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The problem with which this study is concerned is the role of middle managers of campus activities and student unions as change agents in higher education.

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent the individuals in middle management positions in campus activities perceive themselves to be effective as change agents.

A thirty-three item survey was mailed to 315 directors. A total of 199 usable returns were received.

The problem was investigated in terms of perceptions of (a) individual adequate training and competency to provide new and expanded service for today's student body, (b) individual influence on upper-level policy and decision making within their own reporting structure, and (c) commanding enough influence on campus to effect significant change.

The responses were compared to a criteria that was developed by an eight member panel from this profession. This provided the method of categorizing respondents.

A high change agent in individuals exhibits a consistently positive perception of almost always being competent enough to initiate change actions. Medium
profile individuals almost always perceive themselves moderately competent, while the low profile individuals rarely perceive themselves as being able to cause innovation. Based on usable returns the breakdown shows that 134 (67.3%) respondents have a high profile, 53 (26.7%) have a medium profile, and 12 (6%) have a low profile.

The findings of this study generally indicate that campus activities professionals perceive themselves sufficiently prepared to meet challenges. The group perceives itself as innovators. The group professes an orientation to management techniques. The group perceives itself to have a high degree of recognizable influence in cross-campus matters. The respondents view themselves on a par with academic administrators. Finally, respondents identify faculty as their main source of resistance.

Conclusions are (a) respondents exhibit concern for management science approaches, and (b) the middle management concept is accepted.

Recommendations for further study: (a) a study focusing on preparation, (b) a follow-up study addressing changes that individuals perceive they have accomplished, and (c) a comparison study be conducted of academic administrators and faculty.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A generation ago colleges and universities responded to the needs of those enrolled. The period from 1960 to 1975 saw the coming of age of the children born during the post-World War II population explosion. Unprecedented numbers of students entered higher education at all levels from the expanded community colleges through the four year and graduate institutions (1). Consequently newer and generally more expanded student services resulted as it became apparent that more than classroom learning was desirable (4; 5).

Higher education emerged as a total lifestyle approach in dealing with students as services ranging from advisement, job placement, housing, activities, and financial aid took on new meaning; the influx of large numbers of students demanded that greater emphasis be placed on the co-curricular needs of the individuals (13). Expanded facilities and enrollments created new emphasis for professionalism and career development as the housemother gave way to the residence life specialist and the dean of students employed special interest and cultural affairs assistants as well as psychologists (14).

Academic achievement could also be viewed in terms of emotional development, social interaction, and a notion that education included the whole person. During this period the
approach assumed that students were the traditional seventeen to twenty one year old age group (11). Student programs and services today reflect this fact, which is the central focus of this study. Not only have the times changed but also, and more importantly, the make-up of the student body has experienced a transformation in recent years (4).

Today, the enrollment at a typical institution is distinctively different from that of the time when the current student services approaches were defined and put into practice. The middle managers, those most involved with the delivery of such services, should also be those who are most aware of the need for a redefinition and direction of their efforts. The individuals who are the means of delivering student services can also be the change agents in the system. Since management is the science of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling (3), the refocusing of these management efforts can then be cause for a more precise alignment of efforts with needs. The role of the campus activities professional, therefore, is significant because perceptions, abilities, and awareness of the realities of the limitations of power and authority are crucial (16).

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is the role of middle managers of campus activities and student unions as change agents.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent the individuals in middle-management positions in campus activities perceive themselves to be effective as change agents in the system in which they operate to the extent that they are able to bring about desired improved services.

Research Questions

Based on the problem and the stated purpose, the research questions focus primarily on attempting to identify the individual's own management profile in terms of whether or not the individual views himself as an effective change agent.

1. To what degree do individual union directors feel properly trained and competent to provide new and expanded services for today's student body?

2. To what degree do individual union directors (or equivalent), as middle managers, perceive themselves as influencing upper-level policy changes that involve institutional mission, priorities, and funding?

3. To what degree do union directors (or equivalent), as professionals, perceive themselves as commanding enough influence on campus to effect significant change (with academic and other support areas)?

4. To what degree are institutional enrollment (size), type of control (public or private), organizational pattern,
and the union directors' educational level, years of service, professional involvement, and relationship with superior related to the union directors' perceptions of their influence within the suprasystem of the institution?

Background and Significance of the Study

Managers who realize that change is desirable have in doing so identified an existing problem--some discrepancy between what is actually happening and what they would like to happen. It is this awareness of the real versus the ideal that initially causes an individual manager to begin the process of creating change within the organization (7). The role of this individual as the change agent, and the leadership style that must be practiced to accomplish the change, can be directly related to the union directors' professional role and the overall management of higher education administration.

Included in this role analysis are several significant theories and the derived models. Understanding and identifying change-agent behavior requires consideration of the decision making and problem-solving skills of the individual, as well as a determination of the motivation and commitment and the employment climate (9).

A further identification of the level of maturity or sophistication involved in the work environment is necessary both above and below the director's position. It is crucially important that there be a willingness to accept responsibility
for performance and decisions (7). Change agents recognize the need to improve a situation in such a way that both themselves and the organization benefit and some greater need is satisfied (10).

Change-agent behavior also includes in many instances the classic hygiene factors and motivators identified as follows by Herzberg (8). Whether an individual will take a risk and attempt to convince those involved with him about the necessity for change can be directly related to job security, upward mobility, recognition, and acceptance of increased responsibility. Identifying and classifying an individual managerial style as being that of a particular type of change agent further requires a true understanding of what change is and what types of behaviors are required to produce it.

The Situational Leadership Theory (7) attempts to explain the cause and effect aspects of task behavior versus relationship behavior in regard to performance. An individual who has a high change-agent potential would be one of relatively high maturity in task and responsibility--both an innovator and delegator who gains respect and support from superiors and subordinates. The main ingredient in producing change is to be successful in convincing others that the idea is desirable. Changing structures, forms, procedures, or tasks will not succeed unless the natural resistance to change, which most of us have, can be overcome. Higher education is often dedicated
to maintenance of the status quo regardless of potential improvement or innovation; resistance can be a cover for insecurity, uncertainty, lack of commitment, or blind dedication.

In most instances, according to Heller (6), the two basic situations of which change agents must be aware are the problem that has made change necessary and the problems created by actions taken to produce the needed change. The middle manager union director, therefore, must be cognizant of his role. The issue or innovation that is desired can only be achieved if the change agent can first recognize that others who are involved in the process also see the need for change (the problem), understand the motives involved, and support the probable solutions or outcomes (the potential problems created). The union director, to be an effective change agent, must possess a variety of skills that will provide the means to overcome individual and institutional resistance to change. Herein lies the true test of a middle manager's abilities that can best be described in classic "force field analysis" terms (7) and also diagnosis-implementation planning theory (12). The overall basic assumption can be summarized by stating that change implies changing individuals (15).

The main thrust of this research is to study the role of union directors as change agents. The composition of this group as true middle managers, deliverers of the services of higher education support activities, is difficult to identify. Little research has been conducted in this area, and available
instruments do not adequately address either the profession, the behavior, or the effectiveness of union directors as change agents.

Available literature tends to focus on basic skills and entry-level situations (2). Consequently, the research approach selected for this study involves identifying and establishing criteria that can be useful not only in the evaluation of preparation programs for union directors but also in the actual preparation of professional development programs for those already in the field.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they relate to this study.

a campus activities professional is an individual who is trained in a discipline that includes preparation in appropriate fields of study related to the position held and who possesses the basic skills and abilities to manage a campus activities program effectively as an educational component of the institution.

middle management includes those who are responsible as department heads, unit directors, deans, or managers reporting to a vice president or equivalent. In the area of campus activities, this includes management of a budget, staff, facility, and fiscally accountable extra-curricular activities program, which encompasses planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling the operation.
a management profile is an individual's style of leadership and management as compared to the person's perception of role, authority, and position in the existing power structure.

non-traditional students are individuals who do not fall into the classic seventeen to twenty-one year old parameter of college students or recognized traditional older groups.

a change agent is a professional staff member who is in an administrative position and who serves as a catalyst, motivator, and developer of human and fiscal resources in such a way as to have an effect on the personnel and the philosophy of the higher educational system.

Limitation of the Study

The study is limited to the field of educational facilities management, specifically in the area of university center management. It is subject to the limitations of self-perceptions or self-evaluation. It is further limited by the factors inherent in a questionnaire which is administered by mail and to the level of honesty of respondents.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Data were collected from union directors nationwide. Questionnaires were mailed to all directors who are currently listed as professional members of either the Association of College Unions—International or the National Association for Campus Activities. Membership in these association requires
the individual to pay dues (non-reimbursable at nearly every campus) and indicates a degree of commitment to the profession.

The questionnaire attempts to establish a relationship between the individual's perceptions of role, power and influence, and actual situational realities. In determining the management profile of the director, an attempt is made to validate the assumption that middle managers agree that they can in fact be instrumental in creating the required process.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a pre-addressed, stamped envelope and a cover letter. Initial mailings were printed on yellow paper, and first and second follow-up mailings to individuals were to be on light blue and light green paper, respectively. This enables identification of response time and facilitates gathering the total sample.

Treatment of Data

The survey instrument used is the result of a two-stage development process. In this field, the practitioners represent the authority, and as career professionals constitute the researchers and teachers of the subject. In the first stage, five veteran staff individuals (who average nine years in the profession and who are recognized for their leadership and scholarship) were asked to define the following:

1. Change agent in terms of professional support staff in an institution of higher education;
2. Ways a professional director in the field of union management or campus activities can be a change agent;
3. Types of behavior exhibited by a change agent;
4. The role of the change agent.

In addition, this panel defined the three management profile categories, as follows:

1. High change-agent potential is a highly positive perception that the individual in question generally feels almost always competent enough to initiate a change pattern within the power situation of the institution;

2. Moderate change-agent potential is a positive perception that the individual in question generally feels moderately competent to initiate a change pattern within the power structure of the institution;

3. Low change-agent potential is a negative perception that the individual in question generally feels rarely able to initiate a change pattern within the power structure of the institution.

Finally, this panel reacted to the questionnaire as to whether or not the instrument measures all areas involved in the identification of the topic.

The second phase involved distribution of the refined instrument to the original panel and to three other individuals who have the same qualifications. Specific responses to each item of the questionnaire were designated as results
that generally will identify the respondents' management profile and place the person into one of the categories listed above. The expanded panel was asked to validate this identification process by determining if a particular response will in fact represent behavior indicative of a particular category.

The combined jury provided criteria by which the individual's perception of actual managerial effectiveness are to be tested in terms that utilize planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling to bring about change in others and ultimately the institution. The responses placed individuals into one of the three identified categories—high, moderate, or low change-agent potential. These are based on the Response Identification Chart included as the Appendix. In some instances, responses place an individual in more than one category, but the overall survey produces an identifiable pattern that allows for classification.

The questionnaire was then pilot tested prior to the distribution process previously outlined. The pilot was sent to three individuals who have left the field. Panel members were excluded from the general sample.

The targeted population of approximately 300 represents the entire group of professionals who are identified through professional memberships as middle managers in the union-activities field. Attempting to report on this target group seems to necessitate the use of descriptive rather than
inferential statistics. Characteristics and traits of the complete population are measured and treated as descriptive data. A minimum response from 60 per cent of the population is necessary for completion of the study.

Summary

Chapter I identifies the problem and purposes, lists the research questions, and explains the background and significance and the statistical procedures for this study. Chapter II reviews the literature that is relevant to this study, and Chapter III details the data collection process and the statistical procedures used.

Chapter IV presents the data analyses and findings. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of literature presents a range of related subtopics drawn from the overall discussion of change agents. Several aspects of the subject are presented in order to achieve a comprehensive view of the main topic. The chapter is divided into five parts that include (a) change in organizational settings as related to change in higher education, (b) change agents, (c) management of change, (d) change agent strategies, and (e) change agents versus resistance.

Change in Organizational Settings as Related to Change in Higher Education

The topic of change and the study of those who create it within organizations is widely discussed within the literature. From the general study of change within society, behavioral scientists have focused during the past forty years upon specific areas within our culture. The formalization of the study of management as a science is but one result of these efforts. Studies and modeling by Drucker (20), Lewin (39), Likert (40), and Maslow (48 set the stage for discussion on a wide variety of related research and theory. Change within organizational structures is but one such subtopic.

For the purposes of this study, an organizational system may be described in McFeely's terms as a "series of components
so interfaced and interrelated that they work together toward the achievement of worthy and legitimate objectives" (49, p. 4). Lorsch and Lawrence (46) agree but add the importance of properly understanding and identifying such interrelationships when attempting to isolate change causes and needs within an organization.

An organization may be further conceptualized in formal and informal terms. In educational organization this takes on special importance as such influences as collegiality, prestige and tradition tend to have a great influence on the functioning of the organization. The formal organization is obvious, according to Kast and Rosenzweig, the planned structure represents "the deliberate attempts to establish patterned relationships among components" (34, p. 172). Formal structure, they continue, typically results from "explicit decision-making and is prescriptive in nature--a 'blueprint' of the way activities should be accomplished" (34, p. 172). The informal organization refers to system aspects not formally planned or stated, but arises from the interactive components and participants. Informal structures, as noted above, can command significant influence within the organization.

An organization takes on a special identity that is indicative of its own personality, role, and definition. Clark (18, p. 98) refers to "organizational saga," which is a collective understanding of unique accomplishment within a formally established group. Many references are made to organizational
climate which may be viewed collectively through defining the orientation exhibited by a particular group. Sperry, Mickelson and Hunsaker (63, pp. 51-52) say that examples can be seen in (a) power-oriented organizations--those uninfluenced by external authorities and unconcerned with human values or individual welfare; (b) role-oriented organizations--those that place emphasis solely on orderliness and rationale and tend not to be flexible or innovative; (c) task-oriented organizations--in which the achievement of superordinate goals becomes the controlling value and all evaluations are based on this criteria; (d) people-oriented organizations--in which structures permit members' needs (individual and group) to be met since authority is a minimal factor. In this context, therefore, it becomes possible to begin to identify some of the internal conditions that must exist to allow change agent types to function.

Whatever the orientation of the organization's formal and informal structures, it is the individuals who comprise the membership of the group that ultimately determines its identity and direction. McGregor's landmark work in The Human Side of Enterprise (50) firmly establishes both the roles of the nature of the organization's climate and its leadership in relationship to the place of individuals within the system. This is focused upon in greater detail by Shirley (60, pp. 98-99) who identifies structural dimension as the distribution of functions throughout the organization. These dimensions
include the vertical and horizontal authority relationships, communication and decision processes, and the formal incentive system--items that establish the basic conditions under which organizational members perform their various roles. Linked to this, Shirley feels, is a coexisting behavioral dimension. In this dimension the members express themselves in relation to their tasks and the way they perform them. Much of this can be viewed in terms of Hertzberg's (30) hygiene factors and motivators that also help to establish the organizational and individual factors necessary for an effective change agent to emerge within an organization.

Organizations exist in an environment that is comprised of systems of many types and complexities. From the all-encompassing suprasystem, which, according to Carlisle (17), can in effect be the environment itself down to the smallest subsystem, the outcome is the same throughout. Information is taken into each system and subsystem, somehow transformed, and then returned to the environment. The organization itself, regardless of its size, power or members, is but a subsystem of a larger system. To understand the systems approach to organizational study, Kurpius (37) says that the four primary elements which must be considered at all times are goals, framework, methods, and people. Foxley (22, p. 7) agrees and adds that systems approaches help in the recognition of the degree of organizational health. She states that a healthy organization (in terms of facilitating change
awareness and possible activities) illustrates (a) adapt-
ability (creativity is possible), (b) sense of identity,
(c) capacity to test reality, and (d) state of integration
of the parts in comparison to the achievement of objectives.

If change is to take place within a system, it must first
be understood as a means of modifying the system in which the
organization functions. Baldridge and Dell (7, pp. 11-13) say
that this entails examining the various subsystems involved as
well as goals, structure, and relationships. Baldridge and
Dell believe change becomes desirable when it is apparent that
something is wrong or out of balance within the system. The
theory is that either the results are not matched to the en-
vironment or the individuals involved in processing the inputs
are not efficiently (systems problem) or individually self-
satisfyingly (personal hygiene problem) producing the results.
In abstract terms, change according to Winstead is the process
of "altering, modifying or transforming, it may entail ter-
mination, growth, substitution, replacement, or simply passing
from one phase to another" (66, p. 19).

Beckhard and Harris say it is imperative that the first
step in the change process, in theory, identifies what parts
of the system are most significantly involved in the change
process and "what changes in present attitudes or behaviors
would probably have to occur if the desired goals were to be
reached" (9, p. 7). Again, entire system awareness is a must;
Beckhard and Harris state that "this means thinking about the total organization as it relates to the change goal" (9, p. 21).

Baldridge and Dell (7, p. 10) state that organization change theory can be thought of in the two basic modes of invention, which is the process of developing new procedures for a system (i.e., something not previously available), and diffusion, which is the process of informing all involved about the invention. There are two dangers, however, that can be encountered in the pursuit of change. Winstead states that "while people sometimes want change, they fear its consequences and there may be conflicting pressures for both change and status quo" (66, p. 21; change may imply loss of power, new relationships, or more responsibility. In relation to the topic of this study, this represents a very definite area of consideration. Higher education-based systems contain a somewhat different set of obstacles for a change agent to overcome in this regard.

The second danger is that the change problem is frequently described only in terms of symptoms. Beckhard and Harris (9) stress the need for an accurate organizational diagnosis in order to produce an accurate statement of the problem to be changed.

Experience has shown that organizations and their managements often make erroneous assumptions about the current state of the organization when developing change strategies. The consequences of such a mistake is that the
action plans developed assume a different current organizational condition than actually exists. The result of then implementing those action plans is likely to be confusion, frustration, unexpected resistance and generally a failure to achieve desired goals (9, p. 21).

The premise is obvious in that an inadequate understanding of what change actually is and what the far-reaching implications are of attempting to bring it about in an organization can create a situation worse than the original. In this scenario, status quo becomes the wisest choice. Beckhard and Harris (9, p. 25) cite Leicher's proposal that change be dealt with in terms of readiness, attitudes, motivation toward implementation, and overall cost. Leicher depicts these variables as $C = (ABD)X$,

where,

$C =$ the change goal, whether determined by the organization itself or a change agent acting independently,

$A =$ the level of dissatisfaction with the status quo,

$B =$ a clearly defined desired state,

$D =$ practical first steps toward that state, and

$X =$ the cost of the process in a variety of ways that relate all types of expendable resources.

A number of primary proponents of change theory agree on two general approaches to organizational change. These are the use of either structural- or people-oriented approaches or some combination of the two. Specific studies and hypotheses can be found in Argyris (1), Baldridge (6), Leavitt (38), and Lorsch and Lawrence (45). The fact that a dichotomy
exists between the two approaches, and in reality many change situations rely on both concepts, underscores the fact that change, to be effective, must take into account the entire system and all the known variables. Kast and Rosenzweig (34) state that a customized approach to each different situation seems to be both the reality and the best method.

Kurpius (37), drawing from the above resources, adequately summarizes by identifying two questions to be answered by the change process. Does the nature of the situation suggest that changing people should be the primary goal? Would greater success and long-range satisfaction occur if structural changes were introduced? Since the ultimate goal should be lasting change then the change agent, acting on his own initiative or in the forefront of an organizational decision to change, must determine which route(s) to follow. Argyris and Schon, in *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective* (5), equate the success of any approach to cause change in an organization to that organization's ability to learn—which is what facilitates the entire process.

Since the goal of change would appear to be the accomplishment of some form of organization improvement even if that implies organizational termination, it can be said that the change action itself is related to the concepts found in organizational development (OD) theories. For purposes of this study, Beckhard's definition provides the conceptual framework for the following discussion. OD is viewed as
"an effort that is (1) planned, (2) organization wide, (3) managed from the top to increase (4) organizational effectiveness through (5) planned interventions in the organizational processes using behavioral science knowledge" (8, p. 9). To be significant, change must be planned. The strong behavioral science influences found throughout this literature review thus far can be viewed as the main thrust behind change efforts by change agents. Those in the forefront of the change process see in OD approaches the necessary systems diagnoses and the planned activities required if their efforts are to succeed. In other words, Beckhard and Harris continue this thought process by focusing on the individual in the change leadership position.

It is not that the responsibilities of executive managers will change. They will continue to be responsible and accountable for the development of priorities, goals and strategies. They will be responsible for managing the conditions and activities that get the organization from its present state to some desired state (9, p. 3).

Winstead (66, p. 22) agrees and further expands the role of those responsible for change by emphasizing that planned change should be based on a program that includes (a) receiving information from the constituencies (subsystems) involved; (b) devising means whereby the information is recognized as legitimate by the constituencies; (c) formulating plans and programs to achieve organizational goals and objectives; (d) implementing actions; and (e) evaluating. French and Bell (24) claim this planning requirement for effective
change directly relates to basic management concepts. Furthermore, Freeman states, "institutional management involves the four primary functions: planning, organizing, directing and controlling. Planning forms the framework within which the other management functions are carried out" (23, p. 35). In this sense, Lippett (42) says planning is not an attempt to forecast the future or determine future decisions.

For the potential change agent who is employed in an organization that is people-oriented and operating under clearly defined goals and objectives, the climate is very supportive of creative, planned change endeavors. In such a system there is less controlling and consequently more planning and directing. Grossman (26, p. 202) says that change agents can exist at all levels (subsystems) of management if a participatory atmosphere exists. Blake and Mouton (11) have explored this theory and graphically portray the participatory style of management required for change to take place in higher education.

Relating this discussion to higher education underscores the potential difficulty that faces change agents in such settings. The literature, as noted, stresses the need for goal orientations, planning, and concise managerial and behavioral science directives (67). Change itself is nothing new to higher education; "it has changed substantially in the past 100 years" (52, p. 3), according to John Millet. In
relating change theory to academia, Millet cites (52, pp. 1-2) the influence of the notion of collegiate governance. Having a pronounced influence on the unique organizational system of higher education are the traditional view of the faculty's role in the ultimate decision-making process, the balance between administrative license and academic freedom, and the pervasive effects of the tenure system. Governance deals with issues of purpose, program and resources. The academic administration must define the main existence of the university in terms of teaching, research, and service-operating systems which inherently may be change resistant. Millet contends that the primary function in this setting should be to plan "in accordance with governance decisions and then act on them" (52, p. 2). Governance and planning are manifested in a university through a third structure and process that is vital to organizational behavior—leadership. Millet emphasizes that "Leadership is essential to decision making and provides the indispensable linkage between governance and management" (52, p. 2).

For colleges and universities, then, leadership emerges as essential if change is to take place. Strong leadership can move an institution to proper planning, goal and mission definition, and action. Winstead agrees and adds that for planned change to be successful "it must be fostered by the top leadership" (66, p. 20). Baldridge defines leadership
in power terms and similarly concludes "the issue of power--personal and positional--must be faced if change is to be accomplished in a university" (6, p. 35).

The application of change theories and strategies, as indicated, are very reliant upon planning, which further implies well-defined mission and goals. For higher education this is a special problem as administrators contend "that the ill-defined and poorly understood measures of process and outcomes in higher education make any kind of planning difficult and render the sophisticated approaches of management science essentially useless" (67, p. 96).

In arguing for the development of Planning, Program and Budget Systems (PPBS) for academic institutions, Freeman charges that "although the need for planning seems self-evident, only recently have colleges and university administrations addressed seriously the need to develop formal institution planning systems" (23, pp. 35-36). This may have been so because, as Hipps states, such concepts do "pose potential threats to collegiality and tradition. Resolution of problems of the 1980's will necessitate effective communication [and] . . . even greater importance on the flow of information" (31, p. 15).

This negative theme flows throughout the literature and is best summarized by Goodman and his associates.

The American college or university is vital to our intelligent and ethical future, but it is largely unable to
reform itself in response to the needs of that future without considerable pressure. Colleges and universities combine deeply rooted norms, values, structures, sub-groups and power relations with great complexity, low formalization and de-centralization of control. Many new ideas penetrate such organizations, but very few can bridge the status quo (25, p. 29).

Real change, Clark (18) speculates, if it is to become possible, in spite of the need for it, will have to be in some respects forced on the academic world in such a fashion as to be compatible with the existing power structure.

The role of the change agent, in many respects, becomes that of an educator or trainer, underscoring the statements above relating change to learning. The primary skill of a change agent, Argyris (4) says, may emerge as one of teaching ability. Successful planned change in higher education involves a number of unique perspectives. Beckhard and Harris (9, p. 16) identify six primary aspects for a successful change process in a large institutional system. These include previously cited items such as diagnosis of the current situation, goal setting, and evaluation. Added are ideas on defining the transition state between the present and the future; in this way the change agent maintains awareness to resistance and obstacles. Coupled with this is the development of strategies and specific action plans for managing the transition, which will emerge as a vital component of this study. Finally, Beckhard and Harris include the need for stabilizing the new condition and establishing a balance between stability and flexibility, this is essential if the new state is to be viewed as an improvement.
In addition says Winstead the process is seen to be even more sophisticated since in higher education settings there is a need to "create planning mechanisms for renewal and redirection to counteract the built-in bias of complex institutions to maintain the status quo" (66, p. 19). These renewal mechanisms are inherently absent in higher education. Unlike business, the academic world is by and large inexperienced in these matters. Margulies and Wallace (47) believe that initial change processes should involve the establishment of some formal renewal apparatus and should elicit support for the project. Bringing together many of the ideas discussed, Winstead (66, p. 19) describes such mechanisms in terms of leadership to provide encouragement, a valid knowledge base derived from objective research, involvement of institutional expertise and experience, and system-wide movement and support for change--even when the change is targeted for a particular subsystem. With such preliminary planning, change becomes possible within higher education environments.

The role of the change agent becomes significant. In the structural vacuum of the system, a change movement can be managed. According to Lindquist in Strategies for Change (41, p. 3), what is done to produce something different can be the result of a particular change agent who becomes aware of the situation and the system's need for organization development and then takes action. This may be individually initiated action to change a situation, or action taken to
achieve an organization's stated goal. In higher education, the change agent must rely on training, consulting and researching while perhaps realizing that according to Burgher, "1--change agents play a variety of roles; 2--clients play a variety of roles; and 3--the final shape of a change agent's role is not yet clear" (16, p. 68).

Change Agents

Change is a process that can be either random or planned. When planned, the moving force is often the change agent. Dyer (21) refers to the "sensitive manipulator," stating that in the past twenty or so years, newer professionals have emerged that range from consultants, applied behavioral scientists, facilitators, trainers, and OD specialists—all invariably described as change agents. Dyer says, "The new breed of professional has as its world the diagnosis of human systems [aiming] to help that system change in the desired direction on the basis of carefully considered diagnosis of it" (21, p. 14). French refers to this individual as the "key figure who collects and uses data from the organization in an educative attempt to alter behaviour" (24, p. 163). Soltis, in A Systematic Approach to Managing Change, identifies the change agent as a "catalyst or linking pin in a group" that effectively stimulates productive change (62, p. 133).

In facing the reality of our ever-changing world, organizations have much to gain by the efforts of a change agent.
To survive and be productive, timely, and relevant in their efforts, organizations must keep pace with the ever-changing environment, suiting the pace to the overall goals of the group. There has to be some way of changing the organization within the larger system, while maintaining a healthy balance within the group—without which the change process becomes disruptive and chaotic. In *The Change Agent* (26) Grossman identifies the main question facing organizations as being how to "administer change in the proper amount, in the right places and at the right time" (26, p. 10). His obvious answer is the change agent, who he describes as a "generalist who reacts to changes within the outside world and causes matching changes within the organization" (26, p. 10). Once again, there appear the components of the consistency between the notion of change within an organization, the need for systematic planning and development, and the role of a change agent. Conceptually, the change agent theory is not a new idea. Grossman notes that "Freud visualized the therapist's role with respect to his patient as that of a change agent" (26, p. 12).

Initially, the development of change agent theory focused on the introduction of an outside expert into the system. As noted previously, the behavioral scientist label provided the bases for many different types of professional interventions into organizational systems, all directed toward providing the means for facilitating change. Management
as a science is a relatively new phenomenon. Further refinements such as OD theory, systems theory and others are indeed products of modern research and analysis. What began as an idea that change agents had to be highly skilled experts and behavioral scientists has matured into a generally accepted belief that anyone, even within the organization, can be an effective change agent. To be sure, there are still definite differences of opinion on this subject which point to the need for further research.

The arguments favoring inside versus outside change agents are convincing for both sides. Baldridge and Dell (7, pp. 283-284) note that on one hand, the highly trained professional facilitator is the expert who brings into the situation skills and knowledge that will benefit the organization; on the other, the insider possesses greater insight, understands the internal workings of the group and has personal ownership and interest in the future well being and health of the organization. Lippett (42) initially referred to a change agent as an outside helper with a doctorate in some behavioral science. Bennis, Benne and Chin (10) later broadened the definition by including anyone who tried to effect change. "Thus the early social and behavioral scientists who coined the term limited its application to skilled professionals with proper training" (26, p. 12). Later practitioners of the actual craft recognized that most managers could themselves become change agents. All change agents must be capable of mastering four major roles
according to Lippitt (43); these roles are (a) that of change specialist, (b) that of coordinator of change efforts and programs, (c) that of fact finder and information link, and (d) that of internal or external consultant to the system (43, p. 60). In terms of this study, the focus now is placed on the inside change agent, whose most important function is that of serving as an internal problem-solving consultant.

Sperry, Mickelson and Hunsaker (63, pp. 170-172) cite Havelock who has expanded upon the belief of Dennis and others (10) regarding the effectiveness of inside change agents. Havelock identifies five distinct advantages of such a position that range from knowledge of the system and its power structure to speaking the language of the organization. Havelock also adds that the insider is familiar to the members, identifies personally with the needs and goals of the group, and, most importantly, understands what he calls organizational norms. These are commonly held beliefs, attitudes and behaviour patterns--items that must be contended with if change is to take place.

There are certain disadvantages to being an inside change agent, however, such as lacking objectivity, special knowledge, and skills. Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63) point out that the insider may not have total perspective about the organization because of an inadequate power base within the system. In addition, effectiveness may be hindered by past successes and failures as well as the degree of independence
of movement within the system. For middle managers, all of these could in reality be major obstacles to success. However, perhaps the main difficulty for an individual at this level is in redefining on-going relations with other members of the organization. Citing Havelock again, Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63, p. 173) say a successful internal change agent must be able to change the expectations that associates have developed or have come to accept about the individual.

Baldridge and Dell (7), in Managing Change in Educational Organizations, tend to agree; "Any serious change agent must propose changes that directly benefit the client," and they continue, "in order to serve the client better, any vision of change must take into account political realities" (7, p. 381). Baldridge and Dell expand this notion by asserting that allowances for structure as well as members' attitudes must be planned; "Altering structures without a corresponding change in attitudes will effect behavior only minimally; while attitudes that change without accompanying structural change are quickly squelched by the system" (7, p. 318), they state. The authors also feel, as does Havelock, that is is imperative for the change agent to have a clear awareness of what is politically feasible within the system. This must be coupled with the change agent's individual awareness of his own ability to influence that political sphere.

Argyris and Schon (5) add another dimension by focusing on the relationship between change and learning. Their
argument centers on the need for change agents to become learning agents for the system. Learning takes on two thrusts as the agent must discover the sources of error within the organization. These can be attributed to errors in strategy and assumption in existing theory-in-use, hence the need for change. The invention of new strategies and assumptions are efforts to correct errors—actions that must produce positive learning among the membership if the change is to become stabilized and long lasting. Indeed, the individual must be competent in many areas in order to provide what appears to be vital to the change process (5, p. 19).

Obviously, the possibility of becoming a successful inside change agent is realistic. According to Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63), middle managers seem to be at responsibility levels conducive to such behavior. Along with previously discussed criteria, it would appear that the individual's own initiative to undertake such a role is a primary ingredient. Only a remarkable individual will have the motivation to seize upon a situation, evaluate the variables, develop the necessary competencies, and have the commitment to pursue what could possibly be either a very successful experience in self-actualization or a traumatic career setback. It is not realistic to expect that everyone with decision-making responsibility has the potential to become a change agent. This is especially true in higher education where it has been shown that the system tends to perpetuate the status
quo and stymie those that would seemingly attack it. The final deciding factor may be that becoming a change agent represents an action that is in the individual's own best interest; this becomes a way of surviving within a system that experiences change by chance or political circumstance, while being innovative and creative (63, p. 11).

Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63) again cite Havelock who advances a series of principles for being a successful inside change agent. For the middle manager in higher education, these could be viewed as the guideposts to follow as the author suggests. Summarized, these include (a) know yourself, (b) understand the organization, (c) keep lines of communication open, (d) determine how others feel, (e) analyze the different points of view, (f) understand all the dimensions of the intended change, (g) continue the effort, (h) develop a sense of timing, (i) share the credit, and (j) avoid win-lose strategies (63, pp. 172-174). Indeed, this does not represent an easy course to follow.

Others tend to agree. Partin (56) lists seven basic skills and areas of knowledge that a person must have in order to make changes inside an organization. Partin emphasizes the need to ensure continuity and transfer of the change endeavor throughout the organization and to all of its members.

Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63) have developed a continuum to display the psychologically unhealthy-healthy dimensions that are related to lo-synergy/hi-synergy and the
type of individual who is best suited for the role of change agent inside an organization. Synergy stresses a process whereby individuals are able to release their creative process. The authors argue that synergy focuses on the individual's positive attributes as being properly balanced with other behavior components, thereby producing harmonious development and an "integrated, whole personality that is larger than its parts" (63, p. 31). A healthy personality style possesses a hi-synergy level and can be seen as a successful change agent. This would be the individual who is the achiever, who is courageous, fair, and both leader and helper (Hi) versus the individual who is a driver, inadequate, a martyr, right, controller, and getter (Lo). The psychologically high, healthy profile describes the ideal change agent (63, pp. 31-33).

Marguiles and Wallace (47) particularly emphasize that inside change agents must choose to adopt reinforcement techniques in order to redesign the reinforcement environment of the organization. This implies that the environment can be "clarified, enriched and brought into congruence with the goals and objectives of the organization" (47, p. 58). It was precisely the lack of congruence that initially made the inside change agent aware of system imbalance. The authors cite and expand Havelock's sense of timing in these terms. According to Marguiles and Wallace "Change agents should consider the questions involving scheduling and timing of
reinforcements. As a general rule, immediate reinforcements are far more effective than delayed ones" (47, p. 60).

This developing description of middle manager-inside change agent is further enhanced and expanded by Ottaway's (55) assertion in Change Agents at Work that all middle managers can be classified in some way as change agents. He uses three basic categories to describe this hypothesis. First, there are change generators, who convert issues into felt needs for change. Prototypic change generators are "those few gifted persons who do so best and whom others emulate" (55, p. 11). Demonstrative change generators demonstrate their personal convictions in support of change. The three types of these agents are (a) barricade demonstrators, "those in the first line of confrontation with resisters" (55, p. 11); (b) patron demonstrators, the suppliers of patronage to the effort and (c) defender demonstrators, those that give support in somewhat less than direct ways.

Ottaway's second group is the change implementors, who have the task of implementing change after an organization has recognized a felt need to change. External change implementors are those who are invited into the organization to assist with implementing "because of their special knowledge in pioneering often high-risk experimental effort" (55, p. 12). External-internal change implementors are inside of the organization but come to the situation as external. The
totally internal change implementor has the task of working with the grassroots of the group.

The third category is the change adopters, who practice the new behavior and thereby normalize the change. Prototype change adopters are the first members to commit to change. Organizational maintainers are those who are more committed to maintaining the organization by performing their duties than they are to fighting the change. Finally, product users are those who accept the change. Ottaway feels that these individuals may be totally unaware of their role as change agents, "but without whom the change would not be fact" (55, p. 12).

Lippitt (43) furthers the construction of the definition of insider change agent. His terminology tends toward the more descriptive as he reports on the militants, the apocalyptics, the regressors, the historians, the technocrats, and the liberal-democrats. In much the same fashion as the synergy continuum, an attempt is made to label the change agent type that is most desirable to bring about effective change in an organizational setting. Lippitt sees the liberal-democrat as a reformer who has a solid humanistic and behavioral science background to draw upon (43, pp. 58-59).

It is Baldridge and Dell (7) who add that in educational institutional settings, the individual needs to be able to perform as a sort of "change-oriented Machiavellian" who follows prescribed rules to be a successful insider. Taking into account the unique and often frustrating realities of
attempting change in higher education, Baldridge and Dell have devised five specific rules and tactics that the change agent must be able to create—mostly on the strength of his own skills, position, and personality. These, in fact, read like a battlefield manual written by a combat-tested veteran of many confrontations. Summarized, these are (a) concentration of efforts, (b) knowing when to fight, (c) knowledge of history, (d) establishment of a coalition, and (e) the joining with external coalitions. Placed in an academic institutional setting, application of each can be conceptualized and seen as vital (7, pp. 383-385).

Katz and Kahn (35), Schaffer (58), and Shoemaker (61), provide additional insight into this advancing description. An individual who is a change agent must be first of all a catalyst so that existing inertia can be overcome. The motivation behind this trait could range from dissatisfaction to ambition. Effectiveness as a catalyst is mandatory for the change effort to be successful. The task for an insider is to develop that effectiveness in spite of a personal, emotional involvement in the system and its problems. According to Shoemaker (61) this can be accomplished through thinking reasonably about a course of action, visualizing the situation from the leadership's viewpoint, promote feelings of common purpose in the group, forming alliances with natural linkers and processors within the group, and, again, development of a sense of timing.
Schaffer (58) further stresses that inside change agents must be effective solution givers, which, in fact, is highly related to having an effective communication style. This has more to do with the change agent's individual style and the methods employed. How others perceive the change movements has much to do with how the change agent is perceived.

Burack and Torda (15) agree, and they also indicate that the change agent must be someone capable of utilizing a multi-processing mental approach to the task. A balancing effort must be maintained that keeps a wide variety of forces, opinions, and personalities in check or the effort will fail. This has to be nurtured by cultivating organizational resources and drawing upon a gamut of allies and supporters (15, pp. 109-109). This is similar to Ottaway's (55) listing of generators, implementors, and adopters.

Common threads appear throughout the literature on change agents, and it is this commonality that clearly defines a change agent. Change agents in higher education emerge as three major groups; first are the trainers (3), second are the consultants (42), and the third group is comprised of a wide range of individual change agents who do not fall into either of the two dominant groups (55, pp. 10-11).

The question of motivational forces is an important one. Those driving factors that determine the behavior patterns of individuals should be part of the overall portrait of change agents. Questions related to motive, method, and general
behavior need to be answered in terms of values, morals, and ethics. The ideal, crystal-clear notion of change being always for the better, which is always brought about by leaders striving for unselfish ends that will greatly benefit the entire organization, may not, in every instance, be true.

Hipps (31, p. 33) presents a three-part model that describes change-agent behavior and permits classification of actions taken to initiate change. On one extreme are those who employ an empirical-rational strategy which leaves little room for involvement or decision-making by others (38). On the other extreme are the change agents who rely on a power-coercive style, which in many ways is almost identical to the first. In the center can be found what is described as the normative-re-educative mode (10).

The role of the change agent is critical in many ways. Values and ethics can be seen as all-important when the entire process is viewed in terms of the change agent and the organization as the client. Cummings in referring to this concept, stresses that the relationship between the two is vitally important since that relationship "is potentially a microcosm of what the organization might become" (19, p. 189). Viewing the organization as a social system (client system) enables the change agent to comprehend those forces that have to be contended with—resisters, leaders, allies. By doing so, say Margulies and Wallace (47, p. 54), the change agent then defines the change actions to be taken in terms of his own
values. Kast and Rosenzweig (34) assert that at this point the change agent is presented with many dilemmas in terms of individual professional versus organizational identity; here, the change agent is forced to face specific choices which, at some point, must be translated into costs in terms of whether or not the entire experience of being a change agent has been worth it. Kast and Rosenzweig identify this as being caused primarily by "basic questions of value systems" (34, p. 93). Managers, in the role of change agents, "should be constantly aware of the possible existence of systematic differences in beliefs, values and patterns of behavior within his organization" write Margulies and Wallace (47, p. 46).

For success, there needs to be a high degree of congruence between the change agent's values and those of the client system. However, prior to any action, it is imperative that the change agent recognize and know his own values. Without doing so, he will not be able to select and combine from his own resources those tools necessary to create the desired change. Bennis and others advise that "He must use his own feelings and emotional apparatus to achieve the best understanding he can of his client's feeling and emotions. Balancing these modes of understanding is part of the artistic skill it requires" (10, p. 134).

Lippitt (43) details to great degree the ethical requirements for change agents by elaborating on a series of basic considerations that include the rationale for specific
task-oriented motivation. It is not necessarily wrong for a change agent to be motivated in part by status, security, and prestige, but "the essential concern should be that the new condition achieved is better than the first, not that any one person should receive credit" (43, p. 67). Lippitt also lists as additional considerations the need for collaboration—ethical change agents recognize the value of other ideas.

Also, experimental problem-solving should be encouraged since preconceptions should not be beyond question. Emphasis is also placed on accountability (in terms of self and others) and confrontation; this means that the person who best understands himself is best able to confront situations that arise in the change process (43, pp. 67-68).

Miller and Prince (51) propose a much more detailed mode for ethical change agent behavior that combines change and systems theories. The main thrust is that prior to taking any actions, change agents "should clearly understand their own drives, needs, values and purposes, as well as those of the system" (51, p. 164). Miller and Prince discuss an action sequence that is particularly applicable to inside change agents in higher education since it relies on realistic appraisal of the environmental system of the organization and shows how to respond to various academic institution roadblocks (51, p. 164).

Baldridge and Dell (7, pp. 15-17) also focus on possible incongruence between the inside change agent and the client's
value systems. The result can only be failure. Since throughout this chapter emphasis has been placed on the fact that change-agent theory and practitioners (both professional and novice) draw from behavioral science roots, another conflict can be seen. Bennis and others report that "in addition to the basically human difficulty in handling value confrontations constructively, behavioral scientists often suffer additional feelings of shame and guilt for being involved in value commitments at all if these are by definition unscientific" (10, p. 468). Value considerations are equated to value commitments, i.e., commitments to collaborative "ways of working [of] basing plans for change upon valid knowledge and information, and to reducing power differentials among men" (10, p. 467).

Argyris (2) identifies what he terms the predominant value system in modern organizations. His model illustrates how traditional organizational values can decrease interpersonal competence and in turn decrease organizational effectiveness. Change agents rely on interpersonal relationships to take action in terms of technique, structure, and tasks. Their main preoccupation is with people and the process of human interaction. Burgher (16, p. 60) says that since the situation often demands that change agents assume a variety of roles, it is imperative that role definition be precise and well stated. This must be in terms of self and client system.
Moore (53) lays some ground rules for change agents that include acknowledgement of the fact that beliefs may not be shared by subordinates and that the change agent's attitudes may not meet with their approval. Bennis and others believe that perhaps the most straightforward way to state the entire values issue is to recognize that the OD tradition in planning is implemented by change agents; they are characterized by developing a sense of self-awareness, by knowledge of organizational behavior and change process, by a transactive style of interacting with others in an organizational client situation and by a humanistic value system (10, p. 273).

Managing Change

It is not within the scope of this study to develop a very detailed position on management science or techniques. Rather, this portion of the review of related literature will focus on the topic of management and how it specifically relates to the change agent. To be sure, such individuals need to be highly qualified and successful managers who are fully cognizant of the principles of management and the skills and resources required; however, it is the position of this study that these are all factors that need to be present for a manager to be or decide to be a successful change agent.

As stated previously, there exists an organizational culture of sorts that must be recognized and totally understood. Margulies and Wallace state that managers who "attempt change programs in ignorance of the cultural context (formal and informal) of the organization may find their time and
effort wasted" (47, p. 45). Beckhard and Harris state, "it is difficult for a stable organization to change itself, that is, for the regular structures of the organization to be the structures used to manage the change" (9, p. 44). Hence, the change agent's primary purpose is managing change.

Most authorities agree that no one single factor can be isolated that determines an individual's capacity for managerial effectiveness. Throughout the literature it is apparent that a diverse combination of factors can emerge that combine to produce successful managers or administrators. Foxley (22, p. 1) suggests that four general groupings may be used to categorize these factors. First, personal characteristics of individuals; second, the managerial process or actual managerial functions utilized by the individual; third, the components that make-up the organizational environment; fourth, the actual outcomes or results of the managerial process employed.

Change can be managed in a variety of different ways. Blake and Mouton (13) established an identification process for managers in terms of style, perception, and role. It is not due to coincidence that the more participatory the manager's own style, the greater the likelihood that he will be a successful change agent. Mandated change is generally viewed as counterproductive in organizations. According to Hipps (31, p. 34) the line between leadership and dictatorship is
easily crossed if the manager does not have the proper understanding of the undertaking.

Bobbe and Schaffer (14) contend that experience with change is a primary prerequisite for the would-be change manager; "The essential element in developing managerial capacity to carry out complex change is successful experience in managing change" (14, p. 7). They suggest a series of "breakthrough projects" that deliver not only immediate success and reinforcement but also provide learning experiences for change agents which "generate the ingredients for additional accelerating progress" (14, p. 7). According to Schaffer (58) change projects should have built in goals of achieving the desired state in a method that satisfies those involved and also provides managers with new skills. Schaffer says,

In this kind of framework, major change, instead of becoming a series of disruptive causes and battles, becomes an accelerating, self-sustaining process involving many aspects of the organization's performance. Success at each level provides the foundation for the next steps. As the enterprise changes, its managers grow, and as they grow they can handle more change (58, p. 83).

This suggests an unfolding maturation process for both the organization and the manager-change agent who takes the lead for that organization.

Experience in directing change is also recognized by Lippitt (43) as being essential. His definition of the professional behavior required to be a change agent includes "a manifestation of appropriate knowledge, skills and
attitudes in our daily work" (43, p. 65). Lippitt adds that this "cannot be merely an outgrowth of the acquisition of degrees" (43, p. 65). The change agent then has to be first and foremost an experienced, competent manager who recognizes the role to be played and the ways and means to play that role most effectively. As stated, without being a successful manager first, one cannot hope to be a successful change agent. In higher education environments, this would appear to be unquestionably the case. In addition to experience, power, position, and priorities need to be recognized.

The change agent needs authority to mobilize and reallocate necessary resources while maintaining regard for ongoing programs. Beckhard and Harris (9) state that the middle manager can accomplish little without the respect and support of the leadership, who condone the change action; peer level members, who provide balance and linkage; and subordinates, who must ultimately support the changed organization. These all underscore the need for the individual to possess a great deal of interpersonal skills, since force and formal power can mean little in reality (9, p. 46).

For the change manager, the challenges are complex and a constant threat to the undertaking. It is solely the responsibility of the change agent to foster in the membership as much understanding as possible of the situation and the consequences of change. In addition, Lippitt (43) believes, the change agent should strive to have members feel that the
process is a voluntary one and that the change includes respect for emotions and values. Lippitt says, "As long as the change agent acts congruently with the principles of the program and as long as the client has a chance to test competence and motives the change agent should be able to provide the psychological support so necessary" (43, p. 57). What all this amounts to is a much more elaborate definition of managerial skills than the traditional terms of directing, planning, controlling, staffing, and organizing.

Manager-change agents need to focus more on the learning potential of the individuals involved than on the actions required to manage those individuals. The change agent-type manager defines professional goals in terms of the institution and population needs. According to Miller and Prince (51) who refer to systems theory, the manager needs to think in terms of the subsystems that comprise the overall suprasystem of the client organization. To manage change, then, those subsystems that are most likely to respond to change efforts must be selected first. Gradually, a communication and reference network emerges within and around this initial client subsystem. By negotiating specific behavior goals with this subsystem and obtaining commitment, Miller and Prince maintain that new concepts and behaviors can be introduced and integrated throughout this group. The change manager can now attempt to transfer these results to the "real world" of the larger system (51, p. 165). This also represents a somewhat
broader approach than defining management in traditional
terms.

Burgher (16), in a work designed for the use of business
consultants, cites Argyris (3), Likert (40), McGregor (50),
Shepard (59) and others in his discussion of the normative
goals of change agents. Included are items that amount to a
basic restatement of the major tenets of management science.
Burgher's main addition can be found in statements concerning
the manager's need to develop better methods of conflict resolu-
tion and development of organic systems. If change brings
about any lasting improvement it should be the creation of a
strong reaction against "the idea of organizations as mecha-
nisms" (16, pp. 63-64). The change agent's humanistic ap-
proach determines goals that differ from those of other mana-
gers in the pure scientific sense (16, p. 64).

Varney (65, p. 188) lists the specific management skills
by which change agents can be identified. Hausser (27) de-
votes an entire book to the need for managers to become change
agents and to ascertain their change direction through aware-
ness of the organization's needs, both group and individual.
Dyer promotes the role of the change agent as an overall
manager who must establish a basic relationship built on "rap-
port, cohesion, or confidence to produce any change" (21,
p. 137).

The synthesis of all these ideas relating to this par-
ticular venue of management might be as follows: managers
can, under certain circumstances, be change agents if they so desire, are properly trained, and possess the appropriate experience. Change agents, however, must always, under all circumstances, be managers.

Change Agent Strategies

Thus far, the discussion has focused on change in organizations and the type of individuals who can most successfully manage the effort required to bring a desired state into reality. It is now necessary to explore the methods available to change agents in educational settings.

In the early 1960s, Bennis and others (10) wrote The Planning of Change, which has served as a primary resource for much that has been written on the subject over the past twenty years. Through three major revisions and several related articles, this work is probably the one most often cited by authors and researchers as the foremost source. When considering how, in fact, change agents work within a system, it is this source that provides the most appropriate direction.

The social scientist generally prefers not to change the system, but to study how it works and to predict what would happen if some new factor were introduced. So we find his attention focused on a "theory of change" or how the system achieves change. In contrast the practitioner is concerned with diagnosis: how to achieve understanding in order to engage in change [and] he needs a "theory of changing" the system (10, p. 99).

It is essential for the change agent to develop this theory-of-changing-the-system concept before any actual change can
be attempted. Wilson (67) agrees and stresses the need for information and data to be made available to the potential manager-change agent to help customize a theory to the particular situation. Wilson gives details on the desirability of having the luxury of using such management tools as a Decision Support System (DSS), Management Information System (MIS), Planning, Program, Budgeting System (PPBS) or a Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT) (67, p. 64). Each of these specialized programs relies on a common product—data presentation in some form or another. The change agent uses this information in the formulation of the required theory of changing.

Lacking such sophisticated and often controversial formal approaches, the individual manager can achieve the same results—the gathering of pertinent data—in other ways. A basic consciousness of when and what conditions favor change can provide the necessary data. Hultman (32) says the change agent can recognize favorable conditions by realizing that people are more likely to change if current beliefs or behavior do not allow them to meet their needs adequately, or if changing will help them more in meeting those needs. In addition, people will change if convinced they are doing so voluntarily and in a participative manner (32).

Dyer (21, p. 140) says change agents will learn much of what they need to know of a situation by developing a true helping relationship attitude. This involves the possession
of true acceptance behavior on the part of the change agent. Behaviors such as listening, accepting, sharing, genuine interest, and expressions of true appreciation provide the change agent with reciprocal responses that return much in the way of constructive data.

The theory of changing provides the change agent with the necessary information to develop a definite change strategy, according to Shepart (59, p. 130), and this becomes the blueprint for action. As in any humanistic approach, the blueprint is open to constant revision within the framework of consistency established by the change strategy. The change agent's responsibility is to recognize the key elements of organizational change and to devise a strategy that addresses itself to the organization's needs and aspirations at that given moment. Shepard says that a clear understanding of organizational dynamics is composed of a complex series of intuitive understandings about the nature and reality of organizational structures.

It is not surprising then that a sound change strategy is also complex. Hultman (32) says that several key characteristics can be found in an effective change strategy. First, it is imperative that a positive change climate be developed by the change agent. The strategy should be to encourage an organization-wide improvement and show members how the change can be of help to them and the organization in general. The effective strategy, which incorporates much of
what this review cites elsewhere, involves a high degree of personalization. Members must see how they will directly benefit from the change, how they are involved in the change decisions, and how the proposed new state will relate to their own values. Hultman states that all of this promotes a sense of teamwork that helps to avoid direct confrontations and risky situations for the change agent. In the end, the effective change strategy provides a true test for the manager's theory of changing that concentrates primarily on controlling factors.

Another possible means of visualizing this, according to Beckhard and Harris (9, p. 27), is to realize that effective change strategies contain an adequate diagnosis of the need for change, a prerequisite to set clear and explicit descriptions of the desired state, a correct picture of the present state, and an identification of the subsystems and members primarily involved. Lippitt (43) agrees and expands the strategy development process to include seven distinct phases. Along with diagnosis, assessment, and other factors previously identified, he adds those of choosing the appropriate role for the change agent, maintenance of the change once achieved, and termination of the helping relationship.

The theory produces the strategy that helps determine the action to be taken by the change agent. Everything up to this point has been preparatory. According to Argyris (3) understanding organizations--how they work and how they change--permits a greater understanding of the type of
individual it takes to manage the changing of them. This individual, says Leavitt (38), in the change agent role, then proceeds to develop the necessary strategies to bring about the change process. Carlisle (17) says all of the contributing factors combine to produce a program that is in balance with the system environment in spite of the fact that its primary purpose is to change that environment. In this vein, it is possible to conceptualize the OD process of change. Foxley (22, p. 18) sees two stages in this process with the change agent-manager-inside consultant accomplishing pre-entry Stage I analysis and actual Stage II intervention. Thus far, much has been discussed about the analysis aspect of change-agent actions.

Varney provides the definition of intervention in OD terminology as "a somewhat precious term for any action on the part of a change agent [that] carries the implication that the action is planned and deliberate" (65, p. 215). In many aspects, this may be too subjective of a statement. Lippitt (43) identifies three different uses of power and seven distinct applications most frequently practiced by managers. Lorsch and Lawrence (44) argue that not all would qualify as change-agent interventions as some such as the unilateral power applications are especially counterproductive in change situations.

Blake and Mouton (13) provide nine concrete kinds of interventions for change agents to utilize in the entry stage.
Each represents a particular state of affairs which with proper planning and analysis during the pre-entry stage will permit the change agent access into the target system. In developing an action strategy, it would be beneficial for the change agent to recognize which of these will most likely match the actual situation within the organization at the time. Blake and Mouton's list includes those areas and topics that are most likely to represent avenues to the successful initiation of a change process within the ongoing activity of the organization. In one technique (named relationships), the change agent focuses on tensions growing out of groups or interpersonal relationships. With the experimentation technique, comparisons are set up and several actions are tested before a decision is made. The intervention technique dilemma identifies significant choice points or exigencies in problem solving and attempts to understand assumptions. The discrepancy technique calls attention to a contradiction in actions or attitudes. Other techniques are called theory, procedural, perspective, organizational structure, and cultural (12, p. 61).

Lippitt (43) chooses to explain intervention in terms of the different roles or combination of roles the change agent can develop as part of the strategy. The scenario envisions eight positions that range from the Advocate--one who persuades client as to proper approach--to the Reflector--one who serves as catalytic agent for client in solving the problem (43, p. 63).
Katz and Kahn (35) suggest that whatever the method employed by the change agent to initiate the intervention and to actually attempt the change process, "considerable importance is attached to establishing himself from the outset as a trustworthy helpful adjunct to the group's own process" (35, p. 508). The intervention can be viewed as perhaps the most integral aspect of the entire change process, since it will be the single most determining factor of whether or not the change agent's other efforts and strategies will succeed. Once the wrong steps have been taken in an intervention, it becomes virtually impossible to reverse the situation. In this case, the change agent's chance for success are perhaps minimal at best. "In behavior specifics," Katz and Kahn write, "the change agent employs the posing of questions to group members; process analysis periods; feedback of observations or feelings; agenda setting, review of appropriateness-testing procedures" (35, p. 508), all of which are intervention attempts that permit further involvement by the change agent.

The entire process of strategy and intervention development is greatly enhanced by the use of models. Lippitt (43) notes that the successful change agent not only practices model building but relies heavily on the technique. Organizations are complex, and models assist in reducing that complexity into simpler, less complicated terms. Lippitt explains that "a model is by nature a simplification and thus may or may not include all the variables"; by eliminating all
but the most essential items, the model serves "as an aid to the event or situation being studied" (43, p. 2). Furthermore, Lippitt says,

In planned change, we must examine the essential variables, then maximize some and minimize others. A professional change agent is more self-conscious about the model because he puts into it variables that may not ordinarily be recognized. A professional change agent should be able to develop a model that is a functional replica of a portion of reality. In doing so, he may use the language of science, but that does not make the entire process scientific. He may not have the many applicable historical models with which to compare the model he develops for the present situation (43, p. 41).

Blake and Mouton caution that change agents should strive to design "a model of what should be the ideal, not the idealistic" (12, p. 111), since the model must be an objective appraisal of the "as is" situation. A true model permits the change agent to realize discrepancies between the system's actual situation versus the hoped for, change-produced ideal. The true model will also lead the change agent to select the correct "steering, correction and control mechanisms" to move the organization (12, p. 117).

Modelling, therefore, can be viewed as an effective tool for the change agent. Lippitt (43, p. 34) suggests that if, in strategy planning, the change agent perceives the functions of the model to be a combination of representing, guiding, interpreting, visualizing, predicting, recreating, and communicating, then the model will provide invaluable assistance in the stage-two intervention process.
Lippitt also believes that the most reliable change model is one that was first identified by Chin. Being developmental in nature, this type "provides a set of expectations about the future of the client system [and] states a developmental process [and] develops a time perspective" (43, pp. 50-51). Kast and Rosenzweig (34) developed a model that they maintain should be the true model for change. It presents a contrasting view of the real and symbolic worlds and delineates the process by which the change agent works with data about the system (real) to develop a first approximation of what the changed system would be like (symbolic). The change agent tests this against the realities of the system (real) and revises the emerging model (symbolic). Then further testing (real), the results of which are realized through intervention steps and organizational analysis as described above, produces the accepted model with which the change agent works. Thus, the final statement of the symbolic world becomes the ultimate goal of the change process. This process should run throughout the change agent's development of theory, strategies, and actual intervention (34, p. 333). In a sense, this model of a model could be applied to each of the different aspects, phases, and stages through which a change agent must move.

Lippitt (43), perhaps, summarizes modelling best by suggesting that the following five basic questions be answered:
1. Does the model account for the stability and continuity in the events at the same time it accounts for changes in them?

2. Where does the model locate the source of change?

3. What does the model assume about how goals and directions are determined?

4. Does the model provide the change agents with levers or handles for affecting the direction, tempo and quality of these processes of change?

5. How does the model place the change agent in the scheme of things? (43, p. 69)

Lippitt adds that "by using models together with his skills as an observer, analyst, and diagnostician the change agent can become more effective" (43, p. 69).

Argyris and Schon (5) have developed MODEL I and MODEL II approaches and have related such techniques to the learning process and organizational development. Heller (28) applies these models to change-agent theory for higher education in terms of total organizational learning, retention and redirection (28, pp. 40-51)

Winstead (66) specifically addresses a change model for higher education that is based primarily on a strengths-weaknesses-opportunities-threats (SWOT) analysis. This is similar to a stage-one analysis of the organization in any field, with the exception of the addition of three basic assumptions about change in higher education. Winstead maintains
that the change agent can assume first that the educational process, organizational structures, and administrative operations are "so complex that it is difficult for institutions to be effectively responsive to the needs for change" (66, p. 25). From this real-world analysis, the change agent can formulate the first approximation (symbolic model) to determine change strategies. The second assumption is that "improved research techniques for collecting and analyzing information exist on most campuses and analytical tools are available" (66, p. 25). This will be the re-testing in the real-world stage that permits further model definition (symbolic). The third assumption brings the process back to reality in that "the complexities of the change process and the comprehensive-ness of the model require on-campus support to expedite the change process" (66, p. 26).

Lindquist (41) provides the most appropriate final analysis of how change agent strategies are grouped in categories representing (a) rationale planning, (b) social interaction, (c) human problem solving, and (d) political activities. Within these general headings can be found the wide range of different approaches and methods that can effectively manage change in higher education environments.

Resistance to Change

Change agents who are engaged in the systematic implementation of a change strategy toward a desired end will always
face resistance. If this were not the case, there would probably be little reason for the existence of a change agent within a system since the organization would change by itself as part of the internal, on-going process.

McFeely (49) discusses resistance in terms of the implementation process which is involved in change actions and which inevitably creates surprises. These result when some elements involved in the change have been overlooked or unappreciated (49, p. 23). Another cause of surprise could result from past situations that remain unresolved or are of a nature that created more organizational damage than realized prior to the change effort. While these represent system problems surprises could be of the change agent's own making in that the time needed to accomplish the change goals was underestimated and, therefore, produces resistance. Another cause could be that during the planning and analyzing stages the change agent overlooked some latent aspects of the process and these, when surfacing later, cause an entirely new group of factors to be managed (49, pp. 22-48). Clearly, minimizing surprises represents an easy way to reduce resistance.

Resistance is, without question, a serious obstacle that every change agent must face. Hultman (32) warns that only through proper, detailed, and accurate planning, along with analysis and strategy development, can it be counterbalanced. For the organization, resistance can become a solution if it perceives the change agent's efforts as trying to change it
"in a way which will either inhibit development or cause less effectiveness" (32, p. 54). For the change agent, resistance is a problem when the proposed change would clearly "allow development of a fuller potential" for the group and they refuse to accept it (32, p. 54).

Odiorne (54) labels resister-type behaviors that change agents need to recognize if they are to be successful. Initial strategy planning should prepare reactions to those who are "idea killers" (54, p. 39) or members who can destroy a sound plan by false analysis or distorting facts. Odiorne describes a "malpractice mentality" that sets activity traps, believes in an ideology of anti-planning, and has undying faith in a bureaucracy that makes cowards out of heroes (54, p. 41).

Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsaker (63) argue that calculated opposition emerges when people see the change effort as having a negative effect on them. Feelings of being threatened lead to resistance "even if there are no certain negative results, because of the fear that the change might damage their interests" (63, p. 10). These authors believe that for the change agent risks are part of the endeavor, while for the follower risks become very real threats to security, reputation, and position if the change effort should fail.

Although Odiorne (54) and Sperry, Mickelson, and Hunsacker (63) are concerned with the field of business consultation, their arguments are very much in line for change agents in higher education. Kauser (33) feels many of the same
bureaucratic traps and unwillingness to take risks can be found in colleges and universities. Often, Kauser argues, the reward system for maintaining the status quo is greater than that of supporting something new and different. As Margulies and Wallace state, "one is even tempted to conclude that modern organizations know far more about resisting and preventing change than they do about initiating and facilitating it" (47, p. 1).

Thomas and Bennis (64) discuss the internal forces that demand change and the change agent who provides the leadership to define and implement the process to cause it. At the same time, Katz and Kahn (36) say, others resist change, and the active resisters lead this opposition. Consequently, organizations can find themselves in a state of tension and conflict. Wilson (67) argues that for the change agent, conflict can be either a cause of disaster or a means of success. While as a social mode conflict is viewed as disruptive and unsettling, it "can be instructive, productive, cathartic and benign [and] open to alteration, direction and management. Those who choose not to be ruled by conflict can instead learn to manage it" (67, p. 106). Grossman agrees and strongly argues that "controlled tension and conflict can serve the best interests of the organization, but it takes a change agent to provide this control" (26, p. 27).

Hersey and Blanchard discuss organizational development and change in great detail in many of their joint works. Their
efforts have been widely used in higher education settings, especially in the area of student development and leadership training. In their Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, Hersey and Blanchard (29) discuss change and the need for it within organizations. In spite of their wide breadth of published material on these subjects, the authors make very little reference to the role of change agents in academic institutions; however, much of their theorizing and postulating can be referenced to this topic.

Hersey and Blanchard rely on Lewin's (39) classic force field analysis and explain resistance to change in this mode. For the change agent, perhaps the entire problem of resistance to change efforts needs to be examined in these terms. Conflict, resistance, and tension are in fact restraining forces while support, timing, and planning are the driving forces. It is imperative then that change agents develop strategies that will insure a greater amount of the latter to successfully overcome the former. Only by doing so can a successful change effort be managed (29, p. 276).

This entire discussion on resistance is purposely limited in scope. The topic of organizational conflict is complex, and it could easily become a tangent to the main question of focusing on the change agent's concern with resistance and how to meet and overcome it. Indeed, as Poulton (57) suggests, no amount of planning, analysis, strategy development, or intervention can overcome resistance if the change agent fails to
identify correctly its causes and supporters. As early sections of this review argue for the need to locate change supporters and members who could provide linkage within the system, so too does the change agent need to plan on answering those who do not follow. Bennis and others, who place this fact into proper perspective and importance, claim that "if the change agent can view the situation with a sympathetic understanding of what the defenders (of the status quo) are seeking to protect, it may prove desirable either to modify the change itself or the strategy being used to achieve it" (10, p. 123).

Summary

This review endeavors to present a synopsis of current theories on the topic of change agents as they might relate to higher educational settings. As the literature points out, the role of the change agent in higher education is unlike that found in any other setting. Due to the educational environment in which tradition, territoriality, and tenure hold sway over normal change forces, the change agent-manager faces a variety of particular challenges with which colleagues in other fields do not have to contend. As indicated, strategies and interventions have to be derived from special models that allow for peculiarities in all the normal change-related variables, including resistance. The individual who becomes a change agent in higher education has the added responsibility
of identifying and preparing appropriate responses to each of these aspects of normal change in academia.

The available body of literature on organizational change rarely specifies higher education. This lack of specialized treatment results because the study of management in itself is a relatively new field, and educators, until very recently, have somewhat successfully insulated themselves, their environment, and their organizational systems from planned change tactics.

The bulk of the primary literature on this subject emerged during the late 1950s and early to middle 1960s. Landmark works by Argyris (1), Baldrige (6), Beckhard (8), Bennis and Associates (10), Katz and Kahn (35), and McGregor (50), among others, provide much of the material from which this review was drawn—yet, very little specific reference to higher education is made. Specialized sources such as Foxley (22), Freeman (23), Hipps (31), Millet (52), and Winstead (66) are found in lesser works by these practitioners of change management in higher education. Much of this type of information is found in the *New Directions* series of publications (in which a number of these authors publish), which are compiled from contributors who someday may expand article and single-chapter materials into full-fledged treatments of the subject. Even the noted specialists of developmental and management concepts for higher education, such as Hersey and Blanchard (29), limit their concern for change agent treatments.
This review has established that (a) it is indeed practical and valid to look to management science for applications to and understanding of educational organizations, (b) such scientific approaches are founded upon principles consistent with those of educational organizations and systems, (c) transference of such theories and research findings does in fact facilitate development of such activities in the purely academic-oriented environment, and (d) what has evolved thus far appears to, at best, merely identify the world of educational management science. It is hoped that this study will address an area of relatively untouched territory and contribute to a growing body of knowledge that will some day stand on its own merits as a recognized field of research.
CHAPTER III
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES

This chapter presents a description of the methods and procedures used for the collection and analyses of data. Included are descriptions of the target population, an explanation of the instrument as it relates to the research questions, procedures for the collection of data, and the procedures for the analysis of data.

The Target Population

The focus of this study is middle managers in the higher education setting as represented by union directors. Middle managers are identified as those individuals who are responsible as a head of a department unit, as a director, dean, or manager reporting to a vice president or equivalent. In the area of union-campus activities, this includes management of a budget, staff, facility, and fiscally accountable extra-curricular activities programs. Such management much include responsibility for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling the operation. In addition, the local campus title is not necessarily the determining factor as to inclusion in this study since it is more a question of actual job duties and responsibilities rather than local nomenclature. This is a significant point mainly because the population is unlike
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any possible lateral comparison to faculty and central admin-
istrative positions which tend to be fairly consistent from
institution to institution regardless of size or designation
as two- or four-year school or university. Support staff,
particularly in areas of student services, operate under a
wide range of titles including counselor, coordinator, di-
rector, dean, and adviser. This is complicated by a further
distinction based on an area designation of union, activities,
campus life, student development or program coordinator. Fur-
ther confusion is found in that at certain institutions what
might be viewed as the minimum educational preparation re-
quired--a Master's degree in some appropriate field--is not
even a job requirement. In spite of this, in a cross section
of campuses it can be found that whatever the specific title
and area designation, job responsibilities and tasks exhibit
a commonality that removes individual campus distinctions.

For purposes of this study, an effort was made to iden-
tify the campus activities professionals. This is a desig-
nation that serves to cut across individual distinctions and
situations and provides a common ground for identifying in
truth what these trained specialists do as middle managers in
higher educational administrative systems. The campus acti-
vities professional is defined as an individual who is schooled
in a discipline that includes preparation in appropriate fields
of study related to the position held and who possesses the
basic skills and abilities to manage effectively a campus
activities program as an educational component of the institution. This would also include successful management of an educational facility that is directly related to that activities program—i.e., the campus union (also referred to as center, commons, hall, or even field house).

To facilitate the identification of these individuals, the professional member lists of two national organizations were used. The Association of College Unions—International is comprised mainly of union directors; these represent both the true facilities managers who, on many campuses, are also those responsible for the activities program. The National Association for Campus Activities' membership is mainly of activities directors who also, on many campuses, are the facilities managers. By selecting those with "director" title from both lists, it is possible to gain a true listing of those middle managers who fit the definition of educational facilities managers and who are campus activities professionals. (Note: due to title ambiguity, there is a percentage of individuals who maintain dual membership.) In an effort to eliminate the need for determining which position the individual holds, the designation of campus activities professional covers both areas.

This use of membership lists provides a population of slightly over 300 individuals, all of whom pay dues and demonstrate an interest in and commitment to their profession. This represents the entire population and the initial attempt
is to receive at least a 60 per cent return of the survey instrument from this population. In order to secure the required return, additional correspondence was originally planned for but proved to be unnecessary.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The data required for this study were acquired from a survey. The process that produced the final product required a series of interrelated steps, each of which was designed to develop the instrument from its inception to the finished product.

The final draft of the survey is the product of the development of the research questions of this study. A preliminary set of general questions was constructed that was aimed at identifying management techniques which middle managers might employ if they were change-oriented individuals. This then permitted larger groupings of questions into areas that tend to focus on particular management styles. From this, it was determined that answering the research questions would permit the identification of specific management profiles that characterize individual middle managers' actions; therefore, the first completed instrument was designed with specific questions derived from each research question (Appendix A).

Since the main theme of this study is the role of middle managers as change agents, the survey questions are worded in such a manner as to provide responses that clearly indicate
the individual's actual performance in terms that each individual perceives and defines. The primary research questions ask specifically to what degree individuals (a) feel properly trained, (b) perceive themselves as having an influence within the institutions, and (c) perceive themselves of being capable of causing change because of their influence. (The fourth research question focuses entirely on demographic variables.) Based upon this type of collected data, respondents are classified as either high, medium, or low potential change agents.

To determine if the instrument did indeed both answer the research questions and provide the means to designate individuals into one of the three identified categories, a panel of professional members in the field was selected to define and validate the criteria for the study. It should be noted that in this field veteran practitioners constitute the researchers and teachers of the subject. The initial panel is composed of five recognized leaders in the field who were asked to participate in original research that would contribute to the existing body of knowledge about their profession.

This panel is composed of the following five individuals:

Panelist One is the president-elect of a major national professional association. He has over nine years in the field as a paid professional and has served in a number of national and regional capacities within his organization. In addition, he is a recognized educational session presentor at conferences, leadership trainer, and developer of training materials.
Currently, he is employed as a director of a student center at a private university and is completing his doctorate.

Panelist Two is a recognized consultant in the business world who has a long background in student affairs and management. Recently appointed the Director of Union, Activities, and Residence Life at a large western campus, he continues his association with management training experts such as Lippett. He is also a frequent presenter at national conferences.

Panelist Three, with over twelve years as a student personnel professional, is currently serving as a vice president of a national professional association and is nominated for next spring's presidential election. Holding two Master's degrees, this panelist is a recognized staff development consultant, author, and mentor, and he is considered one of the field's most prominent leaders. He is currently the director of one of the largest union operations in the nation.

Panelist Four, while being one of the youngest nationally recognized leaders of student affairs associations and organizations, has nearly ten years of actual middle management experience. Known for her leadership, academic excellence, and professional accomplishments, she is a recognized expert in the field who is currently assuming a new directorship in an eastern university.

Panelist Five has left the field for private business since the inception of this study. Prior to this, he had over fifteen years in various capacities in student union management. While
in the field he was instrumental in establishing a regional structure for a national professional organization in a five-state area. He was and is widely sought after to conduct seminars and staff training programs on management and professional development topics. He is currently a doctoral candidate in higher education.

This group's charge was threefold in determining the primary evaluative criteria for the study. First, they were requested to aid in the definitions of terms and behaviors for change agents in higher education and their specific roles. In addition, the panel was asked to define the specific dimensions of the three management profile categories of high, medium and low change agent potential. Finally, the panel was asked to react to the preliminary questionnaire as to whether or not the instrument measured all areas involved in the identification of the topic and categories.

The returns from this entire panel provided the following:

1. Definitions and description of (a) change agent in higher education, (b) ways in which a professional director can be a change agent, (c) types of behaviors exhibited by change agents, and (d) role played by change agents in higher education;

2. Consensus definitions of the three categories of change agent potential; and

3. A refined survey instrument (Appendix B).
The above were achieved by synthesizing the individual responses and redefining and restructuring the various items. The instrument received the greatest degree of revision and refinement; in many cases questions were reworded or deleted. In addition, the survey was reworked to incorporate the other information supplied by the panel and by the research committee.

In an effort to establish further content validity and evaluative criteria, the refined second-stage questionnaire and other material were returned to the original panel plus three added members, who were also selected for their individual expertise, reputation, and leadership (Appendix C). The three additional members are as follows:

Panelist Six is perhaps the most well-known member of the profession today. This woman is a recognized teacher, author, facilitator, and authority on management in student unions. She is a prolific author and in constant demand for seminars and workshops. In addition, she is a researcher and a true applied behavioral scientist. She has served on a national leadership level several times and is in many ways considered the true role model for professional activities persons. She is currently a union director and chair of a national research and training committee.

Panelist Seven, although professionally one of the youngest on this panel, has gained considerable reputation for her skills as a facilitator and a trainer. While she is primarily
experienced in student development training, she has recently become involved in management science and staff development. She is also experienced as a consultant in the business world, and she currently serves as a union director.

Panelist Eight, who is presently a national chairperson for educational services, currently holds a dean's position. He has a wide range of educational experience in management, student development, and facilities coordination. He has been instrumental in developing a five-year systems-based plan for the largest professional association in the field. He is also currently a doctoral candidate in higher education.

The role of this expanded group was therefore somewhat widened. Given the full definition of each potential change-agent category, the panel was asked to react to each item of the refined questionnaire. A statement and question were also added: "Specific responses to each item of the questionnaire have been designated as results that will identify the individual's management profile generally and place the person into one of the categories. Do you agree or disagree with these designations?"

A Response Identification Chart (Appendix D) was included with the instructions to the panel so that they could compare the suggested survey response to the chart and react to whether or not the "particular response does in fact represent behavior indicative of a particular category." The instructions were (a) mark the chart with changes or deletions, and (b) bear in
mind that a majority of those responding would be required to change the chart as submitted. The six returning panelists assisted in accomplishing the stage-three refinement of the survey and contributed to two chart placement changes as discussed below.

At this point, the survey was composed of eight demographic questions and twenty-four specific change-agent related questions (Appendix F) that were drawn from the original research questions. A number of questions were designed to be discriminatory so that category classification might be possible even with complete individual perception responses.

The final refinement stage for the instrument involved submitting it to three former members of the profession who were asked to (a) respond to the survey questions from their current vantage point, and (b) react to items and format and suggest possible changes. This group was composed of the following:

1. A former union director who is now an assistant vice president of student affairs. He is responsible for the development of a facilities management training program at the Master's level and has written several articles and a recent book that has become the standard for new professionals in the field. While serving as the chairman of the board of a national professional association, he was instrumental in establishing a competency-based program for student activities managers. He holds a doctorate in administration.
2. A former director of student activities who now serves as an executive assistant to the president at a large two-year school. This individual is from the "old school" of union professionals who had a background in recreation and athletics before attending a student personnel program. In over ten years in the field, he was very active in education positions in professional associations.

3. A former union director who is presently a dean of students at a private institution. While in the field, he was heavily involved in management research and training; his primary concerns focused on fiscal accountability and facilities development. His background includes a variety of union-activities experiences as well as classroom teaching. He holds a doctorate in higher education.

The responses from this group, while not finding fault with content or objectives, were interesting since reactions to certain questions were consistent and enlightening. At the conclusion of this process, the survey instrument was prepared for distribution. These individuals were eliminated as respondents for the survey.

Description of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument contains questions that require the respondent to make a decision on such topics as actual involvement in upper-level decision making at the institution in the form of actual, solicited, and self-initiated input. If the
response is yes to any of the three areas, then a further identification of how the input is delivered to the system by the respondent is sought (questions 9-12). Change requires planning and development, and the role of the change agent implies involvement in the process of bringing about both factors in a manner consistent with the institution's priorities. Respondents were asked to identify their specific roles in determining the mission and goals of the institution and the funding of programs and operations (questions 13 and 14).

Respondents were asked to identify their particular institutional status as compared to other administrators (question 15) and to indicate where they would be placed in the power structure on their campus (question 24). In conjunction with these questions, a reaction was sought to the classification as middle manager in terms of position, authority, independence, and related perceptions of the individual versus actual managerial circumstances (question 25).

In an effort to determine the initiative capacity of the individual, a set of questions were designed to produce responses that could be a determinant as to the individual's placement in a change-agent potential category (questions 16-21). These items were constructed so that the respondents would, in each instance, be rating themselves in a number of change-related areas. Contrasting these were two items (questions 22 and 23) that require a perception of how others in the work environment would rate the respondents' change efforts.
Reactions to standard management skills were sought in three questions (questions 26-28) aimed at usage of these techniques in day-to-day functioning, approaching change, and, singularly important, in the degree of influence on their performance of duty. Three items were designed to identify actual personal change accomplishments and the cost of being a change agent (questions 29-31).

In scoring the instruments, the individual responses were measured against the criteria established by the expanded panel of professional experts, and from this a designation was made as to the change agent potential for each manager. The Response Identification Chart (Appendix D) displays the range of replies that will permit the management-profile classification of each individual. The categories are as follows:

1. High change agent potential--A highly positive perception that the individual in question generally feels almost always competent enough to initiate a change pattern within the power situation of the institution;

2. Moderate change agent potential--A positive perception that the individual in question generally feels moderately competent to initiate a change pattern within the power structure of the institution;

3. Low change agent potential--A negative perception that the individual in question generally feels rarely able to initiate a change pattern within the power structure of the institution.
In dealing with perceptions held by individual managers, the data results should determine if these impressions are, in fact, congruent with the reality of change in higher education systems. The Response Identification Chart required two changes. For question 15, a third choice was added to the high category, and two were deleted and one added to the moderate category. Question 17 was restructured so that an actual continuum was established throughout the three categories.

A series of ten items were designed to determine the demographic data along with area of reporting and activity level within professional organizations. This data is used to answer research question four which is concerned with the influence of certain demographic variables (such as size of enrollment, individual education, years of service).

Procedures for Data Collection

As indicated, the population for this study is union and activities directors at colleges and universities. Utilizing professional member lists, 315 names were identified as fulfilling the population membership criteria discussed in the first section of this chapter. The 1982-1983 directories for both associations were used. Individual address labels carried the name, title, and insert "or current director." This insured that surveys would not be lost due to normal turnover or incorrect routing. Each was accompanied by a pre-addressed,
stamped envelope. The cover letter indicated method of selection, purpose of survey, and return deadline (Appendix E).

Due to the time of year of distribution, it was felt that a series of follow-up mailings and perhaps telephone contact might be required to generate the required 60 per cent return. Initial printing of the instrument was on yellow paper to be followed by light blue and light green. This procedure would enable the establishment of a time frame for responses. Control over returns to prevent duplicate mailings was handled by comparing name of respondent and postmark to the master list. Since 60 per cent is the stated required return, failure to achieve this number would necessitate repeated attempts to secure responses because the population as defined is finite.

In an effort to promote quick return, the survey was phototypeset so that the appearance is professional and attractive. The time frame for returns was kept at a minimum of nine days and a maximum of sixteen days from mailing date of the initial batch. This approach was developed out of a belief that if individuals did not respond within a relatively short period of time, another mailing would be required.

Analyses of Data

The stated objective of this study is an attempt to establish a relationship between the individual's perceptions of his or her role, power, and influence as a change agent in
an educational system of management and the actual situational realities that exist in higher education which affect that role. Due to the nature of the study, the results are subject to the limitations of self-perceptions and self-evaluation. Asking individuals to rate their performance, accomplishments, and stature within their institutions presupposes a high degree of honesty and unbiased vision. It is hoped that the design of the survey instrument will offset a significant percentage of this type error due to questions that bring forth valid information in spite of individual perceptions and evaluations.

The data will be treated solely as descriptive material since the focus is on an entire defined population. Using the criteria established by the juried panel, each response was compared with the Response Identification Chart, and a determination was made regarding the individual's management profile as to change-agent potential. From this, it is possible to make statements concerning the entire group in relation to the four primary research questions of the study and the basic assumption that middle managers demonstrate agreement that they are, in fact, instrumental in creating change. If the self-analysis by the group matches the criteria validity that has been designed in such a way as to establish a change-agent identity, then certain other conclusions may also be drawn from the data.

Further analysis of the data is accomplished by intra-group comparison on an item-by-item basis to establish
percentage results for each category and the individual responses to individual questions. By determining how all the potential high change agent individuals respond to a particular question on innovative style, for example, permits a broader insight into that particular group's make-up and dimension. This is done for each potential change-agent category. Inter-categorical comparisons are also made to determine if any further descriptive data can be derived from the returns. The demographic data permits a further detailing of the percentage reporting and establishes the basis for additional comparisons on the basis of institutional size, sex, education, years of service, and other similar variables.

Each research question is related to specific questions of the survey. By maintaining the research question subject, the initial category distribution created by the responses is presented in another manner. The research question that focuses on the extent to which individuals perceive themselves as influencing upper level policy is answered in terms of high, medium, and low perception analysis. What the study purports to do is exploit the topic of change as the means to determine the perceived effectiveness of this particular group of middle managers within the operating system. The results will be valid descriptors of a more general interpretation of overall management style and effectiveness.
Summary

To determine whether or not union directors can be identified as change agents in higher education, this study intends to establish valid, acceptable criteria by which to measure individual perceptions of action, accomplishment, and activity. In doing so, an abstract evaluative process provides descriptive data by which valid comparisons of percentage results, combined with other supportive data, permits the answering of specific questions and thereby the formulation of conclusions. The study is strengthened by the fact that an entire, identifiable finite population is included by responding to the research instrument. Even so, the population, described by the return of the accepted minimum of 60 per cent, lends itself to scientific analysis and findings.

The criteria-setting panel was selected from among the leaders in the field. Change results from managers who realize it is desirable since they have identified an existing discrepancy within the system and are willing to do what is necessary to correct the environment. If the results of this survey show that the respondent group of middle managers have the perception that they are indeed effective change agents, the true test will be to investigate the environment for evidence of that perception. If the results produce an individual with the perception of change agent effectiveness, the true test then would be to investigate the client institution for the evidence of that individual perception.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Introduction

The data presented are the results received from a survey of the total population of campus activities professionals at the director level who are currently members of the Association of College Unions—International, and the National Association for Campus Activities. The survey was designed to test the perceptions of the respondents about their individual degree of competence, influence, and power position on campus and the possible effect of situational and demographic variables on those items. In addition, the descriptive information received is used to make general statements concerning these individuals as groups of potential change agents within the higher educational system in which they function as middle managers. The categorization of individuals into high, medium, or low change agent potential groups is seen as an integral part of this study since the middle manager is assumed to be a prime candidate for the organization change agent.

While the four research questions focus on individual perceptions, when answered through the survey data, they provide the basis for group identification and determination statements. The overall results of the individual respondents
designation as a particular type of potential change agent, when combined with others in the same category, is then compared on a group basis with the other categories. From this, a consensus profile of the population is derived that permits comparison of this particular group of middle managers with the realities of change potential in higher education.

In a derivative of systems theory application, the study seeks to establish the individual director as a type of subsystem of the suprasystem that is the overall profession. The high, medium, and low categories are but larger subsystems to be viewed as component parts of the general system environment that is the profession itself.

Survey Results

A total of 315 instruments were initially mailed to designated directors. To establish a valid data base to use as descriptive information about the population, it was determined that a 60 per cent return is required. As noted, the research plan included subsequent mailing and other contact in order to assure the required percentage return. This proved unnecessary since prior to the deadline, a total of 209 responses were received (66.3%). Of these, one return envelope was received empty, two were returned by the Postal Service as undeliverable, and two directors returned the instrument unanswered because of personal circumstances. In the tabulation process, a total of five responses were rejected from inclusion because the respondent failed to answer
a majority of the questions (four had completely overlooked the second page). This reduced the number of useable returns to 199 or 63 per cent. Among these, some individuals did not answer all questions, which produced a different number of total responses for some questions.

The survey addresses four research questions. In an attempt to identify perception positions and degrees, the answers to the survey questions, for the most part, rely on individual honesty, self-awareness, and error. To a certain extent the researcher and reader must be aware that such investigation is open to judgemental and objective distortions of perceived and actual competence, influence, and power position—the main ingredients sought by this study.

There are some survey items which were designed to answer, in part, all four research questions (or specific groups of all four) and will be interpreted in that manner. The focus of these questions is such that they identify the cross category, profession-wide areas that facilitate generalization and group description.

The criteria established by the panel provide the response pattern that determines the category designation for an individual. Comparisons between the categories and further intraquestion choice selections permit further development and definition of the three change agent profiles. The survey items for each research question are specifically related to the particular question. Table I illustrates the questionnaire design.
TABLE I
SURVEY INSTRUMENT ITEM DISTRIBUTION
AS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Individual Competence and Training</td>
<td>11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Individual Influence as Middle Managers</td>
<td>9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 24, 25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Individual Influence in overall Institution</td>
<td>15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Situational and Demographic Variables</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 32, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data are viewed from three distinct vantage points. First, on an individual research question basis, specific survey items as identified in Table I are examined to determine how the total group of respondents replied to the survey and how the data are distributed. Second, based on established criteria, the entire group is divided on the basis of high, medium, and low change agent potential. These results are related to the concept of organizational change and change agent behavior as discussed in the review of the literature. The final report highlights specific key survey item responses that relate to the individual research questions in terms of the high, medium, and low categories. Contrasts and comparisons are in some cases made on the basis of an intraquestion item analysis. Following is a presentation of the collected data.
Research Question I: Competency Perceptions as Related to Position

The initial research question centers on the competence felt by individual directors in relation to job challenges and demands. As with each research question, what is sought is the perception of the individual respondents as to the degree of self-determined feelings of competence. A series of questions was designed to reveal each individual's perception as to the adequacy of his individual behavior and management style in the face of the requirements of his middle managerial position today.

Survey item 11 asked if the administration seeks advice on major policy matters. Of the 199 respondents, 97 (48.7%) indicated that they perceive their advice as being sought by the administration, 92 (46.2%) perceive their advice as not being sought, and 10 (5%) did not respond.

As indicated by Table II data for those 97 respondents who feel that they have a relationship with the administration that permits input into the formulation of major policy matters, 41.2 per cent of this group feels that their input is requested as part of the initial planning process on their respective campus. However, the majority (55.6%) of the group indicated that their input is generally sought after the initial planning and implementation process is underway.
TABLE II

METHODS MOST FREQUENTLY USED BY ADMINISTRATION TO SEEK ADVICE ON MAJOR ISSUES FROM RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Affirmative Group N=97</th>
<th>Total Respondents N=199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Part of the process from the start</td>
<td>40 (41.2%)</td>
<td>40 (20.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Brought in after planning starts</td>
<td>27 (27.8%)</td>
<td>27 (13.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Asked for input after idea is formulated</td>
<td>27 (27.8%)</td>
<td>27 (13.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. None of the above</td>
<td>3 (3.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97 (100.0%)</td>
<td>97 (48.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey item 17 specifically addressed competency perceptions in that respondents were requested to rate their own abilities as an innovator or change agent. These data are presented in Table III.

Since no definitive criteria were provided for each grade, the responses represent clear indications of perception in terms of innovative abilities. A majority (87%) of the respondents perceive themselves to be above average (B+ to A categories) in this respect, while 11.1 per cent give themselves perfect A+ ratings. Conversely, an
insignificant 1 per cent feel that they are C grade innovators at best.

TABLE III

SELF RATINGS BY RESPONDENTS OF THEIR ABILITIES AS INNOVATORS OR CHANGE AGENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing the establishment of a competency-adequacy profile for union directors as a group, survey item 18 is closely related to the preceding question. Respondents were requested to react a step further by selecting a single term that best describes their particular innovative style. Table IV displays the data on the range of received reactions.

Again, since no definitive criteria were provided, these answers represent individual perceptive evaluations of behavior most often employed when attempting an innovation or change. The question was designed to be a continuum with the
assertive choice as the supposed central tendency. As indicated in Table IV, the data show an almost equal division between the upper three choices with 86 (43%) responses and the lower three choices with 72 (36%) responses. As expected, the central types of descriptive behaviors—creative, assertive, and planned—encompass the majority of responses (80.9%).

TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term for Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Threatening</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey item 20 also asked the respondents to indicate their feelings of adequacy with regard to assuming additional duties or responsibilities. Respondents were asked to identify
what type of action would be followed by them if a new project or program were to be undertaken (no mention is made of whether such program is self-initiated or assigned). Table V presents these data.

**TABLE V**

**RESPONDENTS REACTIONS REGARDING ALLOCATION OF TIME TO HANDLE A NEW PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Allocation Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop something</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate it</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find time</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait for time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of dealing with the prospect of a new project, well over half (56.8%) of the directors feel that in some way, other than waiting for the opportunity or dropping something else, they could arrange to address the situation adequately. Highly related to this is their individual perception of how well they generally perform. Responses to survey item 21 with all 199 responding indicate overwhelmingly (85%) that directors rely on regular evaluation of programs and operations, which suggests the method of reallocating available time to pending programs and projects.
Research Question I requires a finer definition of both competency and adequacy for the role, responsibility and position of union directors in the overall management system of the institution. As middle managers, these individuals by definition must possess a range of managerial and administrative skills in order to function successfully and effectively. A series of three survey instrument questions specifically addressed management tenets and identifies this group's views on each in terms of the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as mastering and utilizing these scientific basics.

Survey questions 26, 27, and 28 required responses of individual perceptions on planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, in terms of time spent doing each and which was individually most important for change as middle managers. Table VI presents a comparative analysis of the response data.

While directing (28.6%) emerges as the primary way the highest percentage of respondents spend their actual on-the-job time, planning (67.4%) and organizing (17.6%) are perceived as the most important management skills needed by middle managers in general.

Finally, Research Question I is addressed by survey item 30. In an effort to determine respondents' feelings of adequacy, frustration, and possible positive reinforcements,
and their perceptions of worth of effort, appreciation, and value to the institutional system, item 30 requested a simple decision as to whether or not the cost of being innovative, in terms of time, energy, effort, and consequences, is worth the measurable results. Of 199 replies, 88 per cent indicated a positive response.

**TABLE VI**

**RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF FIVE MANAGEMENT COMPONENTS IN RELATION TO ALLOCATION OF TIME, IMPORTANCE OF COMPONENT, AND IMPORTANCE TO MIDDLE MANAGER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Component</th>
<th>Per Cent of Time Allocation</th>
<th>Importance of Component to Change</th>
<th>Importance of Component to Middle Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, Research Question I seeks to determine if this particular group of middle managers perceives itself to be effective in terms of training, background, and competency to deal with the challenges of their positions. From the
data collected, a number of inferences can be drawn and
generalizations made for the purposes of this study.

1. On the whole, while tending to be indecisive about
whether or not the general administration seeks their input,
the respondents generally feel that they are a part of the
decision-making process at some point. Specifically, for
this study, those who feel or perceive themselves to be a
great part of that process can possibly be viewed in terms
of change agent potential.

2. Perceptions of adequacy and competence emerge
strongly in self-rating and style selection. That this group
tends to view itself in the upper half of the rating scale,
and expresses itself primarily in terms of creativity and
planning, also strongly supports the contention that they
would also perceive themselves as change agents.

3. The overwhelming reliance on evaluation processes
and positive feelings for expended endeavors is a notable
combination in terms of successfully facilitating organi-
zational change. Change implies planning if it is to be
meaningful and lasting. Bladridge (1) feels that the change
agent must know the organization thoroughly and understand
its climate and operating system. This can be accomplished
by an inside change agent through planning and evaluation--
both primary change strategies.

4. The results would tend to validate the often-repeated
remarks made by respondents concerning the lack of time for
other than routine managerial tasks. The high selection of planning as the individually most important skill relates to survey item 21 with its 85 per cent response that indicates a regular evaluation process is used. The relatively low across-the-chart position of the staffing component is most likely indicative of consistent limited budgetary control or discretion at middle management levels. Controlling is perceived as the least desirable managerial skill in all three categories. This would be a predictable response from a group that is overwhelmingly comprised of individuals with humanistic, liberal arts educational training and philosophies. Since nearly half the respondents (43.8%) did not respond to the first item, it may indicate a poorly worded question.

Research Question II: Competency Perceptions as Related to Reporting System

The second research question seeks to determine perceptions related to the degree to which each respondent perceives he has the ability to influence, from his position of middle manager, upper-level policy formulation as derived from the institution's mission statement, immediate priorities, and funding base. This question specifically focuses on the individual in relation to the structure or larger subsystem that makes up the day-to-day sphere of influence and responsibility. This question seeks perceptions concerning items that are more operational in nature than political. The survey questions asked the campus activities professionals
to respond on their view of themselves in the limited scenario of their particular divisions—with conscious regard to other areas also.

Survey item 9 specifically asked if the individual's supervisor consults or informs him on matters that represent policy directly affecting the director's own area. Of the 195 responding to this item, 173 or 87 per cent (total N=199) feel that they are consulted prior to decision-making of this type. This would tend to indicate that these individuals feel they have definite influence at some upper level, which generally is the source of major policy.

The responses to survey item 10 (Table VII) establish a more precise picture of the group's feeling concerning decision-making advice to upper-management levels. Of the 199 respondents, 135 (67.8%) indicated that they are able to advise and influence the administration, 60 (30.2%) feel that they are not listened to, and 4 (2%) did not respond. As shown by Table VII data, a substantial 45.2 per cent of these 135 respondents feel that they are part of the change process from the beginning and advise upper-level managers. An equal number (choices B and C), however, feel that their input is most often reactive in nature.

Survey items 12 and 13 (Tables VIII and IX) addressed the primary concern of Research Question II by directly asking for individual perceptions on both the initiation of major policy changes and influence on determining institution mission
priorities and funding. From this set of responses the over-
all group's perceptions illustrate both the degree and depth
of belief that they have actual upper-level influence. Of
the 199 respondents, 131 (65.8%) perceive themselves as major
policy innovators, 57 (28.6%) do not, and 11 (5.5%) did not
respond.

TABLE VII

METHODS MOST FREQUENTLY USED BY RESPONDENTS
TO ADVISE OR SUGGEST CHANGES
TO ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Affirmative Group N=135</th>
<th>Total Respondents N=199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Part of the process from inception</td>
<td>61 (45.2%)</td>
<td>61 (30.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Brought in after planning starts</td>
<td>31 (23.0%)</td>
<td>31 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Asked for input after idea is formulated</td>
<td>30 (22.2%)</td>
<td>30 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. None of the above</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>11 (8.1%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135 (100.0%)</td>
<td>135 (67.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data in Table VIII for these 131
respondents, the more passive methods (such as preparing a
report, asking permission, and making a formal proposal)
generally outweigh behavior that might be labeled assertive. From the data presented, it is obvious that this subgroup (65.8%) feels it has the ability to be major policy initiators. In addition, the primary methods employed appear generally to be associated with major policy matters in that such areas require research and formal preliminary proposal work.

TABLE VIII
PERCEPTIONS OF THE RESPONDENT CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS REGARDING THE METHODS USED TO INITIATE MAJOR POLICY CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Affirmative Group N=131</th>
<th>Total Respondents N=199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Use other source to initiate</td>
<td>9 (6.8%)</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Prepare a report/research</td>
<td>24 (18.3%)</td>
<td>24 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lobby</td>
<td>16 (12.2%)</td>
<td>16 (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Assign a committee</td>
<td>15 (11.4%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ask permission to go ahead</td>
<td>21 (16.1%)</td>
<td>21 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Make a formal proposal</td>
<td>29 (22.1%)</td>
<td>29 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Go ahead</td>
<td>17 (13.1%)</td>
<td>17 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Other</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131 (100.0%)</td>
<td>131 (65.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the survey item (13) that asked respondents if they had had an influence on matters that determine institutional mission, priorities, and funding, 124 (62.3%) of the 199 respondents answered yes, 72 (36.2%) answered no, and 4 (1.5%) did not respond. The data in Table IX show the methods used by these 124 respondents to affect such change. Over 72 per cent of the subgroup (62.3%) feels that their influence takes a direct form since they perceive choices A, B, and D (Table IX) as being the best descriptors of their role in whatever the process.

### TABLE IX

**PERCEPTIONS OF THE RESPONDENT CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS REGARDING THE TYPE OF INFLUENCE USED TO AFFECT INSTITUTIONAL MISSION, PRIORITIES, AND FUNDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Influence</th>
<th>Affirmative Group N=124</th>
<th>Total Respondents N=199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Members of task force</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Part of the planning process</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Respondent to a proposal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Contributor to a concept being developed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Respondent to a proposal being developed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked about their individual budgets (item 14), 121 (60.8%) selected the proactive choice and 52 (26.1%) indicated reactive as the best way to describe the annual funding process on individual campuses; 26 (13.1%) did not make a choice. The question sought to identify more detailed impressions of the respondents' conception of their role in the work environment. The proactive group tended to describe their budget process in terms of planning, developing, monitoring, and overall responsibility for their in-house financial operations. One respondent reported it as a "projection of needs." Statements such as these tend to indicate a high level of feeling of ownership and influence. Generally, the proactive people appear to perceive themselves as having a significant level of influence in financial matters.

The reactive group divided into two distinct groups. The first defined reactive in terms of responses to forces and matters out of their control. Representative of this group are statements such as "we must respond to unexpected problems" and their attribution of budget problems to the economy and state allocated fees. While clearly not caused by a lack of influence or a perception of an inadequate power base to accomplish anything, these problems also affect those in the proactive group. This portion of the reactors tended to place blame for their lack of control on factors other than the system or their individual place within it. The second group
of reactors clearly identified their feelings of inadequacy in relation to their operating system. This group tended to report "top down amounts assigned," "supervisor reports outcome (of budget process); I cope," and "they tell you how much you receive." This group then generally expresses its feelings of not having a great deal of influence within its reporting system in terms of frustration and acquiescence.

From responses to item 19, an attempt was made to determine the perceptions of campus activities professionals regarding their levels of innovative autonomy. This is described in terms of new duties during the past year and how those responsibilities came about. Of the 194 responding, 35 (17.6%) indicated that most new projects were assigned by a supervisor, while 18 (9%) said most were developed as a result of a staff project. Contrasting these choices, a notable 141 (70.9%) respondents stated that they initiated the majority of their new duties. The five non-respondents account for 2.5 per cent.

The responses to items 24 and 25 helped to establish exact perceptions of respondents regarding their power positions on campus. The first question asked the respondent to select a proper position on a continuum of systems and the second tested for reaction to the term "middle manager" within those systems. Tables X and XI present these data.

As Tables X and XI data indicate, the majority (93.6%) place themselves in the middle to upper levels of their
institution's management and tend to agree with the classification of their positions as that of middle manager.

**TABLE X**

**RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PLACEMENT LEVEL OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS IN MANAGEMENT CONTINUUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Levels</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmers, Head Residents, etc.</td>
<td>Directors--Housing, Admissions, etc.</td>
<td>Deans, Department Heads</td>
<td>Vice Presidents, Top Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>3.0**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Response N=3
**No Response %=1.5

**TABLE XI**

**RESPONDENTS' REACTION TO IDENTIFICATION OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS AS MIDDLE MANAGERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Agree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Position is higher</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Position is lower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Do not understand concept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question did not consider local campus titles or the fact that there is little if any title standardization within the profession. Strictly from individual perceptions, it appears that campus activities professionals as a group can be identified as middle managers within the limits defined for this study in Chapter I since 60.8 per cent accept this designation.

In summary, Research Question II addresses the role directors see for themselves within their reporting system. Generally speaking, as a group, these directors feel they play a deciding role within the power structure of the university and consequently a number of inferences can be drawn from the data.

1. In terms of being a successful inside change agent, it would appear then that the people in this group are in a position to make change happen. This further implies both a direct influence and a role in the development of mission and priorities, which tends to dispute the data from items 10 and 11.

2. As part of the governing and administrative functions of the university (if they do in fact have access and influence in matters pertaining to mission, priorities, and funding), then they are potential change agents. Such knowledge would permit factual and accurate interpretation of the need for change, the planning required to bring it about,
and the political awareness to insure its implementation and permanency.

3. Middle managers, as perceived by this group, can become change agents in terms of being either the implementor of some system-wide planned, desired, and needed change even if brought into the process after upper level administrative decision on the course to follow, or the initiator of change based on their own insightful awareness.

4. As a group, these individuals emerge as having the general impression that they do work with their supervisors in a proactive fashion, that their input is generally sought, and their expertise generally relied on for important projects.

5. A sense of group status seems to emerge from these results that portrays directors as having a definite, appreciated role in their operating systems--one that is recognized by upper-level management. For potential change agents, these are all essential ingredients.

Research Question III: Competency Perceptions as Related to the Entire Operating System

Along with individual feelings of competency and a perception of performance in a proactive relationship with the supervising system, it is also necessary to have a balanced existence with other, and often competing, areas of the university. Research Question III focuses on the directors' perceptions of the degree to which they feel they command
enough influence and respect from the campus in general to effect significant change. This research question specifically attempts to elicit respondents' perceptions regarding the faculty and academic administration as well as supervisors and staff.

Traditionally, the fun-and-games stereotype of student center operations and activities programs has been at odds with the notion that the classroom and academic development are the sole priority for the existence of higher education institutions. Brattain (3) feels that the relatively recent emergence of student affairs professionals with academic credentials and the implementation of leadership training and human development programs have generally not had much impact on reducing long-held opinions. Hersey and Blanchard (4) indicate that faculty opposition, political action and, often times, open antagonism have created difficulties and frustrations for many directors. Likewise, lack of proper training, programs of questionable value, and inadequate accountability on the part of the activities professional has contributed greatly to the often-strained relationship with faculty. Research Question III therefore seeks to identify the group's perception of its campus position by asking a series of questions about status, opposition and reactions.

Survey item 15 asked the respondents to place themselves in a comparative position with administrators who are strictly academic. Table XII displays these data results.
TABLE XII
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF COMPARABLE POSITION EQUIVALENCY OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Academic area department head</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Academic division chair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assistant dean</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. None of the above</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these data, more than a quarter (27.1%) of the respondents find no comparison between their position and that of any academic administrator, while an equal percentage (27.1%) feel equal to a department head, the lowest academic level listed. Although the local differences are multitude, the question especially addressed the cross-sectional situation, which is apparently represented by the extremes of these two predominant choices. In many ways, these responses provide a fairly well distributed data pattern and tend to establish that some perceptive relationship to academic titles exists. It should be noted that several university systems accord faculty rank to certain support staff positions.
The responses to item 16 attempted to gauge the degree of perceived resistance that directors feel when attempting to initiate a new campus-wide program. These efforts are more likely to be viewed in a variety of different ways than as a policy or program change within the building or activities spheres. By seeking opinions on resistance, important insights can be gained concerning change actions and the traditional faculty-staff attitude previously described. Table XIII reports these data results.

**TABLE XIII**

**RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AREAS OF RESISTANCE TO PROGRAMS INITIATED BY CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Resistance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. In-house staff</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Vice presidents of respondent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. President</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other directors on campus</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other vice presidents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. No Response</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lowest percentage registered attributes resistance to supervisor (2.5%). Even with the addition of those who report to a vice president (5%), less than 10 per cent of the respondents feel that resistance comes mainly from supervisors. In contrast, 69 (34.7%) respondents identify the faculty as the main opponents to innovative new programs.

Survey items 22 and 23 are related. Item 22 asked respondents to rank a list of academic staff positions in the institution that would give the highest rating to campus activities professionals who were trying to bring about change. Item 23 asked respondents to rank the same list of academic staff positions that would give the lowest marks to campus activities professionals who sought to maintain the status quo. Again, in testing perceptions and feelings, the results provide useful insight into this group’s overall view of its position on campus. Table XIV presents the combined data.

Once again, it appears this group recognizes the faculty as its primary organizational adversary (34.7%). The results tend to confirm the perception of the faculty and academic administrators as the groups that give the least support for change activities and also the lowest support for respondents’ efforts to keep things as they are. While not an exact distribution, the two sets of results tend to form an inverse proportional display of the data. This would be expected and tends to provide an acceptable test of the group’s perceptions on this point. Clearly, the group feels that it does, in fact,
represent change on campus since such change efforts are perceived by the directors to cause resistance reactions.

TABLE XIV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE RATINGS BY CAMPUS STAFF POSITIONS FOR CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF CHANGE AGENT ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position</th>
<th>Rating of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High/Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. President</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supervisor</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty in general</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Academic administrators</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Your staff</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other directors on campus</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data should be compared to the results of item 24 (Table X) where over one third (34.7%) indicated they feel their particular position and title places them on a par with academic deans and department heads. Even if there is equal position, status, and authority, it appears that there can also be a significant degree of negative reaction to respondents' efforts and decisions.
In summary, Research Question III focuses on respondents' self perceptions of having a degree of influence throughout the campus that is high enough to allow them to bring about change. In terms of discussing this group as change agents, the data imply the following:

1. In order to bring about organizational change, the change agent must occupy a position of recognized influence. It appears that this group feels it possesses such influence.

2. In addition, this group appears to agree generally on the campus staff areas from which resistance is most likely to be engendered. Successful change agents must be able to recognize resistance and develop adequate strategies to overcome it.

3. Likewise, the group appears to be cognizant of what behaviors are most likely to produce resistance, which is another awareness to which a successful change agent responds in a positive manner.

4. Finally, the data appear to indicate that there is a general awareness that in-house staff can also offer resistance. If change is to be accomplished, this group also needs to be considered by the potential change agent.

From the data collected in response to the first three research questions, an overall performance profile of the group emerges in relationship to change potential. In terms of change agent behavior, the survey results describe a group of professionals that generally can be viewed as meeting the
criteria for such a role. The ability to recognize necessary management skills, the required competency, areas of influence and credibility within the established systems appear to be present among the majority of the respondents.

Research Question IV: Management Profile Definition

Research Question IV addresses a series of situational and demographic variables. The objective of this question is to determine if items such as school size, education, years of service, area of reporting, and involvement in professional associations have any direct influence on both the respondents' perceptions of influence and success within the overall institutional suprasystem and their potential to be change agents. To place this data in a more useful reporting mode, it is necessary to interpret the foregoing data by another method.

One of the objectives of this study is to determine the respondents' ability to function as change agents while being recognized middle managers. Thus far, each research question has been answered in terms of specific survey-item responses, and some inferences have been made from the group's answers. To enhance the descriptive data and to add more refinement and dimension to results based solely on respondents' perceptions and opinions, the further classifications of high, medium, and low change agent potential are used.

By utilizing the Response Identification Chart (Appendix D), it is possible to categorize respondents generally on the
basis of their responses. The developmental process for the categories and this chart were reported in Chapter III. Basically, the indicated perceptions of the respondents are matched with categorical criteria that the professional panel of experts approved of as being definitive for the three change categories. While not concrete, this process establishes a management profile of high, medium, and low change agent potential that generally describes each individual respondent's potential in terms of the survey choices made. Specific replies are matched to particular behaviors that are identified as those qualities and characteristics which a change agent should possess. Measuring responses in terms of those aspects produces the category classifications, allows a more in-depth examination of the perceptions supplied by the respondents, and permits a further classification of the group based upon those perceptions. In a sense, each of the first three research questions is viewed from the vantage point of exactly how strong or valid are individual perceptions when tested against objective measuring criteria. While not eliminating the inherent weakness found in soliciting individual perceptions and self-evaluations, this process does add to the overall validity of the study through both the criteria testing and several discriminating questions.

Research Question IV is discussed in terms of high, medium, and low change agent potential categories. The responses to all previous questions have been individually tested
against the Response Identification Chart as have the items related to Research Question IV to provide a complete profile for each respondent. It is those responses then that place each respondent into a particular category. The demographic and situational variables data are presented in terms of both group and category results. Reference to the Response Identification Chart indicates which choices place an individual into a particular category. Further discussion follows the next set of data presentation.

Table XV, a composite table of the first six survey questions, presents the range of demographic data reported in high, medium, and low categories with respondents' percentages for each question and category. The data indicate that this group scored predominantly as high change agents when matched to the evaluative criteria. However, it is understood that perceptive-type response questionnaires allow respondents a full range of self-diagnosis that may or may not be accurate.

As indicated by Table XV, the high change agent potential profile emerges as the strongest represented category based on the criteria established by the panel for this classification. In this study, the high profile most generally typifies a professional who has more than thirteen years in the field, a master's degree, is a male who is between 30 to 39 years old, and who is employed by a school with an enrollment of under 5,000 that is a public institution.
The group is similarly characterized when compared to individual results. Aside from the three category classification, the overall profile of the group indicates a comparatively young group of professionals (63.3% are younger than 40), with considerable academic preparation (83.9% have at least a Master's degree), the majority of whom are in the process of maintaining long-term careers (69.8% have been campus activities professionals for eight years or longer). While the largest number of respondents hold a Master's degree, no provisions were made in the survey instrument to indicate respondents' continuing education for other advanced degrees. However, a disproportion exists between those who have the longest service time (40.1%) and those who have doctorates (10.5%), which perhaps indicates that many do not continue with graduate work. Since the largest age group is found in the combined 30 to 39 year old categories (49.2%), and the greatest number of respondents fall into the 8-12 (29.7%) and 13+ (40.1%) years of service categories (69.8%), the combined results suggest that the profession is generally composed of individuals who remained with this career following academic preparation (assuming a graduating age of from 21 to 23).

Since the largest number of respondents are from schools of less than 5,000 students (43.2%), this may be indicative of the general membership of professional organizations in this field and may further suggest a series of other relationships. High category respondents make up 82.5 per cent of the 13 or
more years in the profession subgroup and 59.3 per cent of the 8 to 12 years of service subgroup. In addition, they comprise 67 per cent of those at the Master's level and nearly 81 per cent of those who hold doctorate degrees. Over 70 per cent of the males and 54.5 per cent of the females fall into the high category. Slightly over two-thirds of the combined 30 to 39 year age group are high change agent profile types. The greatest percentage of high profile respondents (75%) are from schools that enroll between 10,000 and 20,000 students, while this group also makes up 71 per cent of those employed in public institutions and over 55 per cent of those in private schools.

TABLE XV

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Years of service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D./Ph.D.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XV--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional enrollment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20M+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey item 7 addressed a situational variable that can be linked to several of the items that answer previous research questions. In terms of reporting system, the respondents were asked to identify their perception of the relationship that
exists with their immediate supervisor. Table XVI illustrates the results in high, medium, and low categories and for the total group.

**TABLE XVI**

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP WITH THEIR SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Highly supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Non-Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Antagonistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted, this total group generally is inclined to feel a part of the decision-making process of their institutions. The results for all categories overwhelmingly favor the positive end of the continuum which tend to follow from such perceptions. High category respondents comprise 78.1 per cent and 55.5 per cent of the first two subgroup row totals, respectively.
Item 8 explored this concept further by asking the respondents to identify the style of administration under which their unit operates in the overall organization. Table XVII data report the results; since the majority view (80.4%) is that theirs is a participatory-type administrative structure tends to indicate a positive atmosphere for change actions for the individuals. Those in the low profile category also indicate this perception of their administrations. It is not possible from the data to determine the respondents' definition of each choice. The high category represents over 50 per cent of the participatory choice subgroup.

**TABLE XVII**

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR UNITS' ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN IN RELATIONSHIP TO INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Autocratic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Participatory</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Laissez-faire</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another situational variable item (32) determined the level of involvement this group exhibits in professional organizations. Inferences about the level of participation can be made concerning individual commitment and even employment situations that encourage or block such activity. Table XVIII displays the results.

**TABLE XVIII**

**RESPONDENTS' LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Very active</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Active</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Somewhat active</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Member only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is likely that high profile respondents would indicate a high level of professional association involvement, which with this group accounts for slightly over half of the total (choices A and B = 51.2%). This likelihood can be supported from the standpoint that greater involvement exposes individuals...
to new concepts and other dynamic individuals and is further evidence of professional and career commitment. This same type individual would also be the change agent type since many of the same drives and motives are involved. High category respondents make up 79.2 per cent of the very active subgroup and 63.4 per cent of the active subgroup. The medium change agent profile group represents nearly 20 per cent and slightly over 30 per cent of these two groups, respectively.

Results of this nature provide a clarified analyses of the change agent profiles. The final survey item (33) for Research Question IV concerns area of reporting. Change agents were initially behavioral scientists. Beckhard and Harris (2) believe individuals with a behavioral studies or humanistic educational background can be effective change agents. This profession is almost exclusively comprised of individuals who have student personnel, counseling, or similar academic experience. The reporting structure must be supportive for change agent action to succeed. The question to be answered is what percentage of this population reports to supervisors of similar background. The data in Table XIX illustrate the results.

Of the low change agent potential profile, two individuals report to non-student affairs type supervisors (16.7%), while 11.8 per cent of the medium respondents and 13.5 per cent of the high category do so. Basically, this group, in all categories, reports to student affairs supervisors of some type.
TABLE XIX
RESPONDENTS' IDENTIFICATION OF POSITION TITLE
OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP fiscal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary services manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP student affairs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of student activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, of the seventeen high-category responses in non-student affairs situations, all but three had selected either the autocratic or laissez-faire choice (as shown in Table XVII), while all of the six medium-category individuals
selected either of these choices. In the low profile column, the administrative vice president was perceived to be autocratic while the fiscal affairs vice president was termed laissez-faire.

For Research Question IV, several summary points may be made as follows.

1. The group is generally well educated and familiar with academic settings.

2. The group appears to be career and profession oriented.

3. The group as a whole feels positive about their supervisors and their relationship with them. Also, the group generally reports to supervisors who have similar training and philosophical backgrounds.

4. It is a relatively young group.

5. There is a relatively large percentage of potential change agents as defined by members of the profession. Generally, this group represents individuals who could become successful change agents in higher education on the basis of their background, professionalism, and career commitment.

Further Discussion on Change Agent Potential as Related to the Research Questions

As noted, responses to each question for each individual were measured against the evaluative criteria devised by the panel of professional experts. This makes it possible to categorically divide the entire group by terms other than
simple reporting of percentages for survey item choices. While establishing a criteria for classification, the previous response pattern analysis does not provide hard and fast measurements that definitely place a respondent in a definite descriptive mold. While this study has focused on perceptions of individuals in this profession, the evaluative criteria of the panel are also based on perceptions of what change agents can and should exhibit at different levels of potential. The differentiation between high and low potential is often not great for a particular item or behavior. It is, however, the collective responses to overall established descriptive criteria that place a respondent into one category or another.

Along with this are items which clearly tend to indicate, in spite of a respondent's stated perceptions, whether or not change has been accomplished and whether or not the individual is in fact a potential change agent. As a result, some consistently high responding individuals emerge in the medium change agent potential category because their final, overall profile does not meet the established criteria.

Overall survey results point to a large majority of respondents who emerge with high change agent potential profiles. Based on usable returns (N=199), the breakdown shows that 134 (67.3%) respondents have a high change agent profile, 53 (26.7%) have a medium change agent profile, and 12 (6%) have a low change agent profile.
Survey item 17 (Table III) was used to answer Research Question I; in an effort to determine respondents' perceptions of competency and adequacy to face the demands and challenges of their positions, respondents were asked to rate themselves as innovators. Further examination of the data is presented in Table XX in terms of the high, medium, and low change agent potential criteria where a specific response was deemed appropriate to each particular category.

**TABLE XX**

RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' SELF RATING OF INNOVATION LEVEL TO CHANGE AGENT POTENTIAL CATEGORIES

| Innovation Grade | Change Agent Category | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
|                  | High  | Medium | Low  | Total | |
|                  | $N$   | $\%$  | $N$  | $\%$ | $N$  | $\%$ | $N$  | $\%$ |
| A+               | 18    | 9.1   | 3    | 1.5  | 1    | .5   | 22   | 11.1 |
| A                | 59    | 29.6  | 13   | 6.5  | 3    | 1.5  | 75   | 37.8 |
| B+               | 51    | 25.6  | 21   | 10.5 | 4    | 2.0  | 76   | 38.2 |
| B                | 3     | 1.5   | 10   | 5.0  | 3    | 1.5  | 16   | 8.0  |
| C                | 1     | .5    | .    | .    | 1    | .5   | 2    | 1.0  |
| No Response      | .     | .     | .    | .    | .    | .    | 8    | 4.0  |
| Total            | 132   | 66.3  | 47   | 23.6 | 12   | 6.0  | 199  | 100.0 |

These data indicate that grades A and B+ were primarily selected by the high change agent type respondents and these choices comprise the majority in each line total (78.7% for
A grade and 67% for B+ grade). Proportionally, the medium and low respondents rate themselves in greater numbers in the lower grade choices, as was to be expected. From this it can be seen that it could be anticipated that a professional with high change agent potential or actual accomplishment would choose a self-innovation style grade, as this group of high respondents has done.

Survey item 18 (Table IV) went further in asking for a term that best describes that innovation style. Table XXI presents these results according to change agent profile.

As indicated on the Response Identification Chart, expected behavior for high, medium, and low change agent profiles is again borne out by the data results. Creative and planned styles are those most widely used by the respondents. For those who selected creative, high-profile types constitute 67.6 per cent, medium 28 per cent, and low respondents 4 per cent. Planned style behavior received similar responses with 60.6 per cent, 32.7 per cent and 6.5 per cent for high, medium, and low, respectively. Assertive style behavior, while recognized as a valid strategy for change agents, does not emerge as a strong choice of the responding group. Bold, constrained and non-threatening styles received inconsequential returns. All data collected from the group appear to be generally consistent with established criteria.

From the responses to these two questions, it appears that a group which generally rates itself quite high for
innovation and which relies on positive innovative styles could be said to have a perception of adequate skill and competence to meet employment tasks and challenges in change situations. This is somewhat enhanced by the fact that the majority of the respondents do in fact score as high change agents when their perceptions are compared to the expected perceptions on the criterion scale.

**TABLE XXI**

RELATIONSHIPS OF RESPONDENTS' SELF DESCRIPTIONS OF INNOVATIVE CHANGE AGENT STYLES ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term for Style</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-threatening</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question II focused on influence within the reporting and administrative systems. Three survey items, which are reexamined in terms of the definitive criteria of expected results, provide expanded comparisons of returned data. Survey item 9 asked if consultation takes place with supervisors in most instances when policy decisions are involved that affect the respondents' area. Nearly 89 percent indicated they were consulted rather than informed in such instances. Table XXII illustrates the data results in terms of change agent profiles.

**TABLE XXII**

RELATIONSHIPS OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TYPE OF COMMUNICATION ON POLICY MATTERS WITH SUPERVISORS ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Type</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consult</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Inform</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results verify the expected returns for a group that feels consulted in general by its supervisors and would also be considered as change agents in terms of established
criteria. The high profile subgroup overwhelmingly selected the predicted response (consult) as did the medium subgroup.

Item 10 from the survey seeks the level of actual input by respondents into upper-level decision making. Nearly 68 per cent responded that they have a say in the decision-making process. The change agent profile criteria indicate that high change agents would so respond. Seventy-four per cent of those answering Yes were classified as high-profile individuals. Of the 135 positive responses received, the 100 (74.1%) in the high-profile group responded that they were either (A) asked to take part in the process from the beginning or (C) asked for advice if the idea is a possible desirable direction. In this instance, again, the established criteria is compatible with the descriptive data received. The medium group was also consistent with the projected results as 17.7 per cent in this category selected either (A) or (B) to indicate that they were brought in after the initial planning starts (as predicted). A negative answer to this item automatically placed the respondent in the low category.

The final significant item for Research Question II is survey item 19 regarding initiation of new duties. High profile individuals were predicted to select either of choice B (developed as a result of a staff project) or C (initiated by you). Table XXIII displays these data results.
TABLE XXIII

RELATIONSHIPS OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SOURCE OF INITIATION OF NEW DUTIES ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Choice</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Assigned by supervisor</td>
<td>19  9.5</td>
<td>11  5.5</td>
<td>5  2.5</td>
<td>35  17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Developed from staff</td>
<td>9  4.5</td>
<td>9  4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18  9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Initiated by you</td>
<td>104 52.3</td>
<td>30 15.0</td>
<td>7  3.5</td>
<td>141 70.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>5  2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132 66.3</td>
<td>50 25.1</td>
<td>12 6.0</td>
<td>199 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the high group data is actually as expected, the medium and low profiles deviate considerably from anticipated results. As stated, however, the category selections are not precise, and it is the overall set of responses that places an individual into a particular grouping. That those who are considered generally as low profile individuals should select a high or medium profile choice does not indicate a notable inconsistency, since at some point numerous out-of-character responses would result in different categorical classifications.
For Research Question II, these profile analyses are important. The group generally feels it does have input and influence in decision making at the upper levels, as is indicated by the entire survey results. The further refinement into categories establishes that the majority tend to be high change-agent profile respondents and, if that perception of influence is correct, then they could conceivably be actual, effective change agents within their systems.

The same consistency generally holds true for the medium and low categories also. The criteria emerge as a measure by which the three categories are validated.

Research Question III is very similar in its purpose although the direction in which influence and authority are viewed is outward—across the entire university community—rather than merely within a respondent's reporting system. Key survey questions for this area are items 15 and 16 that address status and resistance to change efforts for which the respondent is responsible. Data results from these questions describe a group that perceives itself equal to an academic administrator of either division chair, department head, or assistant dean. They also identify the faculty as nearly the single most important source of resistance to their efforts.

In terms of change agent profiles, the criteria establish specific items for each category. Table XXIV displays item 15 data (Table XII) in change agent profile categories.
### TABLE XXIV

**The Relationship of Respondents' Perceptions of Comparable Position Equivalency of Campus Activities Professionals and Academic Administrative Levels According to Change Agent Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Academic department head</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Academic division chair</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assistant dean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dean</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. None of the above</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For high profile respondents, the criteria answers were any comparison to an academic administrative position from department head upward. While slightly less than 85 per cent of the highly classified respondents indicated such choices, 14.6 per cent did not make this comparison. The largest number (17) of medium profile respondents selected choice E above the possible equivalencies. Even in the low category,
only slightly less than 30 per cent selected the criteria-indicated choice E. Generally, it is sufficient to state that this group as a whole perceives itself as being on a par with some level of middle management academic administrator. Those with stated high-change agent profiles predominantly view themselves as equal to these academic counterparts. If this par status is a correct perception, then it would appear that a percentage of this group could be successful change agents within their organizational settings.

Survey item 16 measures perceptions of resistance; specifically, where do the respondents perceive the most resistance when they attempt change. In simple analysis (Table XIII), the faculty emerged as the single most notable source of resistance (34.7%). The change agent profile criteria indicate that the high category individuals would most likely select any of the choices available. Resistance to change agents is recognized as part of the process and, consequently, planned for through the development of specific strategies. As Lippitt (6) indicates, resistance, in itself, and not specific sources is viewed as what is to be answered. The criteria indicate that medium profile individuals would cite either the faculty or their supervisors as the primary choice, while low profile respondents would select their supervisors or staff. Table XXV displays the results after applying change agent criteria. While 44 per cent of the high subgroup identifies the faculty as their primary resistance,
TABLE XXV

THE RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AREAS OF RESISTANCE TO PROGRAMS INITIATED BY CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice president</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other directors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vice presidents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the 48 responses is nearly 70 per cent of the total that selected this source. However, generally speaking, the high type respondents range throughout the field of choices as the criteria suggest. Other directors and other vice presidents appear as resistance sources, which is to be expected, since change agents, as Hultman (5) argues, are often viewed with suspicion or anxiety by others who in this case may add territoriality to the causes. The medium group tends to
follow the criteria somewhat in that the faculty is the single most perceived source of resistance (46.5%). The low group responses were close to predicted with in-house staff and supervisors as sources of resistance.

Research Question III, when viewed through these representative questions, can be answered in more emphatic terms. Yes, the group in general views itself as on an equal basis with academic administrators who are generally drawn from the ranks of those who constitute their main opposition when attempting change action on the campus. However, it can be argued from the data that those most capable of being change agents recognize this source of opposition, plan to answer it, and feel positive about their status, rank, and influence on campus in order to facilitate effective change strategies.

Research Questions II and III have to be viewed in a somewhat similar fashion since their topics are similar although their individual aims are specialized. However, the further categorical analysis of the overall group has tended to recognize a specific element within the total group that meets, in generalized terms, criteria that describe a successful change agent pattern of behaviors, actions, and perceptions in settings similar to that of the tested population. Since change is generally discussed in specifics of management and management skills, a further presentation of additional survey items will directly establish this study's results in change agent terms. Survey item 27 required respondents to
select the one most important management technique in their view. These data are presented in Table XXVI.

**TABLE XXVI**

RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Planning</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Organizing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Directing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Controlling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria for the high category list planning as the choice primary management technique that change agents would employ. The 95 responses to this choice constitute nearly 50 per cent of all the replies and 71 per cent of the replies for this particular item. In the medium range, a deviation is noted as planning again is the primary choice (16.1%) while the criteria establish organizing, which accounts for a
significant second choice (26% of the column total). The low category, with only twelve total responses, is fairly well distributed with planning again as the most important technique to the majority in this subgroup. The criteria-established technique of directing registers as the second selection. In general, the results overall are what might be expected for managers with strong liberal arts, humanistic educational backgrounds.

The respondents' attitudes concerning being identified and termed as middle managers was tested (item 25, Table XI). Simple reporting indicates that the group definitely accepts this title (60.8% agree). The following enhanced data in Table XXVII are displayed in categorical analysis to test those responses in terms of established criteria.

The established criteria are validated by the responses as over half (60.8%) of all respondents and over two thirds (69%) of those in the high category selected the agree choice. That the majority views itself as middle managers is notable for the discussion of this population as change agents. These high potential individuals in this sense have identified themselves as managers who are well-placed in the organization to be in the forefront of change activities. A relatively notable number of high profile respondents (21.9% of column total) selected C, registering their perception of their positions as being higher than middle management. The large reply from smaller institutions may account for this since
it is not uncommon to find their union or activities directors with the titles of assistant dean or dean.

TABLE XXVII

RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' REACTION TO IDENTIFICATION OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES PROFESSIONALS AS MIDDLE MANAGERS ACCORDING TO CHANGE AGENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Change Agent Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Agree, best description</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disagree, doesn't do justice</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Position is higher</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Position is lower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Do not understand concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of middle management titles, both the middle and low range profile respondents also heavily agreed with the title. This indicates a general across-the-population (60.8%) acceptance of the label.
Two questions, which have not previously been discussed, asked for specific replies to be given by the respondents. The first asked that individuals list up to three proposed changes they have made during the past year and then check the number accomplished. Projects currently in progress were to be excluded. In a straightforward numerical analysis, the criteria established three accomplished changes for the high profile, two or one accomplishments for the medium profile, and one or none for the low profile category. The responses to this question emerged as a clear deciding factor for the high category since all three changes had to be present. This produced, along with the rest of the responses, a total of 134 individuals or 67.3 per cent in the high category (all 199 responded to this question). In a similar fashion, the criteria produced 53 (26.7%) medium profile respondents and twelve (6%) low-category individuals. Since many of the questions allowed for a range of answers that generally produced a category for a respondent, the answers to this question definitely determined categorical placement. No distinction was made concerning the accomplished change projects as to scope, quality, or overall caliber. As a result, a wide variety of items was listed.

Item 31 was, however, identified by criteria as having specific areas into which all of the responses were divided. For the high category, people was the response to the question of the single most important element needed to be convinced
if change is to be successful. For change agents to be successful, the people to be affected by the change must see its value, then accept and support the change. Change agents address their efforts to all people in the system since their primary objective is to bring about a difference in environmental conditions that affect all members. Rather than identifying a particular target element to convince, as in recognizing resistance, high change agent profile individuals will plan for this by using specific strategies. The criteria indicate overall that medium-range individuals will indicate an area identified as supervisor (meaning their immediate supervisor) or some element of the upper administration. Low profile individuals, according to criteria, would respond by identifying a wide-range of items.

The results for this question follow the criteria very closely. High profile respondents list responses such as people, student body, division staff, staff members who are assigned a new idea, and lobbying concerned parties. One individual stressed including everyone involved in the entire process, while another calls for wide participation at an early stage that allows for and encourages involvement.

Medium profile individuals tended to cite the need for open-minded administrators and convincing the president of the college. One individual listed top-level administrators as the prime target. The low profile people suggest other
elements as necessary for change such as surveys, documentation, and welfare of the students.

An answer to this question did not act as a deciding factor to place someone into a particular category. Rather, the criteria, in a type of self test, indicate that these types of responses could be expected from individuals who fall into these particular categories. Generally speaking, the respondents did provide answers that are indicative of the category into which their previous responses had placed them.

Summary

The data presented in this chapter can be summarized as follows.

1. There is a positive perception among these 199 respondents that they are sufficiently prepared to meet the challenge of their profession and to be the initiators of change actions within the scope of their position.

2. There is a general feeling of competency among the group that tends to be exhibited by their having a high self-appraisal as innovators, being self-starters for new tasks, and having an effective leadership style of behavior that produces positive results in change undertakings.

3. The group generally describes itself as being oriented to management skills and techniques which is illustrated by their recognition of these approaches as being most successful in their particular change endeavors.
4. For a group of self-described innovators and change promoters, this population overwhelmingly feels the price of inventiveness has been worth whatever they individually view the costs to be.

5. There is a notable degree of perception that the respondents do, in fact, take part in upper-level decision making and overall policy creation for the institution.

6. These respondents regard themselves as having positive, effective, and important relationships with their supervisors and upper management in general.

7. In practical, measurable terms, these respondents feel that they have a definite proactive role in the creation and disbursement of their budgets and actual funding.

8. Generally, these respondents feel that they have recognizable influence and leadership in cross-campus matters and politics even where recognized resistor groups are identified.

9. For the most part, respondents' attitudes and perceptions are that their positions rank on a par with middle and upper-level academic administrators.

10. By the standards established in the evaluative criteria, these respondents are predominantly a potentially high change agent population given all the variables and perceptions investigated within this study.

11. Actual change has been instituted by this population as evidenced by returned data.
12. Management abilities and approaches are significant to this population and readily indicated as important concepts.

13. This particular group of respondents recognizes the benefits of continued involvement with professional associations in various degrees of levels of participation.

14. Generally speaking, this is a group of potential change agents at all levels of the profiles described. The basic requirements of successful change action behaviors tend to be exhibited by the overall group.

15. Campus activities professionals are by their own perception middle managers with adequate influence, status and ability to be change agents in their organizational setting.

16. The respondents have identified the faculty and academic administrators as their main source of resistance, conflict and general difficulty when attempting to alter the status quo.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent individuals in middle management positions in campus activities perceive themselves to be effective enough as change agents in the system in which they operate to bring about desired improvements. The descriptive data findings are reported in relation to particular research questions and also discussed in terms of established response criteria in order to determine general potential behavior profiles.

Data for this study was collected from a thirty-three item survey that was mailed to 315 college union and activities directors nationwide. A total of 199 (63%) usable returns were received. Responses were treated as descriptive data and reported as percentage results.

The following data findings are summarized according to the research questions and the profile categories:

1. There is a positive perception among these 199 respondents that they are sufficiently prepared to meet the challenge of their profession and to be the initiators of change actions within the scope of their position.
2. There is a general feeling of competency among the group that tends to be exhibited by their having a high self-appraisal as innovators, being self-starters for new tasks, and having an effective leadership style of behavior that produces positive results in change undertakings.

3. The group generally describes itself as being oriented to management skills and techniques which is illustrated by their recognition of these approaches as being most successful in their particular change endeavors.

4. For a group of self-described innovators and change promoters, this population overwhelmingly feels the price of inventiveness has been worth whatever they individually view the costs to be.

5. There is a notable degree of perception that the respondents do, in fact, take part in upper-level decision making and overall policy creation for the institution.

6. These respondents regard themselves as having positive, effective, and important relationships with their supervisors and upper management in general.

7. In practical, measurable terms, these respondents feel that they have a definite proactive role in the creation and disbursement of their budgets and actual funding.

8. Generally, these respondents feel that they have recognizable influence and leadership in cross-campus matters and politics even where recognized resistor groups are identified.
9. For the most part, respondents' attitudes and perceptions are that their positions rank on a par with middle and upper-level academic administrators.

10. By the standards established in the evaluative criteria, these respondents are predominantly a potentially high change agent population given all the variables and perceptions investigated within this study.

11. Actual change has been instituted by this population as evidenced by return data.

12. Management abilities and approaches are significant to this population and readily indicated as important concepts.

13. This particular group of respondents recognizes the benefits of continued involvement with professional associations in various degrees of levels of participation.

14. Generally speaking, this is a group of potential change agents at all levels of the profiles described. The basic requirements of successful change action behaviors tend to be exhibited by the overall group.

15. Campus activities professionals are by their own perception middle managers with adequate influence, status and ability to be change agents in their organizational setting.

16. The respondents have identified the faculty and academic administrators as their main source of resistance, conflict and general difficulty when attempting to alter the status quo.
Discussion of Data Findings

As indicated by Lippitt (7), organizations fall into a continuum from power-to-role-to-task-to-people orientation. Higher education exhibits a composite identity that, at times, seems to draw from each of these. At different administrative levels, manager-change agents are likely to encounter evidence of each of these orientations and must, therefore, be aware of these aspects of organizational personality. From the data received, it appears that this respondent group possesses this awareness and generally functions in a manner to address it.

McGregor's work (9) indicates how the individual develops a management leadership style that will accomplish operational objectives, which for the respondent group could be highly change related. Kast and Rosenzweig (6) feel the successful change agent needs to identify the distribution of functions that exist in the organization. Among these are items that these respondents readily recognize and, in their perspective, apparently sufficiently address; these include the vertical and horizontal authority relationships, communication and decision process, and the formal governing system. The survey results appear to indicate a high degree of consciousness of these areas on the part of the respondents.

In many ways, these respondents have a very thorough understanding of systems theory and recognize their place in the overall system that is their university. Agreeing with
Carlisle's (5) theory, generally, there appears to be an ability to manipulate and process the systems involved in order to produce the change that the respondents view as desirable.

Beckhard (2), Bennis (3), and other major theorists repeatedly stress that the first step in a successful change process is to identify the parts of the system that are most likely to be involved. This implies a level of perception that permits an examination of the entire system and all its components. From this, change actions are planned and tested. From the data, it is apparent that the majority of the respondent group practices this type of systems analysis prior to change activities.

Change implies the use of planning and organizing, and change agents are those who utilize these management techniques in their overall management approach to their responsibilities. The survey results overwhelmingly confirm that this concept is recognized by this respondent group, which again tends to illustrate high change agent potential.

As inside change agents, this respondent group seems to exhibit all the positive benefits of such a role which, as Lippitt (7) states, include a knowledge of the system, a familiarity with its members and language, a sense of ownership of the change being attempted, and an understanding of the organizational norms and limits. These items relate to the degree of perceptions reported by these respondents as
strong levels of input on policy, mission, and operational function.

Argyris (1) also points to the need for adequate role definition on the part of the would-be change agent in relation to the client system. For higher education middle managers this often translates into power, prestige, status, and actual on-campus political clout. Whatever the actual fact, this group overwhelmingly indicates its belief that it does possess the wherewithal to be effective in the change situations that they initiate.

Burgher (4) indicates strategy development as a key to successful change-agent activity. As the data reveal, this group appears to be capable of mastering such skills. The recognition of resistance, for example, for the majority of the high change agent potential group, involves the ability to see many sources of possible resistance to change and to prepare for as many contingencies as possible.

The dominant personality type that emerges from this group appears to follow the hi-synergy theory of Sperry, Nickelson and Hunsaker (12). The group also conforms to the congruence theory of Marguiles and Wallace (7) as well as Ottaway’s (10) ideas on generators, implementors, and adopters of change. The initiative ability that the high profile subgroup exhibits can be taken as what Shoemaker (11) describes as the role of the organizational catalyst who
overcomes the existing inertia that tends to block change. This segment of the population has reported what they consider to be three actual change projects that have been accomplished. Whatever the scope or impact of these projects, these individuals have become Lippitt's (7) solution givers. In short, this population perceives itself in ways that could be described as those behaviors, attitudes, motivators, and actions that best identify organizational change agents. The criteria established responses that would identify a high, medium, or low potential profile. The responses thus divided the respondents, and the results indicate that there is a high level of change agent behavior in this group. As reported in the responses to each of the research questions, it would appear that this particular population possesses the management skills, knowledge of techniques, and expertise from previous endeavors that would allow them to be categorized as change agents in higher education.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, which are based on the findings of this study, appear to be warranted when applied to this particular respondent group.

1. Concern for management ability and management science approaches is apparent, in spite of the fact that campus activities professionals generally receive limited training in these areas in traditional student personnel preparation
programs. In terms of change agent behavior, these are both essential. Strong management implies awareness of the need for planning, the recognition of the realities of the system, and the need for adequate strategies. This group possesses these abilities, certainly at the high and medium profile levels.

2. The middle manager concept of being in the mainstream of organization activity—an involvement with upper-level planning while administering lower-level activities—is solidly embraced by this group. This conceptualization is another key ingredient for change agent ability.

3. Change agents, while recognizing the need for change, also recognize the path of least resistance and the required strategies to achieve such goals. This group generally validates this premise.

4. Campus activities professionals potentially can be effective change agents in higher education since they are a predominantly well-educated, active, and involved group of career-minded professionals who have a behavioral science background and a humanistic approach to their tasks.

5. Situational and demographic variables appear not to have a dramatic effect on the results of this study. This is due in part to the fact that this population is very representative of the profession. The majority of institutions in this country are under 10,000 in enrollment. The standard
requirement for a director title tends to be a Master's degree, hence the large number of responses in that area. In addition, the profession has emerged and come into its own primarily in the last ten to fifteen years which accounts for the majority of answers in the 30-39 year old categories. In addition, that the directors tend to be male at an almost four-to-one ratio over women is merely reflective of our society in general. As a result of this in many ways being a somewhat homogeneous population, the influence of such variables is apparently insignificant.

6. The professional panel did define an adequate measuring criteria to identify change agent behavior in terms applicable to this population. Most of the respondents generally matched the profiles defined and tended to validate the behavior and action assumptions made by the panel. While not precisely identifying each individual in concrete terms, the profile criteria permit the measuring of actual perceptions against a criterion system of values that were somewhat abstractly devised.

7. Based upon the profile results, this group represents a potential change agent force in higher education with the abilities, expertise, willingness, and knowledge to use their middle management positions as a base from which to effectively influence the overall system to change.
Implications

The following general implications are based upon the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Greater emphasis should be placed on management training for campus activities professionals. Although the data definitely indicate both the importance of such skills and knowledge of such techniques, traditional student personnel education programs do not tend to prepare the individual adequately. Such programs are generally philosophically based in counseling and guidance terms. An interdisciplinary approach would provide a more balanced and realistic preparation for the real humanistic management world that these professionals will enter.

2. Individual campus activity professionals probably have, in fact, more influence than their perceptions reveal. It is the lack of formalized skill development in true management techniques that hinders their efforts. Given the solid perceptions displayed in the data, the impression remains that major change is not taking place. The responses to the requested listing of changes proposed and accomplished yielded identified successes of a somewhat trivial nature in many cases. These could, in fact, have been major personal triumphs, but they do not, in reality, amount to successes that will alter the course of union management or student
development programs. Therefore, while the perceptions tested tend to prove that interest, ability, and commitment exist among this group, the results tend to reveal achievements of insignificance when tested against changes that could be accomplished. While the profile criteria and the responses given indicate change potential, the state of higher education tends to indicate somewhat that the potential is not being fulfilled. It may be asked why—if, indeed, this is a group of such promising change agents—have they not been more obviously active? This again points to the need for better training and preparation.

3. The professional associations can provide dynamic, meaningful in-service training for its members. The majority of respondents claim affiliation at some point above the inactive level. The profession itself, then, could be in the forefront of promoting greater development of its members. These associations could also provide leadership in the area of change in higher education. Since change is a factor in the operation of all organizations, these professional associations could in some ways become a suprasystem of the system in which middle managers of this type work. By providing advanced, change-oriented training and networking to the middle managers, the national organizations could foster a large-scale interrelated change program.

4. The same research questions could be the basis for a national dialogue by members of this profession. Asking
about abilities, influences, position, and actual accomplishment could provide the basis for some form of professional accreditation.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for future research are suggested.

1. A study should be conducted that focuses primarily on the training that campus activities professionals have received for their positions. Emphasis should be placed on degrees, fields of study and specialization, and continuing formal education. This would permit a clearer identification of the subject population and the testing of more detailed research questions. Since this is a finite population that appears quite homogeneous, such a detailed examination may reveal more data that would substantiate specialization or interdisciplinary approaches.

2. It is recommended that a follow-up study be conducted that would focus precisely on the changes that individuals perceive they have accomplished. A scale of gradation would produce data that could be interpolated in a more precise fashion and provide for more clearly definitive change actions. While still relying on perceptions of the respondents, this rating scale would allow for a ranking of accomplishment in a more graduated fashion. In addition, the evaluative criteria format should be reevaluated by a
panel of professional experts in terms of concise categories of change agent potential. While the intent and nature of this study were to view data in general terms, it now appears that a further formalization of categories would permit greater understanding of the population.

3. It is also recommended that comparison studies of this type be conducted on academic administrators of a specified rank using the same format and criteria. This would permit the comparison of perceptions between two groups that have been traditional competitors and adversaries in higher education. Such a study might reveal interesting correlations and similarities between the two distinct areas of middle management. A similar need exists to focus on the whole concept of the change agent in higher education. While isolating one area in this study, it is apparent that so much of what one group can accomplish depends on the interrelationship that exists with the many other systems in the overall suprasystem of the institution. Higher education lends itself to this approach since there are, in fact, many finite populations available that could be studied.

4. It is further recommended that this study be replicated using the student population as a variable.
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APPENDIX A

INITIAL SURVEY DRAFT TO PANEL

Part II - Management Profile

1. Indicate your number of years in the field as a paid professional staff member:
   
   ____1-3
   ____4-7
   ____8-12
   ____13+

2. Indicate the highest degree you have achieved:
   
   ____A.A.S.
   ____B.A./B.S.
   ____M.A./M.S.
   ____Ed.D./Ph.D.

3. Do you, in your current position, feel adequately prepared to work with:
   
   Older students    ____Yes  ____No
   Married students  ____Yes  ____No
   Divorced students ____Yes  ____No
   Thirty-year-old board members ____Yes  ____No
   Foreign students  ____Yes  ____No

4. Do you feel a need to acquire additional staff to program for:
   
   Older students    ____Yes  ____No
   Married students  ____Yes  ____No
   Foreign students  ____Yes  ____No

5. Does your supervisor consult you in most instances when policy decisions effect your area or inform you of policy after it is decided:
   
   Consult
   Inform
6. Do you feel you have actual input in upper-level decision-making at your institution:

____ Yes
____ No

7. Does the administration seek your input on major policy matters:

____ Yes
____ No

8. Can you effectively initiate major policy changes for the institution at your level:

____ Yes
____ No

If yes, rank methods you employ to initiate policy change:

____ Use another source to bring it up
____ Prepare a report/research and data
____ Lobby
____ Assign a committee the task
____ Seek permission to go ahead
____ Make a formal proposal
____ Go ahead with the idea
____ Other ______________________________

9. Do you have an influence on matters determining the mission, priorities and actual funding of the institution activities:

____ Yes
____ No

10. Is your annual budget process proactive or reactive on your part:

____ Proactive
____ Reactive

11. On your campus, as a director, are you recognized on a par with:

____ Academic department head
____ Academic division chair
____ Assistant Dean
____ Dean
____ None of the above
12. In approaching a new campus-wide program—at the expense of an existing one—which area generally offers the most resistance:

- Faculty
- In-house staff
- Supervisor
- Your vice president
- President
- Other directors
- Other vice presidents

13. Rate yourself as an innovator:

- A+
- A
- B+
- B
- C

14. Check the word that best describes your "innovation style:"

- Bold
- Aggressive
- Creative
- Assertive
- Planned
- Constrained
- Non threatening

15. The most important of your newest duties this past year was:

- Assigned by a superior
- Developed as a result of a staff project
- Initiated by you

16. A major new undertaking would most likely result in:

- Dropping something else
- Delegating something to another staff person
- Finding the time to fit it in
- Waiting for the time to materialize

17. Do you conduct regular evaluation of programs and operations:

- Yes
- No
18. In your opinion, which of the following would give your efforts the highest marks (rank):

- President
- Supervisor
- Faculty in general
- Academic administrators
- Your staff
- Other directors

19. In your opinion, who would give your efforts the lowest marks (rank):

- President
- Supervisor
- Faculty in general
- Academic administrators
- Your staff
- Other directors

20. In the existing power structure on your campus where would you place yourself:

- At the top--at a par with vice presidents
- In the upper levels--at a par with deans and department heads
- In the middle--on a level with directors of housing, admissions, etc.
- At the lower levels--at a par with dorm directors, programmers, etc.

21. What is your reaction to being identified as a "middle manager:"

- Agree, it best describes the position, authority and status
- Disagree, it does not do justice to the position, authority or status
- Neither agree or disagree since the position is higher than middle management
- Neither agree or disagree since the position is lower than middle management
- Don't understand the concept
22. Indicate by ranking how you as a director spend most of your working time:

- Planning
- Organizing
- Staffing
- Directing
- Controlling

23. Which of the above would you say is the most important to utilize in order to bring about change:

- Planning
- Organizing
- Staffing
- Directing
- Controlling

24. Which of the above would you say is the most important for you as a middle manager to master:

- Planning
- Organizing
- Staffing
- Directing
- Controlling

25. In your experience, has the cost of being innovative, in terms of the time, energy, effort and possible consequences, been worth the results:

- Yes
- No
APPENDIX B

REFINED SURVEY RESULTS FROM INITIAL PANEL

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Indicate your number of years in the field as a paid professional staff member:
   - 1-3
   - 4-7
   - 8-12
   - 13+

2. Indicate the highest degree you have achieved:
   - A.A.S.
   - B.A./B.S.
   - M.A./M.S.
   - Ed.D./Ph.D.

3. Your sex:
   - Male
   - Female

4. Your age:
   - 25-29
   - 30-34
   - 35-39
   - 40-44
   - 45-49
   - 50+

5. Does your supervisor consult you in most instances when policy decisions affect your area or inform you of policy after it is decided:
   - Consult
   - Inform

6. Do you feel you have actual input in upper-level decision-making at your institution:
   - Yes
   - No
If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:

- Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
- Brought in after initial planning starts
- Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
- None of the above

7. Does the administration seek your input on major policy matters:

- Yes
- No

If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:

- Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
- Brought in after initial planning starts
- Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
- None of the above

8. Can you effectively initiate major policy changes for the institution at your level:

- Yes
- No

If yes, rank methods you employ to initiate policy change:

- Use another source to bring it up
- Prepare a report/research and data
- Lobby
- Assign a committee the task
- Seek permission to go ahead
- Make a formal proposal
- Go ahead with the idea
- Other

9. Have you had an influence on matters determining the mission, priorities and actual funding of the institution activities:

- Yes
- No
If yes, were you:

- On a task force
- Part of the planning process
- Asked to respond to a proposal
- A contributor to an actual concept as it was being developed
- A respondent to a concept as it was being developed

10. Is your annual budget process proactive or reactive on your part? Define each in your own terms.

- Proactive
- Reactive

11. On your campus, as a director, are you recognized on a par with:

- Academic department head
- Academic division chair
- Assistant dean
- Dean
- None of the above

12. In approaching a new campus-wide program—at the expense of an existing one—which area generally offers the most resistance? Check one.

- Faculty
- In-house staff
- Supervisor
- Your vice president
- President
- Other directors on campus
- Other vice presidents

13. Rate yourself as an innovator:

- A+
- A
- B+
- B
- C Explain your grade:
14. Check one word that best describes your "innovation style:"

- Bold
- Aggressive
- Creative
- Assertive
- Planned
- Constrained
- Non-threatening

15. The majority of your newest duties this past year were:

Check one.

- Assigned by a superior
- Developed as a result of a staff project
- Initiated by you

16. A major new undertaking would most likely result in:

Check one.

- Dropping something else
- Delegating something to another staff person
- Finding the time to fit it in
- Waiting for the time to materialize

17. Do you conduct regular evaluation of programs and operations:

- Yes
- No

18. In your opinion, which of the following would give your efforts the highest marks (rank) in situations where you attempt to bring about change:

- President
- Supervisor
- Faculty in general
- Academic Administrators
- Your staff
- Other directors on campus
19. In your opinion, who would give your efforts the lowest marks (rank) in situations where you strive to maintain the status quo:

___ President
___ Supervisor
___ Faculty in general
___ Academic administrators
___ Your staff
___ Other directors on campus

20. In the existing power structure on your campus, where would you place yourself: Check one.

___ At the top--at a par with vice presidents
___ In the upper levels--at a par with deans and department heads
___ In the middle--on a level with directors of housing, admissions, etc.
___ At the lower levels--at a par with dorm directors, programmers, etc.

21. What is your reaction to being identified as a "middle manager:" Check one:

___ Agree, it best describes the position, authority and status
___ Disagree, it does not do justice to the position, authority or status
___ Neither agree or disagree since the position is higher than middle management
___ Neither agree or disagree since the position is lower than middle management
___ Don't understand the concept

22. Indicate by percentages how you as a director spend most of your working time:

___ Planning
___ Organizing
___ Staffing
___ Directing
___ Controlling
23. Which of the above would you say is the most important to utilize in order to bring about change? Check one.

___ Planning
___ Organizing
___Staffing
___ Directing
___ Controlling

24. Which of the above would you say is the most important for you as a middle manager to master? Check one.

___ Planning
___ Organizing
___ Staffing
___ Directing
___ Controlling

25. List three changes (exclude current projects) you have proposed in the last year and indicate if they have been accomplished:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
<th>Check If Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In your experience, has the cost of being innovative, in terms of the time, energy, effort and possible consequences, been worth the results:

___ Yes
___ No

27. In a managerial sense, in attempting to bring about change, which is the single most important element to convince that change is necessary:

28. What is your institution's current full-time enrollment?
29. You were selected from the professional membership lists of ACU--I and NACA. Check your level of activity in such organizations:

- Very active--involved in volunteer leadership, contribute time and research
- Active--attend conferences (national and regional), seminars, etc.
- Somewhat active--occasionally attend conferences
- Member only

30. Identify who you report to:

________________________________________
Title

________________________________________
Administrative Area
APPENDIX C

SURVEY AS SENT TO EXPANDED PANEL

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Indicate your number of years in the field as a paid professional staff member:
   ____ 1-3
   ____ 4-7
   ____ 8-12
   ____ 13+

2. Indicate the highest degree you have achieved:
   ____ A.A.S.
   ____ B.A./B.S.
   ____ M.A./M.S.
   ____ Ed.D./Ph.D.

3. Your sex:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female

4. Your age:
   ____ 25-29
   ____ 30-34
   ____ 35-39
   ____ 40-44
   ____ 45-49
   ____ 50+

5. What is your institution’s current full-time enrollment?

6. Check one of the following for your institution:
   ____ Public
   ____ Private
7. In regards to your immediate supervisor, is your relationship from that person to you: Check one.

___ Highly supportive
___ Supportive
___ Neutral
___ Non-supportive
___ Antagonistic

8. Identify the organizational pattern in which your unit exists by checking one of the following in relation to your unit's overall place in the reporting structure:

___ Autocratic
___ Participatory
___ Laissez faire

9. Does your supervisor consult you in most instances when policy decisions affect your area or inform you of policy after it is decided:

___ Consult
___ Inform

10. Do you feel you have actual input in upper-level decision-making at your institution:

___ Yes
___ No

If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:

___ Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
___ Brought in after initial planning starts
___ Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
___ None of the above

11. Does the administration seek your input on major policy matters:

___ Yes
___ No
If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:

- Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
- Brought in after initial planning starts
- Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
- None of the above

12. Can you effectively initiate major policy changes for the institution at your level:

- Yes
- No

If yes, rank methods you employ to initiate policy change:

- Use another source to bring it up
- Prepare a report/research and data
- Lobby
- Assign a committee the task
- Seek permission to go ahead
- Make a formal proposal
- Go ahead with the idea
- Other

13. Have you had an influence on matters determining the mission, priorities and actual funding of the institution activities:

- Yes
- No

If yes, were you:

- On a task force
- Part of the planning process
- Asked to respond to a proposal
- A contributor to an actual concept as it was being developed
- A respondent to a concept as it was being developed
14. Is your annual budget process proactive or reactive on your part? Define each in your own terms.

___ Proactive
___ Reactive

15. On your campus, as a director, are you recognized on a par with:

___ Academic department head
___ Academic division chair
___ Assistant dean
___ Dean
___ None of the above

16. In approaching a new campus-wide program—at the expense of an existing one—which area generally offers the most resistance? Check one.

___ Faculty
___ In-house staff
___ Supervisor
___ Your vice president
___ President
___ Other directors on campus
___ Other vice presidents

17. Rate yourself as an innovator:

___ A+
___ A
___ B+
___ B
___ C

Explain your grade: ____________________________

18. Check one word that best describes your "innovation style:"

___ Bold
___ Aggressive
___ Creative
___ Assertive
___ Planned
___ Constrained
___ Non-threatening
19. The majority of your newest duties this past year were: Check one.

___ Assigned by a superior
___ Developed as a result of a staff project
___ Initiated by you

20. A major new undertaking would most likely result in: Check one.

___ Dropping something else
___ Delegating something to another staff person
___ Finding the time to fit it in
___ Waiting for the time to materialize

21. Do you conduct regular evaluation of programs and operations:

___ Yes
___ No

22. In your opinion, which of the following would give your efforts the highest marks (rank) in situations where you attempt to bring about change:

___ President
___ Supervisor
___ Faculty in general
___ Academic administrators
___ Your staff
___ Other directors on campus

23. In your opinion, who would give your efforts the lowest marks (rank) in situations where you strive to maintain the status quo:

___ President
___ Supervisor
___ Faculty in general
___ Academic administrators
___ Your staff
___ Other directors on campus
24. In the existing power structure on your campus, where would you place yourself: Check one.

____ At the top--at a par with vice presidents
____ In the upper levels--at a par with deans and department heads
____ In the middle--on a level with directors of housing, admissions, etc.
____ At the lower levels--at a par with dorm directors, programmers, etc.

25. What is your reaction to being identified as a "middle manager:" Check one.

____ Agree, it best describes the position, authority and status
____ Disagree, it does not do justice to the position, authority or status
____ Neither agree or disagree since the position is higher than middle management
____ Neither agree or disagree since the position is lower than middle management
____ Do not understand the concept

26. Indicate by percentages how you as a director spend most of your working time:

____ Planning
____ Organizing
____ Staffing
____ Directing
____ Controlling

27. Which of the above would you say is the most important to utilize in order to bring about change: Check one.

____ Planning
____ Organizing
____ Staffing
____ Directing
____ Controlling

28. Which of the above would you say is the most important for you as a middle manager to master: Check one.

____ Planning
____ Organizing
____ Staffing
____ Directing
____ Controlling
29. List three changes (exclude current projects) you have proposed in the last year and indicate if they have been accomplished:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
<th>Check If Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. In your experience, has the cost of being innovative, in terms of the time, energy, effort and possible consequences, been worth the results:

- Yes
- No

31. In a managerial sense, in attempting to bring about change, which is the single most important element to convince that change is necessary:

32. You were selected from the professional membership lists of ACU--I and NACA. Check your level of activity in such organizations:

- Very active--involved in volunteer leadership, contribute time and research
- Active--attend conferences (national and regional), seminars, etc.
- Somewhat active--occasionally attend conferences
- Member only

33. Identify who you report to:

- Title
- Administrative Area
APPENDIX D

RESPONSE IDENTIFICATION CHART

CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY EXPANDED PANEL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>The Management Profile of a High Change Agent Potential Individual</th>
<th>The Management Profile of a Moderate Change Agent Potential Individual</th>
<th>The Management Profile of a Low Change Agent Potential Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 - Consult</td>
<td>Consult or Inform</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Yes/A or C</td>
<td>Yes/A or B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Yes/A or C</td>
<td>Yes/A or B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Yes/Open Ranking</td>
<td>Yes/Open Ranking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Yes/A, b or D</td>
<td>Yes/E and C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - Proactive</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - Academic department head or higher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - Open</td>
<td>A or C</td>
<td>C or B</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - A+, A, B+</td>
<td>B+, B, C</td>
<td>B and C, D, E</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - Planned, Creative Assertive</td>
<td>Planned, Constrained, Non Threatening</td>
<td>Planned, Constrained, Non Threatening</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - B or C</td>
<td>A or B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - B or C</td>
<td>C or D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - B or E</td>
<td>F or D</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - Open</td>
<td>B or E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - A</td>
<td>C or D</td>
<td>D or E</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - Planning</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - Planning</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - Planning</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 - All Three Accomplished</td>
<td>One or Two Accomplished</td>
<td>One or None Accomplished</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - Yes</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - Other People</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Very Active</td>
<td>Active/Somewhat Active</td>
<td>Member Only</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Colleague:

You have been selected from the membership of the Association of College Unions--International and the National Association for Campus Activities to participate in a doctoral dissertation study.

Your responses will contribute to an area of original research concerning the topic "Union Directors as Change Agents in Higher Education." For the purpose of this study and recognizing that exactness of job descriptions and titles is not universal within the profession, those individuals with the Director of Student Activities title have been included where a Union Director was not listed.

Enclosed please find the survey and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Strict confidentiality will be maintained. Schools and individual respondents will in no way be identified.

The survey has been designed to take a minimal amount of your time. Please do so--you will be contributing greatly to your field by expanding the available body of research on this profession.

Please return by September 29, 1983.

Thank you--Your assistance is both invaluable and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Mitura
APPENDIX F

FINAL SURVEY AS DISTRIBUTED
UNION DIRECTORS AS CHANGE AGENTS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

NAME: ____________________________

1. Indicate your number of years in the field as a paid professional staff member:
   - 1-3
   - 4-7
   - 8-12
   - 13 +

2. Indicate the highest degree you have achieved:
   - A.A.S.
   - B.A./B.S.
   - M.A./M.S.
   - Ed.D./Ph.D.

3. Your sex:
   - Male
   - Female

4. Your age:
   - 25-29
   - 30-34
   - 35-39
   - 40-44
   - 45-49
   - 50 +

5. What is your institution's current full-time enrollment?

   ____________________________________________

6. Check one of the following for your institution:
   - Public
   - Private

7. In regards to your immediate supervisor, is your relationship from that person to you (Check one):
   - Highly supportive
   - Supportive
   - Neutral
   - Non-Supportive
   - Antagonistic

8. Identify the organizational pattern in which your unit exists by checking one of the following in relation to your unit's overall place in the reporting structure:
   - Autocratic
   - Participatory
   - Laissez faire

9. Does your supervisor consult you in most instances when policy decisions affect your area or inform you of policy after it is decided:
   - Consult
   - Inform

10. Do you feel you have actual input in upper-level decision-making at your institution:
    - Yes
    - No

   If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:
   - Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
   - Brought in after initial planning starts
   - Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
   - None of the above

11. Does the administration seek your input on major policy matters:
    - Yes
    - No

   If yes, in which one of the following ways are you most often involved:
   - Asked to take part in the process from the beginning
   - Brought in after initial planning starts
   - Asked for input if the idea is a possible desirable direction
   - None of the above
12. Can you effectively initiate major policy changes for the institution at your level:  
   Yes  
   No  
   If yes, rank methods you employ to initiate policy change:  
   Use another source to bring it up  
   Prepare a report/research and data  
   Lobby  
   Assign a committee the task  
   Seek permission to go ahead  
   Make a formal proposal  
   Go ahead with the idea  
   Other  

13. Have you had an influence on matters determining the mission, priorities and actual funding of the institution activities:  
   Yes  
   No  
   If yes, were you:  
   On a task force  
   Part of the planning process  
   Asked to respond to a proposal  
   A contributor to an actual concept as it was being developed  
   A respondent to a concept as it was being developed  

14. Is your annual budget process proactive or reactive on your part:  
   Define each in your own terms:  
   Proactive  
   Reactive  

15. On your campus, as a director, are you recognized on a par with:  
   Academic department head  
   Academic division chair  
   Assistant Dean  
   Dean  
   None of the above  

16. In approaching a new campus-wide program — at the expense of an existing one — which area generally offers the most resistance:  
   Check one:  
   Faculty  
   In-house staff  
   Supervisor  
   Your vice president  
   President  
   Other directors on campus  
   Other vice presidents  

17. Rate yourself as an innovator:  
   A +  
   A  
   B +  
   B  
   C  
   Explain your grade:  

18. Check one word that best describes your "innovation style:"  
   Bold  
   Aggressive  
   Creative  
   Assertive  
   Planned  
   Constrained  
   Non-threatening  

19. The majority of your newest duties this past year were:  
   Check one:  
   Assigned by a superior  
   Developed as a result of a staff project  
   Initiated by you  

20. A major new undertaking would most likely result in:  
   Check one:  
   Dropping something else  
   Delegating something to another staff person  
   Finding the time to let it sit  
   Waiting for the time to materialize  

21. Do you conduct regular evaluation of programs and operations:  
   Yes  
   No
1. In your opinion, which of the following would give your efforts the highest marks (rank) in situations where you attempt to bring about change:
   - President
   - Supervisor
   - Faculty in general
   - Academic Administrators
   - Your staff
   - Other directors on campus

2. In your opinion, who would give your efforts the lowest marks (rank) in situations where you strive to maintain the status quo:
   - President
   - Supervisor
   - Faculty in general
   - Academic Administrators
   - Your staff
   - Other directors on campus

3. In the existing power structure on your campus, where would you place yourself? Check one:
   - At the top — at a par with vice presidents
   - In the upper levels — at a par with deans and department heads
   - In the middle — at a level with directors of housing, admissions, etc.
   - At the lower levels — at a par with dorm directors, programmers, etc.

4. What is your reaction to being identified as a "middle manager?" Check one:
   - Agree, it best describes the position, authority and status
   - Disagree, it does not do justice to the position, authority or status
   - Neither agree or disagree since the position is higher than middle management
   - Neither agree or disagree since the position is lower than middle management
   - Do not understand the concept

5. Indicate by percentages how you as a director spend most of your working time:
   - Planning
   - Organizing
   - Staffing
   - Directing
   - Controlling

6. Which of the above would you say is the most important to utilize in order to bring about change? Check one:
   - Planning
   - Organizing
   - Staffing
   - Directing
   - Controlling

7. Which of the above would you say is the most important for you as a middle manager to master? Check one:
   - Planning
   - Organizing
   - Staffing
   - Directing
   - Controlling

8. List three changes (exclude current projects) you have proposed in the last year and indicate if they have been accomplished:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
<th>Check if Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. In your experience has the cost of being innovative, in terms of the time, energy, effort and possible consequences, been worth the result:
   - Yes
   - No

10. In a managerial sense, in attempting to bring about change, which is the single most important element to convince that change is necessary:

11. You were selected from the Professional Membership lists of ACU-I and NACA. Check your level of activity in either/both organizations:
   - Very Active — Involved in volunteer leadership, contribute time and research
   - Active — Attend conferences (national and regional), seminars, etc.
   - Somewhat active — Occasionally attend conferences
   - Member only

12. Identify who you report to:

---

Thank you — your assistance is greatly appreciated.
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