CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

51

0-315-12366-4

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division | Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

60277

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

JOANNE CAROLYN McNEAL

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

NOV. 6, 1940

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

U.S.A.

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

R.R. #1 STONY PLAIN
ALBERTA T0E 2G0

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

CANADIAN UNIVERSITY GOALS: PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRMEN

University — Université

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M. Ed.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

FALL 1982

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Dr. Abe Konrad

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

October 15, 1982

Signature

Joanne McNeal

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CANADIAN UNIVERSITY GOALS:
PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRMEN

by

JOANNE C. McNEAL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Joanne C. McNeal

TITLE OF THESIS Canadian University Goals: Perceptions of Presidents and Board Chairmen

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(signed) Joanne C. McNeal

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

R. R. #1, Stony Plain,

Alberta, TOE 2GO

Dated October 15, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "University Goals: Perceptions of Presidents and Board Chairmen" submitted by Joanne C. McNeal in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

Date: August 4, 1982

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the goals of Canadian universities, as perceived by their presidents and board chairmen; to compare their perceptions of present and future goals; and to compare these perceptions by position, location, age, and size of university.

The Institutional Goals Inventory was used as the survey instrument, with ten Canadian goal statements and four identification questions added. The questionaire was sent to the fifty universities in Canada -- fifty presidents and forty-eight board chairmen -- in November, 1981. Data were analyzed using frequency and percentage distributions to describe the Is and Should Be ratings of the respondents, rank ordering some combined groups of goals. Standard deviations and means with mean differences were also analyzed.

The data analysis revealed that the traditional goals of teaching, research, and public service were not as important as a number of process goals, especially Institutional Reputation and Community. Many teaching-related goals were of high importance, but Research was only of medium importance. Public Service was found to be of even lower importance.

A number of significant differences were found between the perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen, and also between the regional and size groupings of universities. The least signficant differences were found between the age groups of universities.

The perceptions for future goals indicated increased emphasis on efficiency and planning in universities. They felt more importance should

be placed on developing minority student clientele--adults, part-time, and handicapped students, as well as on faculty evaluation and employment patterns. The respondents perceived a need for more community liaison and accountability. There was a commitment by some groups to innovative programs and the development of educational technology. Student development was seen as becoming more important in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the Presidents and Board Chairmen of Canadian universities who so kindly assisted and participated in this study.

The assistance and guidance provided by members of the author's thesis committee are gratefully acknowledged. Dr. A. Konrad provided encouragement, guidance and assistance during the formative and analytical stages of the study, as well as in the preparation of the thesis. Dr. J. Small and Dr. H. Roberts were helpful in their constructive criticism of the thesis.

Mrs. Chris Prokop assisted with the computerized data analysis. Ms. Wendy Humphreys provided skillful typing of the manuscript. Mrs. Doreen Brooks assisted with follow-up letters to individual respondents.

The University Women's Club provided partial funding for the study, and Athabasca University provided partial funding for the printing of the thesis.

Finally, the author wishes to acknowledge the encouragement and forebearance of her two daughters, Noelle and Corinne McNeal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Universities are subject to many pressures, both from within and without. Students, faculty, administrators, governing boards, business and industry, community groups, and society at large, all have their own perspectives on universities. All of these groups view universities as serving their needs, and therefore universities are asked to become "all things to all people." That this is an impossible task would appear self evident, yet the pressure continues to mount from all sides. With limited funds, and in times of general economic restraint, universities find they must establish priorities in order to make wise choices. It is these priorities, or goals, that this study investigates. Richard Peterson (1970:1) summarizes:

> What should a given university try to do? Educate the able, or educate the masses? Teach the wisdom of the ages, or prepare youths for the job market? Conduct research on any topic for which funds are available? . . . Fortunately, all institutions need not respond to the changing times in the same way.

Universities are having to choose between alternative emphases and priorities. Convention and historical development, outlined in detail in Chapter Two, have ascribed three broad purposes to the university: teaching, research, and public service. These, however, can be interpreted in many ways, and there is much debate over whether universities should take the liberal arts approach and educate the whole person, or prepare students for a vocation. Some universities

have recently studied their mandate and their relationship to society, and have decided on a direction for the future.

What are the goals of Canadian universities in general? Is there a collective norm on a national or regional basis? Is there a difference in goals between the larger and smaller universities? Are the priorities different between the older and younger universities? Is there a difference between what they are accomplishing now, and what they feel they should be doing? This study attempts to find answers to these questions.

PURPOSE AND SUBPROBLEMS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the goals of Canadian universities as perceived by presidents and board chairmen. The perceptions of these two groups provide insights about the priorities of Canadian Universities.

Subproblems

A number of subproblems emerged as part of the larger question:

1. What are the differences in the perceptions of what universities are doing now, and what they should be doing?

2. What are the differences between the perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen of the universities?

3. What are the regional differences in the perceptions of university goals?

4. What are the differences in the perceptions of university goals according to the age of the universities?

5. What are the differences in the perceptions of university goals according to the size of the universities?

6. What are the indications for change in university priorities in the future?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

While no study can provide conclusive answers to all of these questions, this research provided a profile of Canadian university goals as perceived by presidents and board chairmen. To date, only historical profiles of Canadian universities have been compiled (Harris: 1976). No attempt has been made to survey all Canadian institutions of higher education to ascertain their present and future goals. Some studies have examined goals on an institutional level, such as The University of Prince Edward Island (1975), The University of Manitoba (1977), the University of Ottawa (1978), the University of Waterloo (1979), and The University of Alberta (1981). This is the first attempt to study the goals of Canadian universities on a national basis.

Universities have a rich heritage, and it may be helpful for present and future decision-makers to know how each institution fits into the total profile of Canadian universities. Administrators should

know, for example, that if their institution differs from the national or regional goal profile, that it does so by choice and not by accident. Piccinin (1978:i) points out some developments that have caused universities to re-examine their priorities:

> . . . Recent social, economic, and political events have reinforced the current trend and need for careful long-range planning and priority setting. The prospect of declining enrollments and increasingly tighter financial resources are but two of the factors which are forcing institutions of higher learning to re-examine their priorities and directions.

Through the information gathered in this study, each institution may be able to discover how its priorities compare with those of institutions in the rest of Canada, and whether it wants to change its existing or desired goals.

It may also be helpful for university decision-makers to compare their institution's existing and desired goals with those of other similar universities -- by region, size and age. As pressures and demands on universities increase, the need for information on which to base decisions also increases. Thus, this study of Canadian university goal perceptions may help to enlighten the priority-setting process.

DEFINITIONS

A number of words in the literature are used to describe the priorities of universities: purposes, mandate, mission, role, goals, aims, objectives, and functions. Sometimes these words are used interchangeably to describe the same concept. Other times they are used to describe a particular part of the priority-setting process.

Peterson (1970:3) gives working definitions for four of these: function, purpose, goal, and objective:

Function. Higher education functions refer to activities of the university . . . which are functionally related to other social institutions. Such functions evolved over time generally without conscious intent.

Purpose. Purposes in higher education refer to stated conceptions of the mission of systems, groups, or types of institutions. Purposes . . . are usually politically determined by coalitions and trade-offs of interest within and external to the system in question.

Goal. Goals refer to the particular, possibly unique pattern of specified ends, outputs, and priorities established for a single university.

Objective. The word objective is used in speaking about the ends of various component units, programs, and services.

It is the institutional goals that are the concern of this study. Gross and Grambsch (1968) point out differences between types of goals.

Outcome goals. Outcome or output goals result in a product of some kind. The outcome goals are the usual goals of teaching, research, and community service in a university.

Process goals. The process or support goals help the organization survive, run smoothly, motivate participation, and ensure status. Process goals are concerned with maintenance activities.

Several other words also require clarification: university, president, board chairman, age of university, region, and size of university.

University. For the purposes of this study, a university is a postsecondary educational institution that grants degrees, either undergraduate or graduate, by authority of the province in which it is located. It does not have to be named "university," however; it might be called an "institute" or "college" or "seminaire," but it must grant degrees and be a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC).

President. The chief administrator of a university or postsecondary educational institution, whether his title is "vice chancelor," "president" or "rector" or any other name.

Board chairman. The elected head of the board of directors or governors, which includes elected or appointed community members, and representatives from faculty and students as well.

University age. For the purposes of this study, the age of a university was determined by the year in which it received official university status. This may, or may not, be the same year it was

legislated, began offering classes, built its first buildings, was endowed with funds, or consolidated with other institutions.

Region. Four regions were designated in Canada for the purposes of this study: the West, including British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba; Ontario, the province; Quebec, the province; and the Atlantic Region, including New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland. Although two of these "regions" are really single provinces, they are included as separate regions because of their size, and each contains a number of institutions. This division of Canada is also that used by Harris (1976).

University size. The size of university in this study was determined on the basis of full-time student enrolments. For some institutions that have a large number of part-time students, this may include full-time equivalents.

LIMITATIONS

This study was undertaken to outline the priorities and directions of Canadian universities. It was decided that if only one or two persons on each campus could be sampled, that the persons best able to reflect on the total nature of the university would be the president and the chairman of the governing board. It was understood, however, that many other perspectives exist, and that in order to ascertain a comprehensive profile, the perceptions of other administrators, as well as faculty, students, and members of the community at large would have

to be sampled. This study did not attempt to gather that information; it was limited to the goal perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen in regard to their own institutions.

This study was also limited by its definition of a university as a degree-granting public institution. The separate colleges that together make up the University of Quebec, for example, were not included in this study singly, but as a collective unit because the University of Quebec grants the degrees. The same was true of colleges affiliated with other universities, such as Toronto and Saskatchewan.

Another limitation was related to the structure of the survey instrument itself. Each of the twenty goal areas consisted of four statements, and it is possible that some of the differences among perceptual responses resulted from different interpretations of goal items. Words and sentences in the instrument may not convey the same meaning for the authors, researchers, and all respondents.

The ten miscellaneous goals and the ten local Canadian goals each consisted of only one statement, increasing the possibility of different interpretations. At best, these latter goal statements served only as indicators of directions; certainly they were not as reliable as indicators of priorities as were the twenty major goal areas.

A further limitation was in the translation of the ten local Canadian goals, which were not field tested in the French language

version to verify that the two language versions conveyed exactly the same meanings.

Another limitation was in reporting the data in ranked form. The respondents were not asked to rank their priorities; they were merely asked to rate each goal statement on a scale from one to five. It was from these ratings that the rank order was derived. If the respondents had been asked to rank the goals, the answers might well have been somewhat different.

As already noted above, the "Is" and "Should Be" ratings reported in this study were the perceptions of two key individuals at each institution. No attempt was made to validate these perceptual data with other indicators of goal priorities. For example, financial statements could have been analyzed to determine if the perceptions were borne out in the budgetary allocations. Similarly, formal statements of university purpose could have been examined to establish their congruence with the perceptions of these university officials.

Finally, there was a limitation in the very humanness of the respondents themselves. Human perceptions are notoriously subject to various biasing influences: lack of adequate opportunity to observe, subjectivity, etc. In another sense, however, this is not a deficiency, as humans react to perceived realities. Moreover, widespread misperception does point to the need for improved communication. The data reported here were limited because they were not official, and could not be taken as an addendum to official public statements concerning the goals and priorities of any one university.

ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

This report is organized into five main chapters. The first chapter gives the background, defines the research problems and the terms used, gives the rationale for the selection of this topic, and identifies some of the limitations of this study.

The second chapter provides an historical overview of the development of universities in general, and Canadian universities specifically. It also includes a brief review of some research studies that focused upon institutional goals.

Chapter three outlines the research methodology, study population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis, and a brief description of the goal areas used in reporting the data.

Chapter four contains the major findings of the study, including a profile of the characteristics of Canadian universities. The analyses include a profile of the Is and Should Be ratings of all goals, differences between the perceptions of presidents and board chairmen; rankings and goal ratings of all goals by region, university age, and size; and analysis of the discrepancy or gap between the Is and Should Be ratings.

Chapter five provides the summary, conclusions, and implications of the study. A Bibliography and Appendix are also included.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Canadian universities are relatively recent additions to the history of higher education. Institutions of higher learning have existed for thousands of years. Some of the goals expressed by Canadian universities in the 1980's are very similar to those espoused by the academies of Plato and Aristotle. No examination of university purposes could be complete without at least a brief review of the legacy of the modern university.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The Roots of the University

It might be argued that the roots of the university were established in Ancient Greece. Among the figures of this early period who contributed to the idea of higher education were Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Their concern with systematic mental training and their emphasis on abstract thought and the dialectic helped to set the stage for the development of higher education in succeeding centuries.

Plato, following in the footsteps of his teacher Socrates, conceived the idea of establishing a school, the Academy, where the discourses on justice and virtue could be taught. The Academy, according to Collier (1961, Vol. 1:42), was part of a typical Athenian Gymnasia, with outside track facilities for games and competitions, a palestra and indoor court for athletic exercises, showers and baths.

Around the central court were porticoes containing lecture rooms for teachers of economics, rhetoric, philosophy, science, literature, music and art. Plato later bought a home and garden nearby and formally organized his school there, complete with museum. Thereafter, Plato devoted himself to advanced oral teaching and undertook intricate investigations with his students until his death in 347 B.C. Plato's Academy had an almost uninterrupted history for eight-hundred years until it and other schools of philosophy were closed in 529 A.D. by an edict of Justinian I, ruler of the Eastern Roman Empire.

Aristotle became a student in Plato's Academy in the year 367 B.C. and remained there for twenty years until Plato's death, leaving when he did not agree with the successor named to replace Plato. Aristotle founded his own school, the Lyceum, in another part of Athens.

> Like the Academy, the Lyceum had two main functions, those of teaching and research. As the tutor of Alexander, Aristotle had already been obliged to be something of a schoolmaster, and in the Lyceum he offered popular, as well as specialist, courses. But if in its educational role the Lyceum rivalled but did not outshine the Academy, as a centre of research, it far outstripped any earlier institution. Indeed in the whole of antiquity only the Museum at Alexandria was to surpass it. . . . The Lyceum was, or came to be, equipped with a number of important instruments of research, a library, maps, a collection of anatomical diagrams, and perhaps also a collection of biological specimens. And even more important than the material equipment which Aristotle and the successive heads of the school collected was the presence of a number of like-minded friends and pupils who could share in the work of research. The Lyceum concentrated together under a common leadership a body of individuals who were to carry out more extensive investigations over a wide range of scientific, historical and social subjects than had ever been imagined, let alone attempted before (Lloyd, 1977:99-100).

There was little information on the young men who were students at these first schools of philosophy, but it can be assumed that they came from the elite social classes who had few financial concerns. There was often a close association between these great thinkers and philosophers, and the political leaders of their time. At one time or another, these educators brought direct influence on the events and decision-makers of the day, and the "freedom to think" was granted to friends of the monarch in power.

Another development bearing on the idea of the university was the formation of "collegia" or guilds, which under Roman rule spread throughout the Mediterranean world. The guilds were organized to promote the common interests of their members, and served social and religious as well as economic purposes. Their primary interest was to promote businesses, either merchant or crafts, and their interest in education was limited to the governance and regulation of the apprenticeship of young men.

After the fall of the Roman Empire, the preservation of "higher learning" was left to the church. Schools were attached to monasteries, especially after the Benedictine Order was founded in the sixth century A.D. Members of the Order copied manuscripts of Scripture, and later other works of Greek and Roman literature, thereby preserving the classics of these langages. In order to educate young candidates in the Order, schools were established, both elementary and higher, which were open to outsiders who wished to attend for a short period of time. Later cathedral schools were developed for secular students. Rashdall (1936, Vol. 1:44) viewed these schools as the forerunner of the

universities:

> It was the cathedral school in which Abelard had taught -- the Cathedral School of Paris -- which eventually developed into the earliest and greatest university of northern Europe. Abelard, though not in any strict sense the founder, was at least the intellectual progenitor of the University of Paris.

The abbeys became the centres of arts and letters and a number of the early but great univerisites, including Paris and Bologna, found their origins in the monastery and cathedral schools.

Medieval Influences

What we now call universities were identified at first as the "studium generale," indicating that students were admitted from all countries to pursue higher learning with a plurality of masters. Rashdall (1936, Vol. I:17) identified Paris and Bologna as two archetypal or original universities: "Paris supplied the model for the universities of masters, Bologna for the universities of students." Both arose about the same time during the last thirty years of the twelfth century, as an outgrowth of the Renaissance. In Italy, this Renaissance was expressed in the revival and study of Roman law, started at Bologna; in France, it expressed itself in dialectical and theological speculation which found its home in Paris.

Italy. The Italian universities were modeled on the studium generale at Bologna. The curriculum placed importance on legal studies, with medicine taught secondarily, and arts given lesser importance. Theology was separate at first, but later was integrated into the curriculum.

Bologna was a university of students, especially of foreign students. Students selected, paid and controlled the masters and their teaching, although the masters always maintained the right of granting degrees. Of course, great variations existed in the distribution of academic power. Rashdall (1936, Vol. 2:60) maintained that power shifted with the source of revenue for university support:

> The autonomy of the students was originally founded upon the power of the purse. When that power passed to the state, the real control of the studium passed with it. The rector, elected by the students from their own body, is still the superior of the professors; but the professors are now more and more relieved from their humiliating dependence on the students by the subjection of both to the state authorities.
>
> . . . In the earliest days of Bologna the schools were private rooms hired by the professors and paid for by a collecta from his students. For congregations or great public functions a convent or church was borrowed. As the expenses of the studium came to be more and more transferred from the students to the state, the rent came to be paid by the city governments; but still the buildings were as a rule merely hired. (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:61)

The other Italian universities had a municipal character. They were started and maintained by cities, as an outgrowth of civic life. It was not until the fifteenth century that the cities began to build new, or donate old buildings for the universities to use. Although the Italian universities were all founded by Papal Bull, they did not maintain their ecclesiastical ties, and control of them was turned over to the state.

France. The origin of the University of Paris may go back as far as 780 to the establishment of a monastic school at Paris by

Charlemagne. However, its actual status as a university is tied to the fame of the theologian, Peter Abelard, who taught at the Cathedral School of Notre Dame. The guild of teachers and students that began as the overflow population from the Cathedral School at Notre Dame became the University of Paris sometime between 1150-1175, shortly after Abelard's death. Collier (1961, Vol. 15:77) described these beginnings:

> When Philip II of France granted the evolving university a charter in 1200, four faculties were active: arts, theology, law, and medicine. The last three were known as "superior" because they offered instruction in advanced courses, but the arts faculty was the largest . . .
>
> The students were apprentice masters or apprentice professors studying to be admitted to the master's guild, and as apprentices they were required to become proficient by demonstration teaching.

In Paris, the university was best understood as a community of masters.

Generally, the French universities evolved from cathedral schools (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:207-210). They were first governed by masters or doctors. However, the students organized into "nations" according to their origin, and as the nations got stronger the students gained more power in the university governance, eventually electing the rector. As such, then, they more closely resembled the Bologna model of a university of students rather than their closer Paris model of a university of masters. The bishop held the most powerful position in the French universities and had much more authority than the bishops at the original University of Paris, while the cities had much less authority than at Bologna. The professoriate was co-opted in a system of endowed collegia.

Law studies were the most prominent, especially at Anglers and Orleans, who had no other faculty. Only Montpellier specialized chiefly in medicine. Some of the universities had endowed colleges for poor students, and in less prosperous times, these students were kept alive by these colleges. One consequence of the dominance of law, was the unimportance of arts until the separate colleges of arts began to be formed to fill the need.

Other European Influences

The Spanish universities were closely tied to the crown, and in some cases the chancellor was a royal nominee (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:64-65). Their internal constitution and governance were modeled on Bologna, but they were also connected with the cathedral or other churches. In less ecclesiastical universities, the cities took some part in the erection and government of the universities. The chief endowments came from church sources bestowed on universities by royal authority, or by different kinds of taxes on church properties.

The German universities were modeled after the University of Paris, although two of the earliest had a mixed-type of constitution (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:280-285). These had a student dominated government for the jurists, or a government in which students and masters shared in electing the rector. Later, this academic power was held by the masters alone. Originally the "nations" of students were organized just in the faculty of arts where they alone elected the rector. But later the rector came from any of the faculties.

A big difference between Paris and the German universities was

that from the beginning, the teachers in the German universities were endowed. Thus, they had a permanent professoriate who quickly gathered to themselves through the formulation of councils, the largest academic powers. Also, in the German universities, the colleges were more important than at Paris, and were designed to provide the universities with teachers. In fact, the colleges became almost identical to the faculties.

A university was founded in Cracow in 1394 by charter of Casimir the Great, King of Poland, and the following year by a Bull of Urban V. Rashdall (1936, Vol. 2:290) maintained that Cracow was a student university at first:

> This constitution is entirely of the Bologna type, and the fullest student-rights are conferred. Both rector and professors are to be elected by the students, and a master is ineligible to the rectorship. The rector is accorded a full and exclusive civil jurisdiction over students. . . . Salaries were assigned to masters of law, "physic", and arts, and charged upon the revenue arising from the salt-tax of a certain district.

After some extended political problems, a new charter was issued in 1401 and the university was reopened. However, in its new form it contained both a college of jurists and a college of arts, but both were for masters. Salaries were supplied by expropriation of ecclesiastical dignities, canonries, and other benefices.

Scottish Universities. For many years, Scotland did not feel the need of its own university as there was a Scots College established at the University of Paris (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:300-310). But during a war with England, it became unsafe for students to travel to Paris, and

about the same time, foreign students were banned from that university. So the first Scottish university was established at St. Andrews. Many students did their beginning studies at home at the University of St. Andrews, and then finished their arts or advanced studies abroad. The University of St. Andrews had faculties of theology and canon law, and medicine was added in the fifteenth century. From the graduation lists, it could be seen that this university exerted much influence on the clerics of the Catholic Church.

Another Scottish university at Glasgow was begun in 1451 and was closely connected to the cathedral, although without endowments until Queen Mary in 1563 granted "the place of the Blackfriars and certain of their rents" and other property to the university.

> Upon this new foundation, within the medieval scheme, the modern University of Glasgow was built. The beginnings of revival, to which the city made its contribution, had a similarity, in respect of this municipal interest, to the contemporary movement which brought about in 1583 the College of Edinburgh. Both places benefited from the possessions of the old church: both were supported by burgess enthusiasm for the advancement of the new; while the growth in Edinburgh was from the initial status of a town's college, the College of Glasgow preserved for fuller realization and dignity, the traditions, and the constitution of a university conferred by its founders (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 2:318).

A university at Aberdeen was founded by Royal Charter and Papal Bull in 1497 and for several years was scantily endowed. In 1505 a new college was established, now King's College, to provide teachers in all faculties. These new beginnings were described by Rashdall (1936, Vol. 2:319-320):

> A comparison of the early history of those universities which started with sufficient endowments with the fate of those attempts at university-founding which were not thus supported supplies ample illustration of the absolute necessity -- at ordinary times and under ordinary circumstances -- of endowment or some other extraneous support for the maintainance of higher education. To this day Aberdeen is kept alive and flourishing, in spite of the competition of the great city universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, by the number and wealth of its bursaries.

Overall, the Scottish universities were very different from their English counterparts as well as from Paris. Teachers in the Scottish system were usually both college and university teachers -- the two bodies were almost fused into one. Whereas the Oxford tutorial system had a large component of college teachers and almost no university teachers, lectures were almost non-existent, and most of the students were in the arts faculty. Scottish universities educated the able, not just the elite, like the early English universities.

English Universities. Oxford was founded in 1167 and is thought of by many as one of the greatest universities of the world, not only in medieval times, but today. It was also thought that Paris influenced Oxford somwhat in its formative years (Rashdall, 1936, Vol. 3).

Students were housed in groups, like academic households, which banded together to their common benefit in numerous ways. Later these "household groupings" were endowed and compounds or buildings were built for their use and became the colleges. However, the colleges were not as important in the medieval days as they are today. At that time, only a small portion of the students were able to benefit from their facilities.

By 1234 the graduates of Oxford began to assume important positions in the church, which gave Oxford wide influence. The dominant

faculty of the university was arts, the students of which were divided into nations and even the "superior" faculties had no deans. In fact, the Faculty of Arts became so powerful that in 1250 a statute was passed that prevented graduation in theology of men who had not previously been Masters of Arts.

During the Renaissance, scholasticism declined, and was banned by royal injunction in 1535, some say as a result of arguments over the writings of John Wycliffe. During the Reformation, Oxford University was reincorporated by an Act of Elizabeth in 1571. Since then the faculty has controlled the university; the central university body is merely advisory, and each college is autonomous.

The university at Cambridge came into existence around 1200. By 1226 its chancellor had been recognized by both king and pope, and in 1318 the university was officially founded by Papal Bull. The autonomy of the university was described by Collier (1961, Vol. 4:222):

> Cambridge, like all British universities, is a corporate, autonomous institution, controlled by a voluntary society, having its own government, regulating its own finances, and exercising the right to appoint its own staff and to control all university affairs. In no sense is Cambridge a national or state university. It is true that Cambridge is financially aided by local governing authorities and by the national treasury, but such aid does not infringe upon the autonomy of the institution. The governing bodies of Cambridge have always been the resident bodies (colleges); in other words, the faculty controls the entire life of the university. Moreover, each college within the university is autonomous.

Originally the university emphasized philosophy, science, ancient and modern languages, and mathematics. Later, engineering, agriculture, medicine and law were included. Each college had its specialty. Many

scientific laboratories and several museums were attached to the university; two theological seminaries were included as well. The students learned in a tutorial manner, as at Oxford, and even today only number around 5000.

Medieval Universities

By 1500 there were seventy universities in Europe. They were centres of "pure scholarship and humanistic study," by which is usually meant that they were concerned with what is now called the "liberal arts" and the higher professions. Ross (1976:7) reviewed these developments:

> The early universities were indeed vocationally oriented, created to provide leaders for state and the church and practitioners in law and medicine. But as the institutions evolved, marked differences appeared. The Italian universities tended to emphasize the practical: the professions of law, medicine, theology, and administration; whereas Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge were soon dominated by doctors of theology who taught what became known as the seven liberal arts: grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music. It is this latter form and tradition which took root in England and later spread to the United States and Canada.
>
> . . . within the boundaries of knowledge and imagination feasible in that day, the university was a place of adventure. Unorthodox topics, ideas, and theories were investigated and discussed. The whole world of knowledge as it was then known was to be explored -- no facet of it was to be forbidden.

The term, "universitas," was first used to describe the whole body of masters and students collected together in the studium generale, but by the end of the Medieval period, these terms were synonymous.

The structure and many of the practices adopted by universities were first drawn from the established institutions of the day -- the church, the monastery, and the guild. From the church, the universities

took the concept of multi-national organization; the administrative hierarchy of chancellor, rector, and deans; rituals like convocation; and colorful dress in academic gowns. From the monastery, came the idea of separateness; and a self-governing community with its own rules and norms. From the guild came the concept of group support and loyalty. A further summary of the evolution of the medieval university was provided by Ross (1976:13-14):

> The merging of these ideas gave the university its distinctive character and structure: a self-governing community with an elected hierarchy, separated from the world of commerce, involved in a mission to learn and to teach at an advanced level, using mysterious rituals and dress to dramatize its uniqueness, and requiring from its members deep loyalty to and enduring support for each other and the university. The conception of what a university is, or should be, is deeply rooted in academic ideology and has been stoutly defended by scholars in the centuries that have followed.
>
> What is important to recognize is that this ideology and these practices, however often they were ignored, distorted, or abused in medieval times or in the centuries that followed, constituted a model of what a university should be. Like . . . any statement of faith, it motivated men to work toward the ideal; it disturbed their conscience when it was not achieved; and it became part of the university mythology, sacred in the lives of traditional scholars.

Renaissance & Reformation: 1500 to 1850

The Renaissance was at its peak in 1500 and the Reformation and the period of French Enlightenment followed soon afterward. Society was alive and vital, it was a time of discovery, both physical, scientific, and artistic. Scientists such as Galileo and Newton; inventions such as the printing press, microscope, telescope and thermometer; writers like Milton, Voltaire, Shakespeare, Moliere, and Descartes; composers such as

Bach, Handel, and Mozart; and numerous others, point to the fact that these centuries were not dull, either intellectually or culturally for those sensitive to these developments. Universities, according to Ross (1976:15-16), did not seem to be among the sensitive:

> If the universities had been responsive to the social and intellectual movements of the day, they would have been centers of great vitality with imaginative teachers working on the frontiers of knowledge. Instead they were encapsulated by narrow religious dogma and antiquated methods of teaching. They were not for the intellectually brave and adventuresome.
>
> The fact was that most of the creative work in these centuries was carried on outside academic walls -- indeed much of it was subject to ridicule and scorn by those in the universities. It would be no exaggeration to say that most of the greatest works in literature, philosophy, science, medicine, law, and music during the period 1500-1850 were produced outside the university, although . . . some of the creators of these works were university graduates and perhaps received early stimulation or inspiration there.

In England, Oxford and Cambridge were the only universities until the University of London was opened in 1828 and Durham University in 1837. But neither had much real status before 1850. Oxford and Cambridge were criticized for being too narrow in scope, for catering to aristocrats, and for producing clergy whose major expertise was Latin and Greek rather than theology. As a result, there were movements to establish private academies to teach different curricula, and the Royal Society was formed in 1662, becoming in effect an institute of advanced study.

The four Scottish universities, which were started by ecclesiastical authorities, soon shared their governance with laymen. The new

influence of the laymen brought these universities to broader and more practical curricula than those in England.

Development & Change: 1850 to 1950

These hundred years were years of change -- developments that profoundly affected not only the behavior of man and the societies of all nations in general, but also the universities which each country created.

One of the major developments to effect massive change was the industrial revolution. It affected the development of new cities, industries, and wealth. "Perhaps most important," concluded Ross (1976:33), the industrial revolution "created new social classes -- a vast new middle class of workers and a new elite of scientists and managers -- that profoundly affected social structure and social attitudes."

Among the profound effects of these changes was the move of people from the farm to the city. Urbanization and secularization led to the formation of new attitudes and behavior and along with these new social patterns was a growing interest in rational and scientific explanations for these events.

Novel ideas came from outside the church with men such as Darwin, Marx, Freud, and Einstein. Their concepts and explanations led to new ways of thinking, and different approaches to the development of knowledge and research. The time had come for the university to accept the challenge and meet the needs of a changing society. These innovations took a different form in each country and each adapted the

university concept to its own needs.

In England, Oxford and Cambridge made some changes, but were unable to respond to demands for new programs. In order to meet society's needs, the government founded new universities, more practical and vocational than Oxford or Cambridge. Ross (1976:36-37) described these new institutions:

> The civic -- "Redbrick" -- universities flourished. They served a new constituency, with new curricula, and with many first-class teachers and researchers. In some fields they excelled . . . the Redbrick universities were more responsive to the technological and manpower needs of society, more aware of the progress of research in German universities, and more sensitive to the pragmatic approach of some universities in North America.

Still, only the "established" universities retained the status of quality education, and a clear distinction developed between the graduates of the two types of institutes which lasted until after World War II.

In Canada, although the land expanse was enormous, and the population and resources were small, the ambition to become a great nation abounded. The universities and colleges were struggling to survive, and only those with substantial government grants or large private endowments endured. In 1867, education was made a provincial responsibility, and most provinces were against funding colleges with religious affiliations.

According to Ross (1976:39-42), the Canadian universities were pragmatic in their curriculum, offering study in many professions and occupations. They emphasized undergraduate education, while advanced

studies fell behind. Canada took an eclectic approach to university education, emulating the features of many systems: from the United States, practical programs leading toward business and the professional fields; from Germany, student choice and the concept of academic freedom; and from Britain, honors programs, small classes, and an emphasis upon character formation. A more detailed history of Canadian universities is provided in the next section, but this general summary places the Canadian development in the world perspective.

In the United States a number of themes emerged (Kerr, 1963). One was an emphasis on pragmatism and the development of those skills which would contribute to the growth of a young nation. The Morill Act of 1862 granted support to universities that would provide instruction in agriculture and mechanical fields. This resulted in the development of a series of "land-grant" institutions which combined practical and traditional studies.

The influence of the German universities was evident in the founding of the universities that specialized in advanced study and research. Two such institutions were Johns Hopkins(1875) and The University of Chicago (1892).

The two World Wars had a numbing effect on universities. Teaching and research budgets were reduced or were diverted with many students serving in the armed services of their countries. In North America, there was a period of growth after World War I during the 1920's, followed by a slowdown in growth during the great depression of the 1930's, and with the coming of World War II, an even greater decline.

After World War II, in all countries there was a great increase in university enrolments, but nowhere as pronounced as in the United States. With the passage of two Veteran's Educational Assistance Acts in 1943 and 1944, there was an unprecedented capacity for federal expenditure in higher education. The assistance both to veterans and to the colleges and universities was a tremendous boost to strained resources. In many sectors, there was concern that the veteran boom would dwindle. In the United States, Canada and England, enrolment studies were undertaken and projections made for large increases. Administrators expressed concern about enlarged budgets, space for students, and recruiting qualified faculty members. It was a period that led to rapid growth and expansion.

The Growth Years: 1950 to 1975

The two and a half decades between 1950 and 1975 were years of unprecedented growth in universities. The demand from students for higher education created incredible challenges for universities. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development reviewed Canada's national policies for education in 1975 (OECD, 1976). The growth trends they reported reflected the situation not just in Canada, but in all of North America and the Western European countries as well.

Many of the reasons for the unprecedented growth of the last quarter of a century have been offered. Niblett (1969:2-3) summarized his views as follows, emphasizing particularly the expectation of productivity:

No comprehensive study exists, so far as I am aware, of the varieties and strengths of the pressures which have combined to make the movement for more higher education so tremendously powerful. But among them are the hopes that it might give us people with the mental equipment to produce the sophisticated technology and instrumentation, so that more comfort, more health, more prosperity were paid as dividends to all of us -- and this prosperity both for home use or . . . for export. Inventiveness, one-upmanship, whether in circumstances of war or peace, political expertise, marketing expertise: these and many others were part of the social payoff it was assumed that higher education would bring. In a measure it has done this . . . . A developed nation surely was one which cultivated its brains and reaped the harvest . . .

CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

The history of universities in the rest of the world directly influenced the development of Canadian institutions of higher education. This section outlines in more detail the influences that shaped the Canadian universities from their roots to the present.

Quebec Before 1960: Catholic Influences

The European tradition of classical colleges, where boys went to eight years of high school and college, was perpetuated in Canada, especially in Quebec. Young boys studied Latin, literature, English, and French, and later Greek was added, as well.

The first Jesuit College was established in 1635. In its early years the Jesuit College was an elementary school which only later included high school grades and beyond. In 1651 it had twenty-two students. It is not, however, credited with being an early university, because for many years it was exclusively elementary.

Le Grand Séminaire du Québec was established in 1663. Together the two schools worked to provide an education for the clergy and gifted others. These two schools provide evidence of over three hundred years of higher education in Canada. A trade school was established around 1670, also near Quebec.

There was a depression of educational effort after the conquest by the British in 1763, because the estates of the Jesuit Fathers were confiscated in the Treaty of Paris. By 1790 a state-supported university was proposed. But in 1791, Canada was divided into two huge

provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, and the proposal was set aside.

Finally, in 1853, Rome gave degree-granting status to a French-speaking university which was to incorporate the existing classical colleges as full memebers. This did not happen quite as planned but, by 1855, Laval University announced affiliation with seven of them. It was presided over by an archbishop.

In 1860, French Canadian higher education was carried on largely by the séminaires and collèges classiques. Since the founding of the Grande Séminaire du Québec there had been no significant change except improvement in techniques and facilities. There was, however, a significant change in the attitude to the cours classique. Harris (1976:25) explains:

> . . . Increasingly from 1790 to 1860 it was seen as an instrument for the preservation of the French Canadian tradition; its integrated emphasis upon the French language, the Roman Catholic religion, and a culture based firmly on the study of the humanities was seen as a bulwark against the threat represented by a Protestant, English-speaking materialism.

English Canada Before 1860: Protestant Domination

Of the English universities established in Canada before 1860, only two were not originally established by a church: McGill and Toronto. The remainder were founded, supported, and administered by a church for many years. There were many factions of the Protestant church in English Canada, and each wanted its own institution of higher learning. The history of these early colleges was characterized not

by cooperation, but by a lack of it. Woodside (1958:5) gives this example:

> The stubbornness of the Anglicans in maintaining their position (professors had to be Anglicans and students had to subscribe to the 39 articles of the Church of England) prevented King's College, Windsor, from becoming the sole university of Nova Scotia and one of the great centres of learning in Canada. . . . Later, Dalhousie was the offender. When it finally opened in 1838 the Presbyterians insisted on appointing all the professors. Thereupon the Baptists opened their own college in Acadia, its principal being a professor who had been turned down at Dalhousie; the Methodists set up Mount Allison just across the border in Sackville, New Brunswick, where they could serve both provinces, as they still do; and the Scottish Catholics opened St. Francis Xavier in Antigonish, nearby. Later the College Sainte Anne was opened for French-speaking Roman Catholics at Church Point, and St. Mary's University in Halifax for Irish Catholics. The Nova Scotia Government then set up a separate engineering school of university rank, also in Halifax. As time went on all of these colleges became more and more committed, by tradition and by their buildings, to the localities in which they were established, and all efforts to concentrate the resources of Nova Scotian scholarship in one strong university were doomed to failure.

English Canada needed schools to train clergy and future leaders. They wanted the sons of immigrants to be educated in the English or British tradition rather than the French, the Anglican tradition rather than the Catholic. This rivalry between the English and French languages and cultures is deep rooted in Canada, and was only furthered by religious differences.

Until the 1850's there was no public secondary education in Canada or in any other Commonwealth country. Every university that traces its development back as far as 1860 was at some stage a provider of what is now known as high school training. Harris (1958:34)

elaborates on the funding problems that were encountered at this time:

> It must be remembered too that the resources available to early Canadian colleges were limited. Until the 1840's Canada was a frontier community. . . . The history of any one of the early colleges would provide ample illustration of the extraordinary difficulties which were faced and somehow overcome.

English Canada: American Influence

There were many influences on the development of early institutions of higher education in Canada, and one of the strongest was the American. The United Empire Loyalists were people who fled the United States after the revolution in 1776 because of their loyalty to the British crown. These people moved north to Canada from New York or New England where Harvard and the roots of Columbia were already established. They were considered educated and were concerned about their children's future. They established a King's College in Windsor, Nova Scotia, and another in Fredericton, New Brunswick. Both were modeled after the King's College in New York which later became Columbia. The other King's Colleges in the Maritimes, along with Bishop's and Trinity, were modeled directly after the Oxford and Cambridge example. All were tied to the Anglican church in England.

The American influence was felt later as well, especially in Western Canada, where the provincial universities were modeled after the state universities. These state-supported universities offered education for all, with business and agriculture degrees on an equal footing with arts. The titles dean and president come from this

American influence.

English Canada: Scottish Influence

Another major source of tradition handed down to the Canadian universities was the Scottish. While Oxford and Cambridge provided education for the elite, the Scottish tradition brought education to a wider populace. It was this influence that most strongly influenced the American system of democratic education for the masses. This influence was felt doubly in Canada, first from the Scottish settlers, and second from the United Empire Loyalists. The Scottish influence found more favor in Canada than the English, because there were few elite in Canada in the early days. Dalhousie, McGill and Queen's Universities were all founded on the model of the University of Edinburgh.

Still, there are many current traditions in Canada which come from the British heritage: pass and honours, colleges grouped within a university, administrative titles such as principal, vice-chancellor, and provost, and the separate organization of professional schools.

Canadian Universities From 1860 to 1890

Canadian higher education was greatly extended during this thirty-year period. There was considerable expansion in the populated

centres of the east, as well as farther west. Harris (1976:116) elaborates:

> . . . To the considerable number of institutions already in existence. . . were added Dalhousie, St. Joseph's, and College Sainte-Anne in the Maritimes, Assumption, McMaster, and Western in Ontario, . . . the Montreal branch of the Université Laval as well as a number of classical colleges in Quebec. Even more striking was the expansion to the west -- by 1890 a reasonably complex university for Manitoba, a number of small and not necessarily permanent colleges in the territory that would become the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and in British Columbia.

Dalhousie grew strong during this period, but the University of Halifax closed. The rest merely survived. All institutions had to struggle for adequate funds and were under endowed. By 1890 the Faculty of Arts was the dominant one in Canadian universities and the main concern of each university president. During this period, arts began to broaden, providing for a few courses in commerce and technology. The B.A. program divided into the fixed or pass B.A. and the Honours B.A. Some B.A. programs were completely prescribed, others allowed for election of courses in the last year or two.

Admission requirements became more or less standard across Canada for all universities. Harris (1976) points out that the usual requirement was "standing" in five subjects -- classics, mathematics, English, history with geography, and either a science of a modern language. Classics meant Latin and Greek.

Canadian Universities: 1890 to 1920

The Carnegie Corporation in New York, and the Rockefeller Institute began in this period to donate large sums of money to advance Canadian education. The Carnegie Corporation funded a study into Maritime education in 1922. One of the recommendations was the consolidation of all Maritime colleges and universities, except the University of New Brunswick, into one large effort at Dalhousie in Halifax. Some of the colleges would become affiliated faculties, others would revert to high school status. Most of these institutions did not accept this plan, only King's consolidated with Dalhousie, after its main building burned down in 1920.

The most important event in Quebec during this period was the granting of a separate charter to the Montreal branch of the Université Laval in 1919. In doing so, both institutions reorganized themselves for the better. In other centres, both liberal arts and professional training were expanding, and five new classical colleges were founded with a full eight-year B.A. program. Six others had six-year programs, and made transfer affiliations with Laval Université. Woodside (1958:193) summarizes the development in Quebec:

> It has remained until very recent years gripped in the pattern of classical education developed in Catholic Europe just after the Reformation. In the three centuries between the establishment of the first Jesuit college in Quebec in the early seventeenth century, until the end of the First World War, it changed hardly at all.

In Ontario, McMaster was opened with a huge endowment; Ottawa was established by papal decree in 1899; and Victoria College

consolidated with Toronto. Both Trinity and Queen's had raised enough funds that they could remain on their own. After the turn of the century, the governments began to contribute a fair share of the funding until the start of World War I when funds were diverted into the war effort.

Toward the West, the University of Manitoba had quite a different beginning than the other provincial universities. It was founded in 1877 by the cooperation of a number of church-related colleges. Each college continued its own operation on the example of the University of London. For years the university was merely an examining body with a "one room office and a single paid employee, a registrar" (Woodside, 1958:7). The grant from the Province of Manitoba was a mere $250 per year.

The founding of the other three provincial universities in the West was hampered somewhat by problems of passing legislation, acquiring land, and allocating funds at the same time. In all three cases, the choice of location held matters up even more. In British Columbia, the mainland and Vancouver Island fought over the location of the university. Until the issue was settled in 1910, the high schools were authorized to provide two years of university education and the final degrees were granted by McGill. In resolution, the legislature finally gave Victoria the capital and Vancouver the university.

Saskatchewan had less trouble establishing a university. In 1907, two years after it became a province, the legislature passed a University Act providing 1300 acres in Saskatoon and a million dollars in

funds. As Saskatoon got the university, Regina was designated as the capital.

Alberta had a few more problems. Actually one year earlier than Saskatchewan, it passed a University Act in 1906 and a site was purchased in Edmonton. A president was appointed and classes began in temporary quarters. But because of agitation from Calgary over the fact that Edmonton had both the university and the capital, and due to a rail scandal, the legislature did not vote funds for buildings for several years. The issue was finally resolved in 1912.

Calgary had been lobbying for a second university, and a college was granted in 1911. In 1914 a Royal Commission recommended establishment of an Institute of Arts and Technology in Calgary instead of a college, and between this discouragement and the onset of the war, Calgary College closed its doors in 1915.

The Federal Government of Canada played a role in higher education during this period by establishing Khaki University in England for soldiers during the war. It was headed by H. M. Tory of the University of Alberta. All Canadian universities agreed to accept the credits from this innovative institution. But after the war, little help was given to veterans to allow them to complete their studies.

During this period, the general admission requirements of Canadian universities experienced some changes: Science and Greek were required less often, and history was separated from geography. Admission to first year was based on "standing" in five subjects -- English, history, mathematics, Latin and one other (Harris, 1976:235). Only four

institutions required two languages, and only five required a science.

Canadian Universities: 1920 to 1940

The Conference on Canadian American Affairs (1939) was only one of a series of such conferences held between 1935 and 1945, and demonstrates three of the most important developments in this twenty-year period. One was the emergence of economics, history, and political science as academic disciplines; second, was the government's recognition of professors as experts in their fields; and third, was the beginning of professorial involvement in large research projects.

During this period there was a significant increase in enrolments -- undergraduates increased 58 percent in twenty years and graduate students quadrupled. Striking progress occurred in programs of interest to women, especially: education, household science, nursing, social work, library science, and physical and occupational therapy. Graduate programs also increased especially in the new professions: agriculture, dentistry, and engineering. Most of the growth occurred in the first ten years of this period, which leads to the conclusion that the depression of the 1930's stunted the growth of higher education in Canada.

Only two institutions received degree-granting status or charters during this period: Mt. St. Vincent at Halifax in 1925, and St. Thomas in Chatham, New Brunswick in 1934. Sir George Williams College in Montreal was established in 1929 but without full degree-granting status.

During the depression years of the thirties, operating budgets were cut in half, and there were no capital grants. Some two-year colleges were established, eight for instance in Saskatchewan in the

1920's. The University of British Columbia was beset with monetary problems and lack of leadership, and no new programs were introduced. Manitoba in addition to similar problems, found that its one million dollar endowment had been embezzled by its bursar! Harris (1976:449) comments on research activities during this time:

> The amount of first rate scholarship and research produced even at the larger institutions was discouragingly small, and the explanation cannot be fully attributed to the inadequacy of libraries or museums, the dearth of learned societies and journals, or even to the paucity of direct financial support. It could also be ascribed to the fact that most Canadian professors were underpaid and overworked.

Canadian Universities: 1940 to 1960

After the Second World War, the universities staggered into a new era of doubling and tripling enrolments. First came the wave of women returning from the work force, and then the veterans returning from the war. Soon the post-war "baby boom" would arrive at the university gates. A sample of the enrolment statistics of Canadian universities from selected years shows this steady increase (Harris, 1976:456-7)

Year	Full-Time Students	Changes
1939-40	35,903	
1944-45	38,516	8,155 women
1946-47	76,237	10,995 women
1950-51	64,036	34,000 veterans
1960-61	107,346	6,126 veterans
		Still prior to the baby boom!

After the war, the federal government was more supportive of veterans than after World War I. Veterans were given free tuition and

a living allowance to further their education. The enrolments were expected to double and then drop when the veterans finished their degrees, but it did not happen that way. In 1955, a prediction by Dr. E. F. Sheffield (Woodside, 1958) stated that enrolments would double again in just ten years. This prompted the 1956 Conference on the Crisis in Canadian Higher Education. According to Harris (1976:461) the federal government came to the rescue with

> . . . the announcement by the Prime Minister that the existing federal grants would be doubled immediately . . . and that the long and eagerly anticipated Canada Council which had been recommended in the Massey Report would be established. It would be endowed with $50 million for university capital expenditures, and another $50 million to be used for development of the humanities and social sciences.

Initially, the burdens imposed by sudden growth fell on existing institutions, both large and small ones. In general the large universities tripled in size, while the smaller ones doubled. But new institutions were also created to cope with the rapid growth. Assumption, Sherbrooke, and Carleton had recently achieved full university status. The University of Waterloo, Waterloo Lutheran University, York University, and Laurentian University were also new.

Two other developments during this period merit attention: the sharp increase in part-time students, especially in large metropolitan centres, and the rise in the numbers of foreign students. Sir George Williams had started in 1873 as high school night classes in a Montreal Y.M.C.A. In 1929 the first year of college studies was added, and five years later a four-year curriculum was adopted. In

1955 it finally became a separate chartered corporation with new quarters of its own.

Carleton also grew from night classes, granting its first degrees in 1946. Because of its Ottawa location, it has always offered strong programs in public administration.

When Newfoundland became a province in 1949, it upgraded Memorial College in St. John's to university status, with solid provincial funding.

At the very end of this period, a Royal Commission was appointed to study higher education in Quebec, and the mid 1960's saw extensive changes in the classical college system. Science courses were introduced into the programs at Laval, and soon the classical colleges also had a science option. When Laval Université was incorporated in 1852, seven classical colleges were affiliated with it, but by 1958 there were thirty-four colleges affiliated with Laval, thirty-three with the University of Montreal, and seven with the University of Sherbrooke.

In Ontario, in 1940 there were only five degree-granting universities: McMaster, Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, and Western Ontario. Twenty years later, in 1960, there were twelve. A number of the new universities had been affiliated junior members of larger institutions.

Teacher's colleges or normal schools were eliminated in the West and in Newfoundland during this period when government made the universities responsible for elementary teacher training. The federal government was also involved in higher education during this period in its rehabilitation programs for veterans, and in funding a second

Khaki University during World War II.

Technical training also expanded. In 1949 there only existed a few agricultural schools, a forest ranger school, and the Institute of Technology in Calgary. During these twenty years, almost every province in Canada built at least one new vocational or technological institute.

Another development of import should be noted here, and that was the development of Research Institutes and Centres which were administered directly, affiliated with, or located within the universities in almost every province.

Canadian Universities: 1960 to the Present

Since 1960, the university system has continued to grow. Fifteen new universities were created between 1960 and 1969, and another five have been added since 1970. Over all, more than half of all Canadian universities have been created since 1950. In the mid-seventies, however, a new crisis emerged for the universities, the leveling off of enrolments and the beginning of a decline in student numbers. This prompted a re-thinking of the purpose and rationale for universities all over the world -- not just in Canada.

Summary

In his conclusion, Harris found that Canadian universities have common characteristics which bind them together and set them apart from those of other countries. He noted the following characteristics; the first two are those of diversity, the latter two are those of unity.

> The first of the diversifying characteristics is the fact that seven elements have combined to form the compound that constitutes Canadian higher education . . . the American liberal arts college, the Jesuit classical college, the Catholic universities, the Scottish university, the combination of Oxford and Cambridge, the University of London, and the seventh element, the American state university.
>
> A second diversifying characteristic is the combined consequence of the factors of time, space, and language.
>
> There have been unifying factors as well . . . the first . . . is the mechanism of federation or affiliation, two basically similar methods of arranging for cooperation between institutions that are legally independent . . .
>
> The second is . . . the National Conference of Canadian Universities, now called the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (Harris, 1976:593-4).

There are a number of unique features of Canadian programs, such as the three routes to the B.A. or B.Sc.: the classical college course, the general course, and the honours course. Each differs from comparable courses in other countries. The arts curriculum also includes some professional programs such as commerce or journalism.

In providing professional education, Canada is unique because most of the small colleges are involved along with the big

universities. Graduate studies are similar to the American pattern, except that admission to an M.A. program is often based on an honours B.A. degree.

Harris (1976:603), in his summary of the history of Canadian higher education up to 1960, states:

> By 1960, Canadian higher education was a well-organized system with all the facilities needed to fulfill its national, regional, provincial, and community roles, a statement that could not have been made ten years earlier. During the 1960's it faced a series of crises . . . In 1975 it can be said that the Canadian higher education system of 1960 proved to be capable of adjusting itself to this new series of crises.

UNIVERSITY GOALS: PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

From this brief survey of the history of higher education, it was easy to see how dichotomies in the Canadian universities of today have arisen. The views expressed in the literature on universities were based on divergent premises. There were those who said that universities should teach, be relevant, and train workers for jobs. Others held that universities should remain aloof, apart from society, leading society, discovering new facets of the world through research. Some have argued that universities should all be alike, others that universities should all be different--each adapting to its own circumstance.

Perspectives

The historical developments previously reviewed have left the Canadian universities with a legacy of perspectives about their purpose. A few statements on university goals are offered to illustrate the variety of perspectives that exist. The commonalities in these statements reflect an underlying unity of purpose; divergent views indicate the complexity of the multi-purpose universities of today's world.

Cardinal Newman (1966:7), in the preface to his discourses on "The Idea of a University," delivered in Dublin in 1852 said:

> The view taken of a university in these discourses is the following: that it is a place of teaching universal knowledge. This implies that its object is on the one hand, intellectual, not moral; and on the other, that it is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement. If its object were scientific and philosophic discovery, I do not see why a university should have students; if religious training, I do not see how it can be the seat of literature and science.

> Such is a university in its essence, and independently of its relation to the Church. But, practically speaking, it cannot fulfill its object duly, such as I have described it, without the Church's assistance; . . . the Church is necessary for its integrity. Not that its main characters are changed by this incorporation: it still has the office of intellectual education; but the Church steadies it in the performance of that office.

In 1930, Abraham Flexner wrote a series of Rhodes lectures given in Oxford. In examining the universities of Germany, England, and the United States, he offered this definition (1930:3), and concludes:

> I am endeavoring to indicate in the most explicit fashion that a university, like all other human institutions . . . is not outside, but inside the general social fabric of a given era. It is not something apart, something historic, something that yields as little as possible to forces and influences that are more or less new. It is, on the contrary -- so I shall assume --an expression of the age, as well as an influence operating upon both present and future.

Some thirty years later, Clark Kerr delivered a series of lectures at Harvard, in which he observed (1963:1-2, 18):

> The university of today can perhaps be understood, in part, by comparing it with what it once was -- with the academic cloister of Cardinal Newman, with the research organism of Abraham Flexner. Those are the ideal types from which it has derived, ideal types which still constitute the illusions of some of its inhabitants. The modern . . . . university, however, is not Oxford nor is it Berlin; it is a new type of institution in the world. As a new type of institution, it is not really private and it is not really public; it is neither entirely of the world nor entirely apart from it. It is unique. . . .
>
> A university anywhere can aim no higher than to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates, as German as possible for the sake of the graduates and research personnel, as American as possible for the sake of the public at large -- and as confused as possible for the sake of the preservation of the whole uneasy balance.

In a collection of essays by ten American scholars, Robert Ulrich, Professor of Education at Harvard University, wrote (Frankel, 1959:46-47):

> The history of higher education shows that its institutions have alienated themselves from the spirit of their period, or have decayed into glorified trade schools, whenever they have not seen the necessity of a productive interaction between scholarship and

> human culture. Only when they have been able to combine the advancement of knowledge with the interpretation and guardianship of the deeper meanings of human existence have they been really respected. This synthesis is today more difficult than ever. But one may confidently hope that . . . our colleges and universities are aware of the challenge offered to them in one of the greatest periods of transition in human history.

Claude T. Bissell, (1968:153-155, 157, 159) President of the University of Toronto, outlined the characteristics of a great university in an address given in Vancouver in February, 1965:

> The first characteristic is that the university is a stronghold of scholarship in the pure theoretical subjects that lie at the basis of any expansion of knowledge. If I were asked to name them I would say they are physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics, political science, economics, literature, history, philosophy.
>
> . . . The second characteristic of the great university is that it has graduate and undergraduate divisions that are both strong.
>
> . . . The third characteristic of the great university is that it maintains a balance between its long-range goals and its short-range obligations, or between its responsibility to pure scholarship and its responsibility to the society of which it is a part.
>
> . . . There is a fourth characteristic of the great university that is the hardest to define and the most difficult to realize. That is the maintenance of a sense of community.

In a seminar of twenty-five distinguished representatives of universities in England, the United States, and Canada, W. R. Niblett (1969:25) offered a pluralistic view of the university:

> Any place of higher education, as we have seen, must without doubt today be a pluralist institution: inevitably it will have within it numerous parts, most of them dealing with particular areas of knowledge and particular ways of knowing. There is a fruitfulness in such diversity, the chance of challenges that will compel fresh consideration of conflicting evidence and incompatible theories. From the opposition and interplay of minds, if they come close enough to hear each other, new understanding can arise. But if this is to happen, a university must be more than a collection of contiguous departments; and it will only happen if within the plurality there is a deeper unity.

In the Foreward to The University Today: Its Role and Place in Society (Ducret and Zaman, 1960:iv), Vittorinto Veronese, Director-

General of UNESCO, identified the enduring qualities of a university:

> The university has proved throughout the centuries that it can best serve society by being itself, and by being true to itself. It possesses within itself those capabilities which are essential in an age of discovery and change like ours: to train human beings as much as specialists, to respect creative thought unconditionally, to instruct in research methods, to open the mind so that it will not only learn to apply the techniques of today, but also to visualize and create the world of tomorrow. Lastly, it strives to rise above temporary upheavals and to build for all time and all men.

Commenting about the complexity of university goal statements, George Pederson (1979:1), President of Simon Fraser University, stated:

> . . .not only are academic goals lacking in clarity, but they are also highly contested. Provided that such goals are left ambiguous and diffuse, people accept them; as soon as efforts are made to specify them in concrete terms which can be operationalized, important differences of opinion become dominant . . . In this sense, the academic goals of any university tend to be a bit like "mom's good old apple pie" -- enough cinnamon to create a sense of spiciness but overidden with ample sugar to satisfy a multiplicity of tastes.

These statements of perspective on university goals and purposes exemplify the dilemma facing universities today. Rooted in the ancient past, today's institutions of higher learning have demonstrated remarkable strengths to perpetuate longstanding traditions of scholarship and also to respond to the changing demands of a complex environment. Among the enduring issues are equality of access, excellence, program comprehensiveness, meeting social and manpower needs, and authority and control. In an era of little or no growth, goals have arisen in response to demands for external accountability along with the need for internal self-renewal. The changing environment of higher education led to the inevitable articulation of new goals for universities.

Research

In order to determine future goals of the universities, a whole new priority-setting process was needed, hence a number of studies were developed at the institutional level, and even larger.

An exhaustive study, using the Institutional Goals Inventory, was prepared on the California State system of Higher Education by Richard Peterson, in March, 1973. This research studied four types of institutions (116 in total) and used seven constituent groups: faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, evening students, trustees, administrators, and community people. This study found general agreement among all constituent groups about Intellectual Orientation and Community as the most important goals of all institutions. Administrators agreed that the traditional values of Academic Development and Research were of high importance.

Several Canadian universities have also used the Institutional Goals Inventory to discover the priorities on their campuses. The University of Prince Edward Island sampled five sub-groups on its campus: administrators, faculty, full-time students, part-time students, and alumni, reporting its findings in 1975 (Loucks, 1975). This study grouped the twenty goal areas into five general categories, in the following order of priority: Education for Intellectual Growth, Training in Academic Work, Self and Career Development Humanism - Altruism, Community Service, and Democratic Campus Community.

The University of Manitoba surveyed six constituent groups with the Institutional Goals Inventory: administrators, faculty, support staff, students, legislators, and community representatives. A summary

report was made to the Senate in October, 1977 (Hu, 1977). The major findings of this study suggested that emphasis should be placed on the achievement of the outcome goals of Advanced Training, Intellectual Orientation, Graduate Literacy, Academic Development, and Individual Personal Development. Of the process goals, Institutional Reputation was the most important, followed by Community, Off-Campus Learning, and Concensus on Campus Goals.

The University of Ottawa undertook a similar study of the perceptions of faculty, students, and administrators, reporting its findings in 1978. This study was designed to be a part of a study of all Ontario universities, but the research on the rest of the province never materialized (Piccinin, 1978).

McMaster University undertook a study using the Institutional Goals Inventory and received the report of its Long Range Planning Committee in September, 1976 (McMaster, 1976). The report indicated that goals in the areas of research and graduate study and commitment to high-quality instruction were of high importance, and the goals of Adult Education, Humanism, and Individual Personal Development should be given greater emphasis in the future.

A number of other universities have undertaken planning studies using means other than the Institutional Goals Inventory. One of these was the University of Waterloo, which in 1979, received the report of the Long Range Planning Committee (Brzustowski, 1979). This report outlined a number of recommendations for development between 1977 and 1988 in the following goal areas: teaching and research activities, intellectual and social development of students, employability of

graduates, cooperative education, scholarship on social issues, egalitarianism, benefit of research to society, and instructional innovation.

Other Canadian universities have studied their long range plans, but by 1981, there were still many that did not even have an official statement of purpose (McNeal, Konrad, and Hodysh, 1981). That study, undertaken for the University of Alberta Senate Commission on University Purpose, attempted to discover the goals of other Canadian universities. The request for a purpose statement from each university in Canada resulted in the receipt of documents ranging from Calendars and three-hundred-page planning papers, to annual reports and letters with one-sentence goal statements. The lack of uniform information, and the breadth of materials received, prompted the need for this study of the goals of all Canadian universities using standard format and terminology and common goal areas.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Population

All Canadian universities were included in this study. The definition of a university used herein is "a postsecondary educational institution that currently grants degrees, either undergraduate or graduate, by authority of the province in which it is located." There are fifty institutions in Canada that fit this definition of a university.

Only two constituencies were included in this study, the presidents, representing the university, and the board chairmen, representing the community. It was felt that incumbents in these two positions would best be suited to reflect on the purposes espoused by the university as a whole. There were ninety-eight possible respondents in all, as two Quebec institutions have a single officer that fulfills both functions.

Instrumentation

The Canadian version, both French and English translations, of the Institutional Goals Inventory (Form 1) was used as the survey instrument. The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was prepared over a period of several years by the Institute for Research in Higher Education of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. The IGI was designed to conceptualize and assess the relative importance of goals

embraced by colleges and universities, as perceived by one or a number of constituent groups.

The theoretical framework of the IGI consists of twenty "goal areas," thirteen of which are conceived of as outcome goals -- the substantive objectives of institutions, or the desired end results; and seven as process goals -- the educational process, climate or learning atmosphere. These twenty major goal areas are outlined below:

Outcome Goals:

1. Academic Development - this goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

2. Intellectual Orientation - this goal area relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem-solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to lifelong learning.

3. Individual Personal Development - this goal area means identification by students of personal goals and the development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence.

4. Humanism/Altruism - this goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

5. Cultural/Asthetic Awareness - this goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-western art, and encouragement of active participation in artistic activities.

6. Traditional Religiousness - this goal area is intended to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental -- in short, traditional rather than "secular" or "modern."

7. Vocational Preparation - this goal area means offering specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.

8. Advanced Training - this goal area can be most readily understood simply as the availability of postgraduate education. It means developing and maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the professions, and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas.

9. Research - this goal involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

10. Meeting Local Needs - this goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural centre for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community service activities.

11. Public Service - this goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

12. Social Egalitarianism - this goal area has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

13. Social Criticism/Activism - this goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing Canadian values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in Canadian society and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in Canadian society.

Process Goals:

14. Freedom - this goal area is defined as protecting the rights of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own lifestyles.

15. Democratic Governance - this goal area means decentralized decisionmaking arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for invididuals to participate in all decisions affecting the institution and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

16. Community - this goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

17. Intellectual/Asthetic Environment - this goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

18. Innovation - this goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life; it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and more specially, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

19. Off-Campus Learning - this goal area includes time away from the campus in travel work-study, CUSO work, etc. study on several campuses during undergraduate programs, awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

20. Accountability/Efficiency - this goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.

The IGI consists of 90 goal statements, 80 of which are related to the above 20 goal areas -- four per area, and 10 additional statements which are referred to as miscellaneous goal statements. The miscellaneous statements reflect goals judged by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) as less important than the twenty major goal areas above, but significant enough to be included in the survey instrument. These goal statements included such topics as the literacy of graduates, institutional autonomy, institutional reputation, organizational planning, program evaluation, community liaison, community participation in planning, extracurricular activities, and intercollegiate athletics.

The IGI was designed to provide the option of writing extra goal statements to assess local priorities. This study added ten local goals from Canadian concerns gleaned through a research project for the

University of Alberta Senate in 1981 (McNeal, Konrad, Hodysh). These goals reflected the following current Canadian concerns: delivery of programs to remote areas, credit for experiential learning, new faculty employment programs, faculty development and evaluation, educational technology, bilingual instruction, French Canadian cultural programs, provision of equal access to programs for adult or mature students, part-time students, and handicapped students (See Appendix 1).

In total, then, the respondents were asked to rate 100 goal statements. These are reported in the data tables as Outcome Goals, Process Goals, Miscellaneous Goals, and Local Canadian Goals.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of statements at their institution on two dimensions:

- How important IS the goal at the present time?
- How important SHOULD (this goal) BE?

The respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions on a five-point, Likert-type cale:

- Of no importance, or not applicable 1
- Of low importance 2
- Of medium importance 3
- Of high importance 4
- Of extremely high importance 5

On the last page of the IGI, the respondents were asked four identification questions pertaining to their position (president--administrator, or governing board member), province, university age, and university size. The ten Canadian goal statements and the four

identification questions were translated into French to complete the French version of the instrument.*

Data Collection

On November 12, 1981, a total of one hundred questionaires were mailed out with a covering letter explaining the nature of the study (See Appendix I). Three weeks later, on December 3, 1981, a follow-up letter was sent urging prompt response. Two weeks later, in the week of December 16-21, 1981, telephone calls were made to the presidents' offices of the twenty-four universities that had not yet replied, and a few more telephone calls were made in mid-January. By the end of January, thirty-eight out of 50 presidents had responded, but only sixteen out of 48 board chairmen.** All together, the combined replies of the presidents and board chairmen represented thirty-nine of the 50 institutions that were included in the total population (See Table 1).

Although the validity of the responses of board chairmen was questionable because of the low response rate, they were used as a comparison group with the group of presidents. The combined data from both groups were used in examining differences in goals by region, age and size of the university because the distribution of the board chairmen was fairly even across these dimensions.

---

* The translation services of Andrée Smith of Athabasca University are gratefully acknowledged.

** Two presidents in Quebec also served as chairman of their boards.

Table 1

Response Rate of Presidents and Board Chairmen

Population	Total Sample	Number Replied	Percent
Presidents	50	38	76
Board Chairmen	48	16	33
Total	98	54	55

Data Analyses

The data in this study were analyzed in seven ways: first, the respondent profile was examined; then, the ratings and rankings for Is and Should Be goals were compared; next, the mean ratings, standard deviations, and rankings were compared by position, region, age, and size of university. Finally, the mean differences were examined between the Is and Should Be goal ratings, and combined with the Should Be ratings.

When analyzing the goal perceptions, they were usually separated into four groups: outcome goals, process goals, miscellaneous goals, and local Canadian goals. Most of the analyses of the Is and Should Be ratings include the mean and standard deviation for each respondent group.

The mean scores show the average rating of perceived importance for each goal area -- the higher the mean the greater its perceived importance by the respondents. The standard deviation shows the amount

of agreement or disagreement among the respondents in a given group. Those goal areas that had the lowest standard deviations showed the greatest amount of consensus among the respondent group.

The goal rankings report the means from the highest to the lowest ratings. The rankings were derived from the ratings of each respondent group. A few of the tables report only the rankings by name for the sake of comparison. These rankings give an indication of the relative importance of each goal area.

The mean differences between the Is and Should Be ratings in the perception of the respondents showed the "gap" that exists -- the greater the gap, the larger the need for more change in that goal area. The smaller the gap, the more satisfied the respondents were with the achievements of their university in that goal area. The last table reports the means for Should Be goals combined with the mean difference between that rating and the Is rating, to get a perspective on what the priorities for change might be in the future. For instance, when a goal area had a mean Should Be rating of 3.0 and a gap of 1.5, the priority rating would be 4.5. The priority rating could serve as an indicator of the importance a goal area should have in the future of the universities in the perception of the respondent groups.

Summary

The data which are analyzed in the next chapter were collected over a period of two months beginning in November, 1981. The institutional Goals Inventory was sent to all university presidents and board chairmen in Canada. A very good return rate was received from the presidents, but a somewhat less adequate return rate was received from board chairmen. The survey results were analyzed by computer, and the statistical results are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSES

This chapter outlines the findings of this study. The data analyses are presented in six sections: the profile of respondents, the Is and Should Be ratings and rankings, the ratings with some rankings by means of position and region, the mean ratings and standard deviations by age and size of university, and, finally, the mean differences or gap between the Is and Should Be ratings.

RESPONDENT PROFILE

Tables 2 through 9 show the respondent groupings by the respondent's position and the region, age, and size of university. Table 2 shows the distribution of universities in the provinces, and the rate of return by respondent groups. Table 3 indicates the regional groupings which were derived from the above data, and the response rate of the presidents and board chairmen for each region. Most of the provinces were well represented except for Prince Edward Island, which did not reply at all, and Ontario, where the response rate of presidents was only 59 percent and board chairmen was 40 percent. Newfoundland had the highest response rate with 100 percent for both presidents and board chairmen (one each).

When the groupings in Table 3 were examined, the response rate in the regions was quite high except in Ontario. It could be said that Ontario was under represented in this study, with only 10 presidents and 5 board chairmen responding out of 17 in each group.

Table 2

Provincial distribution of IGI returns
by respondent groups in Canadian Universities

Province	Number of Universities	Rate of Presidents		Rate of Chairmen		Rate Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
British Columbia	3	2	67	1	33	3	50
Alberta	4	4	100	1	25	5	63
Saskatchewan	2	2	100	1	50	3	75
Manitoba	3	3	100	2	67	5	83
Ontario	17	10	59	5	29	15	44
Quebec	7	6	86	2*	40	8	57
New Brunswick	4	4	100	1	25	5	63
Nova Scotia	8	6	75	2	25	8	50
Prince Edward Island	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newfoundland	1	1	100	1	100	2	100
Totals	50	38	76	16	33	54	55

* Two presidents were also board chairmen.

Table 3

Provincial and regional distribution of IGI respondents as a percentage of all respondents

Province	Region	Universities N & Respondent N		Response N & Percent		Total % of Respondents in Region
British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba	West	12	24	16	67	29.6
Ontario	Ontario	17	34	15	46	27.8
Quebec	Quebec	7	12	8	67	14.8
New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland	Atlantic	14	28	15	52	27.8
Totals	Universities in Canada	50 + 48 = 98 possible response		54	55	100.0

The Western region and Quebec had the highest response rate with 67 percent total response rate. In Quebec not all universities have both a president and a board chairman, as there are two universities that have one administrator that performs both functions. In the Atlantic region, the total response rate was 52 percent. Ontario had a total response rate of only 46 percent.

Table 4 shows the original and new groupings of the year in which the institutions received university status. This is referred to in later discussions as the "age" of the university. The percentages indicate the number of respondents in the original nine groups by decade, and the number in the four new groups, which are in thirty year blocks.

Table 5 shows the full-time enrolment of the respondents' universities in the original and new groupings. This full-time enrolment will be referred to in later discussions as university "size." Once again, the numbers for the total sample by original and new groupings are given with the percentage of total respondents in each group.

Tables 6 through 10 show the distribution of respondents by age, size and region of institutions. Table 6 shows percentage of presidents and board chairmen in each age group of universities. More than a third of the universities in this study had received university status since 1960, while little more than one fourth became universities in the thirty years previous. From 1900 to 1929 only thirteen percent of the institutions achieved university status, and less than one quarter became universities before 1900. If the latest two groups are combined, over 60 percent of the respondents' universities were established since 1930.

Table 4

Original and new groupings according to the year institution received university status (age) as a percentage of all respondents

Original Grouping			New Grouping		
Year rec'd Status	Total Response N	Total Response % in Group	Year rec'd Status	Total Response N	Total Response % in Group
Before 1900	12	22.2	Before 1900	12	22.2
1900 - 1909	4	7.4	1900 - 1929	7	13.0
1910 - 1919	2	3.7			
1920 - 1929	1	1.9			
1930 - 1939	3	5.6	1930 - 1959	15	27.8
1940 - 1949	4	7.4			
1950 - 1959	8	14.8			
1960 - 1969	15	27.8	Since 1960	20	37.0
Since 1970	5	9.3			
Totals	54	100.0		54	100.0

Table 5

Original and new groupings according to full-time enrolment (size) of universities, as a percentage of all respondents

Original Group			New Groups		
Enrolment	Response		Enrolment	Response	
	N	%		N	%
Under 4,000	26	48.1	Under 4,000	26	48.1
4,000-7,999	9	16.7	4,000-11,999	17	31.5
8,000-11,999	8	14.8			
12,000-15,999	5	9.3	12,000 or more	11	20.4
16,000-19,999	2	3.7			
20,000 or more	4	7.4			
Totals	54	100.0		54	100.0

Table 6

IGI returns according to respondent position and age of universities.
Percentages are given for each group in proportion to the total response.

University Status Granted Year/Age Group	Presidents #	Presidents %	Chairmen #	Chairmen %	Total Sample #	Total Sample %
Since 1960	13	34.2	7	43.8	20	37.0
1930 - 1959	10	26.3	5	31.3	15	27.8
1900 - 1929	6	15.8	1	6.3	7	13.0
Before 1900	9	23.7	3	18.8	12	22.2
Totals	38	100.0	16	100.0	54	100.00

Table 7

IGI returns according to respondent position and age of universities.
Percentages are given for each group in proportion to the total response.

University Full-Time Enrolment/Size Group	Presidents #	Presidents %	Chairmen #	Chairmen %	Total Sample #	Total Sample %
Under 4,000 (small)	17	44.7	9	56.3	26	48.1
4,000 to 11,999	13	34.2	4	25.0	17	31.5
12,000 or more (large)	8	21.1	3	18.8	11	20.4
Totals	38	100.0	16	100.0	54	100.0

Table 7 shows the proportion of presidents and board chairmen at universities in the groups by size or full-time enrolment. The small institutions, those with under 4000 full-time students, made up the largest percentage of the respondents -- almost half. Less than one-third of the universities were in the mid-size range with between 4000 and 11,999 full-time students. Only 20 percent of the respondents were from universities with a full-time enrolment of over 12,000. When these figures were compared with those in Table 5, it was seen that only one tenth of the Canadian universities in this study had enrolments of 16,000 full-time students or more. In these two tables, the figures of the response rate for the presidents and board chairmen is given along with the percentages for the total sample in each group. This shows the consistency between them and the proportions of each group in the total sample.

Table 8 shows a cross-tabulation of respondents by regions and age of the institutions. Of the respondents in this study, ten were from universities in the West that had been created since 1960, compared with five in Ontario, one in Quebec, and four in the Atlantic provinces. From the years 1930 - 1959, seven of the respondents' institutions were given university status in Ontario, compared with four in Quebec, three in the Atlantic region, and one in the West. Three respondents each in both the Western and Atlantic regions and one in Ontario were from universities that had achieved university status between 1900 and 1929. In the oldest category, the largest number, five, were from the Atlantic provinces, compared with three in Quebec and two each in Ontario and the West.

Table 8

IGI returns by respondent groups
according to age and region of universities.
(President response group in brackets)

Region \ Age	Age Groups: New ← → Old								Total Sample	Pres. Only
	Since 1960		1930-1959		1900-1929		Before 1900			
Western	10	(6)	1	(1)	3	(3)	2	(1)	16	(11)
Ontario	5	(3)	7	(4)	1	(1)	2	(2)	15	(10)
Quebec	1	(1)	4	(3)	0	(0)	3	(2)	8	(6)
Atlantic	4	(3)	3	(2)	3	(2)	5	(4)	15	(11)
Totals	20	(13)	15	(10)	7	(6)	12	(9)	54	(38)

Table 9

IGI returns by respondent groups
according to size and region of universities
(President response group in brackets)

Region \ Size	Full-Time Enrolment: Small ← → Large						Total Sample	Pres. Only
	Under 4,000		4,000-11,999		12,000 +			
Western	7	(4)	5	(4)	4	(3)	16	(11)
Ontario	5	(3)	7	(5)	3	(2)	15	(10)
Quebec	2	(1)	2	(2)	4	(3)	8	(6)
Atlantic	12	(9)	3	(2)	0	(0)	15	(11)
Totals	26	(17)	17	(13)	11	(8)	54	(38)

In tables 8, 9, and 10, the figures for the total number of respondents is given with the number of presidents only in brackets. This is done for comparison with the profile on universities in Canada, as the most complete response rate was received from the president group.

Table 9 represents the cross-tabulation of the respondents as they were grouped into regions according to size or full-time enrolment. More Western respondents came from thesmall institutions (7) and mid-size universities (5) than large ones -- only 4. Ontario's response was more from the mid-size institutions (7) than from the small (5) or large (3) universities. Quebec replied more often from the largest group of institutions (4) compared with 2 each for the other two groups. The Atlantic provinces replied more from the small universities (12) as opposed to 3 in the mid-size group and none in the large group.

The cross-tabulation presented in Table 10 compares the responses from institutions in the three size groups with responses from universities in the four age groups. The largest group (14) of respondents came from universities with under 4000 full-time students that were created since 1960. The second largest group (9) came from mid-size universities that were created between 1930 and 1959. The third largest group of respondents (6) came from universities that were created before 1900 but had less than 4000 full-time students. All the other groups in this table had 4, 3, or 2 respondents each. Almost half of the respondents came from universities with less than 4000 full-time enrolments, but they were either very old or very new.

Table 10

IGI returns by respondent groups
according to age and size of universities
(President response group in brackets)

Age \ Size	Small Under 4,000		4,000-11,999		Large 12,000 +		Totals N	Pres.	%
Since 1960	14	(9)	4	(3)	2	(1)	20	(13)	37.0%
1930 - 1959	3	(2)	9	(6)	3	(2)	15	(10)	27.8%
1900 - 1929	3	(2)	2	(2)	2	(2)	7	(6)	13.0%
Before 1900	6	(4)	2	(2)	4	(3)	12	(9)	22.2%
Totals	26	(17)	17	(13)	11	(8)	54	(38)	100.0%
Percentages	48.1%		31.5%		20.4%		100.0%		

In summary, then, Tables 6 through 10 indicate how the 54 respondents were distributed among the groups according to position and institutional size, age, and location.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: IS AND SHOULD BE RATINGS/RANKINGS

This section contains an examination of the ratings of the goal areas for both Is and Should Be as perceived by the total sample. First, the outcome and process goals were ranked from the highest to lowest mean rating for both the present situation -- Is, and for projected future emphasis -- Should Be. Second, the twenty major goal areas were ranked together according to their mean ratings. Finally, all forty goal areas were ranked together. The tables in this section show both the mean and standard deviation for each goal area, and the goal areas are ranked from highest to lowest mean rating as perceived by the total number of respondents.

Table 11 lists the ratings of the outcome goals ranked by Is and Should Be means. These outcome goals are the traditional goals of universities, and are sometimes, without question, assumed to be the most important priorities that universities pursue. Academic Development and Intellectual Orientation exchanged first place on the two lists, with a high level of agreement among respondents. Research and Individual Personal Development exchanged third and fourth places on the two lists, but with a lesser amount of agreement. Meeting Local Needs was fifth on both lists, with high consensus, and Advanced Training, or Graduate Studies, sixth on both lists, but with the highest amount of disagreement among respondents. Public Service appeared in eighth rank on both lists with a good amount of agreement. The remaining goals were in various positions down the list, with the range of disagreement between .60 and .80.

Table 11

Respondents' perceptions of the outcome goals ranked by Is and Should Be means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1.	Academic Development	3.49	.54	1.	Intellectual Orientation	4.28	.51
2.	Intellectual Orientation	3.42	.68	2.	Academic Development	3.98	.50
3.	Research	3.23	.90	3.	Individual Personal Development	3.66	.70
4.	Individual Personal Development	2.97	.74	4.	Research	3.61	.78
5.	Meeting Local Needs	2.95	.58	5.	Meeting Local Needs	3.36	.52
6.	Advanced Training	2.85	1.06	6.	Advanced Training	3.20	1.05
7.	Vocational Preparation	2.81	.63	7.5	Humanism/ Altruism	3.20	.80
8.	Public Service	2.75	.65	7.5	Public Service	3.20	.73
9.	Social Egalitarianism	2.43	.68	9.	Vocational Preparation	3.17	.67
10.	Humanism/ Altruism	2.42	.76	10.	Cultural Awareness	3.07	.67
11.	Cultural Awareness	2.41	.60	11.	Social Egalitarianism	2.82	.81
12.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.39	.64	12.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.76	.75
13.	Traditional Religiousness	1.50	.72	13.	Traditional Religiousness	1.77	.97

The last two goals on each list were Social Criticism/Activism in twelfth rank, and Traditional Religiousness in last position.

All goals were rated on a scale from one to five, and the highest Is ranking of 3.49 for Academic Development indicates that this traditional university goal was perceived to be of little more than medium importance in Canadian universities. Further, of all these outcome goals, only Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation, and Research were of more than medium importance, while the rest had scores or mean ratings below 3.0 for Is. The Should Be ratings were considerably higher, with Intellectual Orientation, scoring the highest rating of 4.28, of high importance. Nine of the remaining Should Be goals had means of between 3 and 4, between medium and high importance. Traditional Religiousness was the only Should Be goal to fall below low importance, with a mean of 1.77 and a standard deviation of .97.

The standard deviation indicates the amount of consensus or disagreement in the perceptions of the respondents. The greatest consensus was achieved on the goals of Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation, and Meeting Local Needs. The highest disagreement, or range of perceptions, was on Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, and Research.

Table 12 gives the ratings of the process goal perceptions of all respondents by rank according to mean scores. Most of the process goals had mean scores between the medium (3) to high (4) importance range, with a high degree of consensus. The highest ranked of these goals was Community, and the others did not fall into any clear sequence. The goals perceived as important now (Is) were quite different from the goals perceived as important in the future (Should Be), indicating there should be a change in priorities. Innovation, although second to last, was still rated for Should Be at 3.41 -- almost halfway between medium and high importance.

These process goals were generally rated higher than many of the outcome goals in Table 11 for Is, and also somewhat higher for Should Be. This indicates that, in the perception of the respondents, the process goals were more important in Canadian universities than the traditional outcome goals.

The standard deviations on the process goals were relatively low, between .51 and .70 for most. Only Freedom had a higher rate of disagreement, with standard deviations of .93 and .94.

Table 13 lists the mean ratings of both Is and Should Be scores by rank for the miscellaneous goals. Institutional Reputation was first in both rankings, with Graduate Literacy third on both, and Community Liaison fifth on both lists. Organizational Planning moved from fourth on the Is list to second on the Should Be list. Program Evaluation moved from being tied for sixth place to fourth in importance for a Should Be goal.

Table 12

Respondent's perceptions of process goals ranked by Is and Should Be means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1.	Community	3.71	.61	1.	Community	4.29	.55
2.	Democratic Governance	3.53	.58	2.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.87	.63
3.	Freedom	3.51	.94	3.	Intellectual Environment	3.86	.64
4.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.27	.70	4.	Democratic Governance	3.72	.60
5.	Intellectual Environment	3.23	.68	5.	Freedom	3.63	.93
6.	Innovation	2.83	.60	6.	Innovation	3.41	.61
7.	Off-Campus Learning	2.09	.51	7.	Off-Campus Learning	2.58	.68

When the scores or mean ratings were examined, only four of these goals were considered to be of medium or higher importance now, but all but one of these goals moved up to being of more than medium importance for the future. In fact, seven out of ten of these goals were rated above 3.5 for Should Be, or closer to being of high importance for the future. This was interesting considering that when the IGI was first designed about ten years ago, these were felt not to be significant enough to constitute major goal areas.

That these goals were only considered by one item each, may affect the size of the standard deviation. The disagreement shown here was quite high compared with the previous two groups. The standard deviation of the Is ratings ranged from .88 to 1.17, and the standard deviation of the Should Be ratings ranged from .66 to 1.07. The most agreement for future emphasis was shown on the goals Organizational Planning, Program Evaluation, and Institutional Reputation.

All of these goals showed a marked increase between the perceptions of the Is and Should Be ratings, except for Intercollegiate Athletics, which was almost nil.

Table 13

Respondent's perceptions of miscellaneous goals ranked by Is and Should Be means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1.	Institutional Reputation	3.87	.89	1.	Institutional Reputation	4.40	.69
2.	Institutional Autonomy	3.50	.89	2.	Organizational Planning	4.28	.74
3.	Graduate Literacy	3.33	1.17	3.	Graduate Literacy	4.06	1.05
4.	Organizational Planning	3.20	1.04	4.	Program Evaluation	4.02	.66
5.	Community Liaison	2.94	.88	5.	Community Liaison	3.87	.73
6.5	Program Evaluation	2.93	.97	6.	Institutional Autonomy	3.85	.92
6.5	Campus Consensus on Goals	2.93	.97	7.	Campus Consensus on Goals	3.61	.92
8.	Extracurricular Activities	2.91	.91	8.	Community Participation in Planning	3.28	.90
9.	Community Participation in Planning	2.67	.95	9.	Extracurricular Activities	3.24	.95
10.	Intercollegiate Athletics	2.42	1.01	10.	Intercollegiate Athletics	2.45	.93

Table 14 shows the respondents' perceptions of the local Canadian goals when ranked by Is and Should Be means. Like the goals in Table 13, these had somewhat higher mean scores as well as somewhat higher disagreement (standard deviations) among the respondents. Programs for Adults or Mature students was at the top of both lists, followed by Accessibility of Programs for the Handicapped and Part-time Students, and Faculty Development and Evaluation. New Faculty Employment Patterns, French-Canadian Cultural Programs, along with the Development of Educational Technology moved higher in the Should Be rankings, and in the ratings moved from below the middle to above it.

The standard deviations in these lists were higher and showed a larger range than any previously examined set of goals. They ranged within the Is column from .83 to 1.23, and on the Should Be column from .64 to 1.42. The most consensus came on Accessibility of Programs to the Handicapped, while the least consensus came on Bilingual Instruction. Once again, the wide range of scores on these items could be related to the fact that the scores were based upon the perceptions of single items in the questionaire. The direction of the means, however, indicates that these items were of moderate or higher importance in Canadian universities.

When both the outcome and process goals were combined and ranked according to the means, the priorities were quite different, as shown in Table 15. This combination shows how important the outcome and process goals were perceived to be in relation to each other. The findings did not support the traditional view that outcome goals were the most important ones in most universities, at least not in Canadian universities.

Table 14

Respondent's perceptions of the local Canadian goals ranked by Is and Should Be means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1.	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	3.72	.88	1.	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	4.06	.76
2.	Accessibility: Part-Time Stud.	3.46	1.15	2.5	Accessibility: Handicapped	3.98	.64
3.	Accessibility: Handicapped	3.34	.85	2.5	Faculty Development/Evaluation	3.98	.71
4.	Faculty Development/Evaluation	3.06	.83	4.	Accessibility: Part-Time Stud.	3.87	.99
5.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	2.80	1.23	5.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	3.69	.82
6.	French-Canadian Cultural Programs	2.76	1.15	6.	French-Canadian Cultural Programs	3.20	1.23
7.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	2.52	.77	7.	Development of Ed. Technology	3.17	1.06
8.	Development of Ed. Technology	2.43	.92	8.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	2.94	1.30
9.	Bilingual Instruction	2.04	1.12	9.	Bilingual Instruction	2.48	1.42
10.	Experiential Learning	2.02	.96	10.	Experiential Learning	2.44	1.06

Table 15

Respondents' perceptions of combined outcome and process goals ranked by Is and Should Be means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1.	Community	3.71	.61	1.	Community	4.29	.55
2.	Democratic Governance	3.53	.58	2.	Intellectual Orientation	4.28	.50
3.	Freedom	3.51	.94	3.	Academic Development	3.98	.50
4.	Academic Development	3.49	.54	4.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.87	.63
5.	Intellectual Orientation	3.42	.68	5.	Intellectual Environment	3.86	.64
6.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.27	.70	6.	Democratic Governance	3.72	.60
7.5	Research	3.23	.90	7.	Individual Personal Development	3.66	.70
7.5	Intellectual Environment	3.23	.68	8.	Freedom	3.63	.93
9.	Individual Personal Development	2.97	.74	9.	Research	3.61	.78
10.	Meeting Local Needs			10.	Innovation	3.41	.62
11.	Innovation	2.88	.60	11.	Meeting Local Needs	3.36	.52
12.	Advanced Training	2.85	1.06	12.	Advanced Training	3.20	1.05
13.	Vocational Preparation	2.81	.63	13.5	Public Service	3.20	.73
14.	Public Service	2.75	.65	13.5	Humanism/ Altruism	3.20	.80
15.	Social Egalitarianism	2.43	.68	15.	Vocational Preparation	3.17	.70
16.	Humanism/ Altruism	2.42	.76	16.	Culture Awareness	3.07	.67
17.	Cultural Awareness	2.41	.60	17.	Social Egalitarianism	2.82	.81
18.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.39	.64	18.	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.76	.75
19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.09	.51	19.	Off-Campus Learning	2.58	.68
20.	Traditional Religiousness	1.50	.72	20.	Traditional Religiousness	1.77	.97

When the mean scores for Is were examined, five of the top ten goals were process goals -- and of these, three were rated higher than any outcome goals. There was a reasonably high concensus on these ratings, as well. The Is rating of Community was highest, followed by Democratic Governance, and Freedom. The outcome goals Academic Development and Intellectual Orientation followed in fourth and fifth places, and Research was well down the list -- tied for a place at 7.5.

The Should Be column showed even greater emphasis on process goals -- six out of the top ten were process goals. Community was still on top, followed by two outcome goals, Intellectual Orientation and Academic Development. Next came the process goals of Accountability/ Efficiency, Intellectual Environment, and Democratic Governance. The other two outcome goals on this list -- Individual Personal Development and Research -- were ranked seventh and ninth, respectively. The consensus was quite high on all goals, except Freedom and Advanced Training.

The balance between outcome and process goals was quite startling, since there were thirteen outcome goals and only seven process goals, and yet half or more of the top ten goals were process goals.

The perceptions of all goals in the four areas were compiled and ranked by means. Table 16 shows only the top twenty ranked of all forty goals. The outcome goals were even further diluted by the presence of other priorities -- the Is column listed only five outcome goals out of twenty, as compared with six process goals, four miscellaneous goals, and five local Canadian goals. The Should Be column had even fewer

Table 16

The twenty highest ranked goal areas as perceived by all respondents, when all goal areas were combined

Is			Should Be		
Rank	Goal	Mean	Rank	Goal	Mean
1.	Institutional Reputation	3.87	1.	Institutional Reputation	4.40
2.	Adult/Mature Student Programs	3.72	2.	Community	4.29
3.	Community	3.71	3.5	Intellectual Orientation	4.28
4.	Democratic Governance	3.53	3.5	Organizational Planning	4.28
5.	Freedom	3.51	5.5	Graduate Literacy	4.06
6.	Institutional Autonomy	3.50	5.5	Adult/Mature Student Programs	4.06
7.	Academic Development	3.49	7.	Program Evaluation	4.02
8.	Accessibility: Part-time Students	3.46	9.	Faculty Development and Evaluation	3.98
9.	Intellectual Orientation	3.42	9.	Accessibility: Handicapped Students	3.98
10.	Accessibility: Handicapped Students	3.37	9.	Academic Development	3.98
11.	Graduate Literacy	3.33	12.	Accessibility: Part-time students	3.87
12.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.27	12.	Community Liaison	3.87
13.5	Intellectual Environment	3.23	12.	Accountability/ Efficiency	3.87
13.5	Research	3.23	14.	Intellectual Environment	3.86
15.	Organizational Planning	3.20	15.	Institutional Autonomy	3.85
16.	Faculty Development and Evaluation	3.06	16.	Democratic Governance	3.72
17.	Individual Personal Development	2.97	17.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	3.69
18.	Meeting Local Needs	2.95	18.	Individual Personal Development	3.66
19.	Community Liaison	2.94	19.	Freedom	3.63
20.	Program Evaluation	2.93	20.	Consensus on Campus Goals	3.61

outcome goals -- only three, as compared with six process, six miscellaneous, and five local Canadian goals. The highest ranked goal on both lists was Institutional Reputation, a miscellaneous goal, followed on the Is list by a local Canadian goal, Programs for Adults/Mature Students. The outcome goals were farther down the list, seventh, ninth, and thirteenth. On the Should Be listing, the outcome goals were Intellectual Orientation in third place, followed by Academic Development in the ninth, and then Individual Personal Development in the eighteenth position. Research was 13.5 on the Is list, but was not among the top twenty in the Should Be list. Other traditional goals of universities, such as Advanced Training, Vocational Preparation, and Public Service, did not appear in the top twenty of either list.

The overall perceived importance for these top twenty goals was quite high -- sixteen out of twenty were rated on Is higher than medium importance -- a score of 3 or better, and the Should Be means were even higher, all of the top twenty were above 3.5 and seven were above 4.

All together, the Should Be ratings were considerably higher than the Is rating on almost all items, indicating that the respondents felt universities should be doing more than they were doing at present in most goal areas.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRMEN

This section outlines some of the differences between the goal perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen in Canadian universities. The response rate of the president group was much higher and, therefore, was more representative of the total number of universities. However, the group of board chairmen was used for comparison, because they represent a major position of importance in Canadian universities. The perceptions and priorities of the two groups were quite different, as can be seen in the tables that follow.

Tables 17 through 20 portray the complete list of goals with means and standard deviations of the perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen on both the Is and Should Be ratings, unranked. Generally, the presidents rated the goals on both the Is and Should Be dimensions higher than did the board chairmen. In the outcome and process goals tables (17 and 18), the presidents had higher mean scores on all goals except Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, and Traditional Religiousness. There was a mix of high and low means on several other goals, when the board chairmen rated a goal lower than the president group on Is, but higher on Should Be.

The differences that reached statistical significance at the .10 level are starred. There were three goals that showed significant differences between the two groups, and two of these were the Is ratings of Vocational preparation (Table 17) and Freedom (Table 18). In both of these goal areas, the presidents rated them significantly higher than did the board chairmen. Faculty Development and Evaluation (Table 20) was rated significantly higher by the board chairmen.

Table 17

The Presidents' and Board Chairmen's perceptions of outcome goals, with means and standard deviations, ranked

Goal Area	Goal		Presidents Mean	Presidents SD	Board Chairmen Mean	Board Chairmen SD
1.	Academic Development	IS	3.54	.55	3.40	.52
		SB	4.05	.50	3.80	.46
2.	Intellectual Orientation	IS	3.50	.66	3.34	.71
		SB	4.36	.51	4.09	.49
3.	Individual Personal Development	IS	2.91	.76	3.13	.67
		SB	3.63	.73	3.73	.65
4.	Humanism/ Altruism	IS	2.37	.80	2.53	.69
		SB	3.19	.81	3.22	.80
5.	Cultural Awareness	IS	2.45	.62	2.30	.54
		SB	3.14	.68	2.89	.65
6.	Traditional Religiousness	IS	1.45	.74	1.63	.66
		SB	1.66	.93	2.05	1.02
7.	Vocational Preparation	* IS	2.93	.65	2.52	.47
		SB	3.24	.74	3.01	.59
8.	Advanced Training	IS	2.89	1.13	2.77	.88
		SB	3.25	1.10	3.09	.94
9.	Research	IS	3.32	.96	3.03	.75
		SB	3.72	.80	3.34	.69
10.	Meeting Local Needs	IS	3.01	.65	2.81	.36
		SB	3.39	.55	3.30	.46
11.	Public Service	IS	2.80	.70	2.66	.52
		SB	3.18	.75	3.25	.71
12.	Social Egalitarianism	IS	2.50	.67	2.25	.69
		SB	2.86	.75	2.70	.96
13.	Social Criticism/Activism	IS	2.45	.69	2.23	.50
		SB	2.80	.71	2.69	.84

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Table 18

The Presidents' and Board Chairmen's perceptions of process goals, with means and standard deviations, unranked

Goal Area	Goal		Presidents Mean	Presidents SD	Board Chairmen Mean	Board Chairmen SD
14.	Freedom	* IS	3.68	.94	3.13	.82
		SB	3.79	.90	3.27	.93
15.	Democratic Governance	IS	3.61	.57	3.44	.58
		SB	3.78	.54	3.56	.71
16.	Community	IS	3.72	.63	3.67	.57
		SB	4.30	.48	4.25	.70
17.	Intellectual Environment	IS	3.26	.71	3.17	.63
		SB	3.85	.65	3.88	.64
18.	Innovation	IS	2.91	.62	2.78	.58
		SB	3.40	.58	3.44	.70
19.	Off-Campus Learning	IS	2.07	.53	2.14	.47
		SB	2.55	.66	2.66	.74
20.	'Accountability/ Efficiency	IS	3.29	.69	3.23	.73
		SB	3.83	.61	3.95	.69

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

In both Table 17 and 18 the consensus or agreement among the respondent groups was quite high, usually ranging between .50 and .70. There were a few exceptions, however, where goal areas had standard deviations as high as 1.13 on Advanced Training. Other areas with higher disagreement among respondents were Traditional Religiousness, Research, Social Egalitarianism, and Freedom.

Table 19 portrays the mean ratings of the miscellaneous goals for both respondent groups. In many of these goals, the presidents rate the Is somewhat higher than the board chairmen, except for Organizational Planning, Community Participation and Planning, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Program Evaluation. The board chairmen rated the Should Be higher than did the presidents on all goals except Institutional Autonomy. The only goal area that did not rate improvement, or a higher Should Be than Is score, was Intercollegiate Athletics -- and then only by the president group.

The level of consensus portrayed in this table was clearly not as high as in the previous two tables. The standard deviations ranged from .45 to 1.28, although most were between .70 and .90. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups on the miscellaneous goals.

Table 20 portrays the perceptions of the two respondent groups of the local Canadian goals. Board chairmen rated goals higher for both Is and Should Be, except on four: Bilingual Instruction, Accessibility of Programs to Part-time and Handicapped Students, and French-Canadian Cultural Programs. The two groups agreed quite closely on the importance

Table 19

Presidents' and Board Chairmen's perceptions of miscellaneous goals, with means and standard deviations, unranked

Item	Goal		Presidents Mean	Presidents SD	Board Chairmen Mean	Board Chairmen SD
12.	Graduate Literacy	IS	3.39	1.28	3.19	.83
		SB	3.97	1.22	4.25	.45
71.	Institutional Autonomy	IS	3.58	.89	3.31	.87
		SB	3.97	.85	3.56	1.03
80.	Institutional Reputation	IS	3.92	.72	3.75	.77
		SB	4.37	.68	4.43	.73
82.	Extracurricular Activities	IS	2.92	.91	2.88	.96
		SB	3.23	.94	3.25	1.00
84.	Organizational Planning	IS	3.18	.98	3.25	1.18
		SB	4.21	.78	4.43	.63
85.	Community Participation/Planning	IS	2.61	1.00	2.81	.83
		SB	3.21	.94	3.44	.81
86.	Intercollegiate Athletics	IS	2.34	1.02	2.60	.99
		SB	2.34	.93	2.73	.88
88.	Program Evaluation	IS	2.92	.94	2.94	1.06
		SB	3.97	.68	4.13	.62
89.	Community Liaison	IS	2.97	.97	2.88	.62
		SB	3.87	.78	3.87	.62
90.	Consensus on Campus Goals	IS	3.05	.93	2.63	1.02
		SB	3.58	.98	3.69	.79

Table 20

Presidents and Board Chairmen's perceptions of Canadian goals with means and standard deviations, unranked

Item	Goal		Presidents. Mean	Presidents. SD	Board Chairmen Mean	Board Chairmen SD
91.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	IS	2.74	1.18	2.94	1.39
		SB	2.89	1.25	3.06	1.44
92.	Experiential Learning	IS	1.95	.90	2.19	1.11
		SB	2.37	.99	2.63	1.20
93.	Development of Educational Technology	IS	2.37	.82	2.56	1.15
		SB	3.24	1.05	3.00	1.10
94.	Bilingual Instruction	IS	2.11	1.11	1.88	1.15
		SB	2.61	1.35	2.19	1.60
95.	Accessibility: Part-time Students	IS	3.53	1.06	3.31	1.35
		SB	4.00	.81	3.56	1.32
96.	Programs: Adult/Mature Students	IS	3.71	.87	3.75	.93
		SB	4.05	.77	4.06	.77
97.	Accessibility: Handicapped Students	IS	3.45	.95	3.19	.66
		SB	3.97	.69	4.00	.52
98.	French-Canadian Cultural Programs	IS	2.82	1.14	2.63	1.20
		SB	3.13	1.19	3.38	1.36
99.	Faculty Development/Evaluation	IS	3.03	.92	3.13	.62
		* SB	3.87	.77	4.25	.45
100.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	IS	2.45	.83	2.69	.60
		SB	3.66	.82	3.75	.86

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

of some of these goals, each rating the following goals highest: Programs for Mature or Adult Students, Accessibility of Programs for Part-time and Handicapped Students, Faculty Development and Evaluation, and New Faculty Employment Patterns. The only statistically significant difference at the .10 level was the difference between the ratings of the two groups on how important Faculty Development and Evaluation Should Be.

When the standard deviations were examined, however, a high level of disagreement was observed, especially among the board chairmen. The lack of consensus ranged as high as 1.60. The means also had a wide range, from as low as 1.95 on Is for Experiential Learning, to 4.25 on Faculty Development and Evaluation. The two goals which were designed to examine the commitment of universities to the concept of a bilingual country -- French-Canadian Cultural Programs and Bilingual Instruction -- both showed the highest disagreement among the respondents. Further examination of this discrepancy occurs in the following sections when the data are analyzed by groups according to region, size, and age of universities.

Table 21 presents the perceptions of the two respondent groups in rank order for the top eight goals in the combined outcome and process goals. There are four columns, each presenting the priorities of one group for either Is or Should Be goals.

Community was rated high on all four lists -- highest on all lists except for the president group on Should Be. The presidents rated Freedom and Democratic Governance as second most important for Is, while rating them as sixth and seventh for Should Be. The presidents placed

Table 21

Presidents' and Board Chairmen's perception of outcome and process goals, the highest eight rankings by means for Is and Should Be

Rank	Presidents Is	Presidents Should Be	Board Chairmen Is	Board Chairmen Should Be
1.	Community	Intellectual Orientation	Community	Community
2.	Freedom	Community	Academic Development	Intellectual Orientation
3.	Democratic Governance	Academic Development	3.5 Intellectual Orientation	Accountability/ Efficiency
4.	Academic Development	Intellectual Environment	3.5 Democratic Governance	Intellectual Environment
5.	Intellectual Orientation	Accountability/ Efficiency	Accountability/ Efficiency	Academic Development
6.	Research	Freedom	Intellectual Environment	Individual Personal Dev.
7.	Accountability/ Efficiency	Democratic Governance	7.5 Freedom	Democratic Governance
8.	Intellectual Environment	Research	7.5 Individual Personal Dev.	Innovation

Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

Acadmic Development and Intellectual Orientation currently at fourth and fifth, while rating them as third and fourth for the future. The board chairmen rated Academic Development and Intellectual Orientation as second and third highest presently, while moving Intellectual Orientation up to second and Acadmic Development down to fifth most important for Should Be. Accountability/Efficiency rated quite differently between the two groups: the presidents ranked it seventh on Is and moved it up to fifth for Should Be, while the board chairmen indicated that it was fifth at present, and should move up to third. Research was sixth in the Is list of the presidents and moved down to eighth on the Should Be list. Research did not appear in the list of the top eight goals of the board chairmen. Innovation and Invidivual Personal Development appeared in the list of the board chairmen, but not in the top eight listings of the presidents.

When all four lists of goal areas were combined and ranked together from highest to lowest, an interesting pattern emerged. Table 22 contains the highest ranked twenty goals out of all forty.

The miscellaneous goal, Institutional Reputation, was ranked highest on all four lists, and Community, a process goal, was also ranked high -- either second or third on all lists. The two groups agreed that Programs for Adults or Mature Students, and Democratic Governance, were fairly important now, but should be given somewhat less attention in the future. The same was true for Research and Freedom. There was also agreement on some areas that needed improving -- Organizational Planning, Graduate Literacy, Faculty Development and Evaluation,

Table 22

The twenty highest ranked of all goals as perceived by Presidents and Board Chairmen

	Presidents		Board Chairmen	
	Is Ranking	Should Be Ranking	Is Ranking	Should Be Ranking
1.	Institutional Reputation	Institutional Reputation	Institutional Reputation	Institutional Reputation
2.	Community	Intellectual Orientation	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	Organizational Planning
3.	Adult/Mature Student Programs	Community	Community	Community
4.	Freedom	Organizational Planning	Academic Development	Graduate Literacy
5.	Democratic Governance	Academic Development	Democratic Governance	Faculty Development and Evaluation
6.	Institutional Autonomy	Adult/Mature Student Programs	Intellectual Orientation	Program Evaluation
7.	Academic Development	Accessibility: Part-Time Students	Accessibility: Part-Time Students	Intellectual Orientation
8.	Accessibility: Part-Time Students	Program Evaluation	Institutional Autonomy	Adult/Mature Student Programs
9.	Intellectual Orientation	Graduate Literacy	Organizational Planning	Accessibility: Handicapped
10.	Accessibility: Handicapped	Institutional Autonomy	Accountability/ Efficiency	Accountability/ Efficiency
11.	Graduate Literacy	Accessibility: Handicapped	Graduate Literacy	Community Liaison
12.	Research	Community Liaison	Accessibility: Handicapped	Intellectual Environment
13.	Accountability/ Efficiency	Faculty Development and Evaluation	Intellectual Environment	Academic Development
14.	Intellectual Environment	Intellectual Environment	Freedom	New Faculty Employment Patterns
15.	Organizational Planning	Accountability: Efficiency	Individual Personal Dev.	Individual Personal Dev.
16.	Consensus on Campus Goals	Freedom	Faculty Development and Evaluation	Consensus on Campus Goals
17.	Faculty Development and Evaluation	Democratic Governance	Research	Democratic Governance
18.	Meeting Local Needs	Research	Program Evaluation	Accessibility: Part-Time Students
19.	Community Liaison	New Faculty Employment Patterns	Program Development - Remote Areas	Institutional Autonomy
20.	Vocational Preparation	Individual Personal Dev.	Community Liaison	Innovation

Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

New Faculty Employment Patterns, Program Evaluation, and Community Liaison -- all moved to a higher position in the Should Be lists than in the Is lists.

The areas of disagreement, where the presidents' ranking indicated an area should increase in importance, and the board chairmen felt it should decrease in importance, were worthy of examination. Such goal areas included Intellectual Orientation, Academic Development, and Accessibility of Programs to Part-time Students. There was opposite disagreement between the two groups as well, when the presidents' group indicated a goal area should become less important, and the board chairmen felt it should become more important. These goal areas included Accessibility of programs to the Handicapped, Accountability/Efficiency, Intellectual Environment, Individual Personal Development, and Consensus on Campus Goals.

These rankings were derived from the mean ratings of how important goals were or should be. While all goal areas were rated as needing increased importance in the future, the amount of increase caused changes in the rankings or priorities. The differences between the two ratings are examined in detail in Tables 39 through 42.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: DIFFERENCES BY REGION

This section reviews the goal perceptions of both the presidents and board chairmen as a total group of fifty-four respondents. Their perceptions of the goals for both Is and Should Be were examined by region to discover whether, indeed, there were any significant differences in goal perceptions among the regions in Canada.

The goal perceptions, or ratings, for the outcome goals are listed in Table 23 with the Is mean and Should Be mean given for each. There were only three statistically significant differences at the .10 level, and these are starred on the left side of the table. The differences occurred on Individual Personal Development between the Quebec (low) and Atlantic respondents' (high) ratings for Should Be; on Humanism/Altruism between the West (low) and Ontario's (high) Is ratings; and on Cultural Awareness between Quebec (low) and Ontario and Atlantic regions (high) on the Should Be ratings.

There were some general patterns which were worthy of note: Academic Development had the lowest Is and Should Be rating in Quebec; Intellectual Orientation had the lowest Should Be rating in the Atlantic region; Traditional Religiousness was rated highest in Ontario and lowest in Quebec; Research was rated highest in the West; Public Service was rated highest in Ontario; and Social Egalitarianism was rated highest in the West.

Table 23

Outcome goal perceptions of all respondents by regional groupings, giving mean and standard deviation for each, unranked

Goal #	Area	IS SB	West Mean	West SD	Ontario Mean	Ontario SD	Quebec Mean	Quebec SD	Atlantic Mean	Atlantic SD
1.	Academic Development	IS	3.58	.52	3.57	.45	3.09	.46	3.53	.64
		SB	4.08	.57	4.03	.39	3.72	.45	3.95	.54
2.	Intellectual Orientation	IS	3.47	.71	3.48	.75	3.19	.59	3.43	.66
		SB	4.39	.42	4.28	.58	4.28	.45	4.17	.59
3.	Individual Personal Dev.	IS	2.72	.72	3.12	.80	2.72	.56	3.23	.70
		* SB	3.38	.59	3.92	.83	3.22	.63	3.95	.49
4.	Humanism/ Altruism	* IS	2.00	.55	2.75	.80	2.19	.32	2.65	.89
		SB	2.89	.67	3.48	1.03	2.84	.83	3.43	.45
5.	Cultural Awareness	IS	2.38	.60	2.53	.40	1.97	.51	2.55	.73
		* SB	2.93	.57	3.40	.55	2.47	.67	3.20	.68
6.	Traditional Religiousness	IS	1.33	.45	1.70	.85	1.22	.36	1.63	.89
		SB	1.47	.63	2.18	1.28	1.34	.57	1.92	.95
7.	Vocational Preparation	IS	2.88	.52	2.72	.56	2.78	.83	2.83	.73
		SB	3.26	.56	3.17	.63	3.09	.86	3.12	.87
8.	Advanced Training	IS	2.91	1.06	2.78	1.09	2.97	1.34	2.80	.95
		SB	3.41	.90	3.06	.98	3.22	1.46	3.12	1.09
9.	Research	IS	3.39	.98	3.18	1.07	3.22	.94	3.12	.65
		SB	3.88	.70	3.48	.95	3.69	.76	3.40	.68
10.	Meeting Local Needs	IS	2.83	.66	2.93	.43	3.34	.64	2.88	.57
		SB	3.30	.61	3.42	.45	3.47	.39	3.32	.57
11.	Public Service	IS	2.66	.63	2.90	.78	2.59	.40	2.80	.65
		SB	3.00	.67	3.45	.80	3.13	.71	3.20	.72
12.	Social Egalitarianism	IS	2.69	.67	2.45	.58	2.38	.69	2.17	.73
		SB	3.04	.79	2.82	.72	2.84	.65	2.57	.98
13.	Social Criticism	IS	2.19	.51	2.62	.86	2.34	.40	2.40	.60
		SB	2.61	.63	2.98	1.08	2.78	.39	2.70	.61

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

The level of consensus in the West was fairly even -- about .50 to .70. In Ontario the standard deviations ranged wider, going both higher and lower than in the West, showing a greater consensus on some goals and less agreement on others. Quebec's scores ranged even wider, from .36 on Is for Traditional Religiousness to 1.46 on Advanced Training. Both Ontario's and Quebec's wide range of scores may be explainable in historic terms by types and age of the institutions. These provinces have the widest range of universities -- from huge to very small, from old to very new, from liberal arts colleges to multiversities or provincial systems. The Atlantic region had a level of consensus more like the West, and this may be because there are no large institutions in this region.

Table 24 portrays the means and standard deviations of the process goals by respondents' region. Although there were no statistically significant differences at the .10 level, there were some differences which illucidate the priorities and emphases in each region. Democratic Governance was rated highest in Quebec on Should Be; Community was rated highest in the West for Is; Innovation was rated highest in the West and in Quebec for Is; and Off-campus learning was rated highest in the West for Should Be. There was a fairly high degree of consensus on these goals except on Freedom, both scores ranging widely in the West and Atlantic Canada; and on Quebec's Should Be rating of Accountability/Efficiency. Quebec had the most agreement on the goal Intellectual Environment; the Is rating had a standard deviation of only .23.

Table 24

Process goal perceptions of all respondents by regional groupings, giving mean and standard deviation for each, unranked

Goal #	Area		West Mean	West SD	Ontario Mean	Ontario SD	Quebec Mean	Quebec SD	Atlantic Mean	Atlantic SD
14.	Freedom	IS	3.63	1.10	3.45	.80	3.63	.82	3.40	.99
		SB	3.73	1.10	3.57	.72	3.75	.90	3.53	1.02
15.	Democratic Governance	IS	3.52	.65	3.52	.60	3.69	.46	3.48	.59
		SB	3.66	.75	3.63	.58	3.94	.44	3.75	.53
16.	Community	IS	3.78	.68	3.68	.64	3.63	.44	3.69	.61
		SB	4.45	.61	4.22	.61	4.16	.27	4.24	.53
17.	Intellectual Environment	IS	3.09	.80	3.25	.83	3.16	.23	3.40	.53
		SB	3.77	.65	3.92	.79	3.84	.44	3.90	.59
18.	Innovation	IS	3.11	.79	2.62	.51	3.09	.46	2.77	.42
		SB	3.61	.69	3.32	.59	3.56	.53	3.22	.57
19.	Off-Campus Learning	IS	2.16	.55	2.02	.50	1.91	.46	2.20	.50
		SB	2.78	.77	2.57	.76	2.38	.60	2.48	.52
20.	Accountability/ Efficiency	IS	3.34	.71	3.06	.72	3.25	.89	3.42	.56
		SB	3.88	.60	3.91	.60	3.89	1.03	3.80	.47

Table 25 lists the means and standard deviations of the miscellaneous goals by the respondents' region. There were three statistically significant differences which are starred on the left side of the table. The Is rating of Graduate Literacy was much lower in Quebec than in the Atlantic region, yet the Should Be ratings were more similar; the Is rating of Extracurricular Activities was much higher in the Atlantic region than in the West; and the Should Be rating of Program Evaluation was much higher in the West, Ontario, and Quebec, than in the Atlantic provinces. The only goal that rated lower on Should Be than Is was Intercollegiate Athletics in the West and in Atlantic Canada.

The standard deviations indicated the level of consensus about these goals. Atlantic Canada showed the most agreement, followed by Ontario. Both the West and Quebec had much wider ranging scores, especially on goals such as Institutional Autonomy, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Organizational Planning.

Table 26 outlines the perceptions of the local Canadian goals in the different regions of Canada. There were five statistically significant differences on these goals, which are starred on the left side of the table. Program Delivery/Remote Areas was much more highly rated in the West for Should Be than in the rest of Canada; the Accessibility of Programs to Part-time Students was rated much higher in the West for Is than in Atlantic Canada, although it was also somewhat higher in Quebec. Both the Is and Should Be ratings of Programs for Adults/Mature Students were higher in the West than in Quebec. The

Table 25

Miscellaneous goal perceptions of all respondents by regional groupings, giving mean and standard deviation for each, unranked

Goal #	Area		West Mean	West SD	Ontario Mean	Ontario SD	Quebec Mean	Quebec SD	Atlantic Mean	Atlantic SD
12.	Graduate Literacy	* IS	3.00	1.15	3.67	1.11	2.50	.53	3.80	1.21
		SB	3.94	1.24	4.27	.88	3.88	1.13	4.07	1.03
71.	Institutional Autonomy	IS	3.63	.96	3.33	.72	3.50	.76	3.53	1.06
		SB	3.75	1.06	3.73	.88	4.13	.64	3.93	.96
80.	Institutional Reputation	IS	3.75	.58	3.93	.88	4.00	.93	3.86	.66
		SB	4.56	.63	4.60	.63	4.13	.83	4.14	.66
82.	Extracurricular Activities	* IS	2.50	1.10	2.73	.70	3.25	.89	3.33	.72
		SB	3.19	1.11	3.07	1.10	3.13	.83	3.53	.64
84.	Organizational Planning	IS	3.06	1.24	3.13	.99	3.38	1.06	3.33	.90
		SB	4.38	.72	4.20	.68	4.13	.99	4.33	.72
85.	Community Particip/Plan.	IS	2.69	1.20	2.60	1.06	2.63	.52	2.73	.80
		SB	3.38	.89	3.00	1.07	3.38	.74	3.40	.83
86.	Intercollegiate Athletics	IS	2.75	1.18	2.00	.68	2.25	1.04	2.53	.99
		SB	2.69	1.08	2.28	.73	2.38	1.06	2.40	.91
88.	Program Evaluation	IS	3.00	1.10	2.60	.91	3.50	1.07	2.87	.74
		* SB	4.19	.66	4.13	.52	4.25	.71	3.60	.63
89.	Community Liaison	IS	3.19	.91	2.93	.96	2.75	.89	2.80	.77
		SB	4.13	.72	3.87	.64	4.00	.53	3.53	.83
90.	Campus Goal Consensus	IS	2.75	1.13	2.93	1.03	2.75	.71	3.20	.86
		SB	3.56	1.03	3.73	1.03	3.50	.93	3.60	.74

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Table 26

Local Canadian goal perceptions of all respondents by regional groupings, giving mean and standard deviation for each, unranked

Goal #	Area		West Mean	West SD	Ontario Mean	Ontario SD	Quebec Mean	Quebec SD	Atlantic Mean	Atlantic SD
91.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	IS	3.50	1.03	2.53	1.19	2.50	1.20	2.47	1.30
		* SB	3.75	1.13	2.73	1.10	2.25	1.04	2.67	1.45
92.	Experiential Learning	IS	2.06	1.18	2.07	.70	2.38	1.19	1.73	.80
		SB	2.81	1.17	2.40	.83	2.38	1.19	2.13	1.06
93.	Development of Ed. Technology	IS	2.75	1.29	2.20	.68	2.00	.76	2.53	.64
		SB	3.44	1.36	3.00	.93	2.63	.92	3.33	.82
94.	Bilingual Instruction	IS	2.06	1.34	2.20	1.08	2.00	1.20	1.87	.92
		SB	2.31	1.35	2.87	1.55	2.25	1.49	2.40	1.40
95.	Accessibility: Part-time Stud.	IS	3.81	1.11	3.53	1.13	3.75	1.17	2.87	1.06
		* SB	4.31	.70	3.93	.96	4.13	.64	3.20	1.15
96.	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	* IS	4.25	.77	3.80	.68	3.25	.71	3.33	.98
		* SB	4.44	.63	4.13	.74	3.38	.74	3.93	.70
97.	Accessibility: Handicapped	IS	3.81	.98	3.07	.59	3.63	.74	3.07	.88
		* SB	4.33	.72	3.67	.62	4.00	.53	3.93	.46
98.	French-Canadian Culture	IS	2.81	1.11	2.87	1.13	3.25	1.28	2.33	1.11
		SB	3.31	1.01	3.53	1.35	3.38	1.41	2.67	1.18
99.	Faculty Developmt. and Evaluation	IS	2.94	.77	3.13	.92	3.38	.74	2.93	.88
		SB	4.06	.68	4.27	.70	3.50	.76	3.87	.64
100.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	IS	2.69	.70	2.40	.91	2.50	.53	2.47	.83
		SB	3.81	.98	3.87	.74	3.38	.92	3.53	.64

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Accessibility of Programs to Handicapped Students was also much higher in the West than in Ontario.

There were other regional differences which were notable because they indicated the different priorities of the regions: Experiential Learning was rated higher for Is in the West than in the rest of Canada; Educational Technological Development was rated higher in Atlantic and Western Canada than in the central provinces; Bilingual Instruction was rated lowest in Quebec and highest in Ontario; French Canadian Cultural Programs was rated highest in Ontario and lowest in Atlantic Canada; Faculty Development and Evaluation was rated highest in Ontario and lowest in Quebec; and New Faculty Employment Patterns was rated higher in Ontario and the West than in Quebec and Atlantic Canada.

The standard deviations on these goals showed a considerable lack of consensus among respondents. Many of the deviations ranged beyond 1.0. Very few of these goals showed the level of agreement found for the outcome and process goals discussed previously.

Table 27 portrays the rankings by means of the outcome goal perceptions by region or location of the respondent's university. This was done because the outcome goals are the traditional goals of universities, and because an examination of these different rankings, in addition to the ratings and significant differences already examined, would help to define the regional differences even further.

Table 27

The rankings of the Outcome Goals by region of all respondents

Rank		West	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic
1.	IS	Academic Devel.	Academic Devel.	Meet Local Needs	Academic Devel.
	SB	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.
2.	IS	Research	Research	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.
	SB	Academic Devel.	Academic Devel.	Research	Academic Devel.
3.	IS	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.	Academic Devel.	Ind. Pers. Dev.
	SB	Research	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Academic Devel.	Ind. Pers. Dev.
4.	IS	Advanced Train.	Advanced Train.	Research	Research
	SB	Advanced Train.	Research	Meet Local Needs	Human./Altruism
5.	IS	Vocational Prep.	Meet Local Needs	Vocational Prep.	Vocational Prep.
	SB	Meet Local Needs	Human./Altruism	Advanced Train.	Cultural Aware.
6.	IS	Meet Local Needs	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Advanced Train.	Meet Local Needs
	SB	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Cultural Aware.	Vocational Prep.	Research
7.	IS	Social Egalit.	Vocational Prep.	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Public Service
	SB	Vocational Prep.	Meet Local Needs	Public Service	Meet Local Needs
8.	IS	Public Service	Public Service	Public Service	Human./Altruism
	SB	Social Egalit.	Public Service	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Vocational Prep.
9.	IS	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Cultural Aware.
	SB	Public Service	Vocational Prep.	Social Egalit.	Public Service
10.	IS	Cultural Aware.	Human./Altruism	Social Egalit.	Advanced Train.
	SB	Cultural Aware.	Advanced Train.	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Advanced Train.
11.	IS	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Cultural Aware.	Human./Altruism	Soc. Crit./Activ.
	SB	Human./Altruism	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Human./Altruism	Soc. Crit./Activ.
12.	IS	Human./Altruism	Social Egalit.	Cultural Aware.	Social Egalit.
	SB	Soc. Crit./Activ.	Social Egalit.	Cultural Aware.	Social Egalit.
13.	IS	Trad. Religious.	Trad. Religious.	Trad. Religious.	Trad. Religious.
	SB	Trad. Religious.	Trad. Religious.	Trad. Religous.	Trad. Religious.

Academic Development topped the list of Is for all regions except Quebec, while respondents in all four regions agreed that Intellectual Orientation Should Be of highest importance. The Is rating for Research was second most important in the West and Ontario, but moved to fourth in Quebec and Atlantic Canada. All regions except Quebec rated Academic Development as second most important Should Be; Quebec rated it third. The future priority for Research was quite different in each region -- the West rated it third Should Be, Ontario -- fourth, Quebec -- second, and Atlantic Canada -- sixth. Advanced training was another goal on which there was much disagreement as to its future priority: Western Canada rated it Should Be fourth, Ontario -- tenth, Quebec -- fifth, and Atlantic Canada -- tenth. The Should Be ratings of Meeting Local Needs were also quite different: the Western region rated it Should Be fifth, Ontario -- seventh, Quebec -- fourth, and the Atlantic provinces -- also seventh. The Should Be ratings of Individual Personal Development made a similar zigzag: Western Canada rated it sixth, Ontario -- third, Quebec -- eighth, and Atlantic region -- third again. In fact, there were very few of these outcome goals that were given the same, or even similar, priority ratings by all four regions. The top and bottom goals were the only ones that all regions seemed to agree on.

After examining the table it would seem that Quebec is different in more ways than any other particular region of Canada. These differences may be borne out in further examinations of differences by size and age, but they may be due also to fundamental differences in the structure and evolution of the universities in Quebec. In fact, each

region of Canada has had some distinguishing events in the history of its universities and these should become more apparent in the examination of other characteristics, such as age and size.

The final table in the examination of the data by regions, is Table 28, which lists the highest twenty ranked of all forty goals in the perception of the regional respondent groups. These goals are listed in rank order from highest to lowest, and those mean scores that were tied for a rank are linked with a bracket. The rankings are given for both Is and Should Be, using the Mean ratings of each group.

Both the West and Ontario ranked Institutional Reputation as most important for the future, while Quebec ranked Intellectual Orientation first, and the Atlantic region Organizational Planning. Several other goals were high on all regional lists, although in different ranks: Community, Graduate Literacy, Programming for Adults, and Access to Part-time or Handicapped Students. Academic Development was ranked further down the lists, tenth of Should Be in the West, ninth in Ontario, fifteenth in Quebec, and sixth in Atlantic Canada. Other differences appeared- the Atlantic region, without any large institutions, rated Individual Personal Development as seventh most important Should Be, while in Ontario it was ranked twelgth for Should Be. It did not appear in the list of the top twenty ranked goals for either of the regions of Quebec or the West. Research was ranked fourteenth highest Should Be goal in the West, and sixteenth in Quebec, but did not appear on the Should Be list of either Atlantic Canada or Ontario in the top twenty goal areas.

Table 28

The twenty highest ranked of all goals as perceived by all respondents by region, both Is and Should Be ratings

Rank		West	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic
1.	IS	Prog./Adults	Inst. Reput.	Inst. Reput.	Instit. Reput.
	SB	Inst. Reput.	Inst. Reput.	Intell. Orient.	Organ. Planning
2.	IS	Access/PT Stud.	Prog./Adults	Access/PT Stud.	Grad. Literacy
	SB	Community	Intell. Orient.	Program Eval.	Community
3.	IS	Access/Handicap.	Community	Democratic Gov.	Community
	SB	Prog./Adults	Grad. Literacy	Community	Intell. Orient.
4.	IS	Community	Grad. Literacy	Freedom	Instit. Autonomy
	SB	Intell. Orient.	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Instit. Reput.	Instit. Reput.
5.	IS	Instit. Reput.	Academic Dev.	Community	Academic Dev.
	SB	Organ. Planning	Community	Organ. Planning	Grad. Literacy
6.	IS	Freedom	Access/PT Stud.	Access/Handicap.	Democractic Gov.
	SB	Access/Handicap.	Organ. Planning	Instit. Autonomy	Academic Dev.
7.	IS	Instit. Autonomy	Democratic Gov.	Instit. Autonomy	Intell. Orient.
	SB	Access/PT Stud.	Prog./Adults	Access/PT Stud.	Ind. Pers. Dev.
8.	IS	Academic Dev.	Intell. Orient.	Program Eval.	Account./Effic.
	SB	Program Eval.	Program Eval.	Com. Liaison	Instit. Autonomy
9.	IS	Democratic Gov.	Freedom	Organ. Planning	Freedom
	SB	Comm. Liaison	Academic Dev.	Access/Handicap.	Prog./Adults
10.	IS	Prog.Del/Remote	Instit. Autonomy	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Intell. Environ.
	SB	Academic Dev.	Access/PT Stud.	Democratic Gov.	Access/Handicap.
11.	IS	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Environ.	Meet Local Needs	Extracurr. Act.
	SB	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Intell. Environ.	Account./Effic.	Intell. Environ.
12.	IS	Research	Research	Prog./Adults	Organ. Planning
	SB	Social Egalit.	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Grad. Literacy	Fac. Dev./Eval.
13.	IS	Account./Effic.	Organ. Planning	Extracurr. Act.	Prog./Adults
	SB	Account.Effic.	Account./Effic.	Intell. Environ.	Account./Effic.
14.	IS	Comm. Liaison	Fac. Dev./Eval.	French-Cdn.Prog.	Ind. Pers. Dev.
	SB	Research	Comm. Liaison	Freedom	Democratic Gov.
15.	IS	Innovation	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Account./Effic.	Con./Camp. Goals
	SB	New Fac.Emp.Pat.	New Fac.Emp.Pat.	Academic Dev.	Con./Camp. Goals
16.	IS	Intell. Environ.	Access/Handicap.	Research	Research
	SB	Intell. Environ.	Instit. Autonomy	Research	Program Eval.
17.	IS	Organ. Planning	Account./Effic.	Intell. Orient.	Access/Handicap.
	SB	Prog.Del/Remote	Con./Camp. Goals	Innovation	Extracurr. Act.
18.	IS	Program Eval.	Comm. Liaison	Intell. Environ.	Fac. Dev./Eval.
	SB	Instit. Autonomy	Access/Handicap.	Con./Camp. Goals	Comm. Liaison
19.	IS	Grad. Literacy	Con./Camp. Goals	Innovation	Meet Local Needs
	SB	Freedom	Democratic Gov.	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Freedom
20.	IS	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Meet Local Needs	Academic Dev.	Access/PT Stud.
	SB	Democratic Gov.	Freedom	Meet Local Needs	New Fac.Emp.Pat.

Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

When a total perspective was taken, only four outcome goals were ranked in the top twenty of all goals for Should Be in the West and Ontario, while only three were ranked on this list for each of the regions of Quebec and Atlantic Canada. This indicated that a number of other goals, different ones in each region of Canada, have superceded the traditional goals of universities.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: DIFFERENCES BY AGE OF UNIVERSITY

The data in this section portray the differences in the perceptions of all respondents according to the year their institutions were granted university status. The data were collected in groups by decades of years, as in Table 4, but regrouped into four thirty-year periods for this analysis. The year an institution received university status was not necessarily the year it began offering classes or even degrees. Many of the institutions were high schools or colleges before becoming universities, especially in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces. Only recently some of these institutions became universities, even though their roots go back hundreds of years. For the purposes of this study, however, the line was drawn marking the official "beginning" of a university by the year it was granted official university degree-granting status. This section, shows the mean ratings for the goals by each "age" group.

Table 29 lists the means and standard deviations of all outcome goals by the age of the respondents' university. There were no statistically significant differences by the age of the university, but some trends emerged which were worthy of note. Academic Development was rated lowest in the newer institutions, and rated consistently higher in the older groups for Should Be, although all groups rated it near high importance. Humanism/Altruism also was rated consistently higher for Should Be in the older institutions. Vocational Preparation showed the opposite pattern, with the highest mean ratings in the

Table 29

Outcome goal perceptions of all respondents by age group
(by year the respondent's institution was granted university status)
giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

#	Goal Area	IS SB	Before 1900 Mean	Before 1900 SD	1900 - 1929 Mean	1900 - 1929 SD	1930 - 1959 Mean	1930 - 1959 SD	Since 1960 Mean	Since 1960 SD
1.	Academic Development	IS	3.56	.47	3.71	.57	3.40	.44	3.45	.65
		SB	4.19	.36	4.04	.49	3.92	.34	3.88	.65
2.	Intellectual Orientation	IS	3.23	.69	3.50	.69	3.28	.57	3.61	.74
		SB	4.38	.54	4.25	.35	4.12	.60	4.36	.48
3.	Individual Personal Development	IS	3.00	.75	3.04	.91	2.80	.57	3.06	.81
		SB	3.67	.61	3.43	.70	3.78	.71	3.65	.78
4.	Humanism/ Altruism	IS	2.56	.81	2.43	1.05	2.28	.45	2.43	.85
		SB	3.46	.73	3.25	.84	3.17	.87	3.05	.79
5.	Cultural Awareness	IS	2.52	.50	2.39	.66	2.23	.52	2.48	.69
		SB	3.08	.49	2.86	.79	3.13	.70	3.09	.74
6.	Traditional Religiousness	IS	1.58	.85	1.39	.59	1.63	.91	1.39	.51
		SB	1.88	.82	1.54	.85	2.07	1.33	1.58	.74
7.	Vocational Preparation	IS	2.88	.88	3.04	.47	2.72	.56	2.75	.57
		SB	3.04	.88	3.07	.69	3.07	.62	3.35	.65
8.	Advanced Training	IS	2.75	1.24	3.32	.67	2.97	1.19	2.66	.95
		SB	2.90	1.33	3.64	.50	3.23	1.20	3.21	.88
9.	Research	IS	3.33	.86	3.28	.34	3.23	1.11	3.15	.94
		SB	3.52	.71	3.68	.31	3.50	.92	3.71	.86
10.	Meeting Local Needs	IS	2.96	.52	2.61	.35	2.93	.60	3.08	.65
		SB	3.25	.57	3.18	.61	3.38	.52	3.48	.47
11.	Public Service	IS	2.54	.58	2.86	.69	2.67	.47	2.91	.77
		SB	3.00	.74	3.25	.63	3.18	.62	3.31	.85
12.	Social Egalitarianism	IS	2.25	.58	2.18	.70	2.43	.72	2.62	.69
		SB	2.52	.84	2.39	.81	2.95	.83	3.04	.72
13.	Social Criticism	IS	2.48	.69	2.32	.62	2.30	.46	2.43	.77
		SB	2.81	.56	2.64	.71	2.68	.73	2.84	.90

youngest universities, and the lowest in the oldest. Research was rated highest Should Be in the youngest and second oldest groups, and lower in the other two groups. Advanced Training was rated highest by the 1900 - 1929 age group, and lowest in the oldest group. Four outcome goals were rated highest in the newest institutions: Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, and Social Criticism.

Table 30 outlines the process goal perceptions by age of universities in Canada, including two differences that were statistically significant. In the youngest institutions, Innovation was rated higher for Is than in the other institutions, and Acountability/Efficiency was also rated higher in the younger universities than in the two older groups for Should Be. The lowest ratings for Should Be appeared most frequently for the process goals in the 1900-1929 age group. Freedom had the lowest Should Be ratings in the newest universities, and received consistently higher ratings as the age groups of institutions got older.

Table 31 lists the perceptions of miscellaneous goals for both Is and Should Be ratings by age of respondents' university. There were two statistically significant differences in this table -- both on the Should Be rating of Organizational Planning and Community Participation and Planning. On Organizational Planning, the youngest group of universities rated it significantly higher than the next youngest group, 1930 - 1959. It was the two middle-aged groups of universities that were the most different on the goal Community Participation and Planning,

Table 30

Process goal perceptions of all respondents by age group (by year the respondent's institution was granted university status) giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Goal #	Area		IS / SB	Before 1900 Mean	Before 1900 SD	1900 - 1929 Mean	1900 - 1929 SD	1930 - 1959 Mean	1930 - 1959 SD	Since 1960 Mean	Since 1960 SD
14.	Freedom		IS	3.94	.50	3.71	1.12	3.28	.94	3.36	1.02
			SB	4.06	.54	3.75	1.12	3.47	.91	3.46	1.03
15.	Democratic Governance		IS	3.65	.56	3.32	.43	3.50	.60	3.56	.64
			SB	3.90	.61	3.32	.45	3.77	.53	3.71	.67
16.	Community		IS	3.76	.36	3.71	.67	3.57	.65	3.78	.69
			SB	4.35	.44	4.00	.52	4.20	.56	4.41	.59
17.	Intellectual Environment		IS	3.29	.52	3.14	.76	2.98	.38	3.41	.87
			SB	3.95	.57	3.39	.67	3.82	.45	3.99	.73
18.	Innovation	*	IS	2.73	.43	2.68	.40	2.65	.38	3.20	.76
			SB	3.13	.55	3.04	.39	3.23	.47	3.85	.58
19.	Off-Campus Learning		IS	1.90	.31	2.18	.49	2.07	.43	2.20	.64
			SB	2.42	.53	2.39	.57	2.53	.59	2.78	.83
20.	Accountability/ Efficiency	*	IS	3.17	.72	3.42	.44	3.12	.65	3.40	.80
			SB	3.53	.73	3.51	.49	3.83	.51	4.21	.54

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Table 31

Miscellaneous goal perceptions of all respondents by age group (by year the respondent's institution was granted university status) giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Item	Goal Area	IS SB	Before 1900 Mean	Before 1900 SD	1900 - 1929 Mean	1900 - 1929 SD	1930 - 1959 Mean	1930 - 1959 SD	Since 1960 Mean	Since 1960 SD
12.	Graduate Literacy	IS	3.50	1.00	4.00	1.15	3.00	1.06	3.25	1.29
		SB	4.25	.75	4.29	1.11	4.13	.92	3.80	1.28
71.	Institutional Autonomy	IS	3.58	.79	3.29	1.11	3.53	.92	3.50	.89
		SB	4.00	.60	3.57	1.13	4.00	.93	3.75	1.02
80.	Institutional Reputation	IS	3.82	.60	3.71	.49	3.93	.88	3.90	.79
		SB	4.27	.65	4.00	.58	4.40	.74	4.60	.68
82.	Extracurricular Activities	IS	3.25	1.06	3.00	.58	2.80	.68	2.75	1.07
		SB	3.58	.79	3.14	.69	3.27	1.03	3.05	1.05
84.	Organizational Planning *	IS	3.00	1.04	3.29	.76	2.93	1.10	3.50	1.05
		SB	4.17	.72	4.14	.69	3.93	.80	4.15	.59
85.	Community Participation in Plan. *	IS	2.58	.67	2.29	1.11	3.07	.88	2.55	1.05
		SB	3.33	.78	2.57	.98	3.60	.63	3.25	1.02
86.	Intercollegiate Athletics	IS	2.75	.75	2.00	.58	2.07	.59	2.63	1.38
		SB	2.75	.75	2.00	.58	2.53	.74	2.37	1.21
88.	Program Evaluation	IS	3.17	.83	3.00	.58	2.73	.96	2.90	1.17
		SB	3.83	.72	3.57	.53	4.13	.52	4.20	.70
89.	Community Liaison	IS	2.67	.65	2.86	.38	2.73	.88	3.30	1.03
		SB	3.58	1.00	3.57	.53	3.80	.56	4.20	.62
90.	Campus Goal Consensus	IS	3.00	.85	3.00	.58	2.73	1.03	3.00	1.12
		SB	3.67	.65	3.57	.79	3.60	.83	3.60	1.19

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

the 1930 - 1959 group rated it significantly higher than the 1900 - 1929 group.

There were also some interesting directions in the response patterns shown in this table: in the 1939 - 1959 group, Graduate Literacy was rated over a full point higher for Should Be than Is, implying that a large-scale improvement was needed in this area; Institutional Reputation was rated highest Should Be in the youngest group, implying that newer institutions were less sure of their status; Program Evaluation in both of the more recent groups of institutions was rated over a full point higher for Should Be than Is, implying that considerably more attention needed to be paid to this area in future priorities of these groups.

The ratings of Intercollegiate Athletics were interesting because only one group indicated it should increase in importance in the future, the 1930 - 1959 group. The two oldest groups' rating indicated that it should stay the same in importance, while the respondents from the youngest universities indicated that it should decline in importance in the future. Extracurricular Activities was rated most important in the oldest group, and of least importance in the newest group.

The perception of local Canadian goals by age of universities is shown in Table 32. There were three statistically significant differences in the ratings of these goals -- the two ratings for Adult/Mature Students Programs, and on the Should Be ratings of Faculty Development and Evaluation. Programs for Adult/Mature Students was rated significantly higher in the most recent universities, both for

Table 32

Local Canadian goal perceptions of all respondents by age group (by year the respondent's institution was granted university status) giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Item	Goal Area	IS SB	Before 1900 Mean	Before 1900 SD	1900 - 1929 Mean	1900 - 1929 SD	1930 - 1959 Mean	1930 - 1959 SD	Since 1960 Mean	Since 1960 SD
91.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	IS	2.58	.90	2.14	.90	2.87	1.19	3.10	1.48
		SB	2.83	1.19	2.14	.90	2.93	1.22	3.30	1.45
92.	Experiential Learning	IS	1.75	.87	1.71	.95	2.13	.64	2.20	1.20
		SB	2.17	.94	2.00	.82	2.53	.83	2.70	1.30
93.	Development of Ed. Technology	IS	2.08	.79	2.57	.53	2.40	.74	2.60	1.19
		SB	2.83	.83	3.00	1.00	2.87	.83	3.65	1.23
94.	Bilingual Instruction	IS	2.33	1.07	1.86	.90	2.20	1.32	1.80	1.06
		SB	3.00	1.35	2.14	1.22	2.53	1.55	2.25	1.45
95.	Accessibility: Part-Time Stud.	IS	3.08	.67	3.14	1.35	3.40	1.18	3.85	1.23
		SB	3.75	.62	3.29	1.38	3.87	.99	4.15	.99
96.	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	* IS	3.58	.79	3.43	.98	3.40	.83	4.15	.81
		* SB	3.92	.79	4.00	.82	3.67	.62	4.45	.69
97.	Accessibility: Handicapped Stud.	IS	3.16	1.11	3.57	.98	3.33	.49	3.45	.94
		SB	4.00	.74	4.14	.38	3.80	.56	4.05	.71
98.	French-Canadian Culture	IS	3.25	1.22	2.71	1.25	2.67	1.18	2.55	1.05
		SB	3.83	.83	2.71	1.25	2.93	1.22	3.20	1.36
99.	Faculty Development & Evaluation	IS	3.67	.78	3.14	.69	2.87	.74	2.80	.83
		* SB	4.17	.72	3.71	.49	3.60	.74	4.25	.64
100.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	IS	2.67	.49	2.57	1.13	2.47	.64	2.45	.89
		SB	3.58	.67	3.43	.79	3.47	.83	4.00	.86

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Is and Should Be, than in the 1930 - 1959 age group, and higher than all other groups as well. The Should Be rating of Faculty Development and Evaluation was also significantly higher in the newest group than in the next oldest group.

There were a few other trends in the ratings that may be important: Program Delivery/Remote Areas was rated over a full point higher in the newer institutions than the 1900 - 1929 group. Some of the "newer trends" in universities were more important in the newest group than in older groups -- these included Experiential Learning, the Development of Educational Technology, the Accessibility of Programs to Part-Time Students, and New Faculty Employment Patterns. The Accessibility of Programs to Handicapped Students was most highly rated in the 1900 - 1929 group. Bilingual Instruction, and a commitment to providing French Canadian Cultural Programs was most highly rated in the oldest institutions.

Generally, it would seem from these ratings that it was the youngest group of universities which was the most innovative, while the older groups, especially the ones established between 1900 - 1929, were the most bound to the traditional priorities of universities. The next table shows how these ratings were ranked by each age group.

Table 33 lists the ranking of the highest twenty of all forty goal areas by the four age groups of universities. The outcome goals, or the more traditional goals, were higher in the ratings of the 1900 - 1929 groups, and there were more of them (seven Is and five Should Be) within the top twenty of this group than in other groups. In the oldest

Table 33

The twenty highest ranked of all goal areas as perceived by all respondents when grouped by age, or the year the respondent's institution received university status

Rank		Status Granted			
		Before 1900	1900 - 1929	1930 - 1959	1960 or after
1.	IS	Freedom	Grad. Literacy	Instit. Reput.	Prog./Adults
	SB	Intell. Orient.	Grad. Literacy	Instit. Reput.	Organ. Planning
2.	IS	Instit. Reput.	Freedom	Community	Instit. Reput.
	SB	Community	Intell. Orient.	Community	Instit. Reput.
3.	IS	Community	Community	Instit. Autonomy	Access/PT Stud.
	SB	Instit. Reput.	Organ. Planning	Grad. Literacy	Prog./Adults
4.	IS	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Academic Dev.	Democratic Gov.	Community
	SB	Grad. Literacy	Access/Handicap.	Program Eval.	Community
5.	IS	Democratic Gov.	Instit. Reput.	Acadmic Dev.	Intell.-Orient.
	SB	Academic Dev.	Academic Dev.	Intell. Orient.	Intell. Orient.
6.	IS	Prog./Adults	Access/Handicap.	Access/PT Stud.	Democratic Gov.
	SB	Organ. Planning	Community	Instit. Autonomy	Fac. Dev./Eval.
7.	IS	Instit. Autonomy	Intell. Orient.	Prog./Adults	Instit. Autonomy
	SB	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Prog./Adults	Organ. Planning	Account./Effic.
8.	IS	Academic Dev.	Prog./Adults	Access/Handicap.	Organ. Planning
	SB	Freedom	Instit. Reput.	Academic Dev.	Program Eval.
9.	IS	Grad. Literacy	Account./Effic.	Freedom	Access/Handicap.
	SB	Access/Handicap.	Freedom	Access/PT Stud.	Comm. Liaison
10.	IS	Research	Advanced Train.	Intell. Orient.	Academic Dev.
	SB	Instit. Autonomy	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Account./Effic.	Access/PT Stud.
11.	IS	Intell. Environ.	Democratic Gov.	Reserach	Intell. Environ.
	SB	Intell. Environ.	Research	Intell. Environ.	Access/Handicap.
12.	IS	French-Cdn.Prog.	Organ. Planning	Account./Effic.	Account./Effic.
	SB	Prog./Adults	Advanced Train.	Comm. Liaison	New Fac.Emp.Pat.
13.	IS	Extracurr. Act.	Instit. Autonomy	Comm.Part./Plan.	Freedom
	SB	Democratic Gov.	Con./Camp. Goals	Access/Handicap.	Intell. Environ.
14.	IS	Intell. Orient.	Research	Grad. Literacy	Comm. Liaison
	SB	French-Cdn.Prog.	Instit. Autonomy	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Academic Dev.
15.	IS	Access/Handicap.	Intell. Environ.	Intell. Environ.	Grad. Literacy
	SB	Program Eval.	Program Eval.	Democratic Gov.	Innovation
16.	IS	Program Eval.	Access/PT Stud.	Advanced Train.	Innovation
	SB	Access/PT Stud.	Comm. Liaison	Prog./Adults	Grad. Literacy
17.	IS	Account./Effic.	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Meet Local Needs	Research
	SB	Con./Camp. Goals	Account.Effic.	Con./Camp. Goals	Instit. Autonomy
18.	IS	Access/PT Stud.	Vocational Prep.	Organ. Planning	Prog.Del/Remote
	SB	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Comm.Part./Plan.	Democratic Gov.
19.	IS	Con./Camp. Goals	Ind. Pers. Dev.	Prog.Del/Remote	Meet Local Needs
	SB	Extracurr. Act.	New Fac.Emp.Pat.	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Research
20.	IS	Organ. Planning	Program Eval.	Fac. Dev./Eval.	Ind. Pers. Dev.
	SB	Comm. Liaison	Intell. Environ.	Research	Educ. Technology

Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

and newest groups of institutions, there were only three outcome goals in the Should Be list out of the top twenty goals while there were four outcome goals in the Should Be list of the 1930 - 1959 group.

Institutional Reputation was ranked first or second in the younger groups, while it was third in the oldest group and eighth in the 1900 - 1929 group. Freedom was ranked high for Is in the older groups and considerably lower in the newer groups. Intellectual Orientation was ranked first in the oldest group for Should Be, second in the next oldest group, and fifth in the two newer groups. Academic Development was rated fifth in the oldest groups, eighth in the 1930 - 1959 group, and fourteenth in the youngest age group. This same pattern away from the traditional priorities was seen in the ranking of Research -- ranked for Should Be -- not in the top twenty of the oldest group at all, eleventh in the 1900 - 1929 group, twentieth and nineteenth in the two youngest groups. Individual Personal Development was ranked eighteenth in the two oldest groups of institutions for Should Be, while ranked fourteenth in the 1930 - 1959 group, and not in the list of the top twenty for the newest universities.

The impression from the ratings, of a general moving away from the traditional values of universities, was borne out in this table of rankings. The younger universities were more likely to espouse other than traditional priorities. The most conservative universities seemed to be those which were established between 1900 and 1929.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: DIFFERENCES BY SIZE OR FULL-TIME ENROLMENT

This section examines the differences of goal perceptions by size of university. The definition of size used in this study was one of full-time enrolment. This was a difficult definition because some universities served many part-time students by design. The fact that these students were either excluded or converted to full-time equivalents was not important here. The purpose of examining differences by size was to determine whether size of an institution affected the perception of its goals and priorities. As outlined in Table 5, the under 4,000 group was the largest, almost half of the respondents, and the over 12,000 group was the smallest with just over 20 percent of the respondents.

Table 34 outlines the outcome goal perceptions of all respondents by size of institution. There were seven statistically significant differences among these groups. The first bears out a common assumption that small institutions attend more to the individual than do large ones -- the Is rating of Individual Personal Development was significantly higher in the smaller universities than in the larger ones. The Should Be rating was also higher in the smaller institutions, but the difference was not nearly as great, and was not significant, statistically. Cultural Awareness was also rated significantly higher in the small institutions than in the large ones.

The opposite difference was seen in some of the other goal areas: Vocational Preparation, Advanced Training, and Research were

Table 34

Outcome goal perceptions of all respondents by size group (full-time enrolment of respondent's university), giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

#	Goal Area		Under 4,000 Mean	Under 4,000 SD	4,000-11,999 Mean	4,000-11,999 SD	12,000 plus Mean	12,000 plus SD
1.	Academic Development	IS	3.62	.58	3.34	.43	3.43	.58
		SB	3.93	.53	4.00	.45	4.05	.53
2.	Intellectual Orientation	IS	3.53	.81	3.41	.43	3.18	.64
		SB	4.33	.53	4.19	.58	4.32	.37
3.	Individual Personal Development	* IS	3.21	.78	2.84	.61	2.61	.66
		SB	3.79	.59	3.60	.77	3.45	.84
4.	Humanism/ Altruism	IS	2.66	.88	2.24	.60	2.11	.53
		SB	3.36	.70	2.96	.93	3.20	.80
5.	Cultural Awareness	* IS	2.59	.64	2.35	.48	2.07	.53
		SB	3.21	.65	3.01	.63	2.82	.77
6.	Traditional Religiousness	IS	1.68	.88	1.29	.46	1.39	.50
		SB	1.91	1.10	1.57	.80	1.75	.90
7.	Vocational Preparation	* IS	2.57	.64	2.98	.51	3.11	.58
		SB	3.07	.81	3.24	.58	3.30	.62
8.	Advanced Training	* IS	2.22	.97	3.21	.73	3.80	.70
		* SB	2.64	1.03	3.50	.81	4.07	.57
9.	Research	* IS	2.85	.86	3.44	.85	3.82	.69
		* SB	3.33	.75	3.65	.81	4.20	.47
10.	Meeting Local Needs	IS	2.85	.60	2.96	.52	3.18	.60
		SB	3.37	.52	3.25	.56	3.52	.45
11.	Public Services	IS	2.81	.73	2.69	.63	2.73	.51
		SB	3.23	.79	3.06	.63	3.34	.74
12.	Social Egalitarianism	IS	2.41	.71	2.31	.72	2.68	.54
		SB	2.85	.91	2.59	.75	3.09	.57
13.	Social Criticism	IS	2.47	.75	2.16	.52	2.55	.44
		SB	2.78	.75	2.51	.73	3.11	.67

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

all rated for Is significantly higher in the large universities than in the small ones. The Should Be rating of both Advanced Training and Research showed the same significant difference, the respondents in the large universities rated them higher than in the small universities.

Generally, these differences were found between the two groups on either end of the spectrum, or between the respondents in the small and large institutional groups. However, there were other trends which should be noted here. Academic Development and Intellectual Orientation were both rated very much the same in all groups -- for Is as well as Should Be. There were other goal areas for which the lowest ratings came not in the large or small group, but in the middle-sized group. Although not statistically significant, the lowest rating on the goal areas Meeting Local Needs, Public Service, and Social Criticism occurred in the middle group. Social Egalitarianism had the highest rating for both Is and Should Be in the large group of universities.

Table 35 reports the perceptions of all respondents for the group of process goals, according to size of the respondents' universities. There was only one statistically significant difference in the process goals and that was on the Should Be rating of Innovation; respondents in the small group rated it much higher than those in the middle-sized group.

Some differences in the perceptions, although not statistically significant, were worthy of note because they may indicate a pattern or direction. Freedom was rated consistently higher as the size of the university increased. Democratic Governance, and Accountability/ Efficiency were rated lowest in the middle-sized group, however,

Table 35

Process goal perceptions of all respondents by size group (full-time enrolment of respondent's university), giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Goal #	Area	IS/SB	Under 4,000 Mean	Under 4,000 SD	4,000-11,999 Mean	4,000-11,999 SD	12,000 plus Mean	12,000 plus SD
14.	Freedom	IS	3.36	.94	3.57	.98	3.80	.84
		SB	3.46	.96	3.71	.93	3.93	.86
15.	Democratic Governance	IS	3.51	.63	3.46	.61	3.70	.38
		SB	3.77	.53	3.50	.67	3.93	.58
16.	Community	IS	3.84	.55	3.53	.73	3.66	.49
		SB	4.34	.50	4.16	.65	4.34	.50
17.	Intellectual Environment	IS	3.44	.75	3.00	.49	3.09	.65
		SB	4.00	.64	3.76	.58	3.66	.72
18.	Innovation	IS	2.95	.63	2.76	.61	2.86	.56
		* SB	3.58	.62	3.15	.61	3.43	.53
19.	Off-Campus Learning	IS	2.18	.57	1.96	.48	2.09	.34
		SB	2.65	.68	2.35	.68	2.75	.63
20.	Accountability/ Efficiency	IS	3.28	.84	3.16	.56	3.43	.49
		SB	3.85	.73	3.78	.49	4.03	.60

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

and highest in the large group. Off-campus Learning and Community were both rated more equally in the large and small groups, but of least importance in the mid-size group. Intellectual Environment was rated highest in the small group, and received consistently less importance in the mid-size and large groups.

The standard deviations which indicated the amount of agreement among respondents showed the most variance in the smallest universities, and more agreement in the two larger groups. This indicates that the small universities were more diverse as a group.

Table 36 lists the miscellaneous goal perceptions for all respondents by size of university. There was only one statistically significant difference in these perceptions, and that was the Should Be rating of Extracurricular Activities, which was rated significantly higher in the small universities than in the middle-sized ones.

Other interesting findings indicated the need for greater improvement in certain goal areas: Graduate Literacy especially in the largest universities; Organizational Planning in all groups; Program Evaluation in all groups; Community Liaison especially in the smallest universities, and Campus Goal Consensus especially in the largest universities. On one goal area, Intercollegiate Athletics, respondents in the small universities indicated that it should receive less importance in the future -- while for all other goal areas an improvement was indicated. Generally, there was more disagreement among the respondents in each group on these goals: the highest standard deviation being on Graduate Literacy in the small and mid-size groups, and

Table 36

Miscellaneous goal perceptions of all respondents by size group (full-time enrolment of respondent's university), giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Item	Goal Area	IS SB	Under 4,000 Mean	Under 4,000 SD	4,000-11,999 Mean	4,000-11,999 SD	12,000 plus Mean	12,000 plus SD
12.	Graduate Literacy	IS	3.38	1.24	3.53	1.23	2.91	.83
		SB	4.04	1.08	4.06	1.14	4.09	.94
71.	Institutional Autonomy	IS	3.50	1.03	3.59	.80	3.36	.67
		SB	3.81	.94	3.88	.99	3.91	.83
80.	Institutional Reputation	IS	3.88	.78	3.71	.69	4.09	.70
		SB	4.44	.71	4.29	.69	4.45	.69
82.	Extracurricular Activities	IS	3.12	.99	2.53	.62	3.00	1.00
		* SB	3.46	1.07	2.76	.66	3.45	.82
84.	Organizational Planning	IS	3.27	1.04	3.06	1.03	3.27	1.10
		SB	4.42	.64	4.06	.83	4.27	.79
85.	Community Participation in Planning	IS	2.58	.99	2.88	1.05	2.55	.69
		SB	3.35	.85	3.24	1.15	3.18	.60
86.	Intercollegiate Athletics	IS	2.54	1.14	2.47	.94	2.00	.67
		SB	2.38	.94	2.59	1.06	2.40	.70
88.	Program Evaluations	IS	2.81	.98	2.88	.86	[illegible]27	1.10
		SB	3.85	.73	4.12	.60	[illegible]27	.47
89.	Community Liaison	IS	2.85	1.01	2.94	.83	3.18	.60
		SB	3.85	.83	3.88	.70	3.91	.54
90.	Campus Goal Consensus	IS	2.96	1.00	2.94	1.09	2.82	.75
		SB	3.65	.80	3.35	1.17	3.91	.70

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

Community Participation in Planning and Campus Goal Consensus in the mid-size group.

Table 37 lists the local Canadian goal perceptions of all respondents by size of university. There were two statistically significant differences in the perceptions, both on the goal area of programs in French-Canadian Culture. The Is rating for both the small and middle-sized group was significantly lower than the rating of the large group. The Should Be rating of the large group was also significantly higher than the middle-sized group. The large size group placed significantly higher importance on French-Canadian Cultural Programs.

Program Delivery to Remote Areas was rated more important in the large group than in the two smaller groups, and with less disagreement among respondents. Experiential Learning was rated as being more important as the size group increased. The Development of Educational Technology was rated highest in the small group. Bilingual Instruction was rated lowest in the middle group. Part-time Students received more emphasis as institutional size increased. Programs for Mature Students and Accessibility to the Handicapped were rated much the same by all groups. Faculty Development and Evaluation and New Faculty Employment Patterns were perceived as needing great improvement in the future with large gaps between the Is and Should Be ratings of all groups.

As in previous analyses, the standard deviations were higher on these goal areas than on other goal areas when respondents were grouped

Table 37

Local Canadian goal perceptions of all respondents by size group (full-time enrolment of respondent's university), giving means and standard deviations for each, unranked

Item	Goal Area	IS SB	Under 4,000 Mean	Under 4,000 SD	4,000-11,999 Mean	4,000-11,999 SD	12,000 plus Mean	12,000 plus SD
91.	Program Delivery/ Remote Areas	IS	2.73	1.43	2.65	1.17	3.18	.75
		SB	2.88	1.48	2.76	1.20	3.36	.92
92.	Experiential Learning	IS	1.88	1.03	2.06	.75	2.27	1.10
		SB	2.35	1.23	2.47	.87	2.65	.92
93.	Development of Ed. Technology	IS	2.31	1.01	2.53	.94	2.55	.69
		SB	3.35	1.13	2.94	1.20	3.09	.54
94.	Bilingual Instruction	IS	2.19	1.17	1.71	.99	2.18	1.17
		SB	2.73	1.48	2.12	1.27	2.45	1.51
95.	Accessibility: Part-Time Stud.	IS	3.54	1.17	3.18	1.24	3.73	.90
		SB	3.65	1.09	3.88	.99	4.36	.50
96.	Adult/Mature Stud. Programs	IS	3.88	.95	3.41	.80	3.82	.75
		SB	4.15	.73	3.94	.83	4.00	.77
97.	Accessibility: Handicapped Stud.	IS	3.27	.92	3.47	.72	3.45	1.04
		SB	4.00	.58	3.88	.70	4.09	.70
98.	French-Canadian Culture	* IS	2.69	1.05	2.29	1.05	3.64	1.12
		* SB	3.23	1.36	2.65	1.00	4.00	.77
99.	Faculty Dev. and Evaluation	IS	3.00	.94	2.94	.83	3.36	.50
		SB	4.04	.60	3.76	.75	4.18	.87
100.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	IS	2.46	.76	2.65	.86	2.45	.69
		SB	3.69	.74	3.71	.92	3.63	.92

* Statistically significant at the .10 level.

by size, indicating a lack of consensus in these areas. The largest disagreement came on the goal of Program Delivery to Remote Areas and French-Canadian Culture in the small institutions, and Bilingual Instruction in all groups.

When all four groups of goal areas were combined by perceptual ratings and then ranked accordingly from highest to lowest, the top twenty of the forty goal areas were ordered as shown in Table 38. Here some of the differences by size of university become more apparent. Institutional Reputation was ranked highest Should Be for all groups, and Community was ranked third Should Be in all Groups. The other goals were given a variety of priorities by the different groups, and may indicate further polarity especially between the small and large size groups.

Organizational Planning was rated second Should Be by the small universities, fifth by the middle group and sixth by the large size institutions. The second ranked goal in the middle group for Should Be was Intellectual Orientation, while the large group ranked Accessibility to Part-Time Students as second. Intellectual Orientation was ranked fourth Should Be in the small and large groups, and second in the middle group. Adults/Mature Students Programs was ranked fifth Should Be in the small group, eighth in the middle group, and 14.5 in the large group. Graduate Literacy was ranked sixth Should Be in the small and middle group, and 9.5 in the large group. Individual Personal Development only appeared in the top twenty ranked goals of the small universities; whereas Research did not appear in this group, but was ranked

Table 38

The twenty highest ranked of all goal areas as perceived by all respondents when grouped by size, or full-time enrolment, of the respondents' universities

Rank	IS SB	Full-Time Enrolment Under 4,000 Students	Full-Time Enrolment 4000-11,999 Students	Full-Time Enrolment 12,000 Students Plus
1.	IS	Adult/Ma.St. Programs	Instit. Reputation	Instit. Reputation
	SB	Instit. Reputation	Instit. Reputation	Instit. Reputation
2.	IS	Instit. Reputation	Instit. Autonomy	Research
	SB	Organizational Plan.	Intell. Orientation	Access: P-T Students
3.	IS	Community	Freedom	Adult/Ma.St. Programs
	SB	Community	Community	Community
4.	IS	Academic Development	Community	Advanced Training
	SB	Intell. Orientation	Program Evaluation	Intell. Orientation
5.	IS	Access: P-T Students	Graduate Literacy	Freedom
	SB	Adult/Ma.St. Programs	Organizational Plan.	Program Evaluation
6.	IS	Intell. Orientation	Access: Handicap. St.	Access: P-T Students
	SB	Graduate Literacy	Graduate Literacy	Organ. Planning
7.	IS	Democratic Gov.	Democratic Gov.	Democratic Gov.
	SB	Faculty Dev./Eval.	Academic Development	Research
8.	IS	Instit. Autonomy	Research	Community
	SB	Access: Handicap. St.	Adult/Ma.St. Programs	Faculty Dev./Eval.
9.	IS	Intell. Environment	Adult/Ma.St. Programs	French-Cdn. Programs
	SB	Intell. Environment	Community Liaison	Access: Handicap. St.
10.	IS	Graduate Literacy	Intell. Orientation	Access: Handicap. St.
	SB	Academic Development	Access: P-T Students	Graduate Literacy
11.	IS	Freedom	Academic Development	Account./Efficiency
	SB	Account./Efficiency	Instit. Autonomy	Advanced Training
12.	IS	Account./Efficiency	Advanced Training	Academic Development
	SB	Community Liaison	Access: Handicap. St.	Academic Development
13.	IS	Organ. Planning	Access: P-T Students	Instit. Autonomy
	SB	Program Evaluation	Account./Efficiency	Account./Efficiency
14.	IS	Access: Handicap. St.	Account./Efficiency	Faculty Dev./Eval.
	SB	Instit. Autonomy	Intell. Environment	French-Cdn. Programs
15.	IS	Ind. Personal Dev.	Organ. Planning	Program Evaluation
	SB	Ind. Personal Dev.	Faculty Dev./Eval.	Adult/Ma.St. Programs
16.	IS	Extracurr. Activities	Intell. Environment	Organ. Planning
	SB	Democratic Gov.	Freedom	Democratic Gov.
17.	IS	Faculty Dev./Eval.	Vocational Prep.	Meeting Local Needs
	SB	New Fac.Emp. Patterns	New Fac.Emp. Patterns	Freedom
18.	IS	Consensus/Camp.Goals	Meeting Local Needs	Community Liaison
	SB	Concensus/Camp.Goals	Research	Consensus/Camp.Goals
19.	IS	Innovation	Consensus/Camp.Goals	Program Del'y/Remote
	SB	Access: P-T Students	Ind. Personal Dev.	Instit. Autonomy
20.	IS	Community Liaison	Community Liaison	Intell. Orientation
	SB	Innovation	Advanced Training	Community Liaison

Tied Ranks are indicated by brackets.

eighteenth of the middle group and seventh in the large group. Advanced Training also did not appear in the top twenty ranked goals of the small group, but ranked twentieth in the middle group and eleventh in the large group -- one higher than Academic Development.

The total number of process goals appearing in the top twenty goals for Should Be was interesting, as the middle group had five, while the other two groups had only three each. They were different goals, though, and indicated quite a difference in priority. Respondents from small universities ranked five process goals and three outcome goals in the list of the top twenty, and these were fairly evenly spread over the list. Respondents from middle-sized universities had five outcome goals and only four process goals in the top twenty, but most of these were grouped near the bottom of the list. The group of large universities had four each of both outcome and process goals, but most of the outcome goals were much higher in the list than the process goals. It might, therefore, be concluded that there was a tendency for institutions to give more priority to outcome goals and less to process goals as they increased in size.

In summary, there were a number of significant differences among the perceptions of respondents when they were grouped by region, age, and size of their universities. There were fewer differences when grouped by age of university, almost half the number of differences found than when grouped by region and size. Thus, there were considerably more differences by region and size of university than by age.

GOAL PERCEPTIONS: MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IS AND SHOULD BE

Differences in goal perceptions may be analyzed in a number of ways. This last section examines the differences between the means of the ratings for Is and Should Be for the total sample, and ranks these from highest to lowest. The amount of difference between the two means indicates the amount of change needed as perceived by the respondents. As previously stated, all of these goals were rated as needing more importance in the future than they have now, but the amount of increase was examined here.

Table 39 indicates the ranking of the combined outcome and process goals by mean difference. The goal perceived to need the greatest amount of improvement, or increase in importance, was Intellectual Orientation, followed by Humanism/Altruism, and Individual Personal Development. Cultural Awareness was fourth, Intellectual Environment was fifth, and Accountability/Efficiency was sixth. Community, Innovation, and Off-Campus Learning were next, followed by Academic Development in tenth position. These ratings give another perspective to the total question of priorities, as some of these goals have not appeared high on the lists in previous discussions.

Table 40 presents a ranking of the miscellaneous goals by mean difference between Is and Should Be for all respondents. The two highest mean differences were recorded for Program Evaluation and Organizational Planning. Community Liaison, Graduate Literacy, and Consensus on Campus Goals were next. Institutional Reputation and

Table 39

Ranking of outcome and process goals combined by mean difference between the Is and Should Be ratings of all respondents

Rank	Goal Area	Is Rating	Should Be Rating	Mean Difference
1.	Intellectual Orientation	3.42	4.28	.86
2.	Humanism/Altruism	2.42	3.20	.78
3.	Individual Personal Dev.	2.97	3.66	.69
4.	Cultural Awareness	2.41	3.07	.66
5.	Intellectual Environment	3.23	3.86	.63
6.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.27	3.87	.60
7.	Community	3.71	4.29	.58
8.	Innovation	2.88	3.41	.57
9.	Off-Campus Learning	2.09	2.58	.49
10.	Academic Development	3.49	3.98	.48
11.	Public Service	2.75	3.20	.44
12.	Meeting Local Needs	2.95	3.36	.41
13.	Social Egalitarianism	2.43	2.82	.39
14.5	Research	3.23	3.61	.38
14.5	Social Criticism/Activism	2.39	2.76	.38
16.	Vocational Preparation	2.81	3.17	.36
17.	Advanced Training	2.85	3.20	.35
18.	Traditional Religiousness	1.50	1.77	.27
19.	Democratic Governance	3.53	3.72	.19
20.	Freedom	3.51	3.72	.12

Table 40

Ranking of miscellaneous goals by mean difference between the Is and Should Be ratings of all respondents

Rank	Goal Area	Is Rating	Should Be Rating	Mean Difference
1.	Program Evaluation	2.93	4.02	1.09
2.	Organizational Planning	3.20	4.28	1.07
3.	Community Liaison	2.94	3.87	.93
4.	Graduate Literacy	3.33	4.06	.72
5.	Consensus on Campus Goals	2.93	3.61	.69
6.	Community Participation in Planning	2.67	3.28	.61
7.	Institutional Reputation	3.87	4.40	.53
8.	Institutional Autonomy	3.50	3.85	.35
9.	Extracurricular Activities	2.91	3.24	.33
10.	Intercollegiate Athletics	2.42	2.45	.03

Institutional Autonomy, while ranked highly on other listings, were toward the bottom of this listing.

Table 41 presents a ranking of the local Canadian goal perceptions by mean differences. New Faculty Employment Patterns, Faculty Development and Evaluation, and Development of Educational Technology headed the list of areas that needed considerably more attention in the future. Accessibility of Programs to Handicapped Students, French-Canadian Cultural Programs, and Bilingual Instruction were also quite high.

These perceptual differences may be interesting, and they provide an indication of goal areas that need attention, but they do not indicate the overall priority given these areas. For instance, an area may need much improvement, but still be rated quite low overall, or it might need less improvement because it is already rated high. Therefore, a combination of the ratings for Should Be with these mean differences was calculated in order to analyze the priority for future emphases on the goal areas in Canadian universities.

Table 42 provides a ranking of the two figures combined -- mean differences with Should Be ratings -- for the highest twenty of all goals. This priority listing provides a new set of figures, which indicates how respondents perceive that Canadian universities should give their attention to new initiatives. Organizational Planning tops the list, followed by Intellectual Orientation, and Program Evaluation. Institutional Reputation was fourth, followed by Faculty Development and Evaluation. Community was sixth, New Faculty Employment Patterns was

Table 41

Ranking of local Canadian goals by mean difference between the Is and Should Be ratings of all respondents

Rank	Goal Area	Is Rating	Should Be Rating	Mean Difference
1.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	2.52	3.69	1.17
2.	Faculty Development and Evaluation	3.06	3.98	.93
3.	Educational Technology, Development of	2.43	3.17	.74
4.	Accessibility/Handicapped	3.34	3.98	.64
5.5	French-Canadian Cultural Programs	2.76	3.20	.44
5.5	Bilingual Instruction	2.04	2.48	.44
7.	Experiential Learning	2.01	2.44	.43
8.	Accessibility/Part-Time Students	3.46	3.87	.41
9.	Adult/Mature Student Programs	3.72	4.06	.33
10.	Program Delivery/Remote Areas	2.80	2.94	.15

Table 42

The twenty highest ranked goal areas as perceived by all respondents when the Should Be rating was combined with the mean difference between Is and Should Be ratings

Rank	Goal Area	Should Be Rating	Mean Difference	Combined Total
1.	Organizational Planning	4.28	1.07	5.35
2.	Intellectual Orientation	4.28	.86	5.14
3.	Program Evaluation	4.02	1.09	5.11
4.	Institutional Reputation	4.40	.53	4.93
5.	Faculty Development and Evaluation	3.98	.93	4.91
6.	Community	4.29	.58	4.87
7.	New Faculty Employment Patterns	3.69	1.17	4.86
8.	Community Liaison	3.87	.93	4.80
9.	Graduate Literacy	4.06	.72	4.78
10.	Accessibility: Handicapped	3.78	.64	4.62
11.	Intellectual Environment	3.86	.63	4.49
12.	Accountability/Efficiency	3.87	.59	4.47
13.	Academic Development	3.98	.48	4.46
14.	Adult/Mature Student Programs	4.06	.33	3.39
15.	Individual Personal Development	3.66	.69	4.35
16.	Consensus on Campus Goals	3.61	.69	4.30
17.	Accessibility: Part-Time Students	3.87	.41	4.28
18.	Institutional Autonomy	3.85	.35	4.20
19.	Research	3.61	.38	3.99
20.5	Innovation	3.41	.57	3.98
20.5	Humanism/Altruism	3.20	.78	3.98

seventh, Community Liaison was eighth, Graduate Literacy -- ninth, and Accessibility of Programs to the Handicapped was tenth.

In examining this priority listing, it was interesting to note that only one outcome goal and only one process goal were included in the top ten. Half of the goals of the top ten in this listing were from the miscellaneous goal group, and three were from the local Canadian goals. In the second ten priority goals, four were outcome goals, three were process goals, two were miscellaneous, and two were local Canadian goals. The traditional outcome goal, Research, was ranked nineteenth overall -- with many more goals thought to be more important than it. The other traditional goal of universities, Public Service, was not included in the top twenty, and in fact, was rarely mentioned in any of the lists of the highest ranked twenty goal areas.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a detailed analysis of the data, listing the ratings and rankings of the respondents to the IGI instrument used in this study. The analyses were portrayed in 42 tables which described or listed the responses according to the subproblems of the study. The findings included a respondent profile, ratings and rankings of differences between respondent groups for Is and Should Be goals, and differences between groups by position, and by region, age, and size of university. Finally, the mean differences between Is and Should Be ratings were examined along with the combined totals for Should Be and mean differences. The next chapter presents the conclusions and implications of this study for Canadian universities.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the current and future goals of Canadian universities as perceived by presidents and board chairmen, and to compare their goal perceptions by the region, age, and size of their institutions.

Methodology

The Institutional Goals Inventory (1976) was used as a survey instrument to ascertain goal perceptions because it was well known and had been validated by previous use in such studies. The English and French translations of the Canadian version of the instrument were used, with ten additional goal items added from recent Canadian concerns.

A total of 100 questionaires were sent in November, 1981. Fifty universities were included in the study, and two constituencies were asked to participate -- a president or chief administrator, and a board chairman from each institution. The response rate from the president group was very good, 38 out of 50. The board chairmen were not as responsive, only 16 out of 48 replied.

The respondents were asked to rate 100 goal statements in two ways: how important "is" the goal presently at their university, and

how important it "Should Be." The ratings were given on a 5 point scale with 1 meaning low, and 5 meaning high importance. The one hundred goal statements were divided into four categories: thirteen outcome goal areas, seven process goal areas, ten miscellaneous goals, and ten local Canadian goals.

Respondent Profile

The addition of four identification questions allowed a profile of the respondents to be established by position, and by university region, age, and size. The data analysis was then divided into seven sections: respondent profile, goal perceptions: Is and Should Be ratings, differences by position, differences by region, age, size, and mean differences.

The respondents were grouped by the four regions of Canada with approximately equal numbers: Western Canada with 16 respondents, Ontario with 15 respondents, Quebec with 8 respondents, and Atlantic Canada with 15 respondents. Ontario had the largest number of actual universities, but the lowest response rate -- so as a region, it was under represented in this study. Respondents were also grouped into four groupings by the age of their universities, or the year the institution was granted university status: Before 1900 with 12, 1900 - 1929 with 7, 1930 - 1959 with 15, and Since 1960 with 20. The size of the university, based upon full-time enrolment, resulted in three groups: 11 respondents from universities with an enrolment of 12,000 or more; 17 respondents from universities with enrolments of 4,000 to 11,999

students, 26 from the small universities with under 4,000 students.

Some interesting factors emerged from the respondent profiles: the majority of the oldest universities in Canada responding were from Eastern Canada, and the majority of the youngest universities responding were from the West. The West and Ontario had the most large universities responding; the Atlantic region had the most small universities responding, but no large universities responding. The majority of small institutions responding were established since 1960; however, the largest number of middle-sized universities responding were established between 1930 - 1959. The profile of respondents indicated that this study was fairly representative of a cross-section of all Canadian universities.

FINDINGS

The major finding from the data analyses presented in detail in Chapter 4, is that the traditional outcome goals of teaching, research, and public service were not rated very high, and certainly not as high as other goals in the process, miscellaneous, or local goal categories. Of the three traditional outcome goals, however, it can be said that teaching was definitely rated highest, with research well down the list, and public service toward the bottom. Overall, the process goals were more important in the perception of the respondents than were the more traditional outcome goals.

When the outcome goals were examined by themselves, the teaching-related goals of the university, Academic Development and Intellectual

Orientation, were the most highly rated. However, these were given a rating only half way between "of medium importance" and "of high importance." The Should Be rating of these two teaching-related goals was "of high importance" or a little higher. And when ranked with the process goals, they were rated below the process goal Community, placing second and third rank. When they were ranked with all of the goal areas, they dropped down to third and ninth rank.

Another general finding from this study was that in the perceptions of the presidents and board chairmen of respondent universities, Canadian universities should be doing considerably more in almost all areas in the future. It could be argued that administrators are never satisfied, and that these two respondent groups represent the administration of each university. Yet, in a time of financial restraint, these administrators have suggested that their universities should be doing more and not less. With only one exception, every rating for Should Be was substantially higher than the Is rating. The question immediately comes to mind "How can a university do more with less?" The answer to this question may be in the high ratings given to Accountability/Efficiency, Organizational Planning, Program Evaluation, Faculty Development and Evaluation, and New Faculty Employment Patterns. Attention to these goals may indeed help a university to do more with less.

When all goal areas were combined, the top-ranked goal was Institutional Reputation, from the miscellaneous goal group. It could be argued that administrators, especially the chief administrators, are often most directly concerned with the subject of institutional reputation,

and certainly board chairmen also are greatly concerned about this matter. Perhaps this, too, was a partial result of financial restraint; when a university is asked to do more with less it is apt to become protective of both its territory and its reputation. It was surprising, however, that Reputation was rated as more important than everything else a university does. Perhaps one explanation which could be offered for the high ratings of this goal had to do with the universities' new emphasis on fund-raising, and the dependence for success of this venture on the reputation of a university.

Another highly rated goal area, a process goal, was Community. This goal seems to present the ideal of collegiality, and it was not surprising that it was rated highly. What was surprising was that this goal area was ranked higher than any of the other outcome or process goals for both Is and Should Be. Few administrators would dispute this goal as a statement of the ideal toward which a university should strive, but it was surprising that they would rank it above teaching. The high rating of this process goal, Community, represents a major finding of this study, that in the perception of the presidents and board chairmen of Canadian universities the sense of rapport or community was more important than the teaching and research activities of the university.

Another general finding of this study was the relatively low priority placed on the traditional research function of the university. It could be argued that research was often not an active interest of the president or board chairman of a university. When all goal areas were combined, research was ranked 13.5 for Is, and not on the list of the

top twenty goals at all for Should Be. Even when the outcome and process goals were combined, research was ranked 7.5 for Is and 9 for Should Be among these 20 goal areas.

Public Service is the name given to one of the outcome goal areas, and this goal itself rarely made it into any list of the top twenty goals out of forty. When ranked overall with just the outcome and process goals, it was ranked fourteenth for Is and thirteenth for Should Be among 20 goal areas. However, when this area was examined further, and the goals from the miscellaneous and local Canadian goal lists that were related to Public Service were included, some of these appeared in the top twenty goal areas. These areas that could be considered Public Service may include Meeting Local Needs, Community Liaison, and Programs for Remote Areas. When all goals were combined, the Should Be rating of Community Liaison was twelfth. Meeting Local Needs was low on the list for Is, but not for Should Be. Although it could be argued that universities may attend to community liaison for reasons other than public service, this was the only goal that appeared on the list for Should Be of the top ranked twenty of all goals.

Another surprising finding of this study was the low priority given to both Advanced Training and Vocational Preparation. It has often been assumed that the small liberal arts college and vocational training were at opposite ends of the university spectrum, and that a university with limited funds could do one or the other but not both. When the listing of all goals ranked together was examined, neither Vocational Preparation nor Advanced Training appeared in the top twenty goals. The

listing of just the outcome and process goals revealed that, out of these twenty goal areas, Advanced Training was ranked twelfth for Both Is and Should Be, and Vocational Preparation was ranked thirteenth and fifteenth for Is and Should Be, respectively.

One other group of goals that bears examining was the group that pertains to the students themselves. Individual Personal Development, Humanism/Altruism, and Cultural Awareness are goal areas that relate to the development of the student. Most of the time, these goals were perceived as quite low on the list of what Is most important. In the highest twenty goal rankings of all forty goal areas, Individual Personal Development was ranked eighteenth. This goal area was ranked twentieth of all goals by the presidents for Should Be, but fifteenth for Should Be by board chairmen. The other student related goal areas did not appear at all among the top twenty goals.

While these low ratings indicate importance on the development of individual students, there were a few other goal areas that were often placed higher in the ranks, and involved groups of minority students. These goal areas concerned Part-Time Students, Handicapped, and Adult or Mature Students. These goals were part of the list of local Canadian goals which were added to the IGI for this study. These goals were ranked surprisingly high when combined with all goal areas. Programs for Adults/ Mature Students was rated second most important Is, and 5.5 rank for Should Be. Part-TimeStudents was eighth and twelfth for Is and Should Be, and Handicapped Students was tenth and ninth, respectively.

There is one other area in which the rankings revealed a priority that was unexpected. Throughout the listings, the Is and Should Be ratings and rankings on goals were given. As mentioned previously, very few times were the goals Humanism/Altruism or Individual Personal Development held as of very high importance. But when the mean differences were ranked from highest to lowest for the outcome and process goals, these two goal areas appeared as second and third highest rank after Intellectual Orientation, indicating they needed the most change or improvement in the future. The next two goals were also a surprise -- Cultural Awareness and Intellectual Environment were fourth and fifth ranked.

The last major finding of this study was related to the group of goal areas that were perceived to need the most improvement in the future; they have to do with running universities more efficiently. With only two exceptions, Intellectual Orientation and Institutional Reputation, the top eight priority goals were related to university management. The areas that were perceived to need improvement could be considered related to management issues: Organizational Planning, Program Evaluation, Faculty Development and Evaluation, Community, New Faculty Employment Patterns, and Community Liaison. This listing was surprising only in traditional terms, in thinking of the outcome goals of universities as the most important. In view of the economic situation in Canada, in addition to declining enrolments, these goals are not surprisingly rated as needing the most attention in the immediate future.

CONCLUSIONS

There was considerable evidence in this study that the traditional outcome goals of universities (teaching, research, and public service) no longer constitute the most important university goals in Canada. The following conclusions are based on the findings:

1. Many of the process goals are generally more important in Canadian universities than the traditional outcome goals.

2. The highest priority goal in Canadian universities is Institutional Reputation, especially in the youngest universities.

3. Research is only of medium importance in Canadian universities, and is most important in the large-sized universities.

4. Public Service is of lower than medium importance in Canadian universities.

5. Development of the student as an individual is a more important goal in Canadian universities than job-related training or graduate studies, especially in the small-sized universities.

6. There is growing importance placed on accessibility of programs to minority groups such as the handicapped, part-time students, and adult/mature students.

7. There were significant differences between the goal priorities of the two respondent groups: the presidents placed more emphasis on the traditional goals of teaching and learning, while the board chairmen placed more importance on efficient management or community-related goals.

8. The locality of a university has an impact on its goal priorities -- respondents from all regions agreed that the teaching function was of high importance, but there was less agreement on the priority of other traditional goals, such as research and public service.

9. The age of a university affects its general goals only a little; newer universities tended to be more innovative, or non-traditional, and older universities were more conservative and traditional.

10. The size of a university has a considerable impact on its goal priorities: The larger ones placed higher importance on research and graduate school, while the smaller ones placed more importance on the individual student.

11. Canadian university administrators agreed that universities should be doing more in almost all goal areas then they are doing now.

12. Canadian university administrators agreed that in the future greater emphasis should be placed on efficiency-related process goals, as well as on the more traditional outcome goals related to student development.

In summary, in the opinion of the Presidents and Board Chairmen, the survival of the universities is essential, and comes even before the goals related to teaching. Their conclusions appear to be that the universities must first exist in order to teach, and must be managed effectively in order to do so. The high rankings of the management-oriented goals point to the need for efficiency.

IMPLICATIONS

The data gathered in this study provided some significant findings which are of importance to the future of Canadian universities. There are a number of implications of these findings and conclusions.

Implications for Administrators

In the view of Presidents and Board Chairmen, Canadian university administrators need to attend to the housekeeping chores -- Organizational planning, Program Evaluation, Faculty Development and Evaluation, and New Faculty Employment Patterns. In this era of economic restraint, the universities need to attend not only to their own shop, but to how they relate to the support mechanisms -- government, the community, and other institutions.

Administrators must also attend to the new constituencies, without neglecting the old ones; develop new technologies, but maintain good relations with the community; be accessible to the handicapped, but improve the literacy of graduates; be accessible to part-time students and adults, deliver programs to remote areas, but maintain internal concensus on campus goals. There were many such messages to university administrators in the findings of this study.

Implications for Graduate Training

These conclusions indicate that university administrators will need increasing skill in management: decision-making, human resource management, fund-raising, public relations, and financial planning. They will need to learn how to listen and be sensitive to the needs of their

faculty, students, and the community at large; how to evaluate demands for new programs and evaluate old programs. Administrators of universities in this decade will need to be innovative and creative with old ideas like faculty employment, and know different types and applications for evaluative techniques for people and programs.

Implications for Further Research

The implications of this study for further research are many. The questions raised fall into two broad categories: university goals, and other university characteristics.

Related Questions on Goals

1. Why is the rating of institutional reputation so high? Is it related to fund-raising and economic restraint or declining enrollments?

2. How would constituent groups other than administrators rate these goals: the community, the faculty, or students?

3. How would the various groups in the universities actually rank these goals -- would the result be different than the rankings in this study which were derived from ratings?

4. Why do universities rate the traditional goals lower at present, but say they need more improvement in the future -- do the traditional goals of teaching, research, and public service need redefining?

5. Are the goal priorities expressed in this study supported by, or consistent with, the budget allocations of Canadian universities?

6. Are the goal priorities expressed in this study reflected in the planning documents of universities?

Related Research on Universities

1. Do Canadian universities put such low emphasis on research because it is done elsewhere -- perhaps in associated research centres, or institutes?

2. Why are the small universities not giving higher priority to vocational preparation -- is it by choice, or because they have limited funds?

3. Are the smaller universities more responsive to community needs because they can act with less bureaucracy?

4. Can the larger universities do more because of greater funds?

5. Are younger universities really more innovative, or just less bound by tradition?

6. Does the community in which a university is located really affect its direction and programs?

7. Do communities really want public service and social criticism from the universities?

These are questions raised by this study, and which this study cannot answer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bereday, George Z. F. Univerisites For All. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1973.

Bienayme, Alain. Systems of Higher Education: France. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978.

Bissell, Claude T. The Strength of the University, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Brown, Douglas J. The Liberal University: An Institutional Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1969.

Budig, Gene A. and Stanley G. Rives. Academic Quicksand: Some Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Lincoln, Neb.: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1973.

Cameron, J. M. On the Idea of A University. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education: A Summary of Reports and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Collier's Encyclopedia, Vols. 1, 4, 15, Lewis Shores, (Ed.) New York: Crowell-Collier Publishing, 1961.

Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto: Toward Community in University Governments. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Ducret, Bernard and Rafe-uz-Zaman (Eds.) The University Today: Its Role and Place in Society, Geneva: World University Service, 1960.

Educational Testing Service Institutional Goals Inventory. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Flexner, Abraham. Universities: American, English, German, New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Frankel, Charles. (Ed.) Issues in University Education. New York: Harper, 1959.

Geiger, Roger L. European Universities - The Unfinished Revolution, Yale University: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, 1976.

Giles, Geoffrey J. The Structure of Higher Education in the German Republic. Yale University: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, 1976.

Gillmore, Allan K. "A Brief From the Assbciation of Universities and Colleges in Canada to the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee," Ottawa: A.U.&.C., 1981.

Gregor, Alexander and Wilson, Keith. Monographs in Education Issues in Higher Education . Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba, 1979.

Harris, Robin S. A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Harris, Robin S. Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Higher Education for Everybody? Issues and Implications. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Hodgetts, J. E. Higher Education in a Changing Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Interfaces: Universities, Societies, and Government, Report of a Seminar, Jamaica, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1974.

Jencks, Christopher and David Reisman. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Jones, David R. The Beginning of Civic Universities: A Survey of Societal and International Influences. Yale University: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, 1977.

Ken, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kerr, Clark, et al. 12 Systems of Higher Education: 6 Decisive Issues. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978.

Levy, Daniel. Limits on Government's Financial Control of the University: Mexico. Yale University: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, 1977.

Lloyd, G. E. R. Aristotle: The Growth and Structure of His Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Loucks, Leon F., Rahman, L., and Stevenson, B. Towards a University Community. Charlottetown: The University of Prince Edward Island, 1975.

McMaster University. Report on Institutional Goals Inventory. Hamilton, Ontario, 1976.

McNeal, Joanne, Konrad, A., and Hodysh H. University Purposes: Literature Review and Canadian Overview. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1981.

Nairn, R. A. A letter from R. A. Nairn, Secretary of the Senate, Brock University, to A. G. Konrad, March 12, 1981.

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. The Idea of A University. Martin Svaglic (Ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Niblett, W. R. (Ed.) Higher Education: Demand and Response. London: Tavistock Publications, 1969.

OECD Reviews of National Policies For Education: Canada. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976.

OECD Reviews of National Policies For Education: Netherlands. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1970.

Pedersen, George K. "A Statement of Mission For Simon Fraser University," President's Speech, Burnaby: Simon Fraser University, June 14, 1979.

Perkins, Harold. British Society and Higher Education. Yale University: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, 1977.

Peterson, Richard E. College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Peterson, Richard E. Goals For California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Peterson, Richard E. The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Peterson, Richard E. Toward Institutional Goal Consciousness. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Piccinin, Sergio, and Joly, Jean-Marie. The Goals of The University of Ottawa, What They Are and What They Should Be, Vol. I and II, Ottawa: 1978.

Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. (Eds.) F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, Vol. I-III, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Ross, Murray G. The University: The Anatomy of Academe. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Sadighian, Masoud. "A Comparative Analysis of University Goals and Governance in North America and Iran," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1975.

Sixth Report of the Australian Universities Commission, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra: 1975.

Stanley, George, and Sylvestre, Guy. Canadian Universities Today. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Steers, Richard M. Organizational Effectiveness: A behavioral View. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear, 1977.

Swift, W. H. Trends in Canadian Education. Toronto: W. J. Gage Limited, 1958.

The Long Range Planning Committee, Planning for the Third Decade. Waterloo: The University of Waterloo, 1979.

The University of Alberta Senate, Report of the Commission on University Purpose. Edmonton, 1982.

The University of Manitoba, Attitudes Towards Goals of The University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, 1977.

Trivett, David A. Goals For Higher Education: Definitions and Directions. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

University of Calgary. Annual Report, 1978-1979. Calgary: The University of Calgary, 1979.

University of Prince Edward Island, Summary of Attitudes Toward University Goals. Charlottetown, 1975.

University Program Review Committee. The Shrinking Maze. Calgary: The University of Calgary, 1980.

Wagner, Norman E. "Report of the President" in Annual Report, 1978-1979. Calgary: The University of Calgary, 1979

Woodside, Willson. The University Question: Who Should Go? Who Should Pay? Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1958.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia

Alberta, The University of
Edmonton, Alberta

Athabasca University
Edmonton, Alberta

Bishop's University
Lennoxville, Quebec

Brandon University
Brandon, Manitoba

British Columbia, The University of
Vancouver, B.C.

Brock University
St. Catherines, Ontario

Calgary, The University of
Calgary, Alberta

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Guelph, The University of
Guelph, Ontario

Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, Ontario

Laurentian University of Sudbury
Sudbury, Ontario

Laval Université
Quebec City, Quebec

Lethbridge, The University of
Lethbridge, Alberta

Manitoba, The University of
Winnipeg, Manitoba

McGill University
Montreal, Quebec

McMaster, University
Hamilton, Ontario

Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland

Moncton, Université de
Moncton, New Brunswick

Montreal, Université de
Montreal, Quebec

Mount Allison University
Sackville, New Brunswick

Mount Saint Vincent University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

New Brunswick, University of
Fredericton, New Brunswick

Nova Scotia Agricultural College
Truro, Nova Scotia

Nova Scotia College of Art and Design
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Ottawa, University of
Ottawa, Ontario

Prince Edward Island, University of
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island

Quebec, Université du
Ste-Foy, Quebec

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

Regina, University of
Regina, Saskatchewan

Ryerson Politechnical Institute
Toronto, Ontario

St. Francis Xavier University
Antigonish, Nova Scotia

Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

St. Thomas University
Fredericton, New Brunswick

Saskatchewan, University of
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Sherbrooke, Université de
Sherbrooke, Quebec

Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia

Sudbury, University of
Sudbury, Ontario

Technical University of Nova Scotia
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Toronto, University of
Toronto, Ontario

Trent University
Peterborough, Ontario

Victoria, University of
Victoria, British Columbia

Waterloo, University of
Waterloo, Ontario

Western Ontario, The University of
London, Ontario

Wilfred Laurier University
Waterloo, Ontario

Windsor, University of
Windsor, Ontario

Winnipeg, The University of
Winnipeg, Manitoba

York University
Downsview, Ontario

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

November 12, 1981

To: Chairmen
Boards of Governors
Canadian Universities

I am writing to request that you complete and return the attached Institutional Goals Inventory. We are asking all chairmen of the boards of governors of Canadian universities to participate in this national study. Your assistance in this project will allow us to compile comparative profiles of university goals.

Last spring the Centre surveyed all university presidents for information on university purposes and priorities. The wide range of materials we received was used to assist the Senate of this university in its study of university purposes. The analysis of the materials did not result in a clear profile of university purposes, however, and consequently we decided to use the Institutional Goals Inventory to clarify the goals of Canadian universities.

All returns will be treated confidentially and data will only be reported in summary form. Your participation will allow us to compile a summary of Canadian university goals as perceived by presidents and board chairmen, and national and regional profiles will allow us to identify major trends in Canadian higher education. The data will also serve as the basis for a thesis on university administration by Joanne McNeal, a research assistant in the Centre.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the findings of this study upon its completion. Please complete and return the inventory in the enclosed envelope by November 30th. We sincerely appreciate your assistance in this project.

Cordially yours,

Abram G. Konrad
Professor and Coordinator

AGK/rdv
Encl.

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

November 12, 1981

To: Presidents
Canadian Universities

I am writing to request that you and your board chairman each complete and return a copy of the enclosed Institutional Goals Inventory.

Last spring the Centre surveyed all university presidents for information on university purposes and priorities. The wide range of materials we received was used to assist the Senate of this university in its study of university purposes. The analysis of the materials did not result in a clear profile of university purposes, however, and consequently we decided to use the Institutional Goals Inventory to clarify the goals of Canadian universities.

All returns will be treated confidentially and data will only be reported in summary form. Your participation will allow us to compile a summary of Canadian university goals as perceived by presidents and board chairmen, and national and regional profiles will allow us to identify major trends in Canadian higher education. The data will also serve as the basis for a thesis on university administration by Joanne McNeal, a research assistant in the Centre.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the findings of this study upon its completion. Please complete and return the inventory in the enclosed envelope by November 30th. We sincerely appreciate your assistance in this project.

Cordially yours,

Abram G. Konrad
Professor and Coordinator

AGK/rdv
Enc.

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

December 3, 1981

To: Presidents
Canadian Universities

In our letter of November 12, we asked you and your board chairman to complete the Institutional Goals Inventory. We have received a number of completed returns, but also several requests for an extension of time.

I know you have many demands on your time, but this national project can only be completed with your participation. This research is not designed to investigate official goal statements, but rather to compile perceptions of university goals held by presidents and board chairmen. Your participation will allow us to develop national and regional profiles and to identify major trends in Canadian universities.

We sincerely hope you will take 30 minutes to share your perceptions with us no later than December 30. Please call me if you need another copy of the inventory. If this letter reaches you after you and your board chairman have mailed your responses, please accept our thanks.

Best wishes to you and yours for the holiday season!

Cordially yours,

Abram G. Konrad
Professor and Coordinator

AGK/rdv

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

January 14, 1982

To: Presidents
Canadian Universities

Re: Institutional Goals Inventory National Study

Many presidents and board chairmen of Canadian Universities have shared their perceptions of university goals; but there is no response from you or your board chairman.

After I telephoned your office before Christmas, I was confident that you would respond. Since there are only 50 universities in Canada, each response is very important to this national research. We would sincerely appreciate it if you would complete the Institutional Goals Inventory and return it to us as soon as possible.

Please call me if you need another copy of the questionnaire. Your help in this research is deeply appreciated.

Cordially yours,

Abram G. Konrad
Professor and Coordinator

AGK/rdv

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Pages 169 to 194 have been removed due to lack of availability of copyright material. These pages contain the English and French versions of the Institutional Goals Inventory, and may be obtained from the Educational Testing Service, College and University Programs, Princeton, New Jersey, 08540.