and necessary institution, the writer gained some impressions as he traveled across the state to interview the identified presidents and board chairpersons; in addition, it is the writer's judgment that the community college will be confronted with six crucial educational issues in the wake of its own dramatic development. The manner in which the community college responds to each of these concerns or adapts to the varying changes will provide the substance for its continued existence and the sum of its purpose.

Based on the interview and questionnaire experiences, the writer was heartened and encouraged by:

1. The enthusiasm expressed by the presidents and chairpersons in fulfilling their important roles, and in making a contribution to the community and to education.
2. The many and varied ranges of technical and academic programs offered.
3. The insightful aspect of long-range program and plant planning professed by most of the chairpersons and presidents, with emphasis on community needs and general endorsement of the life-long learning concept.
4. The outstanding physical plant facilities offered by all but one of the community colleges, and even in this one

exception, an ambitious five-year building and expansion program is underway.

However, the writer was disturbed and disheartened by:

1. Little evidence on the part of the college leadership to recruit and employ black and other ethnic-racial minority educators in a leadership or instructional capacity. With the exception of one president and one board chairperson, all of the presidents and board chairpersons were white males.
2. Almost a complete lack of planning and preparation for faculty unionization and negotiations. The approach of many of them to this current critical development seems to be one of resentment and animosity.
3. An over-concentration on the necessity to acquire funds in order to institute change and new activities.
4. Little evidence, except in two instances, on the part of the college to make a special effort to reach out to provide services to all citizens regardless of race, age, or geographic distance.

Based on his own personal and professional experiences, as well as information gleaned from the questionnaire responses and personal interviews, the writer determined the following six issues to be fundamentally significant to community colleges in Michigan today:

1. The processes and procedures involved in providing equal access and opportunity to blacks, other ethnic-racial minorities, and females, especially in terms of curriculum and career planning, will certainly be one of the great problems facing community colleges and this country during the latter phase of this century.

2. On the other hand, the community college, due to its expansion and accessibility to most citizens, is well timed to provide the labor market its greatest demand--people trained in the technical and services fields--tapping in the process a reservoir of neglected

manpower, e.g., the marginal secondary student, the minority student, the late starter, the undecided student, etc.

3. This major change in post-secondary education in Michigan, free public education through grade 14, will necessitate a thorough reassessment and restructuring of the secure and traditional four-year university in Michigan.

4. Of more immediate impact will be the necessity for the community college to develop effective and fair procedures for teacher negotiations and collective bargaining, thereby preparing to respond in an intelligent manner to the ensuing conflicts of confrontation, frustration, strikes and compromise.

5. The local advisory committees, held in such prominence by the presidents and board chairpersons interviewed, can be an invaluable source of consultation and positive community interaction if it is duly established, a fair representation of the community and properly utilized by the community college.

6. The impact of external forces upon decision making in Michigan community colleges is a positive factor. This open systems approach to established resources and the community will enhance and expand the community college as an institution fulfilling its assigned role of responding to the needs of the people it serves.

The major value of this research study was the insights and understandings gained regarding external influences upon the decision-making matrix as perceived by six Michigan community college presidents and six board chairpersons and how, in turn, they responded providing

channels of assistance, cooperation, and accountability so that the community college, as a social institution, can better achieve its organizational objectives.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TABLES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TABLES

Table 28.--How much influence has each of the following national, state, and local sources had on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

	National Level													
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND								
<u>Presidents:</u>														
No influence	--	1-17	--	3-50	1-17	5-87								
Moderate	6-100	4-67	--	2-23	5-83	--								
Considerable	--	1-17	4-67	--	--	1-17								
Major	--	--	2-33	1-17	--	--								
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>														
No influence	2-33	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	4-67								
Moderate	4-67	5-83	--	2-33	4-67	2-33								
Considerable	--	--	6-100	2-33	--	--								
Major	--	--	--	--	--	--								
	State Level													
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	MDE	MCCA	MASA	MEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV		
<u>Presidents:</u>														
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	4-67	1-17	1-17	2-33	--	--		
Moderate	4-67	1-17	5-83	6-100	4-67	4-67	2-33	3-50	4-67	4-67	4-67	4-67		
Considerable	2-33	--	1-17	--	2-33	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	--	2-33	2-33		
Major	--	5-83	--	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	--	2-33	2-33		
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>														
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	5-83	3-50	3-50	1-17	--	--		
Moderate	2-33	--	4-67	6-100	5-83	5-83	1-17	2-33	3-50	4-67	5-83	3-50		
Considerable	4-67	3-50	2-33	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	3-50		
Major	--	3-50	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--		
	Local Level													
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA	
<u>Presidents:</u>														
No influence	--	1-17	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	3-50	2-33	1-17	
Moderate	--	4-67	3-50	3-50	3-50	2-33	3-50	5-83	4-67	5-83	3-50	--	4-67	
Considerable	3-50	--	1-17	1-17	2-33	2-33	2-33	--	2-33	--	--	4-67	--	
Major	3-50	1-17	1-17	1-17	1-17	2-33	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	--	1-17	
<u>Board Chairpersons:</u>														
No influence	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	2-33	5-83	--	
Moderate	2-33	2-33	5-83	3-50	4-67	2-33	4-67	4-67	4-67	4-67	3-50	1-17	5-83	
Considerable	3-50	2-33	--	3-50	2-33	3-50	2-33	2-33	--	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	
Major	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	

Table 29.--During the past year, various external sources have, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following national, state, and local sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

	National Level												
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND							
Presidents:													
Not at all	--	2-33	--	2-33	1-17	4-67							
Occasionally	6-100	3-50	3-50	1-17	5-83	2-33							
Almost constantly	--	1-17	2-33	1-17	--	--							
Continuously	--	--	1-17	2-33	--	--							
Board Chairpersons:													
Not at all	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	3-50							
Occasionally	4-67	5-83	1-17	2-33	5-83	3-50							
Almost constantly	1-17	--	3-50	2-33	--	--							
Continuously	--	--	2-33	1-17	--	--							
	State Level												
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	NDE	MCCA	MASA	MEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV	
Presidents:													
Not at all	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	6-100	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	--	
Occasionally	3-50	1-17	3-50	5-83	4-67	2-33	--	1-17	5-83	3-50	3-50	1-17	
Almost constantly	3-50	1-17	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	--	2-33	--	1-17	2-33	3-50	
Continuously	--	4-67	--	--	--	4-67	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	2-33	
Board Chairpersons:													
Not at all	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	5-83	3-50	2-33	--	--	--	
Occasionally	4-67	--	3-50	5-83	5-83	4-67	1-17	2-33	2-33	6-100	4-67	3-50	
Almost constantly	--	4-67	3-50	--	--	2-33	--	--	1-17	--	2-33	3-50	
Continuously	2-33	2-33	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	
	Local Level												
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA
Presidents:													
Not at all	--	1-17	--	2-33	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	3-50	1-17	2-33	1-17
Occasionally	--	1-17	2-83	2-33	3-50	2-33	6-100	3-50	3-50	3-50	5-83	4-67	3-50
Almost constantly	2-33	2-33	1-17	2-33	2-33	3-50	--	1-17	2-33	--	--	--	1-17
Continuously	4-67	2-33	--	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	1-17
Board Chairpersons:													
Not at all	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	2-33	2-33	2-33	4-67	--
Occasionally	2-33	4-67	6-100	4-67	3-50	4-67	6-100	5-83	2-33	4-67	4-67	2-33	4-67
Almost constantly	3-50	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	1-17	--	1-17	2-33	--	--	--	2-33
Continuously	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 30.--In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following national, state, and local sources during the past year?

	National Level													
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND								
Presidents:														
No influence	--	2-33	--	2-33	1-17	4-67								
Strongly favorable	--	--	--	--	--	--								
Favorable	5-83	4-67	5-83	2-33	5-83	2-33								
Unfavorable	1-17	--	1-17	2-33	--	--								
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--								
Board Chairpersons:														
No influence	1-17	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	5-83								
Strongly favorable	1-17	1-17	2-33	--	1-17	--								
Favorable	4-67	4-67	4-67	2-33	3-50	1-17								
Unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--								
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--								
	State Level													
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	MDE	MCCA	MASA	NEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV		
Presidents:														
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	5-83	1-17	2-33	2-33	--	--		
Strongly favorable	--	--	1-17	3-50	--	3-50	--	--	--	--	3-50	2-33		
Favorable	5-83	6-100	4-67	3-50	4-67	3-50	1-17	2-33	3-50	4-67	3-50	3-50		
Unfavorable	1-17	--	1-17	--	2-33	--	--	3-50	1-17	--	--	1-17		
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
Board Chairpersons:														
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	5-83	3-50	2-33	1-17	--	--		
Strongly favorable	--	--	--	--	1-17	3-50	--	--	--	--	--	--		
Favorable	6-100	6-100	4-67	6-1--	5-83	3-50	1-17	1-17	3-50	4-67	6-100	6-100		
Unfavorable	--	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	1-17	--	--		
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
	Local Level													
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA	
Presidents:														
No influence	--	1-17	--	2-33	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	3-50	2-33	3-50	1-17	
Strongly favorable	4-67	2-33	1-17	1-17	2-33	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	1-17	
Favorable	2-33	2-33	5-83	3-50	3-50	3-50	6-100	4-67	5-83	3-50	4-67	2-33	4-67	
Unfavorable	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	
Board Chairpersons:														
No influence	--	1-17	1-17	1-17	1-17	1-17	--	--	1-17	2-33	--	4-67	--	
Strongly favorable	3-50	--	1-17	--	2-33	--	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	
Favorable	3-50	4-67	4-67	5-83	3-50	5-83	5-83	5-83	4-67	3-50	6-100	2-33	6-100	
Unfavorable	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	
Strongly unfavorable	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	

Table 31.--An institution has various means available for dealing with external sources of influence. What mechanisms have been used by your college to handle influence from each of the following national, state, and local sources during the past year?

	National Level												
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND							
Presidents:													
No mechanisms	1-17	3-50	3-50	3-50	4-67	2-33							
Informal contacts	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	2-33	4-67							
Lobby groups	2-33	2-33	3-50	2-33	--	--							
Media	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Other	2-33	--	--	--	--	--							
Board Chairpersons:													
No mechanisms	1-17	1-17	1-17	2-33	1-17	4-67							
Informal contacts	3-50	3-50	3-50	2-33	3-50	2-33							
Lobby groups	2-33	2-33	2-33	2-33	2-33	--							
Media	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	State Level												
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	MDE	MCCA	MASA	MEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV	
Presidents:													
No mechanisms	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	6-100	2-33	1-17	--	--	--	
Informal contacts	1-17	2-33	1-17	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	1-17	2-33	5-83	2-33	3-50	
Public relations	2-33	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	1-17	--	--	
Advisory committees	--	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	
Other: Formal contacts	3-50	3-50	4-67	3-50	5-83	3-50	--	1-17	1-17	--	4-67	3-50	
Board Chairpersons:													
No mechanisms	--	--	--	--	--	--	6-100	4-67	1-17	--	--	--	
Informal contacts	2-33	1-17	4-67	3-50	5-83	2-33	--	2-33	4-67	6-100	4-67	2-33	
Public relations	1-17	2-33	--	2-33	--	4-67	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Advisory committees	--	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	
Other: Formal contacts	3-50	2-33	2-33	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	3-50	
	Local Level												
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA
Presidents:													
No mechanisms	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3-50	--	2-33	--
Open meetings	2-33	2-33	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	3-50	2-33	--	1-17
Advisory committees	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--
Org. membership	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3-50	--	--
Public relations	--	1-17	1-17	2-33	1-17	--	1-17	--	3-50	--	--	--	--
Formal contacts	4-67	2-33	2-33	1-17	3-50	3-50	3-50	2-33	1-17	--	--	--	1-17
Informal contacts	--	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	3-50	1-17	--	--	3-50	--
Information system	--	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	2-33	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	4-67
Board Chairpersons:													
No mechanisms	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	2-33	--	4-67	--
Open meetings	5-83	5-83	4-67	2-33	1-17	--	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	--	1-17	1-17
Advisory committees	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Org. membership	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4-67	--	--
Public relations	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	--
Formal contacts	--	--	--	2-33	3-50	3-50	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	--
Informal contacts	1-17	1-17	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	3-50	3-50	3-50	2-33	1-17	1-17	5-83
Information system	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	--	5-83

Table 32.--The various sources of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources demand action of the college, and others demand that action not be taken. For each of the following national, state, and local sources, what do you think has been its predominant influence upon your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

	National Level												
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND							
Presidents:													
Supported college	5-83	6-100	4-67	1-17	3-50	1-17							
Opposed college	--	--	--	--	1-17	--							
Demanded action	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	--	--							
Demanded inaction	--	--	--	1-17	--	--							
Not sure	--	--	--	2-33	2-33	5-83							
Board Chairpersons:													
Supported college	1-17	5-83	3-50	--	2-33	1-17							
Opposed college	--	--	--	1-17	1-17	--							
Demanded action	2-33	1-17	1-17	3-50	1-17	--							
Demanded inaction	--	--	1-17	--	--	--							
Not sure	3-50	--	1-17	2-33	2-33	5-83							
	State Level												
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	MDE	MCCA	MASA	MEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV	
Presidents:													
Supported college	2-33	3-50	5-83	5-83	2-33	4-67	--	1-17	1-17	4-67	6-100	3-50	
Protested action	--	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	
Demanded action	4-67	3-50	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	2-33	
Demanded inaction	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	
Not sure	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	6-100	2-33	4-67	2-33	--	--	
Board Chairpersons:													
Supported college	3-50	4-67	3-50	5-83	4-67	4-67	2-33	--	1-17	3-50	5-83	5-83	
Protested action	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	
Demanded action	2-33	2-33	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	
Demanded inaction	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	
Not sure	1-17	--	2-33	1-17	1-17	1-17	4-67	3-50	4-67	3-50	1-17	--	
	Local Level												
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA
Presidents:													
Supported college	4-67	3-50	4-67	3-50	6-100	4-67	6-100	4-67	3-50	4-67	5-83	4-67	4-67
Protested action	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	--	2-33	--	--	1-17	1-17
Demanded action	2-33	2-33	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	1-17
Demanded inaction	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	--	--
Not sure	--	1-17	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	1-17	2-33	1-17	1-17	--
Board Chairpersons:													
Supported college	4-67	5-83	5-83	3-50	5-83	3-50	6-100	6-100	4-67	3-50	5-83	--	4-67
Protested action	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	2-33
Demanded action	--	1-17	--	1-17	--	2-33	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--	--
Demanded inaction	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Not sure	--	--	1-17	2-33	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	6-100	--

Table 33.--Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following national, state, and local sources during the past year?

	National Level												
	USOE	AACJC	ACCR-ASSOC	UNION	ACAD-ASSOC	FOUND							
Presidents:													
No Influence	--	1-17	1-17	3-50	2-33	4-67							
Rational use of inf.	--	4-67	--	2-33	3-50	--							
Formal/legal requirements	3-50	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	--							
Reward for compliance	3-50	--	3-50	--	--	2-33							
Threat for noncompliance	--	--	1-17	1-17	--	--							
Board Chairpersons:													
No influence	--	1-17	--	2-33	2-33	5-83							
Rational use of inf.	4-67	3-50	--	--	3-50	--							
Formal/legal requirements	1-17	1-17	5-83	--	--	--							
Reward for compliance	1-17	1-17	1-17	--	1-17	1-17							
Threat for noncompliance	--	--	--	4-67	--	--							
	State Level												
	GOV	LEG	MBE	SBPC&JC	MDE	MCCA	MASA	MEA	SPInt	PP	CC	UNIV	
Presidents:													
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	5-83	2-33	2-33	3-50	--	--	
Rational use of inf.	--	--	--	4-67	3-50	5-83	--	1-17	3-50	1-17	6-100	4-67	
Formal/legal requirements	5-83	4-67	5-83	1-17	2-33	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	
Reward for compliance	--	1-17	1-17	1-17	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	--	1-17	
Threat for noncompliance	1-17	1-17	--	--	1-17	--	1-17	3-50	--	--	--	--	
Board Chairpersons:													
No influence	--	--	--	--	--	--	4-67	3-50	4-67	1-17	--	--	
Rational use of inf.	--	--	1-17	5-83	3-50	6-100	2-33	1-17	--	2-33	6-100	4-67	
Formal/legal requirements	3-50	4-67	5-83	1-17	3-50	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	2-33	
Reward for compliance	3-50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	
Threat for noncompliance	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	--	
	Local Level												
	ADV-COMM	VOTERS	PARENTS	STUDENTS	SEC-SCHS	UNIV	BUS-CORP	UNIONS	PP	SPInt	CIV-ORG	ALUMNI	MEDIA
Presidents:													
No influence	--	1-17	1-17	2-33	1-17	--	1-17	1-17	1-17	2-33	3-50	2-33	1-17
Rational use of inf.	4-67	4-67	3-50	2-33	3-50	4-67	3-50	2-33	3-50	4-67	2-33	4-67	5-83
Formal/legal requirements	2-33	1-17	2-33	--	2-33	2-33	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	--
Reward for compliance	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17	2-33	--	--	--	--
Threat for noncompliance	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	2-33	--	--	1-17	--	--
Board Chairpersons:													
No influence	1-17	2-33	1-17	3-50	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	2-33	1-17	6-100	--
Rational use of inf.	4-67	2-33	4-67	3-50	5-83	3-50	5-83	2-33	3-50	4-67	5-83	--	5-83
Formal/legal requirements	1-17	2-33	--	--	--	2-33	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Reward for compliance	--	--	1-17	--	--	1-17	1-17	3-50	1-17	--	--	--	--
Threat for noncompliance	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1-17	--	--	--	1-17

Table 34.--Similar to other institutions, community colleges are subject to changes that take place within their environment. Decisions in these colleges may be influenced by a number of different sources in the external environment. In general, how do you feel your college views its external environment?

Presidents:

Essential	1-17
Important	4-67
Bothersome but necessary	1-17

Board Chairpersons:

Essential	2-33
Important	4-67
Bothersome but necessary	--

Table 35.--During the past year, various decisions have no doubt been made at your college that have involved consideration of individuals, groups, or organizations external to the institution. In general, what part have these sources played in influencing your college's goals, methods, and activities?

Presidents:

Major	2-33
Moderate	4-67
Minor	--

Board Chairpersons:

Major	3-50
Moderate	2-33
Minor	1-17

Table 36.--In general, how much influence do you feel your college has felt during the past year from external sources of influence at the national, state, and local levels?

	National	State	Local
<u>Presidents and Board Chairpersons (N=12)</u>			
Major influence	--	8-67	2-17
Moderate influence	8-67	4-33	8-67
Minor influence	4-33	--	2-17

Table 37.--Personal data for presidents and board chairpersons.

Presidents:

Average years in the position	5.8
Average years as resident of community	30.0
Average years in the state	35.8
Highest degree earned and major degree fields of academic pursuit:	ED.D. -- 3
	Ph.D. -- 3
Average percentage of time spent dealing with sources of external influence	39.1%

Board Chairpersons:

Employment:

Business--small industry president	2
Civil organization director	1
County extension agent	1
Corporation executive	1
Educational administrator	1

Average years in chairperson position	4.1
Average years as resident of community	26.0
Average years in the state	33.8
Major degree and fields of academic pursuit:	
Law degree	1
B.A.	3
Ph.D.	1
M.A.	1
Average percentage of time spent dealing with sources of external influence	21.6 hours per week

Note: Information contained in this table was obtained through the questionnaire distributed to presidents and board chairpersons.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

TO:

FROM: John W. Dobbs

DATE:

SUBJECT: Descriptive Study of the Impact of Informal and Formal External Influences on Policy Decision-Making at Selected Community Colleges in Michigan: A Dissertation

_____,'

As you are probably aware, I am beginning to gather data for my doctoral dissertation. I am seeking to determine the degree to which certain community colleges in Michigan are motivated in their decision-making capacity by external influences, as perceived by the college president and board chairperson.

I would like to request your assistance in this effort.

I would like to pilot test my questionnaire for content validity and reliability. As a distinguished administrator and scholar in the field of higher education, I place the highest value on your judgment and evaluation, and would appreciate your responses (as an assumed community college president or board chairman) to the attached questionnaire.

As a result of your participation in this experiment, I shall attempt to adjust the instrument where appropriate to reflect your input and ideas.

I shall be in contact with you personally so that face-to-face discussion can take place.

Many thanks in advance for your time and effort. If you have any questions, please contact me in the Michigan National Tower or call me at (517) 373-3260.

APPENDIX C

**LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD
CHAIRPERSONS RELATIVE TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND
PERSONAL INTERVIEW; PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE**

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRPERSONS RELATIVE TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND PERSONAL INTERVIEW: PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

July 17, 1974

Mr. E. Dean Raven, Chairman
Board of Trustees
West Shore Community College
County Extension Agent
Computer Building
Scottville, MI 49454

Dear Mr. Raven:

My name is John W. Dobbs and I am a doctoral candidate in Higher Education Administration at Michigan State University. My advisor is Dr. James Nelson, Professor of Higher Education at MSU. I was referred to you personally by Dr. Robert Huxol, Associate Superintendent for Higher Education and Adult Continuing Education, Michigan Department of Education.

I am presently with the Michigan Department of Education as Special Assistant to the Superintendent for School and Community Affairs, and Director of Equal Educational Opportunity.

The purpose of this letter, however, is to request your assistance in assessing the impact of various external influences upon how you make decisions at West Shore Community College as Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

I am interested only in your personal perceptions and ideas as you provide post-secondary education leadership for your constituent student body and community.

Providing you grant my request, aspects of the above information will be developed as the major body of research for my intended dissertation entitled:

Descriptive Study of the Impact of
Informal and Formal External Influences
on Policy Decision Making at Selected
Community Junior Colleges in Michigan

Mr. E. Dean Raven
Page 2
July 17, 1974

As key resource community college educational leaders for purposes of the study, I have selected the presidents and board of trustee chairpersons of six community colleges in Michigan, West Shore being one of six. The other five colleges are:

1. Glen Oaks Community College
2. Wayne County Community College
3. Grand Rapids Junior College
4. Oakland Community College
5. Schoolcraft College - Livonia

Hopefully, the results of this study will focus on the myriad and often complicated external public relations tasks demanded of community college presidents and board of trustee chairpersons, and will provide in the process a clearer understanding of human motivations and a course of action for future directions designed to improve services to students and the community.

With your permission and at a time convenient for you, I would like to request the following:

1. Questionnaire Completion -- Please complete the enclosed questionnaire. According to my validation responses, it should take no longer than 50 minutes.
2. Personal Interview -- Do not return the questionnaire. I would like to use it as a basis for discussion during the course of a personal interview. The interview, again, should not last more than an hour. At that time, in addition to the questionnaire, I would like to discuss other perceptions and feelings not covered in the instrument.

Please be assured that all questionnaire and interview information shall be held in the strictest confidence.

I shall be contacting you by phone within a few days after you receive this correspondence. Thank you for your indulgence and I shall be in touch with you soon.

Sincerely,



John W. Dobbs, Special Assistant to
the Superintendent for School &
Community Affairs
Michigan Department of Education

Mr. E. Dean Raven
Page 3
July 17, 1974

P.S. I would like to visit with you during the month of August, 1974. Being cognizant of your very demanding schedule and impending vacation dates, please indicate on the form below at least three possible dates convenient for you. When I have received suggestions from all parties, I'll be in contact with you for confirmation. Many thanks.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>
August _____	_____
August _____	_____
August _____	_____

(If August is not possible, please indicate a September date.)

September _____	_____
September _____	_____

Personal Interview Guide

The format of the personal interviews with the six community college presidents and six board chairpersons was as follows:

1. Each individual had previously received the Questionnaire Instrument.
2. In the accompanying letter he/she was requested to complete and retain the survey questionnaire until the personal interview.
3. When the personal interview took place, each individual was asked if there were any questions he might have had on the survey questionnaire. Using this as an entree, each person was asked to comment and discuss the following areas of inquiry, according to his perceptions:
 - a. The external group or organization having the greatest impact upon your decision making, from each of three levels: national, state, and local.
 - b. The major or critical issue facing your community college today, and how it was prompted or initiated.
 - c. The purpose and function of the community college within your community, and the degree to which you feel that purpose is being accomplished.
 - d. Do you consider the community college as a change agent? Do you feel it should be one? Why or why not?

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH DESIGN QUESTIONNAIRE

ON EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH DESIGN QUESTIONNAIRE ON EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

DIRECTIONS

The general areas being investigated in this study concern various aspects of external influence on community colleges from sources at the national, state, and local levels. In this study, external sources of influence refers to any outside individuals, groups, or organizations which may tend to cause the college decision makers to act or not to act differently than they would have without such an influence having been exerted and perceived.

In answering the questions, base responses on your experience and perception of situations in your college during the past years. All responses are confidential and no individual or institution will be identified in the analysis or reporting of the data.

1. Similar to other institutions, community colleges are subject to changes which take place within their environment. Decisions in these colleges may be influenced by a number of different sources in the external environment. In general, how do you feel your college views its external environment?

2. During the past year, various decisions have no doubt been made at your college which have involved consideration of individuals, groups, or organizations external to the institution. In general, what part have these sources played in influencing your college's goals, methods, and activities?

3. Although a community college primarily serves needs at the local and state level, it is to some degree influenced by sources at the national level. In general, how much influence do you feel your college has felt during the past year from external sources of influence at the national level?

SECTION I: Sources of Influence at the National Level

(For each source, choose one response and enter its number in the space provided to the left.)

4. How much influence has each of the following national sources had on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 No influence
- 2 Moderate influence
- 3 Considerable influence
- 4 Major influence

_____	U.S. Office of Education
_____	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
_____	Program or curriculum accrediting associations
_____	National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
_____	Professional and academic associations
_____	Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
_____	Other (Please specify) _____

5. The various sources of external influence acting upon a community college do not all act in the same way. Some external sources support the actions of the college while others protest the actions of the college. Some external sources demand action of the college while others demand that action not be taken. For each of the following national sources, what do you think has been its predominant direction of influence upon your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 Has supported the actions of the college
- 2 Has protested the actions of the college
- 3 Has demanded actions be taken by the college
- 4 Has demanded actions not be taken by the college
- 5 Not sure how it stands

☐ U.S. Office of Education
☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
☐ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
☐ Professional and academic associations
☐ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

6. During the past year, various external sources have, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following national sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

- 1 Not at all
- 2 Occasionally
- 3 Almost constantly
- 4 Continuously

☐ U.S. Office of Education
☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
☐ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
☐ Professional and academic associations
☐ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

7. Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following national sources during the past year?

- 1 No influence was exerted
- 2 Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
- 3 Use of formal or legal requirements
- 4 Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
- 5 Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

- ☐ U.S. Office of Education
- ☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
- ☐ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
- ☐ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
- ☐ Professional and academic associations
- ☐ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

8. In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following national sources during the past year?

- 1 No influence exerted
- 2 Strongly favorable
- 3 Favorable
- 4 Unfavorable
- 5 Strongly unfavorable

- ☐ U.S. Office of Education
- ☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
- ☐ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
- ☐ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
- ☐ Professional and academic associations
- ☐ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

9. An institution has various means available for dealing with external sources of influence. What have been the mechanisms used by your college to handle influence from each of the following national sources during the past year?

- 1 No mechanisms necessary
- 2 Use of informal contacts
- 3 Use of a lobby group
- 4 Use of the media
- 5 Other (Please specify) _____

- ☐ U.S. Office of Education
- ☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
- ☐ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
- ☐ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
- ☐ Professional and academic associations
- ☐ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

10. How would you characterize the way your college deals with each of the following national sources of influence?

- 1 No mechanisms necessary
- 2 Very effective
- 3 Effective
- 4 Ineffective
- 5 Very ineffective

_____ U.S. Office of Education
 _____ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
 _____ Program or curriculum accrediting associations
 _____ National faculty associations and unions (AAUP, NEA, AFT)
 _____ Professional and academic associations
 _____ Foundations (Danforth, Ford, Carnegie, etc.)
 _____ Other (Please specify) _____

11. What specific issues in your college have brought the most influence from sources at the national level? Who are the primary individuals (by position) who handle influence from sources at the national level?

<u>ISSUES</u>	<u>SOURCE OF INFLUENCE</u>	<u>PRIMARY INDIVIDUAL RESPONDING</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

12. Since a community college serves needs at the local and state level, it is to some degree influenced by sources at the state level. In general, how much influence do you feel your college has felt during the past year from external sources of influence at the state level?

SECTION II: Source of influence at the state level

13. How much influence has each of the following state sources had on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 No influence
- 2 Very little influence
- 3 Moderate influence
- 4 Considerable influence
- 5 Major influence

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community & Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

14. For each of the following sources, what has been its predominant direction of influence on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 Has supported the actions of the college
- 2 Has protested the actions of the college
- 3 Has demanded actions be taken by the college
- 4 Has demanded that actions not be taken by the college
- 5 Not sure how it stands

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

15. During the past year, various external sources have, to varying degrees, acted upon your college. How frequently has each of the following state sources exerted influence on your college?

- 1 Not at all
- 2 Occasionally
- 3 Almost constantly
- 4 Continuously

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

16. Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following state sources during the past year?

- 1 No influence was exerted
- 2 Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
- 3 Use of formal or legal requirements
- 4 Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
- 5 Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

17. In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following state sources?

- 1 No influence exerted
- 2 Strongly favorable
- 3 Favorable
- 4 Unfavorable
- 5 Strongly unfavorable

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

18. An institution has various means available for dealing with external sources of influence. What have been the mechanisms used by your college to handle influence from each of the following state sources?

- 1 No mechanisms necessary
- 2 Use of informal contacts
- 3 Use of a public relations person
- 4 Use of college advisory committees
- 5 Other (Please specify) _____

☐ Governor or Executive Office
☐ State Legislature
☐ Michigan Board of Education
☐ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
☐ Michigan Education Department
☐ Michigan Community College Association
☐ Michigan Association of School Administrators
☐ Michigan Education Association
☐ Special interest groups
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Community colleges
☐ Four year colleges and universities
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

19. How would you characterize the way your college deals with each of the following state sources of influence?

- 1 No mechanisms necessary
- 2 Very effective
- 3 Effective
- 4 Ineffective
- 5 Very ineffective

_____ Governor or Executive Office
 _____ State Legislature
 _____ Michigan Board of Education
 _____ State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges
 _____ Michigan Education Department
 _____ Michigan Community College Association
 _____ Michigan Association of School Administrators
 _____ Michigan Education Association
 _____ Special interest groups
 _____ Political parties (individuals or groups)
 _____ Community colleges
 _____ Four year colleges and universities
 _____ Other (Please specify) _____

20. What specific issues in your college have brought the most influence from sources at the state level? Who are the primary individuals (by position) who handle influence from sources at the state level?

<u>ISSUES</u>	<u>SOURCE OF INFLUENCE</u>	<u>PRIMARY INDIVIDUAL RESPONDING</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

21. Since a community college serves needs at the local and state level, it is to some degree influenced by sources at the local level. In general, how much influence do you feel your college has felt during the past year from external sources of influence at the local level?

SECTION III: Sources of influence at the local level

22. How much influence has each of the following local sources had on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 No influence
- 2 Moderate influence
- 3 Considerable influence
- 4 Major influence

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

23. For each of the following sources, what has been its predominant direction of influence on your college's goals, methods, and programs during the past year?

- 1 Has supported the actions of the college
- 2 Has protested the actions of the college
- 3 Has demanded actions be taken by the college
- 4 Has demanded that actions not be taken by the college
- 5 Not sure how it stands

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

24. How frequently has each of the following local sources exerted influence on your college during the past year?

- 1 Not at all
- 2 Occasionally
- 3 Almost constantly
- 4 Continuously

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

25. Influence on a community college may take many different forms. How would you characterize the predominant basis or form of external influence from each of the following local sources during the past year?

- 1 No influence was exerted
- 2 Rational use of information, persuasion, or expertise
- 3 Use of formal or legal requirements
- 4 Use of reward or promise of support (for compliance)
- 5 Use of coercion or threat (for non-compliance)

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

26. In thinking over your responses, what has been the nature of influence on your college from each of the following sources?

- 1 No influence exerted
- 2 Strongly favorable
- 3 Favorable
- 4 Unfavorable
- 5 Strongly unfavorable

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your student
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

27. What have been the mechanisms used by your college to handle influence from each of the following local sources?

- 1 No mechanisms necessary
- 2 Use of open meetings (Board of Trustees)
- 3 Use of advisory committees
- 4 Use of membership in local groups
- 5 Use of public relations person
- 6 Use of formal contacts
- 7 Use of informal contacts
- 8 Use of an information system to obtain data
- 9 Other (Please specify) _____

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

28. How would you characterize the way your college deals with each of the following local sources of influence?

- 1 Very effective
- 2 Effective
- 3 Ineffective
- 4 Very ineffective

☐ Advisory committees
☐ Community voters
☐ Community parents
☐ Local youth (high school students & peers of your students)
☐ Public and private secondary schools
☐ Local four-year colleges and universities
☐ Business and corporate groups
☐ Labor groups (AFL-CIO, UAW, etc.)
☐ Political parties (individuals or groups)
☐ Ethnic and special interest groups
☐ Civic organizations (Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc.)
☐ Alumni
☐ News media
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

29. What specific issues in your college have brought the most influence from sources at the local level? Who are the primary individuals (by position) who handle influence from sources at the local level?

<u>ISSUES</u>	<u>SOURCE OF INFLUENCE</u>	<u>PRIMARY INDIVIDUAL RESPONDING</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

32. Do you perceive your community college as a change agent, benefit to the student body and the community which the college serves?

33. List the major areas of change resulting from this role that had some measurable impact upon the community and/or the student population.

34. Identify the positive factors in your relationship with external source representatives.

35. Identify the negative factors in your relationship with external source representatives.

36. In what ways, if at all, would you do things differently in the future in responding to external sources of influence?

PLEASE COMPLETE

Present position: _____

Years in this position: _____

Years as a resident of this
community: _____

Years in this state: _____

Highest degree earned: _____

Major field of study: _____

What percentage of your
time is spent dealing with
sources of external influence? _____

NOTE: Let me repeat that all responses to the Questionnaire and all information gathered as a result from the personal interview shall be zealously guarded, and maintained in the utmost confidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguilar, Francis J. Scanning the Business Environment. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Angell, George W. "Collective Negotiations in Upstate New York." Junior College Journal 42 (October 1971): 9-11.
- Baldrige, J. Victor, ed. Academic Governance. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- _____. Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.
- Belts, Lee J. "The Evaluation of Open Education." Community and Junior College Journal, March 1973.
- Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Berrien, F. Kenneth. General and Social Systems. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1968.
- Blocker, Clyde E.; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Buckley, Walter F. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Callahan, Daniel, and Labe, Dale. "Changing a Community College." Education and Urban Society 6 (November 1973): 26.
- Campbell, Roald; Cunningham, Luvern; and McPhee, Roderick. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Books, 1965.
- Carmichael, Oliver C. New York Establishes a State University. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1955.
- Cartwright, Dorwin. "Influence, Leadership, Control." In Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally, 1965.

- _____. ed. Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1959.
- Clark, Burton R. "Interorganizational Patterns in Education." Administrative Science Quarterly 10 (September 1965): 224-237.
- _____. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Coleman, James E. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.
- Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." Behavioral Science 2 (July 1957): 201-215.
- _____. "Power." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Edited by David L. Sills. Vol. XII. New York: Macmillan-Free Press, 1968.
- _____. Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Dill, William R. "Environment as an Influence on Managerial Autonomy." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (March 1958): 409-443.
- Dobbins, Charles G., and Lee, Calvin B. T., eds. Whose Goals for American Higher Education? Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Emery, F. E., and Trist, E. L. "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments." Human Relations 18 (February 1965): 21-32.
- Ensign, Gary C. "New York State Community Colleges and Their External Environment: Administrators' Perceptions of External Influence and Institutional Response." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- _____. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Eulau, Heinz, and Quinley, Harold. State Officials and Higher Education: A Survey of the Opinions and Expectations of Policy Makers in Nine States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

- Evan, William M. "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Inter-organizational Relations." In Approaches to Organizational Design. Edited by James D. Thompson. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966.
- French, John R. P., Jr. "A Formal Theory of Social Power." Group Dynamics. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. 2nd ed. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960.
- Gamson, William A. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.
- Glen Oaks Community College Catalog, 1973-75.
- Glenny, Lyman A. "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 43 (January 1972): 9-22.
- Goodall, Leonard E.; Holderman, James B.; and Nowlan, James D. "Legislature and University: The Uneasy Partnership." Educational Record 52 (Winter 1972): 36-40.
- Grand Rapids Junior College Catalog, 1974-75.
- Greiner, Larry E. "Patterns of Organization Change." Harvard Business Review 6 (May-June 1967): 119-130.
- Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.
- Harper, William A. "Trustee Papers." Prepared by and for Community and Junior College Board Members. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.
- Harris, Norman C. "What Are Community College Presidents Thinking About?" Innovator, The University of Michigan School of Education 6 (March 13, 1975).
- Hawley, Willis D., and Wirt, Frederick M., eds. The Search for Community Power. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- "Higher Education, General Education Survey." Higher Education Management Services, Michigan Department of Education, November 1974.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structures. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Iannaccone, Lawrence. Politics in Education. New York: New York Center for Applied Research, 1967.
- Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Kiester, Edwin, Jr. "Community Colleges: Innovation of Gimmickry." Saturday Review of Literature, February 9, 1974.
- Lawrence, Paul R., and Lorsch, Jay W. Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Letwak, Eugene, and Hylton, Lydia P. "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies." Administrative Science Quarterly 6 (March 1962).
- Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Locklin, Ralph H., and Stewart, Clifford T. Student, Faculty, and Administrator Perceptions of Decision-Making at Four Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1970.
- Oakland Community College Catalog, 1974-76.
- Polsby, Nelson W. Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1963.
- _____. "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative." Journal of Politics 22 (August 1960): 474-484.
- Raven, Bertram H. "Social Influence and Power." In Current Studies in Social Psychology. Edited by Ivan D. Steiner and Martin Fishbein. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Richardson, Richard, Jr.; Blocker, Clyde E.; and Bender, Louis W. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Riess, Louis C. "Summary of a Study Which Examines the Current and Recommended Degrees of Faculty Participation in Decision-Making in California Community Colleges as Perceived by Both Faculty and Administrators." MBA thesis, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Roueche, John E.; Baker, George A.; and Brownell, Richard L. Accountability and the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.
- Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Schoolcraft College, General Catalog, 1974-75.

- Scott, William G. Organization Theory. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967.
- Seiler, John A. Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin-Dorsey, 1967.
- Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- _____. "Notes on the Observation and Measurement of Power." Journal of Politics 15 (November 1953): 500-512; 514-516.
- _____. ; Smithburg, Donald W.; and Thompson, Victor A. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.
- Smith, G. Kerry, ed. The Troubled Campus: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1970. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S., ed. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. "General, Social and Economic Characteristics of Michigan, 1970."
- Wayne County Community College Catalog, 1974-76.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Edited by Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1947.
- Weick, Karl E. The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- West Shore Community College Catalog, 1974-75.
- Zoglin, Mary Lou. "The Community State in the Community College." Community and Junior College Journal, August-September 1974.