DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 805 HE 031 600

AUTHOR Belcheir, Marcia J.; Ollenburger, Jane C.
TITLE Faculty, Student, and Community Perceptions on the Value of a College Education. AIR 1998 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE 1998-05-00
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (38th, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-20, 1998). This research was supported in part through a grant from the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *College Faculty; *College Students; *Community Attitudes; *Educational Attitudes; *Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; *Role of Education; Sex Differences; Student Attitudes; Student Development; Urban Universities; Value Judgment
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; College Outcomes Survey; Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study examined faculty, student, and community perceptions of the purpose and value of a college education. A total of 536 undergraduates, 121 faculty, 211 members of the community of a metropolitan university completed a survey based on the ACT College Outcomes Survey that focused on educational outcomes and student growth. The results indicated that faculty and community members found information management skills to be of more importance than did students. Students and community members, however, placed more importance on the acquisition of job skills than did faculty. Women in all three groups placed more importance on all four educational outcomes--information management skills, academic skills, self-knowledge, and job skills--than did men. Faculty placed more importance on the role of the university in fostering values and intellectual growth than did students or community members. Faculty were also more committed to developing social awareness in students than were students themselves. On the other hand, students wanted the university to help them grow more interpersonally than faculty thought should be the case. (MDM)

FACULTY, STUDENT AND COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS ON THE VALUE OF A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Marcia J. Belcheir, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Institutional Assessment
Boise State University
1910 University Drive
Boise ID 83725
208-385-1117
aoambel@bsu.idbsu.edu

and

Jane C. Ollenburger, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Social Sciences and Public Affairs
Boise State University
1910 University Drive
Boise ID 83725
208-385-3776
jollenb@bsu.idbsu.edu

This research was supported in part through a grant from the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Eighth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 17-20, 1998.
This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of AIR Forum Papers.

Dolores Vura
Editor
AIR Forum Publications

Abstract

FACULTY, STUDENT AND COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS ON THE VALUE OF A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Faculty, students, and the community often are thought to have differing perceptions of the purposes of higher education. This study explored where these differences might lie, guided by the hypotheses that students are really a sub-set of the community and that differences mainly occur because faculty focus on the intellectual function of their occupation while students focus on how they can use what they are learning. Scores were obtained on four outcome factors and on five factors related to university contributions to student growth. These scores were then used to compare the groups. Results indicated that faculty had an educational agenda that differed significantly from students' in the areas hypothesized. The community, however, typically held a viewpoint that fell between that of faculty and students.

FACULTY, STUDENT, AND COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS ON THE VALUE OF A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Faculty, students and community members are all important stakeholders in the future of higher education, particularly on metropolitan campuses. As institutional administrators struggle to define their missions to meet the challenges of the next millennium, the apparent contradictions between the various stakeholders has become more evident and, at times, has been taken into the public sphere through newspaper articles, letters to the editor and editorials. The debate often centers around the beliefs that the public hold concerning the roles of faculty and the need for the institution to better articulate its function. To address some of these concerns, this research quantitatively assesses the perceptions of all three groups of stakeholders concerning the purposes and values of higher education at a metropolitan campus. Our intent is to highlight the similarities and differences in order to better forge a link between the campus community and the public community.

Urban institutions both draw from and give to the surrounding community. The needs of the urban university for student internship experiences, for highly trained and knowledgeable part-time instructors, and for additional cultural experiences are met by the community. In return, communities benefit from the universities' presence. However, an urban community has large and diverse needs that often are not readily met by a single institution and conflicts in priorities among faculty, students, the administration and community will almost inevitably arise.

Literature Background

Surprisingly little research has been conducted that compares student, faculty, and community attitudes and perceptions of higher education outcomes and roles. One recent study is the Adult Learning Outcomes research project currently being conducted through the School for New Learning at DePaul University in conjunction with 25 other institutions. They are investigating the lifelong learning competencies that adult degree programs should develop by surveying program alumni, program faculty and staff, and decision-makers in business (Marienue, & Fiddler, 1998: 13). Of the 38 critical desired outcomes identified by one or more of the three groups, the three constituencies agreed on eight—two in communication skills, two in inquiry and analytic skills, and four within the category of self-management skills. They found adult degree program faculty placed greater emphasis on analytic

skills than the other groups while the business community more highly emphasized interpersonal skills and attitudes and values. In phase two, they plan to look at the relationship to gender, age, and type of institution.

In a recent article in Currents, Netherton summarized some of the findings of three studies concerning opinions about higher education conducted by James Harvey and colleagues for the American Council on Education (Netherton, 1996). The surveys illustrated a marked lack of knowledge among the public concerning the issues facing higher education. In a comparison of public individuals and community leaders, both groups felt that higher education is important preparation for the work place; however, the public questioned the need for liberal arts. Interestingly, the more people knew about the academe, the less likely they were to view the institutions of higher education favorably. This may indicate some "acculturation" effect that takes place as the individual learns about the academy.

Much of recent research on student outcomes and college expectations has focused on the differences between faculty and student expectations (Kalata, 1996) or between faculty and community expectations (Chiang, 1991). Kalata argued that students of Generation X are distinctly different from previous college age generations. Generation X students are perceived to have a strong applied focus on finding a job and do not have an interest in the general culture (Kalata, 1996: 5). The differences in expectations between faculty and students is attributed to the clash of cultures between individuals educated in the 1950s and 1960s--the faculty--and individuals educated in the 1990s--generation X. Calder (1993) in his analysis of first year students' goals also found career related objectives as significant outcome expectations for students.

In the comparison of faculty with community members, Chiang (1991) found much similarity between the professorship and community professionals. Both groups found that "to transmit knowledge" was the most important role for higher education and that higher educational institutions play an important role in molding student attitudes and values (Chiang, 1991).

The type of institution and student will influence the expectations of both faculty and students. Smart and Ethington (1995) found disciplinary and institutional differences in undergraduate educational goals. They focused on knowledge acquisition, application and integration. In institutional comparisons, they found that faculty in two year colleges strongly emphasized knowledge application and faculty in liberal arts colleges focused on knowledge acquisition (Smart and Ethington, 1995). Faculty in research institutions and comprehensive colleges and universities placed significantly less importance on the goal of knowledge integration. In addition, this research

illustrated differences among academic disciplines categorized as hard vs. soft, pure vs. applied and life vs. non-life. For example, they found that the hard disciplines placed greater importance on knowledge application and applied disciplines placed greater importance on knowledge application and knowledge integration (Smart and Ethington, 1995).

Hypotheses

This research is limited to a single metropolitan university located in a two-county service area which comprises a population of about 375,000. The university itself has about 15,000 students, 85% of whom are enrolled in undergraduate academic or vocational programs. Most (90%) commute and are in-state students. About 65% of undergraduates enroll full-time.

Because of its metropolitan nature, the student population for this analysis has a higher than average number of non-traditional students. Many are completing programs part-time or returning to school after working in the paid labor force and/or raising families. Most students on this campus are, in fact, a sub-set of the community by virtue of their multiple roles. Therefore, we hypothesize that student's values and beliefs will be more similar to community members than to faculty. Although we expect differences to exist between different groups of students depending on degree type and age, their dual status makes them a valuable resource for informing the campus community on both student and community expectations.

Faculty perceptions of their role in providing education is often centered on the intellectual function of their occupation. Students, on the other hand, while they value a good teacher, focus their attention on what they learn and how they can apply that learning. We hypothesize that this differential will become apparent in the differences between faculty and students perceptions of college outcomes.

Independent Variables

Previous research has identified gender (Calder, 1993) and age (Kalata, 1996), reflecting traditional vs. non-traditional students (Marienau and Fiddler, 1998), as significant predictors for defining college outcomes. In addition, significant differences between faculty, community and student groups in their perceptions of higher education outcomes and expectations have been documented (Ollenburger and Belcheir, 1997; Marienau and Fiddler, 1998; Kalata, 1996; Chiang, 1991; Netherton, 1996). We also anticipate differences between subject areas of interest and academic disciplines (Smart and Ethington, 1995). In addition, in order to determine whether or not

the amount of exposure to university norms, procedures and protocols influences expectations of outcomes (Netherton, 1996), acculturation to university culture was incorporated as an independent variable.

Dependent Variables

Two dependent variables, importance of educational outcomes and importance of contribution to student growth, were developed from ACT outcomes surveys. The first variable, importance of educational outcomes, incorporates four components: 1) information management and use; 2) academic skills; 3) self knowledge, and; 4) job skills. The second variable, importance of contribution to student growth incorporates five components: 1) values; 2) intellectual growth; 3) social awareness; 4) personal development; and 5) interpersonal development.

Methodology

Survey Methods

Three major constituencies which influence and are influenced by the operation of a metropolitan university were surveyed: students, faculty, and community members. Items for the panel analysis of all three groups were derived from an earlier version of the ACT College Outcomes Survey. Respondents were asked for additional information about their age, gender, and educational background.

The student panel survey was conducted during the fall of 1996 and consisted of two large sections of a general education course, Introduction to Psychology, and some vocational courses. A total of 536 students completed the survey.

The faculty survey was conducted by taking a stratified random sample of full-time faculty from within each college. Of the 491 faculty listed, 192 or 39% were sampled. Of the 192 surveyed, 121 or 63% returned their surveys. The survey took place during the Spring term of the 1995-96 academic year and consisted of the same items given to the student panel.

Surveying the community required a somewhat different approach. Samples were drawn from the two Idaho counties where most students reside and where the main and branch campuses are located. A survey sampling firm drew the random sample of 600 names based on phone book listings. Useable responses were received from 211 or 35%. The survey was given during the summer of 1996, and focus groups were held toward the end of the fall 1996 term.

Responses indicated that students were younger and more likely to be female compared to faculty and community members. Of the students, 48.9% were male and 51.1% were female. Among the faculty respondents, 63.9% were male while 65.6% of community respondents were male. In terms of age, differences were even more dramatic. While 86% of student respondents were under the age of 30, only 8% of community members and 2% of faculty fell in this age category.

Seventeen percent of the students were part-time students and 83% were full-time. Amongst the faculty, 70% held doctorates, 22.5% held masters degrees, 4.2% held baccalaureates and 3.3% held other degrees. In the community group, 7.4% held less than a high school diploma, 15.3% held a high school diploma or a GED, 36.9% had some college credits but had not completed a bachelor's degree, 20.7% held bachelor's degrees and 19.7% held graduate or professional degrees.

Conducting the Analysis

The three groups initially were compared on their survey responses using a one-way analysis of variance using SAS. An F-ratio was considered significant if the alpha level was .05 or higher. Follow-up comparisons among means were tested using Tukey's procedure.

However, in addition to differing as students, faculty, or community members, the groups systematically differed in terms of age, gender, experience with the college environment, and subject area specialization. Therefore, after using a one-way analysis of variance procedure (ANOVA) to check for simple differences among the groups, the remaining analyses sought to account for these additional differences first, and then establish whether or not the differences among faculty, students, and the community remained.

This was accomplished by using the general linear models program (GLM) in SAS and checking the Type III sums of squares for significant F-ratios for the group variable since Type III sums of squares are a partial sum of squares that calculates the significance of each variable after the effects of the others have been included.

The addition of the variables of gender and age were tested for all three levels of group (students, faculty, community), first checking for interaction terms and then rerunning the three-way ANOVA without interactions after none were significant using an alpha level of .05. Least-squares means, which held constant the effects of other variables while calculating the differences for each level of the variable of interest, were then obtained and reported along with the F-ratio for the type III sum of squares associated with the group variable. Two levels of gender (male/female) and age (under 30 or 30 up) were used in the analyses.

To see if differences between faculty and students were modified after accounting for their subject areas of interest, a variable called "Type" was constructed. The three levels of the variable were (1) traditional academic subjects such as biology, art, English and other majors typically found in the college of arts and sciences, (2) subjects leading to professional employment in areas such as education, business, health, and social work, and (3) vocational and technical subject areas leading to associates degrees and certificates. The analysis then proceeded as previously described for analyzing the effects of gender and age. Community group members were excluded from this analysis since information on subject area specialization was unavailable.

To determine whether the amount of exposure to college norms and experiences made a difference in perceptions, students and community members were compared on an additional variable labeled "acculturation." Students were considered acculturated if they had a parent who had a college degree or if they had already earned over 60 credits at the university or if they had previously attended another university and transferred more than 15 credits to their current university. Community members were considered acculturated if they had a college degree. Faculty were excluded from this analysis because it was assumed they were all "acculturated" by virtue of their long experience with higher education. The analysis then proceeded as previously described.

The ACT outcomes survey used in the analysis had 26 outcomes items that respondents were asked to rate on importance (1=of great importance, 2=of some importance, 3=of little or no importance). To reduce the number of dependent variables in the study as well as to clarify the constructs, the 26 items were submitted to a maximum likelihood factor analysis using SAS followed by a Varimax rotation. The best analysis resulted in four major factors. Factor 1, named Information Management and Use, included high loadings on items such as drawing conclusions from data, developing problem-solving skills, improving the ability to apply new information, and locating, organizing and screening information. Factor 2, named Academic Skills, included high loadings on items such as improving writing skills, improving speaking skills, improving reading comprehension skills, and improving study skills. Factor 3, named Self-Knowledge, included items such as learning to set goals and follow through, understanding one's own strengths and weaknesses, and improving the ability to make decisions. The fourth factor, named Job Skills, included developing job seeking skills, learning about career options, and acquiring skills for a career.

Based on these factors, factor scores were produced for each respondent and then standardized with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 10. Lower scores indicated that the respondent or group placed greater importance on that set of outcomes.

The second set of 32 items asked respondents to indicate the extent to which the university should contribute to student growth in a variety of areas. The response options were (1) should contribute a great deal, (2) should contribute a moderate (average) amount, or (3) should contribute little. Again, a maximum likelihood factor analysis with Varimax rotation was used to reduce and better conceptualize the response data.. The best analysis resulted in five major factors. The first factor, labeled Values, included strong loadings on items such as clarifying personal values, learning to be a responsible family member, developing moral principles, and understanding different religious values. The second factor, labeled Intellectual Growth, included items such as learning to critique information, increasing intellectual curiosity, and becoming more willing to consider opposing points of view. The third factor, labeled Social Awareness, included becoming more aware of local, regional, and international issues/events; preparing to participate effectively in the electoral process; and becoming more aware of political and social issues. Personal Development, factor four in this analysis, included items such as developing self-confidence, increasing self-understanding, and improving the ability to relate to others. The fifth factor, Interpersonal Development, included becoming an effective team member, interacting well with people from cultures other than their own, developing leadership skills, and initiating conversations.

Again, factors scores were produced for each respondent and then standardized with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 10. Lower scores indicated that the university should contribute more to student growth in this area.

Findings

Importance Of Educational Outcomes

Results of the one-way ANOVA indicated that there were differences among the three groups in two outcomes areas: Information Management and Use (factor 1) and Job Skills (factor 4). In general, faculty and community members found Information Management Skills more important than students. Students and community members, on the other hand, were more interested in obtaining job skills than faculty. See Table 1 below for further details.

Table 1. Means and F-Ratios on four educational outcomes factors

Factor	Means			F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Community	Faculty	Students		
Info Management & Use	98.38	97.35	101.22	10.27	.0001
Academic Skills	99.60	100.37	100.06	0.23	.7935
Self Knowledge	101.14	98.46	99.94	2.56	.0776
Job Skills	99.82	111.84	97.30	129.95	.0001

Table 2 contains the calculated effect sizes for those pair-wise comparisons that were significant. Note that when students and community members differed, the effect size remained fairly small. Differences between faculty and students could be classified as moderate on the importance of information management. The differences between faculty and both students and the community are very large, however, on the job skills factor.

Table 2. Effect sizes for pair-wise comparisons on educational outcomes factors

Factor	Community Vs. Faculty	Community Vs. Students	Faculty Vs. Students
Information Management & Use	—	.288	.392
Academic Skills	—	—	—
Self Knowledge	—	—	—
Job Skills	1.386	.291	1.677

To see if the group differences remained after accounting for the effects of gender and age, a three-way ANOVA was then run, using the GLM model in SAS and Type III sums of squares. Results indicated that the differences in job skills still remained, while the difference in information management disappeared. In the area of self-knowledge, however, the addition of gender and age now caused significant differences to appear among the groups. Details can be found in Table 3.

After accounting for the effects of gender and group membership, age continued to have a significant effect for information management and use ($F=12.01$, $p=.0006$) and self-knowledge ($F=7.70$, $p=.0057$) with older respondents thinking the outcomes were more important than younger respondents. Gender had an independently significant effect for all four factors. In each case, women thought the outcome was more important than men.

Table 3. Adjusted outcomes means and F-ratios after accounting for the effects of gender and age

Factor	Means			F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Community	Faculty	Students		
Info Management & Use	99.98	98.89	99.72	0.43	.6536
Academic Skills	99.15	100.08	100.16	0.45	.6584
Self Knowledge	102.29	99.68	98.73	4.86	.0080
Job Skills	99.72	111.64	97.14	86.13	.0001

To ascertain whether subject specialization had an effect on perceptions of importance of outcomes, a two-way ANOVA using group and type variables for faculty and students only was conducted. As shown by Table 4, after accounting for the impact of the type of subject matter, significant differences remained for the Information Management and Use factor, but not for Academic Skills or Self-Knowledge. A significant interaction was found for the Job Skills factor (F=20.24, p=.0001). Further analysis indicated that students in traditional academic and professional programs valued job skills much more than faculty. Faculty and students in vocational programs, however, both agreed on the value of job skills. For all factors, type of academic subject did not have an independent effect after accounting for the effect of group membership.

Table 4. Faculty-student outcome differences after accounting for the effects of type of program

Factor	Means		Effect Size	F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Faculty	Students			
Info Management & Use	97.44	101.18	.375	10.53	.0012
Academic Skills	100.39	100.25	—	0.27	.6019
Self Knowledge	98.30	99.94	—	0.47	.4917
Job Skills:					
Traditional programs	115.87	97.55	2.04	152.43	.0001
Professional programs	109.99	97.89	1.38	64.10	.0001
Vocational programs	96.62	96.31	—	0.02	.8912

To ascertain whether acculturation to college had an effect, a two-way ANOVA using group membership and acculturation was conducted for students and community members. Results indicated that group differences still remained for information management (factor 1) and for Self-Knowledge (factor 3), though the effect sizes were small. An interaction between acculturation and group membership was found for Job Skills ($F=9.21$, $p=.0025$). Further analysis indicated a difference between community members and students for the group that had been acculturated to college values only. Details can be found in Table 5. Acculturation provided an independent impact on outcomes for Information Management ($F=4.15$, $p=.0419$) and for Self-Knowledge ($F=5.12$, $p=.0240$).

Table 5. Community-student outcome differences after accounting for acculturation effects

	Means				
Factor	Community	Students	Effect Size	F-Ratio	Prob>F
Info Management & Use	98.38	101.22	.282	13.40	.0003
Academic Skills	99.60	100.06	__	0.56	.4533
Self Knowledge	101.14	99.94	.118	3.72	.0542
Job Skills:					
Not acculturated	98.00	97.20	__	0.74	.3911
Acculturated	102.51	97.34	.630	24.21	.0001

Importance Of The University In Areas Of Student Growth

An initial one-way comparison of the three groups indicated that differences existed for each of the five factors (see Table 6). Again, follow-up pair-wise comparisons showed that most differences were found between the faculty and other groups. The only difference between students and the community was found for Intellectual Growth, where community members thought the university should have a stronger role than students did. Faculty and students, on the other hand, differed on all factors except Personal Development. See Table 7 for further details.

Table 6. Means and F-Ratios for students, faculty, and community members on growth factors

Factor	Means			F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Community	Faculty	Students		
Values	99.43	96.36	101.01	10.77	.0001
Intellectual Growth	97.62	91.41	102.73	79.67	.0001
Social Awareness	99.72	97.99	100.54	3.18	.0419
Personal Development	98.32	98.92	100.82	4.97	.0071
Interpersonal Development	100.47	103.10	99.15	7.75	.0005

Table 7. Effect sizes for pair-wise comparisons on five growth factors

Factor	Community Vs. Faculty	Community Vs. Students	Faculty Vs. Students
Values	.31	—	.47
Intellectual Growth	.679	.558	1.237
Social Awareness	—	—	.256
Personal Development	.251	—	—
Interpersonal Development	—	—	.399

As a next step to see if group differences disappeared with the introduction of gender and age variables, type III sums of squares were checked for remaining statistical significance. For the first three factors (Values, Intellectual Growth, and Social Awareness), differences between the groups remained. For Personal and Interpersonal Development, however, the differences between the groups disappeared with the introduction of the additional variables. See Table 8 for further details. Age had a significant independent effect for Intellectual Growth ($F=4.12$, $p=.0427$) and for Social Awareness ($F=5.80$, $p=.0163$). For Intellectual Growth, older respondents thought the university should have more impact on growth than younger respondents. The opposite was the case for Social Awareness. Gender had significant independent effects for Social Awareness ($F=15.24$, $p=.0001$) and for Interpersonal Development ($F=14.98$, $p=.0001$). In both cases, women thought the university should have more impact than men.

Table 8. Adjusted growth means and F-ratios after accounting for the effects of gender and age

Factor	Means			F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Community	Faculty	Students		
Values	99.90	96.35	100.85	6.14	.0023
Intellectual Growth	98.40	92.12	101.90	29.37	.0001
Social Awareness	98.41	96.08	101.65	7.75	.0005
Personal Development	99.31	99.39	100.48	0.47	.6245
Interpersonal Development	99.81	102.14	99.33	2.51	.0819

To determine whether type of subject matter specialization made a difference, a two-way ANOVA was next conducted using only faculty and students. Results indicated that differences disappeared between the two groups only on the Social Awareness factor. Strong differences remained between faculty and students on the role of the university in intellectual growth. Faculty indicated more strongly than students that the university should have more accountability and impact in this area. Small differences remained in the area of Personal Development, again with faculty seeing the university taking a more significant role. See Table 9 for further details.

Significant interaction effects were found for two factors, Values ($F=4.68$, $p=.0096$) and Interpersonal Development ($F=3.55$, $p=.0294$). Faculty from traditional academic and professional disciplines felt more strongly than students did that the university should have more impact on the development of values. On the other hand, students from traditional academic disciplines thought the university should have a stronger hand in the development of interpersonal skills more than faculty. Vocational faculty and students again did not differ from one another. Independent effects for type of academic area were found for two of the remaining three factors, Intellectual Growth ($F=4.72$, $p=.0093$) and Social Awareness ($F=8.01$, $p=.0004$).

Table 9. Faculty-student growth differences after accounting for the effects of program

Factor	Means		Effect Size	F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Faculty	Students			
Values:					
Traditional programs	95.17	102.14	.748	21.38	.0001
Professional programs	96.62	102.54	.653	14.92	.0001
Vocational programs	102.51	99.49	__	0.93	.3359
Intellectual Growth	91.42	102.69	1.23	66.14	.0001
Social Awareness	98.04	100.49	__	0.19	.6637
Personal Development	98.85	100.88	.206	5.22	.0227
Interpersonal Development:					
Traditional programs	105.83	99.10	.662	16.71	.0001
Professional programs	100.02	98.96	__	0.45	.5214
Vocational progams	99.56	99.58	__	0.00	.9945

To find whether differences in acculturation affected perceptions of the role of the university in student growth, a two-way ANOVA was conducted using only students and community members. Results indicated that differences remained on both the Personal and Interpersonal Development factors, though the effect size was small. An interaction effect was found for the Intellectual Growth factor ($F=7.73$, $p=.0056$). Further analysis showed that although community members thought more than students that the university should take a much stronger role in this area, the differences were much more striking for the group that was considered to have been acculturated to university norms. See Table 10 for details. Besides the interaction, acculturation did not account for any independent effects after accounting for the differences between the groups.

Table 10. Community-student growth differences after accounting for acculturation

Factor	Means		Effect Size	F-Ratio	Prob>F
	Community	Students			
Values	99.43	101.01	—	2.19	.1392
Intellectual Growth:					
No acculturation	99.72	103.06	.369	8.20	.0046
Acculturation	94.44	102.61	.840	42.22	.0001
Social Awareness	99.72	100.54	—	1.46	.2275
Personal Development	98.32	100.82	.259	4.70	.0306
Interpersonal Development	100.47	99.15	.130	3.77	.0524

Conclusions

Results of the analysis on educational outcomes showed that students seemed to disagree about as often with community respondents as they did with faculty. However, the size of the disagreement was larger between students and faculty than between students and the community. As expected, students and the community placed more emphasis than did faculty on attaining skills for a career, even after accounting for differences in age and gender. In the more abstract realm of being able to draw conclusions from data and developing problem-solving skills, faculty placed greater importance on this set of outcomes than students. These differences disappeared, however, when the effects of gender and age were included in the analysis.

After accounting for the effects of gender and group membership, age continued to have a significant effect for information management and use and self knowledge with older respondents placing more importance on these outcomes. Gender had an independently significant effect for all four factors including information management and use, academic skills, self knowledge and job skills. In every case, women thought the outcomes were more important than men. In addition, students in traditional academic and professional programs valued job skills much more than the overall faculty. However, faculty and students in vocational programs both agreed on the value of job skills. Acculturation influenced attitudes toward the importance of job skills with a significant difference between community members and students for the group that had been acculturated.

Results of the analysis concerning the importance of the university in contributing to various areas of student growth indicated that faculty most often differed from the opinions of students and the community. In the area of values, faculty thought the university should contribute more to growth in this area than did either students or the community. The strongest differences showed in the area of intellectual growth, where faculty clearly saw the university playing a stronger role than the community, who in turn saw a stronger role than students. This finding again highlights the different outcomes expected by faculty when compared with student expectations. Faculty were also more committed to developing social awareness in students than were students themselves. On the other hand, students wanted the university to help them grow more interpersonally than faculty thought should be the case. Differences among the groups remained in the areas of values, intellectual growth, and social awareness even after accounting for the effects of gender and age.

The differences between faculty and students on the role of the university again remained even after including the effects of the type program (traditional academics, professional programs, or vocational). Faculty continued to see a much greater role for the university in intellectual growth and personal development. In contrast, students, at least those in traditional and professional programs, saw a much greater university role than faculty in the development of their interpersonal skills. Some differences also remained between students and the community even after accounting for the effects of acculturation to the norms of higher education. The greatest differences were in intellectual growth with community members seeing a stronger role for the university than students. Small differences also remained in the areas of personal and interpersonal development.

The contemporary metropolitan university has a symbiotic relationship with the community. With this research, we have attempted to identify some commonalties and differences which exist among three key stakeholders, faculty, community members and students, in defining the university's purposes and mission. These findings indicate that faculty do have an educational agenda that differs significantly from students'. The community, however, served often as the balance between students and the faculty and did not necessarily echo students viewpoints. Our findings illustrate that there are, in addition, some consistencies among faculty, students and community members concentrated in the areas related to academic skills and the development of intellectual abilities. It is our hope that the findings from this research will help bridge some of the differences which have existed between these groups and to assist in clearing new paths of understanding.

References

Calder, W. (1993). First-year students' goals: six years in the life of a student goals inventory. Journal of the Freshman Year Experience, 5(2): pp. 105-121.

Chiang, L. (1991). Higher education criticism: do university faculty members and community professionals have different viewpoints? Paper presented at the Mid-Western Educational Research Conference, Chicago, IL, October 16-19: 7 pgs.

Kalata, P. (1996). Generational clash in the academy: whose culture is it anyway? Issues of Education at Community Colleges: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University. Princeton University, NJ (June): 18 pgs.

Marienau, C. and M. Fiddler. (1998). Adult learning outcomes research project: report on phase one. CAEL Forum and News, Winter: pp. 13-14, 35.

Netherton, R. (1996). Two views from the trenches: how the public sees higher education. Currents, V. 22(5) May: pp. 10-14.

Ollenburger, J. and Belcheir, M. (1997). Exploring the community college function in a metropolitan university. Report submitted to The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities, Portland, OR: 17 pgs.

Smart, J. and Ethington, C. (1995). Disciplinary and institutional differences in undergraduate education goals. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 64 (Winter): pp. 49-57.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").