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This thesis utilized identification theory to determine if faculty identify with the university and recognize its mission. The study also explored how faculty differentiate between a traditional university and a metropolitan research university. Finally, the study explored whether the faculty consider the University of North Texas to be a Metropolitan Research University.

UNT full-time faculty members (N = 224) completed questionnaires to indicate their identification with the university and their recognition of the university mission. Analysis showed that faculty have not come to a consensus on the definition of a MRU and that they do not identify with UNT.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Study

During the early years of higher education, those who attended universities were the elite, intellectually and financially (Hathaway, Mulhollan, & White, 1995). In the past sixty or seventy years, the configuration of higher education and its students has changed. The traditional university catering to 18-22 year old full-time students who live on campus and complete an undergraduate degree in a four-year period has diminished in significance (Lynton, 1995). Major universities have introduced satellite campuses in metropolitan areas catering to the workforce; community colleges currently attract many students for the first two years due to lower tuition and convenience; and many nontraditional students (i.e., commuting students, part-time students, students who work full-time, older students and returning students) have joined the ranks of the undergraduate (Lynton). Thus, the student population and the demands of higher education have broadened and evolved creating a new way of looking at the institution of higher education.

Emerging from these changes in higher education is the Metropolitan Research University (MRU). The Metropolitan Research University is an institutional model characterized by its location in a major metropolitan area, a high percentage of nontraditional students, and a high percentage of the student population seeking graduate
degrees (Lynton, 1995, Ziegler, 1995). These characteristics create a unique institution of higher learning that has different expectations for faculty and staff. For instance, faculty members are expected to create active links between campus, community, and commerce, a focus that would receive less emphasis in a traditional university (Johnson & Bell, 1995).

The MRU model recognizes that the American university in post-industrial society must take seriously and translate into tangible reality the three traditional elements of higher education: (a) teaching, (b) service, and (c) research. All three of these elements must interact and reinforce each other (Lynton, 1995). In particular, faculty interaction with the surrounding community must link the community and university by identifying research topics and programs that continually reconnect business with academia in a mutually beneficial way (Lynton). The public needs to be assured that higher education is serving their interests (Johnson, 1995) and that equal emphasis is placed on teaching, research, and service (Haaland, Wyleie & DiBiasio, 1995). Consequently the faculty must act as the conduit through which the growth of academic knowledge aligns with the needs of business.

Perhaps, Keller (1983) explains the distinct nature of the MRU best in his description of the changes emerging in academia. In his insightful book Academic Strategy he writes,

For decades, most colleges and universities have been inner-directed, formulating their aims on the bedrock of their own religious commitments, tradition, faculty desires, and ambitions for growth, largely ignoring the world outside... Colleges
are switching from a self-assertion model of their existence to a biological mode of continuous adaptation to their powerful changing social environment (Keller, p. 3).

Although faculty play a crucial role in carrying out the mission of a MRU, little research exists that explains how faculty view this responsibility. Specifically, it is not known whether faculty understand the mission of the MRU, whether they identify with it, and whether the mission of the MRU is carried out through the culture of a university. This study is one step toward achieving this goal. It examines faculty perceptions of the MRU model in order to assess: (a) whether faculty identify with the MRU mission, and (b) whether the culture of the MRU -- culture being the shared values and beliefs of the institution -- is understood and recognized by the faculty.

In the sections that follow, organizational identification and culture will be described as a preface for examining faculty identification with the culture of a Metropolitan Research University.

Identification

Burke (1950) stresses that an important goal of communication is identification. When we communicate, we try to develop a "common bond" with our audience. When trying to persuade an individual or group, we attempt to establish a sense of rapport or similarity with them. Burke (1965) also suggests that if we understand the motives of individuals, we are better able to understand their perceptions of reality, their actions and behaviors, and adopt the language of the group. All these things help to foster identification. Burke (1958) argues that "you persuade a man (sic); only insofar as you
can talk his language; by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his" (p. 5).

Kaufman (1966) claims organizations can encourage members to identify with them through the use of inducement processes. Experiences in the organizational environment gradually infuse into the individual a view of the world and a hierarchy of preferences coinciding with those of their colleagues. Among the many policies and activities of the organization that can foster identification are training and promotion; the use of symbols (e.g., badges, uniforms, etc.); participation in decision-making; complaint procedures; community involvement; and, public relations (Kaufman). “One outcome of the practices is that individual employees make their administrative decisions in terms of the consequences for the organization, and in terms of criteria the leaders of the organization wish them to employ” (Kaufman, p. 6). In this way, members “act out” their identification with the organization, making decisions that support organizational interacts. Thus, identifying with the organization connects employees to the work environment, creating a sense of loyalty and organizational membership.

When people share a joint identity they are inclined to communicate and cooperate with their identity group. In other words, they seek a degree of “consubstantiality” (Burke, 1969). Consubstantiality represents an area of “overlap” either real or perceived between two individuals or between an individual and a group; it is the basis for common motives and for “acting-together” (Burke). An individual who is inclined to identify with an organization -- or an organizational subunit -- will be open to persuasive efforts from various sources within that unit. The organization induces new members by communicating its values, goals, and information (i.e., the organization’s
own stated identifications) in the form of guidelines for individual and collective action. The member may then “complete” the process by adopting or adapting the organization’s interests, doing “what’s best” for the organization, and perhaps even developing a salient identification with the organization (Burke, 1969).

Using Burke’s work as a foundation, Tompkins and Cheney (1983) first outlined a theoretical framework of identification as central to understanding the ongoing process of decision-making within organizations. They claim that “a person identifies with a unit when, in making a decision, the person in one or more of his/her organizational roles perceives that unit’s values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of choice” (Tompkins & Cheney, p. 13). If a decision-maker’s primary concern is to find the solution that is in the best interest of the entire organization, he/she demonstrates identification with the organization. Such a person also would tend to accept decisional premises communicated by the organization and have a favorable attitude toward the organization as a source of those premises (Tompkins & Cheney).

Cheney (1985) tells us that identification with organizations or anything else is an active process by which individuals link themselves to elements in the social scene. Identifications are important because of what they do for us; they aid us in making sense of our experience, in organizing our thoughts, in achieving decisions, and in anchoring the self. Perhaps most importantly for students of communication, identifying allows people to persuade and to be persuaded.

Cheney (1983) recognizes three types of identification strategies that can be used to investigate communication within organizations. First, the common ground technique. To utilize this strategy, the rhetor equates himself or herself with others in a systematic
and observable way. For example, in a university setting when a faculty member is rewarded through personal recognition for his/her research service or teaching this sends a direct message from the administration concerning shared goals and values. The faculty and administration, then, have a "common ground" from which to identify organizational objectives.

The second strategy is identification through antithesis or directly contrasting one organization against another (Cheney, 1983). The act of uniting against a common "enemy" reflects this strategy. For instance, university documents contain passages that emphasize competition within higher education. Another form of identification through antithesis is the promotion of competition with an arch rival school. Both sports and academic competition bring out the competitiveness in participants and spectators. Through such portrayals, universities implicitly stress identification with "insiders" (i.e., members of the organization) as an effort toward achieving unity and collective acceptance of organizational values.

The third identification strategy is the use of the assumed or transcendent "we" (Cheney, 1983). Uses of the assumed "we" and the corresponding "they" (symbolizing outsiders) can be found in university discourse when the sharing of interests by the university and the employee seems taken for granted. Use of the assumed "we" often stresses the ideas of unity, togetherness, sharing, mutual trust and interdependence. The assumed "we" is both a subtle and powerful identification strategy because it often goes unnoticed. To the extent that employees accept this assumption and its corollaries unquestioningly, they identify with their university employer. In summary, then, Cheney
suggests that if people identify with one another and with their organization they will think and act in similar ways. They will possess organizational identification.

In order to investigate his theory of organizational identification, Cheney (1983) examines identification strategies utilized in corporate house organs or periodicals distributed by businesses to their employees. House organs have been recognized as carriers of business policies, viewpoints, and attitudes. Additionally, Cheney isolated several identifiable, although often overlapping, tactics used to perpetuate the strategies of identification. These strategies include (a) expressing concern for the individual as a member or as an integral part of the organization, (b) recognizing individual contributions to the organization, (c) espousing shared values, (d) advocating benefits and activities, (e) receiving praise from people outside the organization, and (f) reproducing “testimonials” by employees (paraphrasing, Cheney, p. 22).

Identification tactics take on tremendous importance when viewed in contemporary organizational life. Cheney (1983) declares that “any organization must, at least part of the time, subordinate individual needs to those of the collectivity if it is to act as an organization” (p.156). Typically, individuals sacrifice a degree of autonomy when they participate in organizational life. They decide to accept certain organizational interests and approach work-related decisions from the organization’s “perspective”, that is, they assume the “role” of the organization (Cheney). Thus, although the “outer-voice” of the organization and the “inner-voice” of the individual are distinct, through identification the employee self-consciously makes the decision to “behave organizationally” (Cheney).
Cheney (1983) considers the role of identification strategies and tactics in the larger process of identification in organizations. Our corporate identities serve to enhance the "self", granting us status and even prestige. He claims that an individual who identifies with some unit (e.g., college, church, company, etc.), and profusely praises this unit, in effect equally praises himself/herself (Cheney, 1985). Conversely, this implies that criticism of an organization to which one belongs may reflect directly upon the individual.

Contemporary organizations are very concerned about identification both with respect to specific interests and with regard to their own status as potential targets of employee dedication. In the past, organizations relied on more direct, even forceful, means of influence (e.g., close supervision, purely monetary rewards, and assembly line "determinism"). Today, although such methods are sometimes evident, managers and administrators use less obtrusive ways to encourage individual involvement, support, and loyalty. For example, public recognition of an employee's accomplishments, rewarding excellent performance with job autonomy, and the insistence on providing a professional work environment are ways that today's employers foster identification with their organizations (Cheney, 1985).

The study of organizational identification and related phenomena is important for several reasons. First, organizational identification has been linked either theoretically or empirically to a variety of work attitudes and behaviors including motivation, job satisfaction, job performance, individual decision-making, role orientation, conflict management, employee interaction, and length of service (Austin, 1991). Second, the study of organizational identification can aid us in explaining the impact of a variety of
organizational policies and activities including socialization (both formal and informal); personnel selection, training, promotion, and transfer; internal organizational communications; and, public relations (Austin). These communication-related phenomena frequently encourage identification with the organization both intentionally and accidentally.

Finally, the study of organizational identification can help us understand the basis of "referent power" in organizational settings. French and Raven (1968) note:

The referent power of one person with another person (or social unit) has its basis in the identification of the two people. Accordingly, one person has the ability to influence the other person even though the person being influenced may be unaware of this referent power (French & Raven, p.263).

Referent power, with identification as its source, may be one of the most salient types of power in organizations. The study of organizational identification provides a vantage point from which to evaluate such claims by looking closely at the mutual influence processes involved in the individual-organizational relationship. Tompkins and Cheney (1983) offer a foundation for this kind of critical approach by outlining the role of identification in the unobtrusive control processes of today's large organizations.

Despite the recognized importance of organizational identification, the phenomenon has not been extensively studied. Further, what research has been done generally exhibits two deficiencies: (a) the process of creating organizational identification has not been addressed, instead the theoretical and empirical focus has been on identification as a product (belief, attitude, and intention); and, (b) researchers have only attempted to assess the existence, strength, importance, and targets (persons, groups,
values, goals, knowledge, activities, or objects identified with) of organizational identification. While this is vital in building basic knowledge in the study of communication, this approach excludes instructional processes that help to accomplish organizational change. Investigators seem most often to ask, "What is?" rather than "What happens?" As a result, there has been little systematic effort to examine the ways in which members identify or come to identify with their employing organizations. This investigation will extend our understanding of organizational identification by examining how a group of organizational members (i.e., faculty) identify with the goals and mission of their work environment. It will assess whether identification with organizational goals facilitates the cultural values of the MRU.

Culture

The construct of organizational culture, borrowed from cultural anthropologists, is used widely in academic work (e.g., Barley & Kunda, 1992; Harrison & McIntosh, 1992; Pratt & Beaulieu, 1992; Rousseau, 1990; Schein, 1985) and popular literature (e.g., Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982) as a root metaphor explaining how meaning is constructed in organizations. Certain attributes of culture are particularly relevant for organizational research:

First, culture is learned. It is not genetic or biological . . . Culture is shared by people as members of social groups . . . Culture is transgenerational and cumulative in its development . . . It is symbolic in that it is based on the human capacity to use symbols. Culture is patterned, it is organized and integrated . . . Culture is adaptive; it is the basic human adaptive mechanism . . . Of particular
relevance for organizational studies are its patterned, shared, learned, and symbolic characteristics (Deetz, 1988, p. 221).

One definition of culture is the common ideas on which a society or group rests, its ideology, or the collective ways in which a group understands its experience (Burke, 1966). A second definition is the practices or the way of life of a group, what individuals do materially from day-to-day (Tompson, 1967). These two senses of culture cannot really be separated, for the ideology of a group is produced and reproduced in its practices. Shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense making are all different ways of describing culture. In talking about culture we are describing a process of reality construction that allows people to see and understand particular events, actions, objects, utterances, or situations in distinctive ways. These patterns of understanding also provide a basis for explaining one’s own behavior.

Burke (1966) tells us that the culture induces its members to think, act, and behave in particular ways. Tompson (1967) suggests that if we want to see “what the organization really is” as opposed to “what it aspires to be”, examination of the discourse of lower levels employees may provide a more realistic portrayal of reality. Cultural dialectic, as manifested in lower level sub-texts, offers a more complete reflection of the organization’s culture. Culture rarely begets consensus (Tompson). Each of us experiences and speaks about our organization differently, and such variables as status, age, and seniority can affect those expressions. Thus, the cultural analyst should collect and integrate diverse examples of discourse in order to construct as reliable a picture of the organization as possible.
Peters and Waterman (1982) indicate that any intelligent approach to identifying culture has to encompass, and treat as interdependent, at least seven variables: (a) structure, (b) strategy, (c) people, (d) management style, (e) systems and procedures, (f) guiding concepts and shared values (i.e., culture), and (g) the present and hoped-for corporate strengths or skills (Peters & Waterman). Deal & Kennedy (1982) identify the elements of a culture, suggesting that the business environment is the single greatest influence in shaping a corporate culture. Values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network are all components of organizational culture (Deal & Kennedy). The articulation of these categories helps to define the central aspects that allow a culture to form.

In an earlier study of organizational culture, Deal & Kennedy (1982) surveyed nearly 80 companies to identify cultural components. Of the companies surveyed, only about one-third had clearly articulated beliefs. Of this one-third, two-thirds had qualitative beliefs, or values, such as “IBM means service.” The other one-third had quantitative goals that were financially oriented and widely understood. Of the 18 companies with qualitative beliefs, all were uniformly outstanding performers. For the first time in the study of organizational culture, Deal and Kennedy characterized the consistently high performers as companies with strong cultures, an important issue because it aligns organizational communication studies with managerial concerns for productivity.

In a follow up investigation, Deal & Kennedy (1982) attempted to determine how values were created and how they were transmitted throughout the corporation. Findings led to one unmistakable conclusion: “the people who built the companies for which
America is famous all worked obsessively to create strong cultures within their organizations" (Deal & Kennedy, p. 22). Furthermore, building a strong culture is accomplished by starting with a widely shared philosophy founded on a well-ordered set of management beliefs and practices; the philosophy emphasizes the importance of people as the greatest resource in an organization (Deal & Kennedy). A people-centered management philosophy is not an after-thought, it’s a principle preoccupation. In fact, in organizations identified as possessing strong cultures, top management spent about half its time in training and in communicating the management philosophy and the essence of the organization (Deal & Kennedy).

In order to build a strong culture, top management must be convinced that it can adhere faithfully and visibly to the values it intends to promote. Any inconsistency in adhering to or continuing to promote the company’s enunciated values will begin to undermine the strength of the culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). What brings values to life is the awareness by everyone in the organization about these values and why they are important. It’s not just values; it is the extensive sharing of them that makes a difference. It is the identification of organizational members with the values that is significant. How do values come to be shared in an organization? Through the reinforcement provided by all the other elements of the organization’s culture, but primarily by the culture’s lead players. Bennis (1986) supports the importance of the powerful actor influence on culture. He states:

I believe that the single most important determinant of corporate culture is the behavior of the chief executive officer. He or she is the one clearly responsible for shaping the beliefs, motives, commitments, and the predisposition
of all executives -- from senior management to the operators of the organization (Bennis, p. 64).

Taking a psychoanalytic perspective, Kets de Vries and Miller (1986) present a typology of organizations based on manifestations of pathological personality characteristics. They argue that organizational cultures and strategies often reflect the neuroses of their top management. Managers, then, must find ways to use stories, legends, and other symbolic forms in order to perpetuate and communicate culture.

Organizational culture is also produced by interactions of the members. Pacanowsky and O’Donnell-Trujillo (1982), ask particular kinds of questions designed to uncover cultural patterns in an organization, viewing stories of organizational members as cultural performances. “Storytelling performances are important because they typify certain experiences as being, in principle worthy of emulation (when the story glorifies success) or deserving of caution (when the story accentuates failure)” (Pacanowsky & O’Donnell-Trujillo, p. 83).

Stories and performances are indicators of culture; they include relevant constructs and related vocabulary, perceived facts, practices or activities, rites and rituals. According to Pacanowsky and O’Donnell-Trujillo (1982) all these are “performances” because they “display” the lived experience of the group. Like stage plays, they offer a picture of the reality of the culture. “Performance brings the significance or meaning of some structural form -- be it symbol, story, metaphor, ideology, or saga-- into being”(Pacanowsky & O’Donnell-Trujillo, p.85).

Specifically, Pacanowsky and O’Donnell-Trujillo (1982) identify four characteristics of communication performances that perpetuate culture. First,
Communication performances are interactional, more like dialogues than soliloquies. They are social actions, not solitary ones, something people participate in together.

Second, performances are contextual. They cannot be viewed as independent acts, but are always embedded in a larger frame of activity. Third, performances are episodes. They are events with a beginning and an end, and the performers can identify the episode and distinguish it from others. Finally, performances are improvised. There is flexibility in how a communication episode is played out, and although the same performances may be given again and again, they are never repeated exactly the same way (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo). The organization's culture is not static, then, but is re-created and changed through communicating members' performances. "When they talk, write a play, sing, dance, (participate in sporting events), fake an illness, they are communicating; and they are creating their culture" (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, p. 123).

Culture is not a characteristic that an organization has; rather, it represents what an organization is (Smircich, 1983). As Wilkins (1984) notes, outstanding organizations may be distinguished from less successful companies by the presence of clear stories that make the organization's philosophy come alive for the membership. As Kelly (1985) suggests, members create their own organizational reality by interpreting the behaviors and activities they see, the stories and myths about the organization that they hear, and the pressures to conform to the norms and practices of the organization that they feel. Similarly, Posner, Kouzes, and Schmidt (1985) observe that strongly shared values lead members to a better understanding and greater regard for organizational objectives.

Drawing upon anthropology's structural functionalist conception of culture, much corporate culture work implies that the cultural dimension contributes in some way to the
systematic balance and effectiveness of an organization (Kilmann et al., 1975; Tichy, 1978; Tunstall, 1983). Thus, a corporate culture is a possession that gives an organization a competitive advantage (Barney, 1986). The conception of culture as an internal variable leads some researchers to claim that culture is simply organizational climate reborn (Falcione, Sussman & Herden, 1987; Schneider, 1985).

Implicit in all of these theories of culture formation is the notion of cultural dispersion, or the degree to which cultural characteristics are dispersed throughout an organization. Louis (1985) describes this dispersion as penetration; psychological penetration is present when organizational members internalize the values, meanings, and assumptions of the culture.

Organizational cultures have been characterized by "shared realities" that contribute to unique behavioral expectations (Bate, 1984; Kinnunen, 1990; Schall, 1983; Wilkins & Patterson, 1985). As Barnett (1988) suggests, "it is through its shared symbol system that an organization communicates its values, behavioral expectations, common experiences, and self-image among its members" (p. 107). Part of the "unique sense of a place" that we call organizational culture develops from the values held in common by organizational members, that is, by members' identification.

Barnett (1988) describes values as the assumptions on which organizational activities occur and suggests that research supports the conclusion that values contribute to goal development, evaluation, and the shared standards by which organizational members' behaviors are judged. Organizational value systems help organizational members to understand what the organization holds as important and how the "unique
sense of the place" should influence their personal decision-making and behavior (Barnett).

Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1989) investigated culture finding that individuals hold personal values, beliefs, and assumptions about ideal organizational life which continually contrast with their perceptions of organizational reality (organizational culture themes). This contrast between the ideal and the real is related to organizational satisfaction and estimations of quality and overall effectiveness. Generally speaking, the closer the fit or congruence between the individual’s ideal organization and his or her perception of a real organization, the more optimistic the individual will be about all aspects of organizational life (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley). Conversely, the greater the dissimilarity between individual values and perceptions of prevailing organizational culture themes, the greater the degree of dissatisfaction (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley).

In summary, organizational culture--culture being the shared values and beliefs of the institution--affects the daily life of employees. Acceptance of the culture is one means of establishing identification with the organization. Likewise, organizational identification sets the tone (either positively or negatively) for the development of culture. Therefore, in order to assess employees’ identification with an organizational culture, we must recognize the reciprocal nature of these two organizational constructs. A strong organizational culture will not exist without employee identification. Identification can not occur if the values and beliefs of the individual conflict with those of the organization.
Because identification is an important element of culture, in order to determine if the culture of a MRU is recognized by its organizational members, the following research questions are advanced for consideration:

RQ 1: Do faculty identify with the university?

RQ 2: Is there a relationship between faculty identification with the university and their alignment with the university's mission as a MRU?

RQ 3: Do faculty recognize the mission of the MRU?

RQ 4: Do faculty believe the University of North Texas is a MRU?
Methodology

The previous chapter provided a review of literature relating to identification theory and its application to culture within a Metropolitan Research University. Research questions were presented. This chapter discusses the methodology used to conduct the study. Specifically, the sampling procedure used to collect the necessary data, the method of data collection, and the statistical methods employed in analyzing the data are described.

Sample

Based on the demographics which indicate information pertaining to the respondents to the questionnaire, 67% of the respondents are male, 27% female and 6% who did not indicate their sex. The mean age for a UNT faculty member is 48 years of age. On average, the faculty members are employed by UNT for 13 years (see Table 1).

The sample for this investigation included all full-time faculty members at the University of North Texas (UNT). It was believed this purposive sample would be representative of the MRU population due to the mission statement of UNT. The sample size was 800 faculty, with 224 responding (see Table 1), producing a response rate of 28%. Thus, although our objective was to produce a 50% response rate, because of the sensitive nature of the survey questions, and because mailed questionnaires generally result in lower response rates (Frey 1991), the sample of 224 was considered acceptable. Berry (1987) cautions that “some methods of boosting response rate may do so at the expense of introducing further bias” (p. 112).
Procedures

Following the acquisition of a faculty list from the university human resource department, approval was obtained for the use of human subjects from University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A). The faculty was then mailed a packet of information that included a brief introduction to the project, a questionnaire with questions pertaining to both organizational identification and decision-making, and a return envelope addressed to the UNT Department of Communication Studies. Among other things, the cover letter stressed the anonymity of respondents. A response time of 2 weeks was requested (see Appendix B).

The research utilized a 37-item instrument (see Appendix C) including an adaptation of 25 questions from the Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ) Cheney (1983), mission questions, and questions asking how faculty differentiate a MRU from a traditional university. The OIQ instrument (Cheney) assesses the product or state of identification. The OIQ was designed to reflect three identifiable, but not analytically distinct, “components” of organizational identification isolated by Patchen (1985): (a) membership, (b) loyalty, and (c) similarity. The original Organizational Identification Questionnaire (Cheney) was altered to address the institution. For example, the original questionnaire stated “I find it easy to identify with this organization”, for the purpose of this study the statement was altered to read “I find it easy to identify with UNT.”

The questionnaire was divided into four sections. A 7 point Likert-type scale (Likert, 1932) was used. The seven point scale reflects a highly positive identification with the university being evaluated as a one and a negative response being evaluated as a seven (i.e., one = YES!, two = YES, three = Yes, four = ?, five = No, six = NO, and
In order to establish measurement reliability, Chronbach’s (1951) alpha coefficient was used. For the 25 questions measuring identification the alpha = .96. The membership portion of the questionnaire included questions asking if the faculty member was proud of being an employee of UNT and if the university’s image in the community represents them well. It also questioned whether faculty have warm feelings toward UNT as a place to work, and whether they would describe UNT as a large “family” in which most members feel a sense of belonging. Membership also was assessed by asking if faculty describe themselves as working for UNT or being from UNT, and by questioning if they are glad they chose to work for UNT rather than another university. The final questions measuring membership ask if faculty feel that UNT cares about them, whether their association with UNT is a large part of who they are, and if they are willing to spend the rest of their career with UNT (see Appendix C).

The loyalty portion of the questionnaire included questions asking if faculty feel loyal to UNT and whether they really care about the fate of UNT. Specifically, the survey asked if they view UNT’s problems as their own, if they are willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help UNT be successful, and whether they make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of their actions for the university. Loyalty also was evaluated by questioning whether the faculty talk up UNT to their friends as a great university to work for, whether they would continue working at UNT even if they didn’t need the money, and if they become irritated when they hear others outside UNT criticize the university (see Appendix C).
The similarity portion of the questionnaire included questions asking if faculty find it easy to identify with UNT. Faculty were questioned to determine if their values and the values of UNT are very similar and whether they believe the people employed at UNT are working toward the same goals. Similarity also was measured by assessing whether the faculty of UNT are perceived to be different than faculty at other universities and whether the respondents had a lot in common with other UNT faculty. Finally, faculty were questioned concerning their level of agreement with UNT policies and procedures (see Appendix C).

The second section of the questionnaire asked 7 questions designed to assess the faculty members’ understanding and alignment with the mission of the university (i.e., 3 questions measured the alignment of the university reward system with the mission of the university, 2 questions addressed the articulation of the administrations’ expectations, and 2 questions addressed faculty allocation of time spent supporting the mission of the university.) The portion of the questionnaire that addressed the reward system included questions asking if the faculty members feel that the faculty reward system is aligned with the published mission of UNT and if they consider the faculty reward system when prioritizing their professional time and energy.

The portion of the questionnaire that addressed administrations’ expectations included questions asking if the faculty member feels the administrations’ expectations of faculty and the mission of the university have been clearly articulated. The portion of the questionnaire that addressed faculty support for the mission of the university included questions asking if faculty members consider the mission of the university and allocate their time in alignment with the mission. Also, faculty were questioned to determine if
they prioritize their time toward building relationships with the regional business community (see Appendix C). A five point Likert-type scale was used, a strong agreement was reflected as a one and a strong disagreement as a four (i.e., one = strongly agree, two = agree, three = disagree, four = strongly disagree, and five = do not know).

The third section asked 5 open-ended questions designed to allow the respondent to write their response in narrative form, these questions addressed faculty perceptions of how metropolitan research institutions differ from traditional universities and whether or not the faculty considers UNT to be a MRU. The questions asked in this section included what first brought the faculty member to UNT, what adjectives best describe UNT, how metropolitan research institutions differ from traditional universities, whether the faculty member considered UNT a metropolitan university, and steps the university administration might take to promote the idea of the metropolitan research institution.

The fourth section asked demographic information, including the age and sex of the participant, academic rank and number of years employed at UNT (see Table 1).

Data Analysis

For the purposes of this study, descriptive statistics and correlations were calculated. Descriptive statistics were calculated to analyze faculty identification with the university. Correlations indicated the type and strength of relationship between or among variables (i.e., correlations assessed relationship between identification and mission). In addition, open-ended responses were analyzed to identify recurring themes that described the faculty's view of the university. All responses to open-ended question were categorized in order to identify the most common responses of faculty. The response categories were weighted according to the number of responses (i.e., categories with the
highest number of responses were interpreted to signal that the idea being expressed was important to faculty).

Research Question 1, “Do faculty identify with the university?” was addressed by examination of descriptive statistics for the identification variables. Research Question 2, “Is there a relationship between faculty identification with the university and their alignment with the university’s mission as a MRU”, was addressed by calculating correlation coefficients assessing the relationship between identification and questionnaire items measuring the university mission.

Research Question 3, “Do faculty recognize the mission of the MRU”, was addressed by examination of an open-ended question that asked how MRUs differ from traditional universities. All responses were categorized, counted and reported using samples of actual descriptive terms faculty had written to describe how a MRU differs from a traditional university.

Research Question 4, “Do faculty believe UNT is a MRU”, was addressed by examination of an open-ended question that asked if the faculty member considers UNT to be a MRU. All responses were categorized, counted and reported using samples of actual descriptive terms faculty had written to describe their opinion. These thematic responses are a strong indicator of the faculty’s alignment with UNT as a MRU.

Summary

This chapter has described the sample and the procedures used to obtain the data for the study. The measurements employed and the method of analysis also were explained. The next chapter will report the results obtained from the analysis of each research question.
Results

The previous chapter described the sample and the procedures used to obtain the data for the study. The measurements employed and the methods of analysis also were explained. This chapter will report the results obtained from the analysis of each research question.

Results for Research Question 1

The first research question explored whether faculty members identify with the university (see Table 2). The identification questions addressed three areas: (a) membership, (b) loyalty, and (c) similarity.

Though falling in the middle range of the scale, the two most positively perceived identity items relating to membership stated that UNT is like a large family (mean = 3.09) and UNT cares about me (mean = 3.47). Items perceived as being less satisfactory were willingness to spend the rest of their career at UNT (mean = 4.76), pride in being an employee of UNT (mean = 4.93), and faculty descriptions of themselves as working for UNT (mean = 5.24) (see Table 2).

The most positively perceived items relating to loyalty -- although these items fell in the middle range of the scale -- were faculty claims that they would continue to work for UNT if they didn’t need the money (mean = 3.65) and their views that UNT’s problems were their own (mean = 3.80). Items perceived as being less satisfactory were faculty claims that they really care about the fate of UNT (mean = 5.33), their willingness to give extra effort to help UNT succeed (mean = 5.01), and whether they consider the consequences for UNT when they make on-the-job decisions (mean = 5.00) (see Table 2).
Items pertaining to similarity that were perceived the most positively included items suggesting that UNT faculty are different from faculty at other universities (mean = 3.56) and that faculty and the university share the same values (mean = 3.76). Items perceived as being less satisfactory were the ease with which one identifies with UNT (mean = 4.21), and UNT’s demonstration of what dedicated people can achieve (mean = 4.17) (see Table 2).

Results for Research Question 2

Results of Research Question 2, "Is there a relationship between faculty identification with the university and their alignment with the university’s mission as a MRU", indicated that there is a relationship between faculty views of identification and their alignment with the mission of the university (see Table 4). The strongest relationship existed between identification and clear articulation of the university mission statement ($R^2 = .33$). The next strongest relationship was a modest but strong relationship between identification and how strongly the faculty believe their reward system is aligned with the published mission of UNT ($R^2 = .25$). Similarly, there was a modest but strong relationship between identification and how clearly the administrations’ expectations have been articulated ($R^2 = .24$). Additionally, there was a modest but strong relationship between identification and whether or not faculty prioritized their time toward building relationships with the regional business community ($R^2 = .21$). There is a moderate relationship between identification and whether faculty considered the mission of the university and allocated their time in alignment with the mission ($R^2 = .20$). Also, there was a moderate relationship between identification and consideration of the reward system when faculty prioritized their professional time ($R^2 = .18$). Finally, there was a
slight relationship between identification and whether faculty considered the reward system to mirror the mission statement of the university \((R^2 = .15)\) (see Table 4).

**Results for Research Question 3**

The third research question utilized a 5-point Likert-type scale to explore if faculty recognize the mission of the MRU. There were few positively perceived items, the most positive items were that: (a) the faculty reward system mirrors the mission statement of the university \((\text{mean} = 2.57)\) and (b) the faculty reward system is aligned with the mission \((\text{mean} = 2.78)\). Items perceived as being less satisfactory include statements indicating that: (a) the mission of UNT has been clearly articulated \((\text{mean} = 3.17)\), (b) building relationships with regional businesses is a priority \((\text{mean} = 3.18)\), and (c) the faculty reward system is a useful guide to prioritize professional time \((\text{mean} = 3.46)\) (see Table 2).

Additionally, Research Question 3 was answered by examining responses to an open-ended question that asked faculty what differentiates a metropolitan research institution from a traditional university. From these responses, 9 categories emerged; 218 individuals produced a total of 321 responses.

The first category was characterized as the non-traditional student population. There were 38 responses in this category, representing 11.84% of the total responses to the question. Representative responses such as “one key difference is the largely commuter student body”, “there is no sense of community”, and “students are here only for classes” exemplify this category.

The second category was defined as implications of the location. There were 65 responses in this category, representing 20.25% of responses. For instance, one faculty
member claimed "this does not feel like a metropolitan research university -- in many ways UNT thinks like a community college." Another respondent claimed that "a MRU should be actively engaged with urban issues, problems, and people." While still another claimed that "MRUs are physically located in large population centers and cater to the business strengths of the region." When contrasting a traditional university to a MRU one respondent claimed, "a traditional university supports the community solely by stimulating the local economy. In contrast, a metropolitan research university provides formalized community services and faculty research is often focused on urban issues."

The third category was funding, there were 15 responses in this category, representing 4.67% of responses. Representative responses include statements that "MRUs try to do more/demand more from faculty", and expect faculty to stay without incorporating new resources or funding. Additionally, claims that "universities that don’t pay well cannot attract top researchers", and that UNT is a research "wannabe" without committing the resources were typical of this category. Similarly, claims that there is a discrepancy in the amount of research money that comes in, the amount of research being done, and how well the faculty members are compensated for it were reflective of this category.

The fourth category represented the positive characteristics that a MRU should possess. It included 15 responses, representing 4.67% of the responses. For instance, one faculty member claimed that "MRUs should focus on ‘access’ and ‘diversity’ ensuring that all types of people can receive an education." Another respondent indicated "flexible class schedules were important to the MRU", while still another claimed that "the ideal MRU would have a stronger focus on community involvement."
The fifth category included the negative characteristics associated with the term MRU. There were 48 responses, representing 14.95% of the responses. For example, one faculty member claims that “MRUs are factories rather than a place one (students & faculty) can be somewhat contemplative.” Another respondent indicated that “the anti-intellectual environment makes MRUs inferior to traditional universities.” While still another claimed that “the ‘metropolitan’ concept debases the research concept as well as ‘university’”. One faculty member sums it up in stating that “MRUs are the dogs of the university system, they are for kids who can’t go elsewhere.”

Many of the responses indicated “the focus at UNT is on producing a large quantity of students, there is no focus on quality” and “there is less concern for ‘real’ education – it is more of a technical school or business annex for large corporations.” Another respondent claims that “the ‘publish or perish’ pressure on faculty undermines the quality of the undergraduate programs.” While still another claims that “the education of undergrads is basically given last priority which is revealed in the tendency to cut corners on student achievement.”

The sixth category was positive connotations associated with a traditional university. There were 8 responses, representing 2.49% of the responses. For instance, one faculty member claimed that “traditional universities are concerned with the quality of educational programs, putting students and teaching first on the priority list.” Another respondent indicated that “a traditional university is focused on student development and sustaining a strong student-life component to the educational experience.” While still another claimed that “traditional universities employ faculty who are leaders in adding to
knowledge and literature in their fields; these top faculty are attracted to universities that are well known nationally."

The seventh category was unique challenges of a MRU. There were 37 responses, representing 11.53% of responses. For example, one faculty member claimed that “MRUs have a greater number of challenges regarding working student’s needs (flexible schedules, the applicability of the curriculum and competition with work/family time).” Another respondent claimed that “the MRU and the traditional university serve different client populations.” While still another claimed that “professors teach classes where the intellect of the students spans a wide range of ability.” Additionally, faculty claim “there is a higher teaching load, a higher student to teacher ratio and students are not as ‘available’, this hinders group projects and library intensive assignments.” Another faculty member claimed that “MRUs have a reward structure with a heavy emphasis on research and publishing” and “there is less emphasis/reward on teaching and less appreciation of the liberal arts.”

One faculty member pointed out that “the goal of North Texas State College was to put the best teachers in our schools and the focus at UNT (a metropolitan institution) is on the research interests of local businesses.” Another respondent claimed “there is a danger in allowing the focus of academic research to be driven by the funding and interests of the ever-changing economy.”

The eighth category represented the actions a MRU might take to differentiate itself from a traditional university. This category included 39 responses, representing 12.15% of the responses. For instance, one faculty member claimed that a MRU should actively “engage in urban problems, the issues and the people.” Another respondent
claimed that UNT as a MRU should “connect research with community goals, business, the public sector, education and public health goals to directly serve the needs of the Metroplex.” While still another claimed that a MRU should “provide a plentiful number of scholarships for students to work directly with doctoral faculty committed to research.” There were several respondents who claimed that MRUs should “recognize that social service—applied research that addresses needs of the complex urban area is social research and it should be valued in the university reward system.”

In addition to these categories 56 responses, representing 17.45% of the responses fell into a ninth category, which indicated that UNT is confused. One response sums up the dilemma: “I don’t know any other universities that are both traditional and metropolitan research universities—we differ in that we don’t know what we want to be.” Another respondent who reported being a committee member of the task group that made the decision to proclaim UNT as a MRU claimed that “the committee members did not have a clear consensus as to the definition of a MRU.”

One faculty member claimed that “if no one knows what a MRU is, how do we know if it is different?” Another respondent claimed that “we need to know who claims this is a research university, because the faculty thinks it is a traditional university.” While another respondent claimed that “it is UNT’s attempt to satisfy and label such as this that helps to create the lack of real focus in our leadership.” In addition, another respondent claimed that “Metropolitan Research University is a socially constructed and created concept with no other basis in reality.”
Results for Research Question 4

Faculty was asked if they believe UNT is a MRU. The responses included both yes and no answers and a place to explain. 192 respondents answered the yes/no question and gave 181 open-ended responses. There were 104 yes responses, this represented 57.46% of the responses. From the yes responses 6 categories emerged.

The first category represented characteristics tied to the location of the university. There were 12 responses in this category, indicating 11.54% of the responses for this question. For instance, one faculty member claimed that “UNT has 75% of its students/alumni/future students from the Metroplex.” Another respondent claimed that the university is sited at the edge of an urban sprawl, so in terms of its location, it is part of a metropolitan area.” While still another faculty member claimed that “if a MRU is a university located in or near a major metropolitan area, then UNT is one – and so are Harvard, U.C., Berkley and U. of Chicago – but there is a huge difference in UNT and these other universities.”

The second category represented responses regarding students who commute to attend the university. There were 33 responses to this category, representing 31.73% of the responses. For example, one faculty member claimed that “the majority of my students work full-time and commute ½ to 2 hours to attend class.” Another respondent claimed that “UNT serves a large population of older and non-resident students.” While still another faculty member claims that “UNT makes an effort to offer courses that are convenient for commuters and the majority of recruiting is done in the Metroplex.”

The third category represented characteristics of the UNT student body. There were 6 responses in this category, representing 5.81% of the responses. One faculty
member claimed "there is a wide ethnic variation and a wide geographical representation to the student body." Another respondent claimed that "with over 25,000 students, a large number of whom work, and a student body that shows little interest in athletic programs, the size and interests of the students help to define UNT as a MRU."

The fourth category represented relationships formed to build funding sources for the university. There were 6 responses in this category, which represents 5.81% of the responses. For example, faculty members claimed that "many areas of UNT have external connections" and that "the administration wants to appeal to the Metroplex business community to help fund programs at the university." Another respondent claimed that UNT has "very few resources to support faculty research."

The fifth category represented responses regarding the mindset of the UNT administration. There were 33 responses in this category, representing 31.73% of responses. For instance, one faculty member claimed that "we are a MRU in that we genuflect when anyone with 6 digits in DFW coughs." Another respondent claimed that "obviously UNT is a MRU in the eyes of some, including especially the upper, non-academic administration and that many faculty very strongly disagree with this view -- and feel betrayed in having been drawn to UNT in the 1980s under a different administrative philosophy." While still another faculty member claimed that "because the administration appears to think on regional rather than national levels and we still limit ourselves to being the best in North Texas -- we are a metropolitan institution." Yet another respondent claimed that "UNT currently pretends to be a MRU and that every 2 years we change our focus."
The sixth category represented the fact that many of the faculty believe “it may be too early to see the results of efforts to move toward being a MRU.” There were 14 responses in this category, representing 13.46% of the responses. For instance, one faculty member claimed that “we seem to be moving in the direction of becoming a MRU, but we often also act like a rural campus such as Southwest Texas or Texas A&M.” Another respondent claimed that “UNT has made a commitment and is beginning, in some areas, to make tangible changes -- not an easy move for any university.” While still another faculty member claimed that “UNT is a major urban-campus university, yet the mission needs to be more clearly articulated and tied to the reward system.”

There also were 31 responses, representing 29.81% of the responses that indicated that faculty are uncertain as to whether UNT is or is not a MRU. For example, one faculty member, who reported having been a member of the committee that determined if UNT should declare its status as a MRU, claimed that they “do not think anyone really knows what a metro institution is, and that the committee did not reach a consensus as to the definition of a MRU.”

For the question of whether the faculty consider UNT to be a MRU, there were 57 no responses, this represented 31.49% of the responses. The overarching theme in the responses were criticism of leadership. For instance, one faculty member claimed that UNT is not a MRU in practice, “words are said but deeds are missing.” Another respondent claimed that “meetings are held but controlled so people can not voice opinions that are needed to change a regressive situation.” While still another faculty
member claimed that “UNT emulates the worst features of Metropolitan universities, MRU is a negative term.”

One respondent claimed that “university policies are not clearly defined.” Another faculty member claimed that “UNT seems to be about size and numbers.” While still another respondent claimed that “UNT strives to establish a relationship with the Metroplex; it fails, however, do to its lack of vision and talent in key departments and administration.” One other faculty member claimed that “while the mission statement has been rewritten, the mindset is still parochial.”

Many of the criticisms of leadership included expressions that “the term MRU was not an accurate or desirable term to fit UNT.” For example, one faculty member claimed that “UNT is a university that has wider appeal and could benefit from the dropping of ‘metropolitan’”. Another respondent claimed that “a university has a national landscape, or even international and the term metropolitan institution is too small-minded.” While still another claimed that “administrative vision has placed us in this status and we claim to be a MRU but continue to operate as an isolated teachers/art/music college in a rural town outside a big city.”

Other criticisms included one faculty members’ claim that “the term ‘Metropolitan’ in higher education often connotes mediocrity, lack of ambition, a large-scale community college.” Another respondent claimed that UNT is too limited to practical applications and dependant on the missions of profit-oriented businesses. Still another faculty member claimed that “UNT is not a MRU because metropolitan institutions aim to be role models of liberal learning and give time to those areas of scholarship that enhance life as well as business.”
One faculty member claimed that they think “the move to claiming that UNT is a MRU is a thinly veiled effort by administration to turn UNT into a glorified community college.” Other respondents claimed that “UNT is very provincial – can’t get beyond teachers college mentally”, “UNT is too small in thinking overall”, and that “UNT seems too unknown nationally.”

Summary

This chapter reported the results obtained from the data analysis examining each of the four research questions. The next chapter will summarize and further interpret these findings.
Discussion

The previous chapter reported the results of the examination of four research questions. This chapter provides a summary of the research findings. It also interprets the results of the study, discusses limitations of the study, and addresses implications for future research.

Summary of the Research Findings

This research project explored the issue of organizational identification as it relates to the mission of a Metropolitan Research University. Guided by four research questions, the results suggest that although a relationship exists between employee identification and organizational mission, faculty (i.e., employees) do not strongly identify with the university nor do they recognize and accept the university mission. Findings also indicate that faculty have varied perceptions about what a MRU is, and how they are to function in a MRU culture. The most important contribution of this research, then, is its potential to generate thoughtful discourse concerning how the university can communicate its objectives among employees, thereby strengthening the university culture.

Related to the ability to strengthen culture is the issue of organizational identification. Results suggest that faculty do not have a strong identification with the university nor do they feel passionate about it. Lack of identity is related to faculty views of UNT and their positions as employees of the university. For instance, findings of the study indicate that faculty do not have a great deal of pride in the university and do not plan to spend their careers at UNT. Consequently, they do not care about the fate of the university nor do they consider the university when making career/academic related
decisions. In other words, the faculty have no real ownership of the University of North Texas.

When exploring the relationship between the organizational mission statement and organizational identification, results suggest that there is a definite but small relationship between identification and the messages received by faculty concerning the university. Specifically, a faculty members' level of identification is related to how clearly the university mission is articulated, and how well faculty understand university administrators’ expectations. Currently, the faculty view the mission of UNT as ambiguous. It makes sense, then, that the faculty claimed clear articulation of the mission was a very important factor in their relationship with the university. The fact that faculty do not have a clear definition of a MRU may be one reason why the faculty do not identify with the university.

The ambiguity concerning the culture of a MRU is also recognized by faculty descriptions of a MRU. Results of this study indicate that faculty emphasize location and student demographics when defining the MRU, and that they are uncertain if UNT clearly meets the criteria to be a MRU. Additionally, although some faculty claim that the research agenda of a MRU should be more closely aligned with business and community than a traditional university, others claim that a "MRU is inferior to a traditional university".

Because of the confusion concerning how a MRU is defined, it is not surprising that almost half the faculty are uncertain if UNT is a MRU. In fact, many faculty claim that UNT is a traditional university. The strongest arguments against being a MRU were that UNT is located at the edge, not part of the urban sprawl, UNT teaches a wide variety
of disciplines, and UNT is not a research university. As long as the faculty do not believe the term MRU applies to their employing university, it will be a struggle to move the university toward becoming a MRU. This will be particularly challenging if the university does not have the financial resources to direct and encourage growth toward becoming a research university.

In summary, if the university administrations' objective is to create a MRU it must first explain what a MRU is, and it must clearly articulate the mission of UNT as a Metropolitan Research University. In short, administrators must use communication to establish an organizational culture that articulates its mission and objectives.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of the study should be acknowledged. Perhaps the greatest limitation concerned the effect that a faculty member's perception of their department has on their perception of the university. The questionnaire did not address perception of the respondents' department and how this perception affects perceptions of the university. While questionnaire instruments often uncover considerable information about a person's attitudes, beliefs, and intentions with respect to his/her organizational life, they offer little opportunity for understanding the dynamics of the individual-organization relationship.

Adams, (1988) Principle of The Diminishment of Organizational Allegiance states that the fundamental allegiance of the faculty member will be to the smallest unit to which he (sic) belongs. This is usually the department, but it may not be, for two reasons. First, departments themselves have become so large in certain disciplines that they have created subdivisions. Second, some departments divide up into research groups that become very close-knit and compete with each other for support. In any case, allegiance
will be to the smallest group, and administrators must count on this as a political fact. Thus, in the current study, the perceptions of the faculty may be primarily dependent on how their departments, colleges, and/or schools view and articulate the university mission.

A second limitation may be the method of data collection. Issues such as using campus mail or even the persons choosing to respond to the study must be considered as potential limitations when interpreting the findings. The findings may be an artifact of the research design. Finally, we must recognize that while one objective of the study was to understand faculty views of the MRU concept, using faculty on one campus limits the generalizability of the results.

**Implications**

Cheney (1983) claims it is natural for an employee to identify with his/her business or corporation. The results of this study suggest that the faculty do not have a strong identification with the university. Therefore, there are problems that need to be addressed. The most important issue for faculty is an open communication forum between faculty and administration that helps to create a stronger identification with the university, and ultimately an understanding of the administrations' goals and expectations.

In order to develop a consensus regarding the definition of a MRU, one important oversight needs to be corrected: The faculty need to be invited to share in the responsibilities of defining the mission of the university and how that mission relates to the MRU concept. Inclusion of the faculty voice is beneficial to establishing a positive culture for the university. Once the faculty voice has been incorporated into the
definition of UNT as a MRU, then, it is possible to build a foundation for autonomy between the faculty and the administration. The necessary component for building a strong and positive culture is open and consistent communication through the reward systems, house organs, and allocation of fiscal and human resources.

Faculty also claimed that "identification would be facilitated more easily if the daily responsibilities of their position were more clearly defined." This again speaks to the lack of clear articulation of administrative expectations. Once faculty uncertainty has been reduced, the organization can begin to accomplish its mission. There are many questions yet to be pursued in this program of organizational communication research as it relates to higher education. Do the faculty recognize that administration recognize that the faculty creates, modifies, and perpetuates the culture of the university? How much does faculty identification direct faculty prioritization of their time and energy? Is it possible that if the faculty identified more with the university they would also be more invested in the mission of the university? How much does the mission of the university direct the professional activities of the faculty?

These and many other questions are yet to be investigated, as we explore the relationships and responsibilities among the faculty and the creation and perpetuation of the university culture. The benefit that UNT derives from this study is assistance in identifying specific areas of faculty uncertainty regarding the mission of the university as a MRU. Also, other Metropolitan Research Universities can examine faculty issues of identification and compare the status of faculty identification at UNT with their institutions. Hopefully, this comparison will clarify pivotal aspects of the university culture that either encourage or discourage faculty identification.
Summary

This chapter presented a summary of the entire research study and of the results obtained from the exploration of the research questions. Limitations of the study were presented, along with interpretations of results and implications of the research findings. In summary, when faculty experience incongruencies in the written and spoken messages of the administration and the allocation of university resources, the uncertainty that these inconsistencies create serves to reduce faculty identification with the university. Also, when faculty do not validate descriptive terms being used in the marketing of the university, the university will struggle to alter its culture and the perception of its audience. In conclusion, this research begins to address the nuances of how a culture is formed, sustained and changed based upon the interactions and communication between the administration and the faculty. This study is important because it examines an evolving institution and the implications communication has for university culture.
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Table 1
Demographic Data of the UNT Faculty Who Responded to the Research Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Employed as UNT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67% Age range 25 to 76.</td>
<td>Years at UNT range from 1 to 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27% Average age is 48</td>
<td>Average years at UNT was 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not indicate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue working if didn’t need the money</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at UNT working toward same goals</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud to be employee of UNT</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNT image represents me well</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often describe myself as working for UNT</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider UNT consequences in decision making</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At UNT we are different from others in our field</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad to work at UNT over another university</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell my friends UNT is a great place to work</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I view UNT’s problems as my own</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to give extra effort to help UNT succeed.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become irritated when outsiders criticize UNT</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm feelings about UNT as a place to work</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to spend the rest of my career at UNT</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that UNT cares about me</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNT exemplifies what dedicated people achieve</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot in common with other employees</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to agree with policies that affect me.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My UNT association is a small part of who I am</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to tell others about UNT projects</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values and UNT's values are very similar</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to UNT</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNT is like a large family</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to identify with UNT</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about the fate of UNT</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean for Identification</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty reward system is aligned w/mission</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of faculty are clearly articulate</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships with regional businesses</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reward system/priority/professional time.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mission of university clearly articulated</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate my time in alignment with the mission</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reward system mirrors mission statement</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means and standard deviations reflect responses on a 4-point scale; 1 equals strongly agree, and 4 equals strongly disagree, with the option of giving no opinion.
Table 4

Relationship between identification and the university mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty reward system is aligned w/mission</td>
<td>.49835</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of faculty are clearly articulated</td>
<td>.49432</td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships with regional businesses</td>
<td>.45289</td>
<td>.0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reward system/priority/professional</td>
<td>.42507</td>
<td>.0452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mission of university clearly articulated</td>
<td>.57150</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate my time in alignment with the mission</td>
<td>.45100</td>
<td>.0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reward system mirrors mission statement</td>
<td>.38974</td>
<td>.1729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 13, 1998

Marlene Gray  
Rt. 1, Box 4402  
Gainesville, TX 76240

Re: Human Subjects Application No. 98-091

Dear Ms. Gray:

As permitted by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects (45 CFR 46), I have conducted an expedited review of your proposed project titled "Faculty Identification Equals Communication Culture." The risks inherent in this research are minimal, and the potential benefits to the subjects outweigh those risks. The submitted protocol and cover letter is hereby approved for use of human subjects on this project.

The UNT IRB must re-review this project prior to any modifications you make in the approved project. Please contact me if you wish to make such changes or need additional information.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rollie Schafer  
Chair, Institutional Review Board

RS:sb

cc: IRB Members
Cover Letter

(insert date)

Dear Faculty,

I am a masters student in the Department of Communication Studies and am seeking your help as I collect data for my thesis. My study investigates the organizational culture of the metropolitan research university from the perspective of faculty members.

I appeal to you to please take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me in the evenings at (940) 665-1103 or call my major professor, Dr. Carol Stringer Cawyer at extension # 2588. Anyone who is interested in the results of this study is welcome to contact me by (insert date).

Please utilize the enclosed envelope and return the completed questionnaire by (insert date), 1998. Nowhere on the information do we ask you to give your name or a way to reach you, this is because we want to safeguard your confidentiality.

Thank you,

Marlene Gray
Masters Candidate in Organizational Communication
Organizational Identification Questionnaire*

Instructions: Think of your role as a faculty member at the University of North Texas (UNT).
For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward the
university. Please respond to all items. The alternative responses are:

YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
YES I agree strongly with the statement.
Yes I agree with the statement.
? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
No I disagree with the statement.
NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each item carefully, please indicate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would probably continue working
   for UNT even if I didn't need the money.
2. In general, the people employed by UNT
   are working toward the same goals.
3. I am very proud to be an employee of UNT.
4. UNT's image in the community
   represents me as well.
5. I often describe myself to others by saying,
   "I work for UNT" or "I am from UNT."
6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by
   considering the consequences of my
   actions for UNT.
7. We at UNT are different from others
   in our field.
8. I am glad I chose to work for UNT rather
   than another university.
9. I talk up UNT to my friends as a great
   university to work for.
10. In general, I view UNT's problems as
    my own.
11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort
    beyond that normally expected in order to
    help UNT be successful.
12. I become irritated when I hear others outside UNT criticize the university. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

13. I have warm feelings toward UNT as a place to work. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

14. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career with UNT. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

15. I feel that UNT cares about me. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

16. The record of UNT is an example of what dedicated people can achieve. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

17. I have a lot in common with others employed by UNT. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

18. I find it difficult to agree with UNT's policies on important matters relating to me. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

19. My association with UNT is only a small part of who I am. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

20. I like to tell others about projects that UNT is working on. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

21. I find that my values and the values of UNT are very similar. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

22. I feel very little loyalty to UNT. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

23. I would describe UNT as a large "family" in which most members feel a sense of belonging. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

24. I find it easy to identify with UNT. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

25. I really care about the fate of UNT. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

In the following section, please indicate whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD), or don't know how you feel (DK) (26-33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. I feel that the faculty reward system is aligned with the published mission of UNT.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel the administrations' expectations of faculty are clearly articulated.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I prioritize my time toward building relationships with the regional business community.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I consider the faculty reward system when prioritizing my professional time and energy.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I feel that the mission of the university has been clearly articulated.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I consider the mission of the university and allocate my time in alignment with the mission.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. I consider the reward system for faculty to mirror the mission statement for the university.

33. What first brought you to the University of North Texas?

34. What adjectives best describe the University of North Texas to you?

35. From your perspective, how do metropolitan research institutions differ from traditional universities?

36. Do you consider the University of North Texas a metropolitan institution? Yes No Please explain your answer.

37. What could the university administration do to promote the idea of the metropolitan research institution?

Please indicate the following demographic information:

Age ________
Sex Male Female
Academic Rank ________
Number of years completed at UNT ________

"Copyright 1988 by Sage Publications, Inc. Reprinted by permission."
Mission Statement
University of North Texas

The University of North Texas is the largest and most comprehensive research and doctoral degree-granting institution in North Texas. The University is committed to excellence in teaching and the discovery and application of knowledge through research and creative activities. As a metropolitan university, the institution is dedicated to continued growth as a leader in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Denton area; the Metroplex; and state, national, and international education communities.

The University:
conducts high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service by:
fostering excellence and innovation in teaching and learning;
supporting research and creative activities that advance knowledge,
   strengthen undergraduate and graduate programs, and promote the application of
   knowledge for the benefit of society; and
accept a primary leadership role in addressing community needs of the metroplex
   region and the state;
maintains a community founded on free and open inquiry, academic integrity, and the
   examination of values;
nurtures development of students by providing continuing opportunities for intellectual,
   physical, emotional, social, and career growth;
stresses understanding and appreciation of the historical, intellectual, technological,
   scientific, and cultural nature of the search for knowledge;
promotes the advancement of the arts; and
supports a culturally diverse environment and advocates mutual respect for all members
   of the University community as they strive for excellence.

The University fosters its relationship with the University of North Texas Health
Science Center at Fort Worth and cultivates partnerships with elementary and secondary
schools, community colleges, and other universities, businesses, government agencies,
and nonprofit organizations to improve the quality of education and community life.

Approved by the University of North Texas Board of Regents December 3, 1993.