

LINES OF COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS DESCRIBED BY THE  
SYSTEM-SEMANTICS METHODOLOGY

by

William L. Robinson  
B.A., University of Kansas, 1967  
M.A., University of Kansas, 1971

Submitted to the Department of Speech and  
Drama and the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of the University of Kansas in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study represents one phase of the most extensive analysis of organizational communication ever undertaken on a university campus. The overall project of which this study is a part required the time, attention, and dedication of several hundred people, only a few of whom is it possible to recognize here.

Prof. Bill Conboy provided the initiative and the guidance required for the design and completion of the overall project, as well as judicious direction in the preparation of this report. It has been a challenge to fulfill his requirements, yet the challenge has resulted in personal growth and scholastic accomplishment, and his patient assistance is most heartily acknowledged.

Prof. Bobby Patton has been instrumental in helping to maintain the personal confidence and professional motivation which occasionally degenerated in the process of completing this project. Prof. Kim Giffin proved once again to be a friendly and incisive critic as the study neared completion.

Del Shankel, Executive Vice-Chancellor of the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas, contributed institutional sanction and financial support for the entire project. His willingness to submit to intensive organizational scrutiny is indicative of his devotion to the goal of a dignified and responsive university.

My sincere thanks (and a warm hug when next we meet) are extended to several friends who provided that support which is so crucial to all endeavors such as this: Frank and Donna, Glen and Karen, Ed, Fred, Emily, Jeff, and Diana. Doug and Liz assumed responsibility for bed and board for what may have been the longest three weeks of their lives, without failing to smile and help me laugh at my own compulsiveness.

Jan Sanders has been singularly instrumental in every aspect of the project, and has given friendship, encouragement, professional expertise, juice, and--on occasion--a sharp word or two. The value I place on her friendship and ability cannot be stated adequately. We both know that we have gained considerably from our work together.

Jean Hardy Robinson, sans qui il n'y a rien, has never doubted the realization of this goal; how can that measure of love and understanding be acknowledged publicly without diminishing its impact and importance?

J.L.R. would have been as happy at this moment as I am.

September 1976

William L. Robinson

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	1
Context of the study . . . . .	3
Scope and focus of the study . . . . .	9
Definitions of critical terms . . . . .	10
Communication . . . . .	11
Line of communication . . . . .	13
Cartographic region . . . . .	15
Affective associations . . . . .	15
Preview of chapters . . . . .	16
II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH . . . . .	18
Communication in higher education . . . . .	18
University of Kansas project to study lines of communication . . . . .	24
Previous utilization of the system-semantics methodology . . . . .	27
III. RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	31
Research questions . . . . .	32
Design of the study . . . . .	33
Design considerations of the grapevine profile . . . . .	34
Sample . . . . .	35
Selection and training of interviewers . . . . .	36
Format of the interview . . . . .	38
Analytic requirements and measures . . . . .	39
Design considerations of the system-semantics profile . . . . .	41
Sample . . . . .	42
Selection of lines of communication . . . . .	42
Construction of the semantic differential scales . . . . .	42
Delivery and return procedures . . . . .	44
Data treatment . . . . .	46
Coding . . . . .	46
Statistical analysis . . . . .	47



IV. RESULTS . . . . .	48
Data related to general research	
question one . . . . .	49
Data related to general research	
question two . . . . .	100
Summary . . . . .	122
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	127
Conclusions and interpretation . . . . .	130
The grapevine profile . . . . .	130
Students . . . . .	130
Faculty . . . . .	131
Classified staff . . . . .	133
Administrative staff . . . . .	134
The university community . . . . .	135
The system-semantics profile . . . . .	140
Students . . . . .	142
Faculty . . . . .	143
Classified staff . . . . .	145
Administrative staff . . . . .	146
The university community . . . . .	148
Implications for the University	
of Kansas . . . . .	149
Observations and suggestions related	
to the methodology . . . . .	155
The cartographic profile . . . . .	155
The grapevine profile . . . . .	155
The system-semantics profile . . . . .	159
VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	163
Summary of the study . . . . .	163
Recommendations for further research . . . . .	167
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	170
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: GRAPEVINE PROFILE INTERVIEW	
SCHEDULE . . . . .	178
APPENDIX B: DR. SHANKEL'S LETTER	
ENCOURAGING COOPERATION . . . . .	180
APPENDIX C: LETTER OF EXPLANATION AND	
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE	
SYSTEM-SEMANTICS PROFILE . . . . .	182
APPENDIX D: SAMPLE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL	
INSTRUMENT . . . . .	184

## LIST OF TABLES

Table

3.1	The research samples . . . . .	37
4.1	Respondents to the grapevine profile interviews. .	50
4.2	Frequency distribution of lines of communication identified by members of the student sample . .	52
4.3	Frequency distribution of lines of communication identified by members of the faculty sample . .	55
4.4	Frequency distribution of lines of communication identified by members of the classified staff sample . . . . .	58
4.5	Frequency distribution of lines of communication identified by members of the administrative staff sample . . . . .	60
4.6	Composite frequency distribution of lines of communication identified six or more times by all samples. . . . .	62
4.7	Valence assignments for lines of communication identified by student respondents . . . . .	66
4.8	Valence assignments for lines of communication identified by faculty respondents . . . . .	71
4.9	Valence assignments for lines of communication identified by classified staff respondents. . .	78
4.10	Valence assignments for lines of communication identified by administrative staff respondents . . . . .	83
4.11	Composite valence assignments for lines of communication identified by all respondents . .	88
4.12	Distribution of codable comments and valences for lines of communication selected for the system-semantics profile. . . . .	95
4.13	Completed semantic differentiation instruments returned by members of the sample populations .	102
4.14	Affective associations related to lines of communication reported by subjects in the student sample. . . . .	104
4.15	Affective associations related to lines of communication reported by subjects in the faculty sample. . . . .	107
4.16	Affective associations related to lines of communication reported by subjects in the classified staff sample . . . . .	109
4.17	Affective associations related to lines of communication reported by subjects in the administrative staff sample . . . . .	111
4.18	Affective associations related to lines of communication, summary of responses obtained from all samples . . . . .	114

4.19	Distribution of responses to bipolar scales: all samples, all lines of communication . . .	116
4.20	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of reliable-unreliable . . . . .	117
4.21	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of fast-slow . . . . .	117
4.22	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of friendly-unfriendly . . . . .	118
4.23	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of useful-useless . . . . .	118
4.24	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of open-closed . . . . .	119
4.25	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of responsive-unresponsive . . . . .	119
4.26	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of humble-arrogant . . . . .	120
4.27	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of effective-ineffective . . . . .	120
4.28	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of near-remote . . . . .	121
4.29	Summary of analysis of variance for ratings of important-unimportant . . . . .	121
4.30	Variables included in the discriminant analysis of the bipolar scales . . . . .	123
4.31	Summary of discriminant analysis of the bipolar scales . . . . .	124

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of Purpose

This study has as a primary purpose the evaluation of a methodology for descriptive research within the field of organizational communication. A second, no less challenging, purpose for the study is the desire to implement a program of organizational communication research in a setting which previously has not been the focus of such inquiry: the organization of higher education known as a university, in this case the University of Kansas. These two purposes are reflected in the following précis of the study: This study employs the system-semantics methodology to ascertain and describe perceptions related to channels of communication within the University of Kansas.

The rationale for describing perceptions related to channels of communication as a prelude to evaluating communicative effectiveness within an organization is suggested by Conboy (1976) in his discussion of the premises on which the system-semantics approach is based:

. . . first, that much communication behavior in an organization depends on the subjective reactions of the members; second, that the members of the organization develop 'meanings' for the lines of communication themselves.  
(p. 86)

Conboy's analysis relies on two features of the communicative process within organizations: 1) that perceptions held by members of the organization shape the communicative interaction within the organization, and 2) that those perceptions are used by members of the organization to assign meanings to the various modes and channels of communication through which communicative interaction occurs.

Haire (1964) supports these assumptions and the contingent rationale:

People tend, in the interest of simplifying the problem of receiving information from the environment, to evaluate the whole medium of information through which information is received, and to accept or reject the medium and everything it carries, rather than to have to make specific judgments on separate items. (p. 100)

Haire's description of the process whereby people assign specific meanings to modes and channels of communication is convincingly supported by Sanford (1972), who reported that some modes of communication have been found to be more effective than others for some functions within organizations. Haire further stated, "Where ever a form of communication has become routine and stereotyped, it is liable to be judged in terms of the kind of information usually contained, and hence may become almost useless for conveying any other kind," (1964, p. 101).

This emphasis on perceptions of modes and channels of communication is seen by this author to be endemic to the rationale for this study. In the framework provided by

that emphasis, this study represents an attempt to assess the perceptions related to various channels of communication within the University of Kansas, an organizational entity with more than 20,000 members.

This descriptive study utilizes four samples from a population identified as the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas. The samples represent all segments of the University community, and are labeled as: Student, Faculty, Classified Staff (civil service employees), and Administrative Staff.

Data collected from each of the four samples provide identification of those channels or agents of communication within the organization which are considered by sample members to be of particular importance, and provide assessments of the ways in which selected channels or agents of communication are perceived by each of the sample populations. These data, in turn, provide the bases for fulfilling both the methodological and institutional purposes on which the study is based.

#### Context of the Study

Higher education in the United States has just passed through a critical turning point in its history, a time which Clark Kerr has described as ". . . a climactic period when unfamiliar forces affected its development and its future was pointed in new directions," (1975, p. 1). Kerr continues, succinctly summarizing the complex history of

American higher education:

After accepting but complaining in the 1950s about the 'apathetic generation,' higher education in the United States in the later years of the 1960s was swarmed over by the political activists, as had earlier happened in Latin America and Japan. After more than three centuries as a strong component of what Ruth Benedict once called the special American 'magic' of education, higher education has seen confidence in its institutions and its leadership drop almost by one-half over the past six years according to the public opinion polls. After largesse from the horn of plenty had been poured on it after World War II, it recently entered the 'new depression.' After the labor market had for so long eagerly sought its graduates, it began around 1968 to declare them in oversupply. After a century of steady growth, doubling enrollments every ten or fifteen years, higher education now faces much slower growth and then at least a decade of enrollment decline in the 1980s. And science, the great genie and source of inspiration to our universities for a century, has now come to be seen by many . . . as having reached the 'point of negative returns.' Seldom has so great an American institution passed so quickly from its Golden Age to its Age of Survival. (1975, p. 1)

The advent of the Age of Survival is a nearly incomprehensible threat to the existence of many colleges and universities. Private schools that had enjoyed basking in assorted positions of academic purity have seen their chastities suddenly sullied in the eyes and pocketbooks of their admirers. Public "multiversities," variously touted as the future and the downfall of American higher education, have been faced with unexpected demands for accountability and fiscal management which give evidence of a nearly lethal erosion of public confidence and support.

Faced with the intricacies of the Age of Survival,

colleges and universities have developed an insatiable desire to understand why critical events continue to present themselves daily and why developments have taken their unsatisfactory courses. Reports and analyses are demanded and commissioned more rapidly than they can be produced. It is as though by looking inward the assorted institutions of higher education hope to absorb enough comprehension to absolve themselves of the new demands of legislatures and boards of trustees.

Between 1968 and 1972, professional journals and public speeches relevant to higher education revealed a new terminology, one expressive of the self-reflexive nature of the institutions and their search for understanding. The organizational foresight that had failed to avoid events leading to the Age of Survival was transformed into an analytical hindsight that sought to prevent the events from recurring:

Although administrators have sought to prepare themselves to deal with violence and widespread campus disorders with firm policies and action plans, equal emphasis has been devoted to the development of means of averting wholesale dissent. The key word in such efforts is: Communication. (Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1970, p. 1)

The report in which the preceding quotation appears is one of many which identify communication as a key variable in the process of management and survival of higher education.

Also apparent in the literature illustrative of the self-reflexive nature of higher education is the



assumption that colleges and universities are composed of several sub-groups which have diverse interests and attitudes toward their common institutions. Media coverage in the late 1960s tended to portray just one sub-group (the administration) as being in perpetual conflict with another (the students). The well-publicized series of student-precipitated shocks which revealed higher education's plummet into the Age of Survival resulted in countless descriptions of warring between these two factions. Less convulsive analyses of the last five years display an awareness of the multiple groupings which exist within the common boundaries of the university community.

The university community traditionally consists of four interactive sub-groups: students, faculty, administration, and classified/supportive staff. The perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and acts of each group form a reinforcing cycle as group members act according to their perceptions of the institution and their own role in it, and react to their own feelings and attitudes about it. The interface of four such cycles provides the infrastructure of the university itself, and also the foundation for myriad communication disorders and disasters.

Our life space, our phenomenal field, our self-concept based on whatever is reality to us seriously affect the way we view or perceive all kinds of stimuli from optical illusions to complex, nonverbal human behavior. (Ross, 1974, p. 62)

A precept of modern communication theory is that one's view of "reality" simultaneously shapes and is shaped

by one's experiences, and simultaneously is a process and product of communication. In the social context of any organization, that precept assumes increased importance because the organization itself is composed of and affected by many individuals--each of whom has a necessarily unique perception of the organization and his/her own role in it. Thus every organizational decision and act can be considered a composite effect of many "understandings" of many individuals.

Perception may be used in . . . a societal or social field context to cover almost everything that enters into the individual's apprehension of the complex situations that comprise his social living. It may include not only his seeing or hearing of the other members of the group, but his awareness of their relationships, their values, and their attitudes toward him. Perception is nothing less than the individual's understanding of the social situation in which he is placed. (Allport, in Minnick, 1968, p. 35) [Stress is this author's]

When at least four different sub-groupings are inherent to the social situation named a university, it should not be surprising that communication difficulties arise there.

Recognition of such differing perceptions and their attendant dysfunctions was voiced by former University of Kansas Chancellor W. Clark Wescoe in discussing the existence and results of campus unrest:

The most frequent causes cited have been a lack of communication between students, faculty, and administration; a breakdown of communication between generations and a degree of suspicion between the various segments of the community not heretofore apparent. (1965)

Laufer and McVey went further in explaining the origins

of inter-group conflict within an institution:

The consciousness of generations is formed by the common historical experiences that shape the perceptions of man and society held by individuals who share the same generational location. Conflict between generations arises when the historical experience of two generations is so disparate that each views the social world from a radically different perspective. Thus, knowledge of the differing images of the world held by young and old is essential to an understanding of the process of generational conflict. (in Chickering, 1972, p. 343)

By turning away from the stress on "historical experiences" and "generational location" which separate two age groups in a university, and by turning toward analysis of "social experiences" and "occupational location" which vary among the four sub-groups of any educational institution, a wider understanding of the causes--and perhaps of the cures--of many contemporary communication disorders in our universities may be obtained.

It is in this contemporary context of the Age of Survival that this study seeks to determine more fully the nature of communication in higher education. In the years since the advent of "communication" as a key term for colleges and universities, it has been flung at their populations as both a lofty ideal and as a pejorative epithet. Yet, its presence and nature as a process existing within and between sub-populations have never been explored.

It is the theoretical base of this study that the actual process of communication within a university is shaped by the perceptions and affective associations of that process as held by the members of the university community,

and those perceptions and affective associations must first be described within the institutional setting before the concept "communication" can be utilized effectively to transcend either internal or external crises. Specifically, a university must be aware of the perceptions and connotative meanings of the various avenues of communication available to it before effective use of those avenues is even a possibility. Inasmuch as "meanings" are not limited to messages, that channels of communication themselves take on meanings as they are experienced by members of an organization (Conboy, 1976), the importance of such awareness seems clear.

#### Scope and Focus of the Study

As a communication scholar and a member of the professional "family" of higher education, the author accepts the necessity of limiting the scope and focus of any research endeavor. To that end, the following statements describe the limitations and conceptual framework for the focus and scope of this study:

- 1) This study, while concerned with the communicative interactions of individuals, considers those interactions to be significant only within the context of an organizational structure.
- 2) This study is directed exclusively toward those organizations which are institutions of higher education known as universities.
- 3) The study further is limited to that institution of higher education known as the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus.

4) The study focuses on the perceptions and affective associations of the internal communication processes within that institution.

5) The perceptions and affective associations reported by subjects representative of the University community are the analytic foci of the study.

### Definitions of Critical Terms

Within the literature of higher education there is nearly total agreement that communication is a vital concept, to the extent that the concept occasionally is considered to be the raison d'être of a university. Even so, there is little or no agreement as to the exact meaning, practices, and impact of communication within the university. The few attempts to provide a common definition will be discussed in Chapter II, but attention must now be given to consideration of those terms which appear in the literature and which are critical to this study.

Four terms are of particular importance to the conceptualization and execution of this study:

- 1) Communication
- 2) Line(s) of communication
- 3) Cartographic region(s)
- 4) Affective associations

As has been suggested, the first term is so general in nature as to be implicit in the recent literature of higher education, yet specific definitions do not exist in that literature. The second term is more limited in its appearance and discussion in the literature, but no less important in its implications. The third and fourth terms are not common to

the literature of higher education, and will be operationalized within the context of this study.

### Communication

The first term to be defined is "communication." Only minimal effort is required to discover that there exist nearly as many definitions of the term as there are studies and theories involving it.

Murphy and Peck (1972) suggest that it is "The life blood of every organization . . ." (p. 4), a notion that is colorful as an implied analogy, but particularly imprecise as a definition. Smith (1950) concludes that communication is ". . . the behavior taking place between individuals as a result of which common understanding is obtained." (p. 273)

Communication also has been defined as ". . . an interchange of thought, an exchange of information." (Earl, 1954, p. 331), and ". . . a process of conducting the attention of another person for the purpose of replicating memories." (Cartier and Harwood, 1953, p. 74)

Gerbner, concerned with the media of communication, concludes that "Communication can be defined as 'social interaction' through messages." (In Dance, 1967, p. 43) His definition projects the possibility that communication is an on-going process rather than a discrete event, a possibility that is considered basic to this study. Thayer, seeking to provide a theoretical rationale for linking communication theory and organization theory, dismisses many of the available definitions and concludes:

. . . I hope to preserve the label 'communication' for exclusive reference to the operation of converting raw sensory data into information for eventual use in determining covert or overt 'behavior.' The process can usefully be analogized to multi-person interactions. (1964, in Dance, 1967, p. 71)

Thayer's suggestion is consistent with an earlier statement by him, regarding the definition of communication:

The notion that communication is a means or a process of transmitting ideas or information seems to me to be based on the questionable assumption that communication is something that one does (or something that gets done by a machine) rather than something that occurs. (1963, p. 223)

As Thayer goes on to say, a source does not merely transmit a message, but rather takes part in an ongoing process composed of sequential interactions, each of which have both external and internal components, with those components specifically manifesting qualities of dynamism and relationship.

Dance (1967) concludes that ". . . communication is the eliciting of a response through verbal symbols," (p. 289) an important assertion in that it suggests that interaction may be symbolic rather than item specific.

A common difficulty with definitions of communication is that they are specific in identifying person-to-person or individual-to-individual transmission. This difficulty is of particular importance to this study because of the collective entities within the organization under study, and because of the tendency of observers to personify collective

agencies within any organization. It is patently clear that the Chancellor's Office of the University of Kansas has no capacity to say or do anything; it is a collective entity within the organization, and comments or actions attributed to it are really those of individuals who work there. Every staff member at the University of Kansas must realize that messages and information originate with a person, yet, as Sanders (1976) demonstrates:

. . . any article appearing in the Faculty/Staff Newsletter had its origin with a person, and . . . was written and edited by other persons. Yet the article copy reads 'The School of Education has decided . . .' and the reader tends to reify both the source (the School of Education) and medium (the Faculty/Staff Newsletter) of communication.  
(p. 14)

It is with the hope of avoiding the ambiguities or limitations of previous attempts to define communication that the author adopts, for this study, the following definition of communication: The ongoing, interactive process through which entities relate symbolically.

#### Line(s) of communication

Specific use of this term, as related to the methodology utilized in this study, was developed by Dr. William Conboy and others (Conboy, 1974, personal correspondence). It is on the basis of the use of the term suggested by Conboy, et al, that a specific definition of the term will be derived in this section.

Deutsch (1952) anticipated the importance of lines of communication, referring to them as "pathways":



If we can map the pathways by which information is communicated between different parts of an organization and by which it is applied to the behavior of the organization in relation to the outside world, we will have gone far toward understanding that organization. (p. 367)

Conboy's use of the term is similar to the common definitions offered for channel of communication, as evidenced by "To a member of the organization, the phrase 'line of communication' or 'communication line' tends to refer to either a source or a channel." (1967, p. 87), Conboy's usage includes the possibility that sources, media, and channels of communication may function as lines of communication, but the term is not limited exclusively to any of them. A line of communication may exist as a source, medium, or channel, but the general term is inclusive of each.

Additionally, Conboy's use of the term specifies that lines of communication exist as part of an organization, and thereby have demonstrable realities independent of their utilization. A message need not be transmitted between two or more entities within an organization for a line of communication to exist. As Sanders (1976) suggests in concluding her derivation of the term to include the use implicit in Conboy's system-semantics methodology, it is sufficient for the assumption of the existence of a line of communication that the potential for transmission exists between discrete agencies or individuals within an organization (pp. 15-18).

Subsequently, with consideration of the implications of its various applications, the following definition for the term line(s) of communication is proposed: The potential for communication, imposed by the presence of the organizational structure, which exists between all individuals and sub-units of the organization.

#### Cartographic region(s)

The third term requiring specific definition in this study is that of "cartographic region(s)". The term is functional within the methodology utilized in this study, and is defined in terms of a portion of that methodology.

The second phase of the methodology utilized in this study involves collection of data from the sample populations through the use of interviews. During this phase of the methodology, respondents are asked to identify whatever elements of the organization they recently have heard being discussed. Those elements, identified as persons, areas, agencies, or collective entities, are referred to as cartographic regions, and provide the basis for the construction of the final phase of the methodology.

Thus, as operationalized for this study, "cartographic region(s)" is defined as: Those lines of communication within the University of Kansas identified by respondents to the Grapevine Profile interviews.

#### Affective Associations

The final term requiring definition in the context of

this study is "affective associations." Throughout the study, in reference both to the methodology and to lines of communication, the term "affective association" will be used to refer to the connotative meanings derived from the perceptions of the members of the research samples and assigned to the various lines of communication.

Conboy incorporates a suggestion of this conceptualization in his rationale for the System-semantics Profile of the methodology, and cites support from the literature for its use (1976, p. 87). It is in consideration of the requirements and limitations of the methodology utilized in this study that the term "affective associations" is defined operationally as: Responses to the ten bipolar scales which comprise the semantic differentiation process of the System-semantics Profile.

#### Preview of Chapters

Subsequent chapters will deal with research related to the specific focus of this study, will describe the evolution of the research project at the University of Kansas of which this study is a part, will display the results of the study, and will propose interpretations of obtained data and offer suggestions for additional research.

Chapter 2 will review previous research in three areas most relevant to this study: 1) communication in higher education; 2) lines of communication at the University of Kansas; and 3) the system-semantics methodology.

Chapter 3 will provide a description of the requirements and procedures of the methodology and of subsequent analyses of obtained data.

Chapter 4 will display the data generated by the system-semantics methodology. Those data will be discussed and interpreted in Chapter 5, and will be followed in Chapter 6 by a summary of the study and recommendations for further investigation.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

This chapter will review research efforts relevant to this study of perceptions of lines of communication at the University of Kansas. The first section of the chapter will present a variety of materials which describe the relevance of communication to higher education. The second section will identify the overall research project of which this study is a part, and the third section will review previous uses of the system-semantics methodology in organizational communication research.

#### Communication in Higher Education

Documentation present in the preceding chapter demonstrates that the role of communication in higher education is considered by many theorists and observers to be of critical importance. It is also suggested that there exists a paucity of responsible research efforts which support or refute that consideration. A review of the literature of higher education substantiates that suggestion, and reveals only theoretical essays and generalities.

Ross (1962) submitted as a dissertation study for the University of Michigan a report titled "Communication in

College Administration." The report falls short of being an adequate synthesis of relevant communication theory, and is equally limited as a review of administrative theory in higher education. Ross, however, did conclude that communication is important to higher education in general, and to college administration in particular. Further, he anticipated the potential value of research efforts within the university context, especially those designed to identify lines of communication within the university setting.

Ayers and Russel (1962), in a document distributed by the federal government, identified communication as one of the facets of organizational structure of institutions of higher education that must be reviewed (and, presumably, updated and improved) continuously by those institutions. Corson (1960) predated their assessment and agreed totally.

Such relatively early warnings regarding the importance of effective communication within the university apparently went widely unheeded, until too late.

Farnsworth (1965) warned that inadequate and ineffective communication in the areas of student-faculty or student-administration communication could result in a condition ". . . of frustration for exploitations by those who would seek to incite disruption and riot on a campus" (p. 6). Steiger (1970) reported support for Farnsworth's prediction, and hinted at other communication breakdowns besides student-faculty and student-administration:

. . . on campus after campus, students expressed the view that adequate channels of communication

with the faculty, administration, and governing boards are lacking. Even those channels which do exist often seem remote from the policy-making power of the university. . . . Complaints about inadequate channels of communication often were linked with charges that those in power were unresponsive to student demands. The frequent failure of administrators and teachers to agree on how to react and the consequent inability of the university quickly to initiate and administer changes often resulted in radicalizing many moderate students. (p. 86)

Henderson provides an interesting measure of the emergent importance of communication in higher education. In 1960 he published Policies and Practices in Higher Education, a work of considerable insight, but in which no mention of communication--either as a concept or as a process--is made. Ten years later, in publishing The Innovative Self, Henderson devoted an entire chapter to discussing the by-then unquestionably important role of communication in higher education. The cliché had come of age.

Deegan, McConnel, Mortimer and Stull (1970), in a treatise that was both heralded and condemned by beleaguered professionals in higher education, suggested a need for a university-wide base of communication to ameliorate the internal organization and leadership functions of the university. Their basic theme was that the era of the power elite or power giants within a university had ended, and that power and responsibility shared among the human components of the institution were the essential elements of responsible higher education. Bennis, in a published interview conducted by Harris (1970), clearly supports the demise of the power

elite and calls for the emergence of "organic populism," a term which he suggests includes the "humanization" of all bureaucratic structures, including universities.

Heiss (1970), writing at the apex of student disruption on American campuses, tended to ignore the problem at hand and dangle "communication" as the key to improved insitutional development in the future.

Despite the steadily increasing interest in communication as an element of institutional life in the field of higher education, there are no studies available which attempt to determine fully the role, impact, effectiveness, or complexities of communication within a college or university. Several studies exist which have implications for the administration within a college or university (Charters, 1969; Goetzinger and Valentine, 1962; Andrews, 1969; Gustad, 1962, and Goldhaber, 1972), but none has yet appeared which attempts to encompass the entire population of a vast university and its attendant communication disorders.

It is virtually an axiom of organization growth, and certainly of institutional growth in higher education, that increased size and complexity result in increased communicative disorders. Dressel and Faricy (1972) state:

As . . . universities grow, communication will certainly become more complicated. Schools that were once relative small, no larger than many . . . departments [today], are increasing in size, and informal approaches are becoming less effective. (p.2)

Rice (1970), in tracing the trends of modern universities, agrees:



In earlier times, when, by today's standards, universities were comparatively small, enclosed communities of scholars, there appears to have been little doubt about university objectives--the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. Members of the faculty and their students found less difficulty in communicating with each other. . . Today, the enormously increased demand for higher education, the explosion of knowledge, and the social misgivings about the use to which knowledge is being put, have not only thrown doubt on university objectives but made meaningful communication between faculty and students difficult, and in many universities, apparently impossible. (p. 2)

Rice could not have been more prophetic in anticipating the conclusions of Tompkins and Anderson in their analysis of the communicative disorders which allowed--if not necessitated--the tragedy known as "Kent State." In their study, Tompkins and Anderson (1971) leave no doubt that the violence and polarization which characterized the events at Kent State clearly were linked to a style and degree of institutional communication which were unjustifiably inept.

Dressel and Faricy, Rice, and Tompkins and Anderson elaborate somewhat on Clark Kerr's basic point that the university becomes a multiversity in part because the human components of the university community do not share a common purpose for their common institution (Kerr, 1966, pp 1-20). Having little else in common, since their functions, values, and even their jargon differ, their communication breaks down. Chickering (1972) describes that lack of common purpose and its resultant diversity of individual purposes in stinging fashion:

For the administrator--a steady boat, a shiny image, solid financial security. For the professor--lectures that can become books and articles, minimal teaching and maximum time for professional advancement and personal interests, two office hours per week to keep individual students at a safe distance. For the student--free access twenty-four hours a day to drugs, drink, and the opposite sex, study what I want, when I want, as much, or as little as I want, hire whoever agrees, fire whoever doesn't. The examples may be exaggerated but the basic point is not--comfort does not always accompany significant development, institutional purposes are not always best realized when things go smoothly. (p. 159)

Bennis (1970) and Bennis and Slater (1968) would find some basis for disagreement with Chickering, but likely would agree with the assessment of the dichotomous purposes. Bennis (1973), writing a personal account of his experiences at the State University of New York--Buffalo, stresses that his motivation was to be part of the creation of a new and responsive "non-bureaucracy," one which would not deter or quash personal idealism and goals. To that end he clearly supports the implied revision of Chickering, yet his goal was a system in which smoothness was the by-word.

Balderston (1974) stresses differences in outlook among sub-groups of the university, but holds out hope for their reconciliation in communication:

Students and faculty are ambivalent about. . . administrative structures, which they often regard as constraining, harassing, and bureaucratic. Yet they expect the institution to work smoothly, and they want a great variety of facilitating services that can be provided only by means of elaborate procedures and organization. Participation, communication and consultation are also essential. . . Harmonizing and humanizing these administrative and communicative

aspects of the university is an important task. (pp. 74-75)

Both Chickering and Balderston provide ample support for the assumption that the interaction among the various human components of a university is based on the perceptions of those components of their environments, perceptions of the ways in which the environments satisfy or restrain the interests of the individuals. The need for comprehensive analysis of the home base, typical of the self-reflexive orientation of the Age of Survival, is both appropriate and timely.

This section has provided an overview of the literature of higher education, with particular emphasis on the role of communication in the routine existence of colleges and universities. Support has been provided for the existence of multiple elements within the university community, and the need for understanding the natures and the interaction of those multiple elements has been documented. The next section of this chapter will describe the self-study project undertaken by the University of Kansas in an attempt to respond to that need.

The University of Kansas Project  
to Study Lines of Communication

This study represents a portion of a larger study, one which Sanders (1976) calls "The most extensive study of internal communication ever undertaken by the University of Kansas. . ." (p. 49). The larger study is presented in relative detail because it is unique in the research history

of higher education. To the extent that it sought to describe formal lines of communication, to discover perceptual and affective dimensions of those lines of communication, and to explore fully the actual utilization patterns of the administrative sector of the University population, the overall project is unparalleled in the literature of research specific to higher education.

The study was commissioned by the executive vice-chancellor of the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus, at a time when the University was engaged in an extensive program of self-study. The study was requested partly as an outgrowth of the advent of the Age of Survival, and--for more immediate purposes--in preparation for a visit by the accreditation team of the North Central Association.

Dr. William Conboy, former chairperson of the Department of Speech and Drama at the University of Kansas, supervised a research team composed of himself, this author, and Janet Sanders. At the time that the project was commissioned, and during its implementation, the author and Sanders were doctoral candidates in Speech Communication and Human Relations and held professional positions within the University administration.

The project to study lines of communication at the University of Kansas was designed to include four distinct phases, derived from two separate research methodologies. The first three phases of the design comprise the system-semantics methodology developed by Conboy, et al. The fourth phase utilizes a data collection procedure described by

Davis (1952), and adapted for specific use in this project by Sanders. All phases of the design were instituted and completed between January and June of 1975.

The results of the first phase of the project design are reported by Conboy in a report to the executive vice-chancellor of the University (1975). The results of the fourth phase of the design, the ECCO analysis of organizational communication, are reported in detail by Sanders (1976). Among the findings reported by Sanders are:

- 1) Highest level administrators show a preference for face-to-face interaction over all other forms. Sanders recommends supplementing that preferred form with intra-administrative written communications as a means of improving the limitations inherent in that preferred form.
- 2) Upward communication within the administrative levels of the University is minimal. Sanders calls for immediate reversal of that feature, both for reasons of morale and efficiency.
- 3) Lateral communication within the middle levels of the administration is virutally non-existant. Team-building training is suggested by Sanders.
- 4) Lowest-level administrators are generally exempted from formal communicative interactions, and rely on mass media and public media for most information. Sanders does not encourage the continuation of the exclusion of that level of administrative staff.
- 5) Sanders suggests that the administration engage in periodic communication audits, for the purpose of assessing its utilization of lines of communication within its own ranks and with other parts of the University. Objectives, derived from regular communicative audits, should be established and implemented.  
(pp. 143-170)

This study reports the results of the second and third

phases of the project design utilized in the University of Kansas project to study lines of communication. In conjunction with the material reported by Conboy (1975) and by Sanders (1976), this study concludes the report of that project.

Previous Utilization of the  
System-semantics Methodology

It has been stated in earlier sections of this study that the system-semantics methodology of organizational communication investigation was originated by Conboy, et al. All known utilizations of the methodology have occurred under the direction of Conboy or his associates.

Conboy (1976) summarizes the implementation and potential of the methodology as follows:

At this writing, the scheme has been used fully in assessing the communication health of four complex organizations: a university, a hospital, an Army school, and a small corporation. Preliminary results have been encouraging in two ways. First, the methodology produces clear-cut data on what communication systems or subsystems have attracted the attention of members of the organization. Second the methodology generates sensitive data on how the members of the organization feel about those lines of communication. (p. 87)

The system-semantics methodology has its assumptive antecedent in the semantic differential concept developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannengaum (1957). That concept, based on the process of semantic differentiation as a means of assessing affective associations, is uniquely appropriate for the purposes to which Conboy, et al, have applied it.

As Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum state (1957):

The semantic differential is, by its very nature, an appropriate analytical instrument for studying the 'meaning' of an issue or channel as it is perceived by its users, viewers, etc. (p. 9)

Darnell (1970) seems to concur, saying: "The limits of it [the semantic differential] seem to be determined only by the imagination of experimenters." (In Emmert and Brooks, 1970, p. 181.)

A semantic differential instrument may be said to consist of a set of rating scales, spaced in an odd number of equal gradations (usually five or seven) between linear extremes marked by bipolar adjectives. A subject is asked to indicate the gradation on each bipolar rating scale which best represents his/her response to the "concept," a person, agency, idea, entity, or organization whose name or label is printed at the top of the instrument page. The instrument is characteristic of a process which is both versatile and reliable in its applications to communication research (Snider and Osgood, 1969; Darnell, 1970; in Emmert and Brooks, 1970). As Fletcher (1972) has suggested:

Considering the extensive work done by Osgood and his associates. . . on semantic differential instruments, it is not only reasonable but urgent that communications researchers who are concerned with such diverse constructs as attitude change, image, ethos, and meaning. . . should draw their instruments from the extensive semantic differential work already completed. (p. 270.)

In the development of the system-semantics methodology, Conboy and his colleagues seem to have anticipated and followed Fletcher's advice.

Portions of the voluminous research related to semantic differentiation are devoted to the issue of bipolar scale selection, a process of critical importance to the usefulness of the instrument. The original description of the process by Osgood, et al, suggested that three factors had emerged in their analyses as being generally inclusive of all scales. While other factors had been derived, those researchers concluded that the three primary factors of evaluation, potency, and directed activity were inclusive of all others. Snider and Osgood (1969) report that factor analytic studies subsequent to the announcement of the semantic differentiation process had generally supported that original assumption.

Darnell (1964) found that the evaluative and potency factors had remained clear and primary in his studies, but that the directed activity factor had emerged as being less clear than was originally suggested by Osgood, et al. Darnell later suggested (1970) that the inclusion of scales related to the potency and activity factors had become, in many applications of the technique, a means of masking the evaluative intent of the instrument. Selection of bipolar scales for inclusion in semantic differentiation instruments remains a topic of major interest to researchers (Tucker, 1971; Fletcher, 1972; McDougall and Fry, 1975, and Haynes, 1975).

Selection of the bipolar scales utilized in this study was accomplished according to the parameters suggested



by Tucker (1971):

. . .justification for the use of a set of semantic differential scales in communication experiments ought to rest with the investigator. If the scales have been factor analyzed, a brief description of the results ought to be adequate. If scales are chosen intuitively, or if they have been borrowed from another experiment, the researcher should accept the responsibility of providing a logical basis for his choices. (p. 190)

As will be described in the following chapter, the bipolar scales utilized in this study have been employed in previous applications of the system-semantics methodology, and were selected specifically for this study in an effort to maintain continuity with other system-semantics studies. Previous utilization of the bipolar scales adopted for use in this study has not resulted in published reports of factor analytic data.

There are no other published accounts of the utilization of the system-semantics methodology. The previous applications of the methodology have not resulted in published or publicly-available reports. In light of these circumstances, it can be said only that this study cannot draw support from previous utilizations of the methodology; happily, neither can it contradict them.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN

#### Research Questions

This study explored intra-university communication by obtaining data related to perceptions and affective associations of communication from sample populations representing all segments of the population of the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus. Data obtained through interviews of the members of the sample populations provided the basis for the construction of semantic differentiation instruments, which were used to assess affective associations of lines of communication.

The institutional purpose of this study is identified by two general research questions:

- 1) What lines of communication are perceived by members of the University community as receiving the most attention?
- 2) What affective associations do members of the University community sustain in relation to those lines of communication?

The first general research question is related to that portion of the research design referred to as the Grapevine Profile, and the second general research question is related to that portion of the research design referred to as the

System-semantics Profile.

These two general research questions generated fourteen additional and more specific research questions:

- 1.a. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the student sample?
- 1.b. What immediate valence can be assigned to each of the lines of communication identified by members of the student sample?
- 1.c. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the faculty sample?
- 1.d. What immediate valence can be assigned to each of the lines of communication identified by members of the faculty sample?
- 1.e. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the classified staff sample?
- 1.f. What immediate valence can be assigned to each of the lines of communication identified by members of the classified staff sample?
- 1.g. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the administrative staff sample?
- 1.h. What immediate valence can be assigned to each of the lines of communication identified by members of the administrative staff sample?

Analysis of data for the above questions included treatment of all lines of communication identified in the Grapevine Profile (n=185), and of the three valence assignments associated with those lines of communication.

- 2.a. What affective associations are held by students in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.b. What affective associations are held by faculty in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?

- 2.c. What affective associations are held by classified staff in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.d. What affective associations are held by administrative staff in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.e. What affective associations are held by the University community in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?

Analysis of data for the above questions included treatment of the lines of communication and of the bipolar scales of the System-semantics Profile.

- 2.f. Which bipolar scales do members of the University community find to be useful in evaluating the lines of communication within the University?

This question reflects the desire to provide specific data pertinent to the selection of bipolar scales for use in system-semantics studies. Analysis of data for this question included treatment of the interaction of the ten bipolar scales within the lines of communication selected for semantic differentiation.

#### Design of the Study

This section describes 1) design considerations of the Grapevine Profile; 2) analytic tools and procedures utilized in treating data generated by the Grapevine Profile; 3) design considerations of the System-semantics Profile, and 4) statistical tools for analyzing data generated by the System-semantics Profile.

Design considerations of the Grapevine Profile

This phase of the methodology provides for participant reports from members of the organization regarding which lines of communication within the organization are given the most attention, and how those lines of communication are regarded. Members of the organization are asked, in interviews, to report what is active in the informal rumor networks of the organization, and to report the nature of comments related to those lines of communication.

Conboy (1976), in presenting this portion of the methodology, says:

The grapevine method has certain unique advantages. In the first place, it taps in on the informal networks of the organization, focusing on person-to-person situations and private conversations which should reveal authentic and unguarded sentiments. In the second place, and even more importantly, it permits the responder to disassociate himself from the responses. In other words, the responder is free to show his own true feelings under the cloak of reporting the comments of others. This technique is far less threatening to a responder than any device which requires him to disclose his personal feelings and attitudes. (p. 87)

The Grapevine Profile obtains indications of the frequency of mention for various lines of communication within the organization, as well as evaluations of the feelings associated with each line of communication. The feelings are reported as "valences," and may be coded as positive/favorable, neutral/descriptive, and negative/unfavorable.

## Samples

The samples required for the Grapevine Profile were drawn from all segments of the population of the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas. In conjunction with other members of the project reserach team, it was determined that the rigors of the overall project required relatively large samples from each of the four segments of the University population. Accordingly, the University population was segmented in the fashion shown below, and samples were drawn as described.

**Student Sample:** Utizing a table of random numbers, a random sample (n=200) of all enrolled students at the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas was drawn from listings of students provided by the Registrar as of 12 February 1975.

**Faculty Sample:** Utilizing a table of random numbers, a random sample (n=200) of all non-classified teaching staff having the rank of assistant instructor or above at the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas was drawn from faculty rosters in the 1974-75 directory of the University. Prior to sample selection, all multiple listings of individuals in the directory were reduced to single entries, all non-teaching staff were eliminated from the directory listings, all emeritus faculty were deleted, and all faculty on leave for the spring semester of 1975 similarly were eliminated from the listings.

**Classified Staff Sample:** A purposive sample (n=100) was selected of all staff members having a civil service classification and listed in current personnel records as of 12 February 1975. The sample was purposive so that it included representatives of all

classification levels, (Guilford, 1965, pp. 141-142)

Administrative Staff Sample: A purposive sample (n=100) of the administrative sector of the University was chosen from directory information as of 12 February 1975. The sample was purposive so that it included only those persons having an administrative rank of at least assistant dean or director, having no more than half-time faculty appointment, and not carrying a civil service classification, and also so that representatives of all administrative ranks would be included. These sampling limitations were dictated by the inclusion in the project design of the ECCO analysis as the fourth phase of the overall project.

The sampling procedures and restrictions resulted in a total sample population of 600, distributed among the four segments of the University community as indicated. In each of the four segments the sampling procedures resulted in inclusion of generally proportionate numbers of male and female subjects, as well as proportionate distributions of classifications of rankings within each segment. Table 3.1 provides a graphic representation of the results of the sampling techniques and procedures.

#### Selection and Training of Interviewers

The Grapevine Profile requires that subjects provide reports of their estimations of the lines of communication which have received the most attention in recent discussions or conversations which the subjects have overheard, or in which the subjects have been participants. Information of

TABLE 3.1  
THE RESEARCH SAMPLES

Level of Sub-sample		(Numbers in parentheses equal percentages)		
		Males	Females	Total
Student	Freshmen	29 (27.62)	25 (26.32)	54 (27.00)
	Sophomores	20 (19.05)	18 (17.14)	38 (19.00)
	Juniors	26 (24.76)	24 (22.86)	50 (25.00)
	Seniors	21 (20.00)	17 (16.19)	38 (19.00)
	Graduate	9 ( 8.57)	11 (10.48)	20 (10.00)
	Total	105	95	200
Faculty	Professor	34 (20.86)	3 ( 8.11)	37 (18.50)
	Assoc. Professor	42 (25.77)	7 (18.92)	49 (24.50)
	Asst. Professor	58 (35.58)	16 (43.24)	74 (37.00)
	Lecturer	11 ( 6.75)	1 ( 2.70)	12 ( 6.00)
	Instructor	2 ( 1.23)	1 ( 2.70)	3 ( 1.50)
	Asst Inst/Tchg Asst	16 ( 9.82)	9 (24.32)	25 (12.50)
	Total	163	37	200
Classified Staff	Secretary	0 ( --- )	45 (46.88)	45 (45.00)
	Cl-Typist 1-2	0 ( --- )	15 (15.63)	15 (15.00)
	Cl-Typist 3-5	1 (25.00)	11 (11.46)	12 (12.00)
	Skilled Maint.	3 (75.00)	1 ( 1.04)	4 ( 4.00)
	Accountant	0 ( --- )	6 ( 6.25)	6 ( 6.00)
	Cl-Steno-Typist	0 ( --- )	18 (18.75)	18 (18.00)
	Total	4	96	100
Admin. Staff	Executive Group <sup>1</sup>	3 ( 4.23)	1 ( 3.45)	4 ( 4.00)
	Vice-chancellor <sup>1</sup>	6 ( 8.45)	0 ( --- )	6 ( 6.00)
	Dean-Director	16 (22.54)	3 (10.35)	19 (19.00)
	Assoc-Asst Dean/Dir.	46 (64.79)	25 (86.21)	71 (71.00)
	Total	71	29	100

<sup>1</sup> Includes Assoc., Asst., and Asst. to, Vice-Chancellors.

this nature is obtained through the use of a moderately-scheduled interview conducted by trained interviewers.

The interviewers employed by the research team to conduct the Grapevine Profile interviews were selected from one or more of the following categories: students enrolled in an upper-division course in interviewing principles and



practices, graduate students with demonstrated capabilities in interviewing, or graduate assistants within the University whose positions with the University required expertise in interviewing. Twelve persons were selected to conduct the interviews for the Grapevine Profile.

The selected interviewers participated in a training program designed specifically to acquaint them with the use of the Grapevine Profile. The training program was planned and conducted in accordance with current theory and practices (Stewart and Cash, 1974).

At the conclusion of the training program, a series of simulated interviews was conducted for all trainees as was a reliability measure of their abilities and of the procedure itself. The procedure and the interview schedule were found to be feasible and adequate, and the interviewers achieved an inter-rater reliability coefficient of .9715 over three simulations. The project research team accepted the interviewers for use in the study, and the interviewers were instructed to complete their interviews, by telephone, within a ten-day period.

#### Format of the Interview

The format of the interview was established according to principles and guidelines suggested by Stewart and Cash (1974, pp. 71-102). The format was open-ended and non-directive, and utilized a moderately-scheduled design. The interview schedule included a comprehensive introduction of

the interviewer and the project for which the interview was to be conducted. Subjects were told that the interview would require approximately five minutes to complete; at the conclusion of all interviews, interviewers reported that the average length of each interview had been approximately four minutes.

The major stimulus to the subjects was provided by the interviewer saying:

The University of Kansas is a large and complex organization with many lines of communication. We are interested in finding out what students/faculty/staff at K.U. thinks about the lines of communication which affect them. You can help us by telling us what you have heard others say recently.

Interviewers were trained to record all mentions of any lines of communication, regardless of context. Additionally, the interview schedule contained potentially useful probing questions in the event that subjects encountered difficulty in responding to the stimulus statement. Interviewers were instructed to close the interview at whatever point it became clear that a subject had nothing more to say, and an appropriate closing was provided in the schedule.

The complete interview schedule utilized in the Grapevine Profile is contained in Appendix A.

Analytic Requirements and Measures of the Grapevine Profile

Data obtained from the Grapevine Profile satisfy two basic criteria of the system-semantics methodology utilized in this study: identification of the cartographic regions to be utilized in the System-semantics Profile, and preliminary

assessments of affective associations related to those cartographic regions. The former element is determined simply by recording the lines of communication mentioned by each subject in response to the interview. The latter element requires evaluation of the comments made by subjects in relation to those lines of communication. This element provides what may be considered a preliminary "valence"--stated as "positive," "neutral," or "negative"--for each of the lines of communication.

Mention of the lines of communication is a relatively simple factor to quantify: each line of communication mentioned by a subject is recorded by the interviewer. The requirements of the methodology dictate that a frequency distribution table be compiled to illustrate the number of times a given line of communication is identified by each and all of the sample populations. The frequency distributions tables are presented in the following chapter (Table 4.2 through Table 4.6).

The valence of each line of communication, identified by each subject in each sample, is determined by the research team through a relatively subjective process that is dependent on two series of interpretations. First, at the time when comments are recorded by the interviewers, factors of memory, perception, interviewer bias, interviewer fatigue, and distortion are inherent to the procedure. Additionally, when all responses from the interviews are compiled, the members of the research team are required to assess the valence value associ-

ated with each respondent-comment recorded by the interviewers.

The research team required unanimity of opinion for establishing all valences; however, the process is necessarily subjective as completed in this study. Those dual levels of subjective interpretation require that the valences obtained for each line of communication in the Grapevine Profile be considered preliminary. That they accurately reflect the perceptions and feelings of the subjects from whom they were obtained is an assumption of the system-semantics methodology, but may not be a valid assumption of this application of the methodology.

#### Design Considerations of the System-semantics Profile

The final phase of the system-semantics methodology is the System-semantics Profile, a process in which selected lines of communication are measured additionally by semantic differentiation techniques. The purpose of this phase of the methodology is to measure the "meanings" of the lines of communication, as perceived by members of the various sample populations.

Conboy (1976) summarizes this phase of the methodology in the following manner:

The term 'system-semantics' refers to the meanings attached to the system itself and the associations it evokes in the user. In this context, 'system' refers to the communication system (or subsystem)--the identifiable 'line of communication' in the organization. To a member of the organization the phrase 'line of communication' or 'communication line' tends to refer to either a source or a channel.

### Samples

The samples utilized in this portion of the study were the same as those drawn from the University community for the Grapevine Profile. Inasmuch as respondent anonymity was guaranteed by the research team, it is not possible to be more specific than to say that the same individuals comprising the four samples for the Grapevine Profile were included in the samples for the System-semantics Profile. There was no attempt made, nor did the possibility exist, to match respondents to the Grapevine Profile with respondents to the System-semantics Profile.

### Selection of Lines of Communication

Of the 185 lines of communication identified by respondents to the Grapevine Profile, the twelve mentioned most frequently across all samples were selected for inclusion in this portion of the methodology. Additionally, six lines of communication of special interest either to the research team or to the University agency sponsoring the project were included, for a total of eighteen lines of communication used as stimuli for the System-semantics Profile. The selected lines of communication, and the criteria by which they were selected, are discussed in a subsequent chapter.

### Construction of the Semantic Differential Scales

According to Conboy (1976), the semantic differential approach is appropriate for this methodology because .it

measures subjective or affective associations. (p. 87)

As Dember and Jenkins (1970) have suggested:

. . .these dimensions do not serve to show the denotative meaning of a term (that is, they do not tell what the word means), but they do serve to tell about the connotative meaning (that is, how someone feels about the word). (In Conboy, 1976, p. 87.)

The construction of the semantic differential scales requires two steps: 1) the identification of the lines of communication to which the scales will refer, and 2) the selection of the bipolar scales to be used in the process of semantic differentiation. The research team followed the advice of Tucker (1971) and selected ten bipolar adjectival pairs to be utilized in the construction of the semantic differential instrument. The ten scales selected, and their order of appearance on the instruments, are:

RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE  
 FAST-SLOW  
 FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY  
 USEFUL-USELESS  
 OPEN-CLOSED  
 RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE  
 HUMBLE-ARROGANT  
 EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE  
 NEAR-REMOTE  
 IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT

When the lines of communication and the bipolar scales to be utilized in the semantic differentiation process had been determined, the instrument was designed and constructed to conform to the requirements of the research project. The instrument contained a section at the top of each page which permitted the research team to identify four factors related to respondents: the sample population to which the respondent was assigned; the classification, appointment level, or rank

of the respondent within that sample population; the gender of the respondent, and the sector of the University in which the respondent was employed, if applicable. These bits of demographic data were necessary to analyze the data for the purposes of both the System-semantics Profile and the ECCOO analysis. At no time following the issuance of the instruments was any effort made to identify specific persons within any of the samples.

Also on the instrument form were the name of the cartographic region, and the ten bipolar scales with which the cartographic region was to be evaluated. The instrument displayed seven equal gradations between each extreme of the ten bipolar scales.

A sample of the semantic differential instrument utilized in this study is included in Appendix D.

#### Delivery and Return Procedures

The semantic differential instruments of the System-semantics Profile were administered to the sample populations on the basis of a stratified rotation mode of distribution, which resulted in each respondent's receiving semantic differential materials for six lines of communication. This procedure was implemented to minimize the demands of time and energy placed on each respondent, in the hope that such a step would help to maximize returns.

The efforts to insure anonymity made it impossible to know which lines of communication had been identified by any one respondent to the Grapevine Profile, and made it inherently

impossible to correlate data from the Grapevine Profile with data from the System-semantics Profile. Therefore, the research team decided that stratified rotation of semantic differentiation materials would in no way limit or inhibit subsequent data analysis.

Campus mail service was utilized in all cases where the mailing address indicated that the service would reach the respondent; U.S. Postal Service delivery in all other cases. Included in the packet of semantic differential materials mailed to each subject was a return envelope addressed to "Communication Survey, Nunemaker College, 1506 Engel Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66044" (the campus address from which mail service was handled). In those cases requiring the use of U.S. Postal Service delivery, appropriate postage was affixed to the return envelope. The packet also contained two brief letters: one from the research team which explained the nature of the study and provided directions for completion of the instruments (Appendix C), and one from the executive vice-chancellor of the University which encouraged subjects to complete the survey materials and return them as indicated (Appendix B).

These arrangements proved to be entirely adequate in that the completion-and-return rate reached 61.44 percent (n=353)--more than double that which would have been minimally acceptable for the study.



Data treatment

Data from the System-semantics Profile were coded to be punched on computer cards for entry to tape. Adjustments were made to the data received in response to the bipolar scales to assure that all data entries were consistent and compatible.

Three of the bipolar scales were presented on the semantic differential instruments in reversed polarity, in accordance with suggested procedure (Snider and Osgood, 1969). That is, they were presented with the so-called "negative" end of the scale presented on the left side of the scale, and appeared as follows: USELESS-USEFUL, ARROGANT-HUMBLE, and REMOTE-NEAR. In coding responses to these three scales, the obtained responses were transformed to conform with the polarity of the other seven scales appearing on the instrument. To illustrate, a response of "2" on the scale "REMOTE-NEAR" was transformed to a "5" during the coding process, and compatibility of response levels for all ten bipolar scales was thereby assured. This transformation was performed for all instruments returned.

In fewer than one percent of the returned differentials, one of the bipolar scales was not marked. There were no indications of trends or similarities accruing to these cases. The adjustment made in these few cases was to record the missing response as "4," the mid-point of the scale of possible responses. This adjustment was made in preference to discarding the entire instrument, and was made after consultation

with other members of the project research team.

In those cases where more than one of the bipolar scales were not marked, the entire instrument was excluded from the data pool and was not coded. This occurred in fewer than one percent of the cases.

No other adjustments were performed in coding the data.

### Statistical Analysis

Data obtained from the System-semantics Profile were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 5.02, with subprograms CODEBOOK, BREAKDOWN, and DISCRIMINANT. All computations were executed at the K.U. Computation Center.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter will present the results obtained from the second and third stages of a four-stage research design utilized in the project to survey lines of communication internal to the University of Kansas. As previously discussed in this study, the first and fourth stages of that project are reported elsewhere by the other members of the overall project research team (Conboy, 1975; Sanders, 1976).

The data included in this chapter were obtained through utilization of the system-semantics methodology within the framework provided by the overall project. The project was conducted between January and June of 1975, and the data from the system-semantics aspects of the study were obtained during the three-month period of February through April, inclusively, of that year.

The stages of the overall research project for which data are presented in this chapter have been described earlier in this report as the Grapevine Profile and the System-semantics Profile. These two aspects of the overall methodology were designed to obtain data in response to two general research questions:

- 1) What lines of communication are perceived by members of the University community as re-

ceiving the most attention?

- 2) What affective associations do members of the University community sustain in relation to those lines of communication?

Each general research question led to the development of additional questions, and the data reported in this chapter will be specific to those fourteen additional research questions.

#### Data Related to General Research Question One

The data derived from the construction of the Grapevine Profile are related specifically to the first general research question. Table 4.1 reflects the number of subjects from each of the four samples who responded to the interviews required by the Grapevine Profile. A simple "inclusion ratio" also is reported for each of the samples as an indication of the numbers of respondents whose comments are included in the obtained data, compared with the maximum number of respondents within each sample. The inclusion ratio is obtained by the formula:

$$\text{I.R.} = \frac{\text{Number of respondents included in data}}{\text{Number of subjects in the sample}}$$

As Table 4.1 shows, the degree of cooperation from sample members was consistently high across all samples. Even the inclusion ratio for the administrative staff (.870), relatively low in comparison with the ratios derived for the other sample populations, is entirely acceptable. Additionally, the incidence of either "no response" or uncodable responses (which included such comments as "You've got to be kidding,"

TABLE 4.1

## RESPONDENTS TO THE GRAPEVINE PROFILE INTERVIEWS

Sample	Subjects n=	Interview Respondents n=	Uncodable Responses n=	No Response n=	Included in data n=	Inclusion ratio
STUDENT	200	192	2	9	181	.905
FACULTY	200	194	0	10	184	.920
CLASSIFIED STAFF	100	99	0	4	95	.950
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	100	95	0	8	87	.870
ALL SAMPLES	600	580	2	31	547	.912

"What are you really trying to do?" and occasional profanity) resulted in the exclusion of only 5.5 percent of the maximum number of possible respondents. In sum, the data from the Grapevine Profile interviews were obtained from a percentage of the samples participating in the procedure which proved to be gratifyingly high (94.31 percent of all subjects interviewed).

These descriptions of the level of participation in the Grapevine Profile provide a necessary basis for reporting the data obtained in the interviewing process of the Grapevine Profile. Reports of obtained data specific to the first general research question are presented within the context provided by these descriptions.

As has been discussed in Chapter III, the rationale and procedures inherent in the Grapevine Profile portion of the methodology require that frequency distribution tables be constructed to reflect the lines of communication most frequently identified by respondents to the interview. This feature of the methodology resulted in the development of four additional and specific research questions:

- 1.a. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the student sample?
- 1.b. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the faculty sample?
- 1.c. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the classified staff sample?
- 1.d. Which lines of communication are most frequently identified by members of the

administrative staff sample?

Table 4.2 reports the results obtained in the Grapevine Profile interviews in response to the first of these questions. The results show that a total of 689 codable comments were obtained from the 181 student subjects. The codable comments contained references to 96 lines of communication. Twelve of those lines of communication account for more than 50 percent of the codable comments, while each of 65 lines of communication was identified by fewer than five percent of the respondents. Each subject identified an average of 0.53 lines of communication within the University community.

TABLE 4.2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT SAMPLE

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
The Athletic Department	46	689
Office of Security & Parking	44	643
Student Government	42	599
The Faculty	36	557
The Athletic Teams	33	521
The University Administration	30	488
Student Involvement	26	458
University Residence Halls	25	432
The Student Senate	24	407
The <u>University Daily Kansan</u>	22	383
Student Union Activities (SUA)	20	361
The Academic Departments	19	341
Advising	17	322
Women's Athletics	14	305
The School of Fine Arts	14	291
Enrollment	14	277
Office of the Chancellor	13	263
Concerts	12	250
The K.U. Medical Center	10	238
Sororities	9	228
Degree Requirements	9	219
The School of Journalism	8	210
The University Libraries	8	202

TABLE 4.2 continued

Line of communication	f	cf
The School of Law	8	194
The School of Business	8	186
The Kansas Union Bookstore	7	178
Office of the Dean of Women	7	171
The School of Social Welfare	6	164
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	6	158
Dept. of Speech & Drama	6	152
The Graduate School Council	6	146
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	5	140
Dept. of Human Development	5	135
"ROCK-CHALK"	5	130
The Student Body President	4	125
The Athletic Corporation Board	4	121
"SEN-EX"	4	117
Dept. of Psychology	4	113
Fraternities	4	109
"Blood-Drive"	4	105
Pre-enrollment	4	101
The "Smoking Policy"	4	97
Commission on the Status of Women	4	93
The School of Architecture	3	89
Office of Affirmative Action	3	86
Secretarial Personnel	3	83
Office of Facilities Plng/Oper.	3	80
Pearson Integrated Humanities	3	77
Office of the Dean of Men	3	74
Univ. Counseling Center	3	71
The School of Engineering	3	68
Colleges-within-the-College	3	65
"Nunemaker Center"	3	62
The School of Education	3	59
T.A.s and A.I.s	3	56
The Information Center	3	53
Committee on Promotion & Tenure	3	50
Board of Regents	2	47
The Kansas Union	2	45
Student Senate Exec. Committee	2	43
The Housing Office	2	41
Office of VC, Student Affairs	2	39
A.U.R.H.	2	37
University Events Committee	2	35
Bus Service	2	33
AMPHS	1	31
Panhellenic	1	30
Office of VC, Business Affairs	1	29
Dept. of Mathematics	1	28
Supportive Educational Services	1	27
The Intensive English Center	1	26
"Feedback" (the publication)	1	25
"Follow-through" (the publication)	1	24
Honors Students	1	23



TABLE 4.2 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
Watkins Hospital	1	22
K.U.O.K. (radio station)	1	21
Dept. of Chemistry	1	20
Dept. of Physics	1	19
The "Indian Committee"	1	18
Dept. of History	1	17
Dept. of Sociology	1	16
Dept. of French & Italian	1	15
Bachelor of General Studies	1	14
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	1	13
Dept. of Spanish & Port.	1	12
The Language Laboratory	1	11
Division of Biological Sciences	1	10
Intramural Athletics	1	9
Teaching Awards	1	8
The "Buckley" Amendment	1	7
The University Attorney	1	6
North College	1	5
The Gun Club	1	4
The Placement Services	1	3
The School of Religion	1	2
The A.A.U.P.	1	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>689</u>	

Table 4.3 provides data related to the second question. A total of 793 codable comments were obtained from the 184 members of the faculty sample who participated in the interview. Of those comments, which identified 123 lines of communication, more than 50 percent were specific to only sixteen lines of communication. Fewer than five percent of the respondents identified each of 84 lines of communication. Each subject identified an average of 0.67 lines of communication within the University community.

TABLE 4.3

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SAMPLE

Line of communication	f	cf
The University Administration	88	793
The Office of the Chancellor	43	705
Office of the College of LA&S	38	662
The Budget	32	624
The University Libraries	30	592
The Athletic Department	29	562
The Academic Departments	20	533
Office of Affirmative Action	17	513
Office of Executive V-C	17	496
Office of Security & Parking	17	479
The School of Fine Arts	17	462
The Athletic Teams	16	445
The Faculty	14	429
"SEN-EX"	13	415
Faculty Involvement	12	402
Office of Facilities Plng/Oper	12	390
Office of Assoc VC, Outreach	11	378
Financial Exigency Report	10	367
Office of VC, Academic Affairs	10	357
The K.U. Medical Center	10	347
Personal feelings about K.U.	10	337
Office of Research Admin.	10	327
The Computation Center	10	317
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	9	307
The School of Business	9	298
The School of Education	9	289
The University Council	8	280
Quality of Students	8	272
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	7	264
The School of Engineering	7	257
Board of Regents	7	250
Dept. of English	7	243
College Assembly (LA&S)	6	236
Dept. of Mathematics	6	230
The "Smoking Policy"	6	224
Degree Requirements	6	218
Committee of Promotion & Tenure	6	212
The School of Social Welfare	6	206
Student Union Activities (SUA)	6	200
Museum of Natural History	5	194
Athletic Corporation Board	5	189
Student Involvement	5	184
Division of Biological Sciences	5	179
Office of VC, Research/Grad Study	5	174
Dept. of Sociology	5	169
Unclsfd Women's Advisory Unit	5	164
"Early retirement"	5	159

TABLE 4.3 continued

Line of communication	f	cf
A.A.U.P.	5	154
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	4	149
<u>The Faculty Senate</u>	4	145
Dept. of Human Development	4	141
The School of Journalism	4	137
Women's Athletics	4	133
Dept. of Political Science	4	129
Dept. of History	4	125
Office of University Relations	3	121
Division of Continuing Educ.	3	118
Graduate Student Council	3	115
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	3	112
The Kansas Union	3	109
Long-range plng comm. Ks. Union	3	106
"This study"	3	103
"Feedback" (the publication)	3	100
The University Senate	3	97
The "Buckley Amendment	3	94
Dept. of Chemistry	3	91
Office of Minority Affairs	3	88
The School of Pharmacy	3	85
Pearson Integrated Humanities	3	82
Dept. of Psychology	3	79
Advising	3	76
Student Government	3	74
The EPPC of the College of LA&S	2	71
Dept. of Art History	2	69
Secretarial Personnel	2	67
Faculty Committee Assignments	2	65
The School of Architecture	2	63
The K.U. Alumni Association	2	61
The University Attorney	2	59
The General Committee Structure	2	57
The Computer Acquisition Com.	2	55
Dept. of Speech & Drama	2	53
"Search Committees"	2	51
Dept. of French & Italian	2	49
The Foreign Studies Office	2	47
Dept. of Spanish & Port.	2	45
"Follow-through" (the publication)	2	43
Dept. of Geology	2	41
Tuition and Fee Waivers	2	39
Unionization of the faculty	2	37
Radioactive Sources Committee	2	35
Dept. of German	2	33
The Intensive English Center	1	31
The "consulting policy"	1	30
Graduate students, quality of	1	29
The Museum of Art	1	28
SAGE	1	27

TABLE 4.3 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
Council of Chief Econ. Officers	1	26
Office of Dean of Women	1	25
The Faculty Council	1	24
Space-Tech: Building & Programs	1	23
The Chinese Student Association	1	22
"University Graduate School"	1	21
C.A.I.A.	1	20
Dept. of Economics	1	19
Humanities Lectures Series	1	18
The University Theatre	1	17
University Residence Halls	1	16
Principal-Counselor-Freshman Conf.	1	15
Office of Institutional Resources	1	14
The Animal Care Committee	1	13
The Placement Services	1	12
Colleges-within-the-College	1	11
Dept. of Asian Studies	1	10
C.R.Inc.	1	9
Dept. of Computer Science	1	8
Dept. of Anthropology	1	7
Affirmative Action Committee	1	6
Women's Studies	1	5
JuCo Transfers: admission	1	4
Dept. of Geography	1	3
The School of Religion	1	2
Council of Chief Admin. Officers	1	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>793</u>	

The data presented in Table 4.4 relates to the third question and shows that the 95 classified staff subjects interviewed provided 297 codable comments and identified a total of 83 lines of communication. Of those, seven lines of communication account for more than one-third of the total comments. Each of 70 lines of communication was mentioned by fewer than five percent of the respondents. Each subject identified an average of 0.87 lines of communication within the University community.

TABLE 4.4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY MEMBERS OF THE CLASSIFIED STAFF SAMPLE

Line of communication	f	cf
The University Administration	27	297
The Budget	20	270
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	16	250
The Athletic Department	14	234
The Payroll Office	14	220
Office of Affirmative Action	13	206
The Athletic Teams	9	193
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	6	184
Office of "The Graduate School"	6	178
Office of the Chancellor	6	172
Office of Admissions and Records	6	166
Office of Security & Parking	6	160
The School of Engineering	6	154
The Computation Center	5	148
Office of VC, Business Affairs	5	143
The Personnel Office	5	138
The School of Fine Arts	5	133
Dept. of Speech & Drama	5	128
Office of Exec. VC	4	123
Dept. of History	4	119
Dept. of Chemistry	4	115
The K.U. Endowment Associaton	4	111
The Faculty	4	107
The University Libraries	3	103
The School of Journalism	3	100
Division of Continuing Educ.	3	97
The "Buckley" Amendment	3	94
Office of the College of LA&S	3	91
<u>Classified Staff Newsletter</u>	3	88
<u>The Kansas Union</u>	3	85
The K.U. Medical Center	3	82
The "Smoking policy"	3	79
Committee on Promotion & Tenure	3	76
Personal feelings about K.U.	2	73
The School of Business	2	71
Office of Assoc. VC, Outreach	2	69
Office of University Relations	2	67
The Housing Office	2	65
Student Government	2	63
Quality of students	2	61
Office of Dean of Women	2	59
Watkins Hospital	2	57
Dept. of Mathematics	2	55
The Intensive English Center	2	53
Classified Employee Involvement	2	51
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	2	49
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	2	47

TABLE 4.4 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
Office of Research Admin.	2	45
The School of Religion	2	43
Classified Employees	2	41
Enrollment	2	39
Division of Biological Sciences	2	37
"Sping on the Hill" (carnival)	2	35
University Residence Halls	2	33
Dept. of Political Science	2	31
Student Union Activities (SUA)	2	29
The Graduate Student Council	1	27
The School of Law	1	26
Union of Classified Employees	1	25
Office of Facilities Plng/Oper	1	24
Campus Mail Service	1	23
Women's Athletics	1	22
The Academic Departments	1	21
Classes	1	20
Office of Dean of Foreign Students	1	19
Architectural Barriers Committee	1	18
The Audio-visual Center	1	17
Board of Regents	1	16
Office of VC, Student Affairs	1	15
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	1	14
Office of VC, Academic Affairs	1	13
"Feedback" (the publication)	1	12
"SEN-EX"	1	11
The School of Education	1	10
The Information Center	1	9
University Counseling Center	1	8
Supportive Educational Services	1	7
Office of the Dean of Men	1	6
Degree Requirements	1	5
Classfd Women's Advisory Unit	1	4
Dept. of Geography	1	3
Kansas Union Bookstore	1	2
Office of Student Financial Aid	1	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>297</u>	

The fourth question is answered by the data provided in Table 4.5. A total of 87 members of the administrative staff sample identified 96 lines of communication in 495 codable comments. Of the total number of lines of communication identified, thirteen account for more than

50 percent of the comments. Each of 65 lines of communication was identified by fewer than five percent of the respondents. Each subject identified an average of 1.10 lines of communication.

TABLE 4.5

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF SAMPLE

Line of communication	f	cf
The University Administration	56	495
Office of Affirmative Action	31	439
The Budget	25	408
The Office of the Chancellor	25	383
The Athletic Department	20	358
"SEN-EX"	13	338
The K.U. Medical Center	12	325
The Athletic Teams	12	313
The University Libraries	11	301
Office of VC, Academic Affairs	11	290
Office of Security & Parking	10	279
"Nunemaker Center"	10	269
The Faculty	10	259
Personal feelings about K.U.	9	249
University Residence Halls	8	240
Office of Admissions & Records	7	232
Office of Executive VC	7	225
Office of VC, Student Affairs	7	218
The "Buckley" Amendment	7	211
Student Government	7	204
Office of Facilities Plng/Oper	7	197
Student Senate	7	190
The Computation Center	6	183
Committee on Promotion & Tenure	6	177
Office of the College of LA&S	6	171
Office of Student Financial Aid	5	165
Office of Assoc. VC, Outreach	5	160
Office of Dean of Women	5	155
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	5	150
The general committee structure	5	145
Dept. of English	5	140
Women's Athletics	4	135
The "Graduate School"	4	131
Advising	4	127
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	4	123
The University Senate	4	119
The K.U. Alumni Association	4	115
Summer Orientation	4	111
The Housing Office	4	107

TABLE 4.5 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
Office of the Dean of Men	4	103
Office of University Relations	4	99
Division of Continuing Education	3	95
Office of Minority Affairs	3	92
The EPPC of the College of LA&S	3	89
The Intensive English Center	3	86
The School of Engineering	3	83
The School of Law	3	80
Athletic Corporation Board	3	77
Student Union Activities (SUA)	3	74
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	3	71
Radio Station KANU	3	68
University Counseling Center	3	65
The Council of Deans	3	62
Women's Unclsfd Advisory Unit	2	59
The Colleges-within-the-college	2	57
TAs and AIs	2	55
Enrollment	2	53
The Kansas Union	2	51
The Personnel Office	2	49
Office of VC, Business Affairs	2	47
<u>Classified Employees Newsletter</u>	2	45
Pre-enrollment	2	43
The Payroll Office	2	41
Bachelor of General Studies	2	39
The consulting policy	2	37
The Financial exigency report	2	35
The K.U. Endowment Association	2	33
The Placement Services	2	31
The University Council	2	29
"Feedback" (the publication)	1	27
"This Week at K.U." (the public.)	1	26
Principal-counselor-freshman conf.	1	25
Campus mail service	1	24
Fraternities	1	23
The Printing Service	1	22
The Faculty Senate	1	21
"Spring on the Hill" (carnival)	1	20
A.U.R.H.	1	19
Board of Regents	1	18
The School of Journalism	1	17
University Events Committee	1	16
Sororities	1	15
"Early retirement" policy	1	14
Dept. of Linguistics	1	13
Office of the Registrar	1	12
University Attorney	1	11
The "Smoking policy"	1	10
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	1	9
Faculty Involvement	1	8



TABLE 4.5 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cf</u>
Concerts	1	7
Search committees	1	6
The School of Social Welfare	1	5
A.A.U.P.	1	4
Office of VC, Research & Grad	1	3
The School of Religion	1	2
The Faculty Council	1	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>495</u>	

Table 4.6 displays a composite summary of the frequency of mention of lines of communication within the University of Kansas by all samples. Only those lines of communication which were identified by more than one percent of all respondents are included in the composite summary. Any line of communication mentioned by fewer than six respondents, inclusive of all samples, does not appear in Table 4.6. All 547 respondents identified a total of 185 lines of communication. Of the 2274 codable comments, more than fifty percent were specific to only 20 lines of communication. Each of 90 lines of communication was identified by fewer than five percent of the respondents, and each subject identified an average of 0.34 lines of communication within the University community.

TABLE 4.6

COMPOSITE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LINES OF  
COMMUNICATION IDENTIFIED SIX OR MORE TIMES BY ALL SAMPLES

<u>Line of communication</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>rank</u>
The University Administration	201	1
The Athletic Department	109	2
The Office of the Chancellor	87	3

TABLE 4.6 continued

Line of communication	f	rank
The Budget	77	4
Office of Security & Parking	77	5
The Athletic Teams	70	6
Office of Affirmative Action	64	7
The Faculty	64	8
Student Government	54	9
The University Libraries	52	10
Office of the College of LA&S	47	11
Academic Departments	40	12
University Daily Kansan	38	13
University Residence Halls	36	14
The School of Fine Arts	36	15
The K.U. Medical Center	35	16
"SEN-EX"	31	17
Student Senate	31	18
Student Involvement	31	19
Student Union Activities (SUA)	31	20
Office of the Executive VC	28	21
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	28	22
Advising	24	23
Women's Athletics	23	24
Office of Facilities Plng/Oper	23	25
Office of VC, Academic Affairs	22	26
Personal feelings about K.U.	21	27
The Computation Center	21	28
The School of Business	19	29
The School of Engineering	19	30
Committee on Promotion & Tenure	18	31
Enrollment	18	32
Office of Assoc. VC, Outreach	18	33
The Payroll Office	16	34
Degree Requirements	16	35
The School of Journalism	16	36
Office of the Dean of Women	15	37
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	15	38
The "Buckley" amendment	14	39
The School of Education	14	40
The "smoking policy"	14	41
Office of Admissions & Records	13	42
"Nunemaker Center"	13	43
Concerts	13	44
The School of Social Welfare	13	45
Faculty Involvement	13	46
Dept. of Speech & Drama	13	47
Dept. of English	12	48
Financial exigency report	12	49
Office of Research Admin.	12	50
The School of Law	12	51
The Athletic Corporation Board	12	52
The "Graduate School"	11	53

TABLE 4.6 continued

Line of communication	f	rank
Board of Regents	11	54
Sororities	10	55
Office of VC, Student Affairs	10	56
The Kansas Union	10	57
The University Council	10	58
"Quality of students"	10	59
The Graduate Student Council	10	60
Dept. of Human Development	9	61
Division of Continuing Education	9	62
Dept. of Mathematics	9	63
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	8	64
Division of Biological Sciences	8	65
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	8	66
The Housing Office	8	67
Office of the Dean of Men	8	68
Office of VC, Business Affairs	8	69
Dept. of History	8	70
Dept. of Chemistry	8	71
Kansas Union Bookstore	8	72
The Personnel Office	7	73
A.A.U.P.	7	74
Unclsfd Women's Advisory Unit	7	75
Office of University Relations	7	76
Dept. of Psychology	7	77
The Intensive English Center	7	78
University Counseling Center	7	79
The general committee structure	7	80
The University Senate	7	81
The colleges-within-the-college	6	82
The Assembly of the College of LAS	6	83
Office of VC, Research & Grad	6	84
Dept. of Sociology	6	85
Early retirement policy	6	86
Dept. of Political Science	6	87
The K.U. Alumni Association	6	88
"Feedback" (the publication)	6	89
Office of Minority Affairs	6	90
Office of Student Financial Aid	6	91
Pearson Integrated Humanities	6	92
Pre-enrollment	6	93
The School of Architecture	6	94
The K.U. Endowment Association	6	95

In addition to indications of the frequency of identification of various lines of communication within the University community, the Grapevine Profile portion of the

methodology also resulted in the assignment of valences--stated as "positive," "negative," and/or "neutral"--for each line of communication. The requirement that these valences be considered as preliminary indices of affective association has been discussed in the preceding chapter. All valences reported in relation to the lines of communication represent the unanimous interpretation, by members of the project research team, of data recorded by trained interviewers.

Table 4.7 reports the valence assignments for lines of communication identified by members of the student sample. Each of the 689 codable comments obtained from student subjects is reported according to its valence assignments in relation to specific lines of communication. As Table 4.7 displays, 118 codable comments were assigned a "positive" valence (17.13 percent of the total), 193 codable comments were assigned a "neutral" valence (28.01 percent of the total), and 378 codable comments were assigned a "negative" valence (54.86 percent). The implications of the heavily negative assessments of student comments will be discussed in the following chapter.

TABLE 4.7

VALENCE ASSIGNMENTS FOR LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY STUDENT RESPONDENTS

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Athletic Department	n	2	11	33	46
	%	4.35	23.91	71.74	
Office of Security & Parking	n	0	2	42	44
	%	-	4.55	95.45	
Student Government	n	5	16	21	42
	%	11.91	38.09	50.00	
The Faculty	n	8	7	21	36
	%	22.22	19.44	58.33	
The Athletic Teams	n	11	8	14	33
	%	33.33	24.24	42.42	
The University Administration	n	4	7	19	30
	%	13.33	23.33	63.33	
Student Involvement	n	5	3	18	26
	%	19.23	11.54	69.23	
University Residence Halls	n	4	4	17	25
	%	16.00	16.00	68.00	
The Student Senate	n	3	9	12	24
	%	12.50	37.50	50.00	
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	n	7	5	10	22
	%	31.82	22.73	45.45	
Student Union Activities (SUA)	n	1	6	13	20
	%	5.00	30.00	65.00	
The Academic Departments	n	2	9	8	19
	%	10.53	47.37	42.10	
Advising	n	0	0	17	17
	%	-	-	100.00	
Women's Athletics	n	7	5	2	14
	%	50.00	35.71	14.29	
The School of Fine Arts	n	4	4	6	14
	%	28.57	28.57	42.86	
Enrollment	n	1	0	13	14
	%	7.14	-	92.86	
The Office of the Chancellor	n	0	8	5	13
	%	-	61.54	38.46	
Concerts	n	0	7	5	12
	%	-	58.33	41.67	

TABLE 4.7 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The K.U. Medical Center	n	1	7	2	10
	%	10.00	70.00	20.00	
Sororities	n	2	2	5	9
	%	22.22	22.22	55.56	
Degree Requirements	n	0	0	9	9
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Journalism	n	1	2	5	8
	%	12.50	25.00	62.50	
The University Libraries	n	2	1	5	8
	%	25.00	12.50	62.50	
The School of Law	n	0	5	3	8
	%	-	62.50	37.50	
The School of Business	n	1	3	4	8
	%	12.50	37.50	50.00	
The Kansas Union Bookstore	n	3	0	4	7
	%	42.86	-	57.14	
Office of the Dean of Women	n	1	6	0	7
	%	14.29	85.71	-	
The School of Social Welfare	n	2	0	4	6
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	n	0	1	5	6
	%	-	16.67	83.33	
Dept. of Speech & Drama	n	2	1	3	6
	%	33.33	16.67	50.00	
Graduate School Council	n	1	5	0	6
	%	16.67	83.33	-	
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	n	0	0	5	5
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Human Development	n	2	2	1	5
	%	40.00	40.00	20.00	
"ROCK-CHALK"	n	2	1	2	5
	%	40.00	20.00	40.00	
Student Body President	n	0	4	0	4
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Athletic Corporation Board	n	0	0	4	4
	%	-	-	100.00	
"SEN-EX"	n	0	4	0	4
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Psychology	n	1	2	1	4
	%	25.00	50.00	25.00	

TABLE 4.7 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Fraternities	n	1	1	2	4
	%	25.00	25.00	50.00	
"Blood Drive"	n	2	2	0	4
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Pre-enrollment	n	3	0	1	4
	%	75.00	-	25.00	
The "Smoking Policy"	n	1	0	3	4
	%	25.00	-	75.00	
Commission on the Status of Women	n	1	1	2	4
	%	25.00	25.00	50.00	
The School of Architecture and Urban Design	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
The Office of Affirmative Action	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Secretarial Personnel	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
Office of Facilities Planning/Operations	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
Pearson Integrated Humanities	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of the Dean of Men	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
University Counseling Center	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
The School of Engineering	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
Colleges-within-the- College	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
The School of Education	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
T.A.s/A.I.s	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
The Information Center	n	3	0	0	3
	%	100.00	-	-	
Committee on Promotion and Tenure	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
Board of Regents	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
Student Senate Executive Committee	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	

TABLE 4.7 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Kansas Union	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
The Housing Office	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	
Office of V-C, Student Affairs	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
A.U.R.H.	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
University Events Committee	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Bus Service	n	2	0	0	2
	%	100.00	-	-	
A.M.P.H.S.	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Panhellenic	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Office of V-C, Business Affairs	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Mathematics	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Supportive Educational Services	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Intensive English Center	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
"Feedback" (the publication)	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
"Follow-through" (HDFL)	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Honors Students	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Watkins Hospital	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Radio Station K.U.O.K.	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Chemistry	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Physics	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
"Indian Committee"	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	



TABLE 4.7 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Dept. of History	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Sociology	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Dept. of French and Italian	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Bachelor of General Studies	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Language Laboratory	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Division of Biological Sciences	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Intramural Athletics	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Teaching Awards	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
The "Buckley Amendment"	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
The University Attorney	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
North College	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Gun Club	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Placement Services	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Religion	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
A.A.U.P.	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Total	n	118	193	378	689
	%	17.13	28.01	54.86	

Faculty respondents to the Grapevine Profile interviews provided 793 codable comments, of which nearly 90 percent were evenly divided between neutral and negative valences. As Table 4.8 reports, 100 comments were assessed as positive (12.61 percent), 352 comments were determined to be neutral (44.39 percent), and 341 comments were identified as negative (43.00 percent). Some of the possible implications of this distribution of valences will be discussed in Chapter V.

TABLE 4.8

VALENCE ASSIGNMENTS FOR LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The University Administration	n	6	19	63	88
	%	6.82	21.59	71.59	
The Office of the Chancellor	n	6	10	27	43
	%	13.95	23.26	62.79	
Office of the College of LA & S	n	0	19	19	38
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
The Budget	n	4	15	13	32
	%	12.50	46.88	40.62	
The University Libraries	n	1	7	22	30
	%	3.33	23.33	73.33	
The Athletic Department	n	0	11	18	29
	%	-	37.93	62.07	
The Academic Departments	n	4	6	10	20
	%	20.00	30.00	50.00	
Office of Affirmative Action	n	0	15	2	17
	%	-	88.24	11.76	
Office of Executive Vice-Chancellor	n	2	10	5	17
	%	11.77	58.82	29.41	
Office of Security and Parking	n	0	7	10	17
	%	-	41.18	58.82	
The School of Fine Arts	n	0	9	8	17
	%	-	52.94	47.06	
The Athletic Teams	n	7	5	4	16
	%	43.75	31.25	24.00	

TABLE 4.8 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Faculty	n	1	9	4	14
	%	7.14	64.29	28.57	
"SEN-EX"	n	0	9	4	13
	%	-	69.23	30.77	
Faculty Involvement	n	3	1	8	12
	%	25.00	8.33	66.67	
Office of Facilities Planning/Operations	n	1	6	5	12
	%	8.33	50.-0	41.67	
Office of Assoc. V-C, Outreach	n	4	5	2	11
	%	36.36	45.46	18.18	
Financial Exigency Report	n	0	8	2	10
	%	-	80.00	20.00	
Office of V-C, Academic Affairs	n	0	6	4	10
	%	-	60.00	40.00	
The K.U. Medical Center	n	0	6	4	10
	%	-	60.00	40.00	
Personal Feelings about the University	n	6	2	2	10
	%	60.00	20.00	20.00	
Office of Research Administration	n	0	6	4	10
	%	-	60.00	40.00	
The Computation Center	n	0	8	2	10
	%	-	80.-0	20.00	
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	n	3	4	2	9
	%	33.33	44.44	22.22	
The School of Business	n	1	5	3	9
	%	11.11	55.56	33.33	
The School of Education	n	2	6	1	9
	%	22.22	66.67	11.11	
The University Council	n	1	5	2	8
	%	12.50	62.50	25.00	
Quality of Students	n	3	1	4	8
	%	37.50	12.50	50.00	
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	n	0	6	1	7
	%	-	85.71	14.29	
The School of Engineering	n	2	3	2	7
	%	28.57	42.86	28.57	
Board of Regents	n	2	2	3	7
	%	28.57	28.57	42.86	
Dept. of English	n	0	5	2	7
	%	-	71.43	28.57	

TABLE 4.8 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>		<u>Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
The Assembly of the College of LA & S	n 1 % 16.67	2 33.33	3 50.00	6	
Dept. of Mathematics	n 1 % 16.67	3 50.00	2 33.33	6	
The "Smoking Policy"	n 4 % 66.67	1 16.67	1 16.67	6	
Degree Requirements	n 0 % -	3 50.00	3 50.00	6	
Committee on Promotion and Tenure	n 0 % -	2 33.33	4 66.67	6	
The School of Social Welfare	n 0 % -	5 83.33	1 16.67	6	
Student Union Activities (SUA)	n 1 % 16.67	2 33.33	3 50.00	6	
Museum of Natural History	n 3 % 60.-0	2 40.00	0 -	5	
The Athletic Corporation Board	n 0 % -	3 60.00	2 40.00	5	
Student Involvement	n 0 % -	1 20.00	4 80.00	5	
Division of Biological Sciences	n 0 % -	3 60.00	2 40.00	5	
Office of V-C, Research and Graduate Studies	n 2 % 40.00	0 -	3 60.00	5	
Dept. of Sociology	n 0 % -	5 100.00	0 -	5	
Unclsfd, Women's Advisory Unit	n 1 % 20.00	4 80.00	0 -	5	
"Early retirement"	n 0 % -	4 80.00	1 20.00	5	
A.A.U.P.	n 0 % -	4 80.00	1 20.00	5	
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	n 2 % 50.00	2 50.00	0 -	4	
The Faculty Senate	n 0 % -	2 50.00	2 50.00	4	
Dept. of Human Development	n 1 % 25.00	3 75.00	0 -	4	
The School of Journalism	n 1 % 25.00	3 75.00	0 -	4	

TABLE 4.8 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Women's Athletics	n	2	2	0	4
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Dept. of Political Science	n	1	2	1	4
	%	25.00	50.00	25.00	
Dept. of History	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of University Relations	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
Division of Continuing Education	n	1	2	0	3
	%	33.33	66.67		
The Graduate School Council	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	n	0	0	3	3
	%	-	-	100.00	
The Kansas Union	n	2	1	0	3
	%	66.67	33.33	-	
Ks. Union Long-range Planning Committee	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
"This Study"	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
"Feedback" (the publication)	n	0	0	3	3
	%	-	-	100.00	
The University Senate	n	0	1	2	3
	%	-	33.33	66.67	
The "Buckley Amendment"	n	0	1	2	3
	%	-	33.33	66.67	
Dept. of Chemistry	n	1	1	1	3
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
Office of Minority Affairs	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
The School of Pharmacy	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Pearson Integrated Humanities	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
Dept. of Psychology	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Advising	n	2	0	1	3
	%	66.67	-	33.33	
Student Government	n	0	1	2	3
	%	-	33.33	66.67	

TABLE 4.8 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The EPPC of the College of LA & S	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Dept. of Art History	n	1	0	1	2
	%	50.00	-	50.00	
Secretarial Personnel	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Faculty committee assignments	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Architecture and Urban Design	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
The K.U. Alumni Association	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Office of the University Attorney	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
The general "committee structure"	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	
Computer Acquisition Committee	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Speech & Drama	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
"Search committees"	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Dept. of French and Italian	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Foreign Studies Office	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
"Follow-through" (HDFL)	n	0	0	2	2
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Geology	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
Tuition and Fee Waivers	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Unionization of the Faculty	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Radioactive Sources Committee	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Dept. of German	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	

TABLE 4.8 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Intensive English Center	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The "consulting policy"	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Quality of graduate students	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Museum of Art	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
S.A.G.E.	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Council of Chief Economic Officers	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of the Dean of Women	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Faculty Council	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Space Tech.: Building and Programs	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Chinese Student Assn.	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of the "Univ. Graduate School"	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
C.A.I.A.	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Economics	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Humanities Lectures Series	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
The University Theatre	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
University Residence Halls	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Principal-Counselor-Freshman Conference	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of Institutional Resources	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Animal Care Committee	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Placement Services	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	

TABLE 4.8 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Colleges-within-the-College	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Asian Studies	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
C.R.Inc.	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Computer Science	n	0	0	0	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Anthropology	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Affirmative Action Committee	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Women's Studies	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
JuCo Transfers: Admission	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of Geography	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The School of Religion	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Council of Chief Administrative Officers	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Total	n	100	352	341	793
	%	12.61	44.39	43.00	

Table 4.9 reports the valence assignments for lines of communication identified by respondents from the classified staff sample. Each of the 297 codable comments obtained from classified staff subjects is reported according to its valence assignment in relation to lines of communication within the University community. As Table 4.9 shows, 38 codable comments were assigned a positive valence (12.79 percent), 158 codable comments were assigned a neutral valence (53.20 percent), and 101 comments were designated



as negative (34.01 percent). Special attention will be given in Chapter V to the possible implications of the percentage of neutral comments obtained from this category of respondents.

TABLE 4.9

VALENCE ASSIGNMENTS FOR LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY CLASSIFIED STAFF RESPONDENTS

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The University Administration	n	3	12	14	29
	%	10.35	41.38	48.28	
The Budget	n	0	14	6	20
	%	-	70.00	30.00	
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	n	1	9	6	16
	%	6.25	56.25	37.50	
The Athletic Department	n	1	5	8	14
	%	7.14	35.71	57.14	
The Payroll Office	n	0	4	10	14
	%	-	28.57	71.43	
Office of Affirmative Action	n	3	9	1	13
	%	23.08	69.23	7.69	
The Athletic Teams	n	5	3	1	9
	%	55.56	33.33	11.11	
Buildings and Grounds (B&G)	n	0	0	6	6
	%	-	-	100.00	
Office of the "Graduate School"	n	0	4	2	6
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Office of the Chancellor	n	0	4	2	6
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
Office of Admissions & Records	n	3	1	2	6
	%	50.00	16.67	33.33	
Office of Security and Parking	n	0	0	0	6
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Engineering	n	0	6	0	6
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Computation Center	n	1	3	1	5
	%	20.00	60.00	20.00	
Office of V-C, Business Affairs	n	2	2	1	5
	%	40.00	40.00	20.00	

TABLE 4.9 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Personnel Office	n	1	1	3	5
	%	20.00	20.00	60.00	
The School of Fine Arts	n	0	4	1	5
	%	-	80.00	20.00	
Dept. of Speech & Drama	n	0	4	1	5
	%	-	80.00	20.00	
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor	n	3	1	0	4
	%	75.00	25.00	-	
Dept. of History	n	2	1	1	4
	%	50.00	25.00	25.00	
Dept. of Chemistry	n	0	4	0	4
	%	-	100.00	-	
The K.U. Endowment Association	n	1	2	1	4
	%	25.00	50.00	25.00	
The Faculty	n	0	0	4	4
	%	-	-	100.00	
The University Libraries	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
The School of Journalism	n	2	1	0	3
	%	66.67	33.33	-	
Division of Continuing Education	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
The "Buckley Amendment"	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
The Office of the College of LA & S	n	0	2	1	3
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
<u>Classified Staff</u> <u>Newsletter</u>	n	1	2	0	3
	%	33.33	66.67	-	
The Kansas Union	n	0	1	2	3
	%	-	33.33	66.67	
The K.U. Medical Center	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
The "smoking policy"	n	1	0	2	3
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
Committee on Promotion and Tenure	n	0	3	0	3
	%	-	100.00	-	
Personal feelings about the university	n	1	0	1	2
	%	50.00	-	50.00	
The School of Business	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	

TABLE 4.9 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Office of Assoc. V-C, Outreach	n 1 % 50.00	1	1	0	2
Office of University Relations	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
The Housing Office	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
Student Government	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
Quality of the students	n 0 % -	0	0	2	2
Office of the Dean of Women	n 1 % 50.00	1	1	0	2
Watkins Hospital	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
Dept. of Mathematics	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
The Intensive English Center	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
Classified employee involvement	n 0 % -	0	0	2	2
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
Office of Research Administration	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
The School of Religion	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
Classified employees	n 2 % 100.00	2	0	0	2
Enrollment	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
Division of Biological Sciences	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
"Spring-on-the-Hill" (carnival)	n 0 % -	0	1	1	2
University Residence Halls	n 0 % -	0	2	0	2
Dept. of Political Science	n 0 % -	0	0	2	2

TABLE 4.9 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>		<u>Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
Student Union Activities (SUA)	n 2 % 100.00	0 -	0 -	0 -	2
Graduate Student Council	n 1 % 100.00	0 -	0 -	0 -	1
The School of Law	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Union of Classified Employees	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Campus Mail Service	n 0 % -	0 -	0 -	1 100.00	1
Office of Facilities Planning/Operations	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Women's Athletics	n 1 % 100.00	0 -	0 -	0 -	1
The Academic Departments	n 0 % -	0 -	0 -	1 100.00	1
Classes	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Office of the Dean of Foreign Students	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Architectural Barriers Committee	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Audio-Visual Center	n 1 % 100.00	0 -	0 -	0 -	1
Office of V-C, Student Affairs	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Board of Regents	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
Office of V-C, Academic Affairs	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
"Feedback" (the publication)	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
"SEN-EX"	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
The School of Education	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1
The Information Center	n 0 % -	1 100.00	0 -	0 -	1

TABLE 4.9 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
University Counseling Center	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Supportive Educational Services	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of the Dean of Men	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Degree Requirements	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Classified Women's Advisory Unit	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Geography	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Kansas Union Bookstore	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Office of Student Financial Aid	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Total	n	38	158	101	
	%	12.79	53.20	34.01	

The results of valence assignments for the lines of communication identified by subjects in the administrative staff sample are reported in Table 4.10. A total of 85 codable comments were assigned positive valences (17.17 percent); 240 comments were assigned neutral valences (48.49 percent), and 170 of the total 495 codable comments were assigned negative valences (34.34 percent). The distribution of valence assignments relative to this group of respondents will be discussed in the following chapter.

TABLE 4.10

VALENCE ASSIGNMENTS FOR LINES OF COMMUNICATION  
IDENTIFIED BY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF RESPONDENTS

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The University	n	4	16	36	56
Administration	%	7.14	28.57	64.29	
Office of Affirmative	n	5	20	6	31
Action	%	16.13	64.52	19.35	
The Budget	n	2	16	7	25
	%	8.00	64.00	28.00	
Office of the Chancellor	n	20	1	4	25
	%	80.00	4.00	16.00	
The Athletic Department	n	1	11	8	20
	%	5.00	55.00	40.00	
"SEN-EX"	n	1	12	0	13
	%	7.69	92.31	-	
The K.U. Medical Center	n	1	10	1	12
	%	8.33	83.33	8.33	
The Athletic Teams	n	8	4	0	12
	%	66.67	33.33	-	
The University Libraries	n	0	4	7	11
	%	-	36.36	63.64	
Office of V-C, Academic	n	0	5	6	11
Affairs	%	-	45.45	54.55	
Office of Security	n	0	5	5	10
and Parking	%	-	50.00	50.00	
"Nunemaker Center"	n	5	4	1	10
	%	50.00	40.00	10.00	
The Faculty	n	1	4	5	10
	%	10.00	40.00	50.00	
Personal feelings	n	6	2	1	9
about the university	%	66.67	22.22	11.11	
University Residence	n	0	6	2	8
Halls	%	-	75.00	25.00	
Office of Admissions	n	2	3	2	7
and Records	%	28.57	42.86	28.57	
Office of Executive	n	1	3	3	7
Vice-Chancellor	%	14.28	42.86	42.86	
Office of V-C, Student	n	1	2	4	7
Affairs	%	14.28	28.57	57.14	
The "Buckley amendment"	n	0	2	5	7
	%	-	28.57	71.43	

TABLE 4.10 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>		<u>Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Total</u>
Student Government	n	2	4	1	7
	%	28.57	57.14	14.29	
Office of Facilities Planning/Operations	n	0	3	4	7
	%	-	42.86	57.14	
Student Senate	n	0	6	1	7
	%	-	85.71	14.29	
The Computation Center	n	0	5	1	6
	%	-	83.33	16.67	
Committee on Promotion and Tenure	n	0	2	4	6
	%	-	33.33	66.67	
Office of the College of LA & S	n	0	3	3	6
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Office of Student Financial Aid	n	1	2	2	5
	%	20.00	40.00	40.00	
Office of Assoc. V-C, Outreach	n	1	3	1	5
	%	20.00	60.00	20.00	
Office of the Dean of Women	n	1	3	1	5
	%	20.00	60.00	20.00	
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	n	1	0	4	5
	%	20.00	-	80.00	
The general "committee structure"	n	0	0	5	5
	%	-	-	100.00	
Dept. of English	n	0	4	1	5
	%	-	80.00	20.00	
Women's Athletics	n	2	2	0	4
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
The "Graduate School"	n	1	1	2	4
	%	25.00	25.00	50.00	
Advising	n	0	1	3	4
	%	-	25.00	75.00	
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	n	1	1	2	4
	%	25.00	25.00	50.00	
University Senate	n	0	1	3	4
	%	-	25.00	75.00	
The K.U. Alumni Association	n	1	2	1	4
	%	25.00	50.00	25.00	
Summer Orientation Program	n	1	3	0	4
	%	25.00	75.00	-	
The Housing Office	n	0	2	2	4
	%	-	50.00	50.00	

TABLE 4.10 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Office of the Dean of Men	n %	0 -	3 75.00	1 25.00	4
Office of University Relations	n %	1 25.00	2 50.00	1 25.00	4
Division of Continuing Education	n %	0 -	3 100.00	0 -	3
Office of Minority Affairs	n %	0 -	2 66.67	1 33.33	3
The EPPC of the College of LA & S	n %	0 -	3 100.00	0 -	3
The Intensive English Center	n %	0 -	3 100.00	0 -	3
The School of Engineering	n %	1 33.33	1 33.33	1 33.33	3
The School of Law	n %	0 -	3 100.00	0 -	3
The Athletic Corporation Board	n %	0 -	2 66.67	1 33.33	3
Student Union Activities (SUA)	n %	0 -	1 33.33	2 66.67	3
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	n %	3 100.00	0 -	0 -	3
Radio Station KANU	n %	0 -	1 33.33	2 66.67	3
University Counseling Center	n %	0 -	3 100.00	0 -	3
The Council of Deans	n %	0 -	2 66.67	1 33.33	3
Unclassified Women's Advisory Unit	n %	0 -	2 100.00	0 -	2
Colleges-within-the- College	n %	0 -	2 100.00	0 -	2
T.A.s/A.I.s	n %	0 -	1 50.00	1 50.00	2
Enrollment	n %	1 50.00	1 50.00	0 -	2
The Kansas Union	n %	0 -	2 100.00	0 -	2
The Personnel Office	n %	0 -	2 100.00	0 -	2



TABLE 4.10 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Office of V-C, Business Affairs	n	1	0	1	2
	%	50.00	-	50.00	
<u>Classified Employees Newsletter</u>	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
Pre-enrollment	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Payroll Office	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Bachelor of General Studies	n	1	1	0	2
	%	50.00	50.00	-	
The "consulting policy"	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
Financial exigency report	n	0	2	0	2
	%	-	100.00	-	
The K.U. Endowment Association	n	1	0	1	2
	%	50.00	-	50.00	
The Placement Services	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
The University Council	n	0	1	1	2
	%	-	50.00	50.00	
"Feedback" (the publication)	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
"This Week at K.U." (publication)	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Principal-Counselor-Freshman Conference	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Campus Mail Service	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Fraternities	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Printing Service	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The Faculty Senate	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
"Spring-on-the-Hill" (carnival)	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
A.U.R.H.	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Board of Regents	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	

TABLE 4.10 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The School of Journalism	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
University Events Committee	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Sororities	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
"Early retirement policy"	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Dept. of Linguistics	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Office of the Registrar	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Office of the University Attorney	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
The "smoking policy"	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Faculty Involvement	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Concerts	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
Search committees	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Social Welfare	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
A.A.U.P.	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
Office of V-C, Research and Graduate Studies	n	0	0	1	1
	%	-	-	100.00	
The School of Education	n	1	0	0	1
	%	100.00	-	-	
The Faculty Council	n	0	1	0	1
	%	-	100.00	-	
Total	n	85	240	170	
	%	17.17	48.49	34.34	

Table 4.11 provides a composite summary of the valence

assignments for codable comments obtained from all respondents. As was the case with the data presented in Table 4.6, only those lines of communication which were identified by at least one percent of the respondents are presented in Table 4.11. The 95 lines of communication delineated in Table 4.11 represent slightly more than one-half (51.35 percent) of the total number of lines of communication identified during the Grapevine Profile interviews. The 2094 codable comments reflected in Table 4.11 represent 92.08 percent of the total number of codable comments obtained during the interviews. The remainder of the total number of lines of communication identified by all subjects (n=90) account for only 7.92 percent of the total number of codable comments, and neither those lines of communication nor the codable comments related to them are reported in the composite summary of valence data which constitutes Table 4.11.

TABLE 4.11

COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF VALENCE ASSIGNMENTS FOR LINES  
OF COMMUNICATION IDENTIFIED BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The University Administration	n	15	54	132	201
	%	7.46	26.87	65.67	
The Athletic Department	n	4	38	67	109
	%	3.67	34.86	61.47	
The Office of the Chancellor	n	26	23	38	87
	%	29.89	26.44	43.68	
The Budget	n	6	45	26	77
	%	7.79	58.45	33.76	
Office of Security and Parking	n	0	14	63	77
	%	-	18.18	81.82	
The Athletic Teams	n	31	20	19	70
	%	44.29	28.57	27.14	

TABLE 4.11 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Office of Affirmative Action	n	8	46	10	64
	%	12.50	71.88	15.63	
The Faculty	n	10	20	34	64
	%	15.63	31.25	53.13	
Student Government	n	7	23	24	54
	%	12.96	42.59	44.44	
The University Libraries	n	3	14	35	52
	%	5.77	26.92	67.31	
Office of the College of LA & S	n	0	24	23	47
	%	-	51.06	48.94	
The Academic Departments	n	6	15	19	40
	%	15.00	37.50	47.50	
<u>University Daily Kansan</u>	n	11	11	16	38
	%	28.95	28.95	42.10	
University Residence Halls	n	5	12	19	36
	%	13.89	33.33	52.78	
The School of Fine Arts	n	4	17	15	36
	%	11.11	47.22	41.67	
The K.U. Medical Center	n	2	26	7	35
	%	5.71	74.29	20.00	
"SEN-EX"	n	1	26	4	31
	%	3.23	83.87	12.90	
Student Senate	n	3	15	13	31
	%	9.68	48.39	41.94	
Student Involvement	n	5	4	22	31
	%	16.13	12.90	70.97	
Student Union Activities (SUA)	n	4	9	18	31
	%	12.90	29.03	58.07	
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor	n	6	14	8	28
	%	21.43	50.00	28.57	
Bi-weekly payroll proposal	n	2	17	9	28
	%	7.14	60.71	32.14	
Advising	n	2	1	21	24
	%	8.33	4.17	87.50	
Women's Athletics	n	12	9	2	23
	%	52.17	19.13	8.70	
Office of Facilities Planning/Operations	n	2	11	10	23
	%	8.70	47.83	43.48	
Office of V-C, Academic Affairs	n	0	12	10	22
	%	-	54.55	45.45	

TABLE 4.11 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Computation Center	n	1	16	4	21
	%	4.76	76.19	19.05	
Personal feelings about the university	n	13	4	4	21
	%	61.90	19.05	19.05	
The School of Business	n	2	10	7	19
	%	10.53	52.63	36.84	
The School of Engineering	n	4	11	4	19
	%	21.05	57.89	21.05	
Committee on Promotion and Tenure	n	0	10	8	18
	%	-	55.56	44.44	
Enrollment	n	2	2	14	18
	%	11.11	11.11	77.78	
Office of Assoc. V-C, Outreach	n	6	9	3	18
	%	33.33	50.00	16.67	
The Payroll Office	n	0	5	11	16
	%	-	31.25	68.75	
Degree Requirements	n	0	4	12	16
	%	-	25.00	75.00	
The School of Journalism	n	4	7	5	16
	%	25.00	43.75	31.25	
Office of the Dean of Women	n	3	11	1	15
	%	20.00	73.33	6.67	
Buildings & Grounds (B&G)	n	0	0	15	15
	%	-	-	100.00	
The "Buckley amendment"	n	0	5	9	14
	%	-	35.71	64.29	
The School of Education	n	3	9	2	14
	%	21.43	64.29	14.29	
The "smoking policy"	n	6	2	6	14
	%	42.86	14.29	42.86	
Office of Admissions and Records	n	5	4	4	13
	%	38.46	30.77	30.77	
"Nunemaker Center"	n	6	6	1	13
	%	46.15	46.15	7.69	
Concerts	n	1	7	5	13
	%	7.69	53.85	38.46	
The School of Social Welfare	n	2	5	6	13
	%	15.39	38.56	46.15	
Faculty Involvement	n	3	1	9	13
	%	23.08	7.69	69.23	

TABLE 4.11 continued

<u>Line of communication</u>		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Dept. of Speech & Drama	n	2	7	4	13
	%	15.39	53.85	30.77	
Dept. of English	n	0	9	3	12
	%	-	75.00	25.00	
Financial exigency report	n	0	10	2	12
	%	-	83.33	16.67	
Office of Research Administration	n	0	8	4	12
	%	-	66.67	33.33	
The School of Law	n	0	9	3	12
	%	-	75.00	25.00	
The Athletic Corporation Board	n	0	5	7	12
	%	-	41.67	58.33	
The "Graduate School"	n	1	6	4	11
	%	9.09	54.55	36.36	
Board of Regents	n	2	5	4	11
	%	18.18	45.46	36.36	
Sororities	n	2	3	5	10
	%	20.00	30.00	50.00	
Office of V-C, Student Affairs	n	2	4	4	10
	%	20.00	40.00	40.00	
The Kansas Union	n	2	5	3	10
	%	20.00	50.00	30.00	
The University Council	n	1	6	3	10
	%	10.00	60.00	30.00	
The "quality of students"	n	3	1	6	10
	%	30.00	10.00	60.00	
The Graduate Student Council	n	2	7	1	10
	%	20.00	70.00	10.00	
Dept. of Human Development	n	3	5	1	9
	%	33.33	55.56	11.11	
Division of Continuing Education	n	1	8	0	9
	%	11.11	88.89	-	
Dept. of Mathematics	n	1	5	3	9
	%	11.11	55.56	33.33	
Dept. of Occupational Therapy	n	0	3	5	8
	%	-	37.50	62.50	
Division of Biological Sciences	n	0	6	2	8
	%	-	75.00	25.00	
<u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	n	5	3	0	8
	%	62.50	37.50	-	

TABLE 4.11 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
The Housing Office	n	0	3	5	8
	%	-	37.50	62.50	
Office of the Dean of Men	n	0	7	1	8
	%	-	87.50	12.50	
Office of V-C, Business Affairs	n	3	2	3	8
	%	37.50	25.00	27.50	
Dept. of History	n	2	5	1	8
	%	25.00	62.50	12.50	
Dept. of Chemistry	n	1	5	2	8
	%	12.50	62.50	25.00	
Kansas Union Bookstore	n	3	0	5	8
	%	37.50	-	62.50	
The Personnel Office	n	1	3	3	7
	%	14.29	42.86	42.86	
A.A.U.P.	n	0	5	2	7
	%	-	71.43	28.57	
Unclassified Women's Advisory Unit	n	1	6	0	7
	%	14.29	85.71	-	
Office of University Relations	n	2	3	2	7
	%	28.57	42.86	28.57	
Dept. of Psychology	n	1	4	2	7
	%	14.29	57.14	28.57	
The Intensive English Center	n	0	5	2	7
	%	-	71.43	28.57	
University Counseling Center	n	1	5	1	7
	%	14.29	71.43	14.29	
The "general committee structure"	n	0	0	7	7
	%	-	-	100.00	
The University Senate	n	0	2	5	7
	%	-	28.57	71.43	
Colleges-within-the- College	n	1	3	2	6
	%	16.67	50.00	33.33	
The Assembly of the College of LA & S	n	1	2	3	6
	%	16.67	33.33	50.00	
Office of V-C, Research and Graduate Study	n	2	0	4	6
	%	33.33	-	66.67	
Dept. of Sociology	n	1	5	0	6
	%	16.67	83.33	-	
"Early retirement policy"	n	0	5	1	6
	%	-	83.33	16.67	

TABLE 4.11 continued

Line of communication		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Dept. of Political Science	n	1	2	3	6
	%	16.67	33.33	50.00	
K.U. Alumni Association	n	1	3	2	6
	%	16.67	50.00	33.33	
K.U. Endowment Association	n	2	2	2	6
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
"Feedback" (the publication)	n	1	1	4	6
	%	16.67	16.67	66.67	
Office of Minority Affairs	n	0	5	1	6
	%	-	83.33	16.67	
Pearson Integrated Humanities	n	1	3	2	6
	%	16.67	50.00	33.33	
Office of Student Financial Aid	n	1	2	3	6
	%	16.67	33.33	50.00	
Pre-enrollment	n	2	2	2	6
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
The School of Architecture and Urban Design	n	2	2	2	6
	%	33.33	33.33	33.33	
Total	n	294	855	930	2079
	%	14.14	41.13	44.73	

Tables 4.2 through 4.11, inclusively, provide data specific to the four samples of the University community in response to the Grapevine Profile portion of the methodology utilized in this study. The extensive length and depth of those tables resulted from this author's desire to present fully the obtained data, as a means of establishing the foundation on which subsequent procedures and data analysis are based. The desire to retain the integrity of each sample's data pool has resulted in the unusual length of Tables 4.2 through 4.11.

Previous chapters have outlined the procedures and



techniques required in the transition from the Grapevine Profile to the System-semantics Profile. Briefly, the System-semantics Profile is based on semantic differentiation of lines of communication by members of the subject samples. The first step in preparing for the semantic differentiation process is selection of the lines of communication to be assessed. Eighteen lines of communication were selected from the composite summaries of data obtained in the Grapevine Profile interviews (Tables 4.6 and 4.11). The lines of communication selected represented the results of the Grapevine Profile, the relative importance of each line of communication within the University community, the interests of the members of the project research team, and the special interests of the project sponsor within the University.

Table 4.12 displays the results of that selection process, and provides a perspective of the distribution of comments and valences for each of the eighteen lines of communication among the four samples of the University community. A complete description of the procedures whereby these eighteen lines of communication were selected for additional measurement is included in Chapter V.

The data contained in Table 4.12 are particularly helpful in describing the characteristics of the samples involved in the Grapevine Profile and, subsequently, the System-semantics Profile. It can be said that the eighteen lines of communication selected for additional measurements accounted for 37.38 percent of the total number of codable

TABLE 4.12

DISTRIBUTION OF CODABLE COMMENTS AND VALENCES FOR LINES OF  
COMMUNICATION SELECTED FOR THE SYSTEM-SEMANTICS PROFILE

Line of communication	Sample	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
1 - The University Administration	Student	4	7	19	30
	Faculty	6	19	63	88
	Clsfd. Staff	1	12	14	27
	Administ. Staff	4	16	36	56
	Total	15	54	132	201
2 - Office of Security & Parking	Student	0	2	42	44
	Faculty	0	7	10	17
	Clsfd. Staff	0	0	6	6
	Administ. Staff	0	5	5	10
	Total	0	14	63	77
3 - The Kansas Union Bookstore	Student	3	0	4	7
	Faculty	0	0	0	0
	Clsfd. Staff	0	0	1	1
	Administ. Staff	0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	5	8
4 - Office of Vice-Chancellor, Business Affairs	Student	0	0	1	1
	Faculty	0	0	0	0
	Clsfd. Staff	2	2	1	5
	Administ. Staff	1	0	1	2
	Total	3	2	3	8
5 - The Computation Center	Student	0	0	0	0
	Faculty	0	8	2	10
	Clsfd. Staff	1	3	1	4
	Administ. Staff	0	5	1	6
	Total	1	16	4	21

TABLE 4.12 continued

Line of communication	Sample	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
6 - <u>Faculty &amp; Staff Newsletter</u>	Student	0	0	0	0
	Faculty	2	2	0	4
	Clsfd. Staff	0	1	0	1
	Administ. Staff	3	0	0	3
	Total	5	3	0	8
7 - Office of the Chancellor	Student	0	8	5	13
	Faculty	6	10	27	43
	Clsfd. Staff	0	4	2	6
	Administ. Staff	20	1	4	25
	Total	26	23	38	87
8 - The University Libraries	Student	2	1	5	8
	Faculty	1	7	22	30
	Clsfd. Staff	0	2	1	3
	Administ. Staff	0	4	7	11
	Total	3	14	35	52
9 - <u>University Daily Kansan (UDK)</u>	Student	7	5	10	22
	Faculty	3	4	2	9
	Clsfd. Staff	0	2	0	2
	Administ. Staff	1	0	4	5
	Total	11	11	16	38
10 - Office of Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs	Student	1	1	0	2
	Faculty	0	0	0	0
	Clsfd. Staff	0	1	0	1
	Administ. Staff	1	2	4	7
	Total	2	4	4	10

TABLE 4.12 continued

Line of communication	Sample	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
11 - The K.U. Medical Center	Student	1	7	2	10
	Faculty	0	6	4	10
	Clsfd. Staff	0	3	0	3
	Administ. Staff	1	10	1	12
	Total	2	26	7	35
12 - "SEN-EX" (The Executive Committee of the University Senate)	Student	0	4	0	4
	Faculty	0	9	4	13
	Clsfd. Staff	0	1	0	1
	Administ. Staff	1	12	0	13
	Total	1	26	4	31
13 - Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor	Student	0	0	0	0
	Faculty	2	10	5	17
	Clsfd. Staff	3	1	0	4
	Administ. Staff	1	3	3	7
	Total	6	14	8	28
14 - Student Government	Student	5	16	21	42
	Faculty	0	1	2	3
	Clsfd. Staff	0	2	0	2
	Administ. Staff	2	4	1	7
	Total	7	23	24	54
15 - The K.U. Alumni Association	Student	0	0	0	0
	Faculty	0	1	1	2
	Clsfd. Staff	0	0	0	0
	Administ. Staff	1	2	1	4
	Total	1	3	2	6

TABLE 4.12 continued

Line of communication	Sample	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
16 - Office of Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs	Student	0	0	0	0
	Faculty	0	6	4	10
	Clsfd. Staff	0	1	0	1
	Administ. Staff	0	5	6	11
	Total	0	12	10	22
17 - Office of Affirmative Action	Student	0	2	1	3
	Faculty	0	15	2	17
	Clsfd. Staff	3	9	1	13
	Administ. Staff	5	20	6	31
	Total	8	46	10	64
18 - The Athletic Department	Student	2	11	33	46
	Faculty	0	11	18	29
	Clsfd. Staff	1	5	8	14
	Administ. Staff	1	11	8	20
	Total	4	38	67	109
Totals	Student	25	64	143	232
	Faculty	20	116	166	302
	Clsfd. Staff	11	49	35	95
	Administ. Staff	42	100	88	230
	All Samples	98	329	432	859

responses obtained in the Grapevine Profile, a significant consideration in that the eighteen selected lines of communication represent only 9.73 percent of the total number of lines of communication identified by respondents to the interviews.

Additionally, student respondents provided 232 codable comments related to the eighteen lines of communication extracted from the Grapevine Profile data, 33.67 percent of the total number of codable comments given by student subjects. Faculty respondents provided 302 codable comments related to the specified eighteen lines of communication, 38.08 percent of all faculty subject responses. Members of the classified staff sample supplied 95 codable comments which were pertinent to the eighteen lines of communication, 31.99 percent of the total codable comments obtained from that group; and the administrative staff subjects supplied 230 codable comments which were specific to the eighteen selected lines of communication, 46.47 percent of the total codable comments obtained from that sample group.

The valences assigned to codable comments which related to the selected lines of communication are similarly representative of the valences assigned to comments pertinent to all 185 lines of communication. With respect to the eighteen lines of communication derived for additional use, the following observations may be made; 28.74 percent (n=98) of all positive valence assignments are included in the

eighteen selected lines of communication; 34.89 percent (n=329) of all neutral valences appear in the selected lines of communication, and 43.64 percent (n=432) of all negative valences are contained within the eighteen selected lines of communication. Additional characteristics and implications related to the selection of eighteen lines of communication for additional measurement will be discussed in Chapter V.

This section of Chapter IV has presented data obtained in response to the first general research question underlying this study. Data have been reported as they relate to each of eight specific research questions subsumed by the first general research question. Reported data reflect the frequency of mention of lines of communication within the University of Kansas, as identified by 547 respondents to a moderately-structured, open-ended, non-directive interview. Also reported were data reflective of the valences assigned to each of the identified lines of communication. Data essential to the transition from the Grapevine Profile to the System-semantics Profile states of the methodology were reported.

The next section of this chapter will delineate the second set of specific research questions, and present data obtained in response to them.

#### Data Related to General Research Question Two

Data derived from the construction and administration of the System-semantics Profile are related specifically to

the second general research question. Table 4.13 reflects the number of semantic differentiation instruments completed and returned by members of each of the four sample populations. A simple "completion index" also is reported for each of the samples as an indication of the numbers of respondents included in the System-semantics data pool, compared with the maximum number of possible responses. The completion index for each sample is obtained by the formula:

$$C.I. = \frac{N \text{ of returned instruments}}{(N \text{ of subjects in data base}) (N \text{ of returned instruments})}$$

As Table 4.13 shows, the degree of return of completed semantic differentiation instruments was acceptably high across all samples, and provided an adequate base for statistical analysis of the discriminative qualities of the bipolar scales of the System-semantics Profile.

The utilization of the System-semantics Profile gave rise to six additional and specific research questions:

- 2.a. What affective associations are held by students in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.b. What affective associations are held by faculty in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.c. What affective associations are held by classified staff in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.d. What affective associations are held by administrative staff in relation to the lines of communication within the University of Kansas?
- 2.e. What affective associations are held by the University community in relation to lines of communication within the University of Kansas?



TABLE 4.13

COMPLETED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION INSTRUMENTS  
RETURNED BY MEMBERS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATIONS

Sample	Usable Instruments Returned n=	Relative Frequency %	Cumulative Frequency %	Completion Index (C.I.)
STUDENTS	602	28.4	28.4	.554
FACULTY	742	35.1	63.5	.672
CLASSIFIED STAFF	340	16.1	79.6	.597
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	432	20.4	100.0	.828
ALL SAMPLES	2116			.645

The data obtained from the semantic differentiation instruments are useful in two ways: 1) they provide information necessary in the formulation of responses to specific research questions relative to the affective associations held in relation to lines of communication within the University of Kansas, and 2) they suggest an additional research question which deals directly with the utilization of the methodology and construction of the instruments utilized in the System-semantics Profile segment of the methodology. Treatments of obtained data permit response to an additional specific research question:

- 2.f. Which bipolar scales discriminate evaluatively among the lines of communication?

Table 4.14 reports data obtained from student subjects in the System-semantics portion of the methodology in response to question 2.a. Means and standard deviations are reported for each of the bipolar scales as they were utilized to assess each of the eighteen selected lines of communication. Composite means and standard deviations also are reported to reflect the assessment across all lines of communication for each bipolar scale. The scalar interval for each bipolar scale was seven, with interval "1" designated as most positive and interval "7" designated as most negative. The expected mean for each bipolar assessment was "4" on the seven-interval scale.

Student responses to the bipolar scales indicate that "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT" received a considerable amount of attention. Additional observations and discussion of these

TABLE 4.14

AFFECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS RELATED TO LINES OF COMMUNICATION,  
REPORTED BY SUBJECTS IN THE STUDENT SAMPLE

Line of communication	n	RELIABLE- UNRELIABLE		FAST- SLOW		FRIENDLY- UNFRIENDLY		USEFUL- USELESS	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1-University Administration	41	2.297	1.381	4.293	1.496	2.878	1.364	2.610	1.339
2-Office of Security & Parking	43	4.163	1.271	4.047	1.771	4.791	1.536	4.023	1.504
3-The Kansas Union Bookstore	43	3.093	1.548	4.047	1.712	3.140	1.684	2.140	1.338
4-Office VC, Business Affairs	31	3.581	0.744	4.097	0.696	3.548	0.768	3.226	0.990
5-The Computation Center	33	3.758	1.281	4.636	1.127	3.879	1.317	2.636	1.295
6-Faculty & Staff Newsletter	31	3.387	1.017	4.000	0.926	3.774	1.392	3.936	1.263
7-Office of the Chancellor	28	2.500	0.713	3.607	0.941	2.821	1.219	2.643	1.394
8-The University Libraries	35	2.086	1.092	2.886	1.451	2.657	1.392	2.029	1.382
9-University Daily Kansan	35	2.714	1.412	2.514	1.112	3.200	1.232	2.686	1.586
10-Office VC, Student Affairs	30	3.400	1.271	4.233	0.936	3.400	1.192	4.000	1.438
11-The K.U. Medical Center	32	2.625	1.068	3.250	1.412	2.844	1.370	2.406	1.643
12-"SEN-EX"	34	3.765	1.311	4.059	1.115	3.824	1.141	3.971	1.766
13-Office Executive V-Chancellor	29	3.448	0.894	3.690	0.627	3.552	1.317	3.793	1.236
14-Student Government	30	3.700	1.361	4.233	1.237	3.700	1.343	3.667	1.826
15-K.U. Alumni Association	30	3.367	1.369	3.533	1.300	3.100	1.296	3.167	1.511
16-Office VC, Academic Affairs	31	3.677	1.029	3.903	1.564	3.452	1.201	3.194	1.263
17-Office of Affirmative Action	32	3.250	1.591	3.563	1.400	3.344	1.405	2.901	1.510
18-The Athletic Department	34	3.667	1.602	4.059	1.316	4.500	1.462	3.588	1.940
Total	602	3.287	1.226	4.821	1.213	3.480	1.284	3.125	1.445

TABLE 4.14 continued

Line	n	OPEN- CLOSED		RESPONSIVE- UNRESPONSIVE		HUMBLE- ARROGANT		EFFECTIVE- INEFFECTIVE		NEAR- REMOTE		IMPORTANT- UNIMPORTANT	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1	41	3.415	1.396	3.415	1.549	4.317	1.193	2.902	1.446	3.781	1.573	2.195	1.249
2	43	4.744	1.498	4.954	1.463	4.954	1.290	4.419	1.708	4.721	1.579	3.512	1.737
3	43	3.209	1.489	3.326	1.554	4.047	1.309	2.767	1.395	3.651	1.758	1.721	0.854
4	31	4.064	1.063	3.936	0.690	4.285	0.855	3.903	0.870	5.032	1.538	3.355	1.226
5	33	3.606	1.223	3.939	1.171	4.182	0.983	3.606	1.249	4.212	1.453	2.727	1.306
6	31	3.936	0.442	4.000	0.817	4.097	0.790	4.000	0.894	4.419	1.148	3.968	1.278
7	28	3.214	1.287	2.964	1.170	3.679	1.056	3.071	1.303	4.607	1.548	2.107	1.133
8	35	3.114	1.491	2.800	1.302	3.771	1.087	2.314	1.078	3.257	1.721	1.686	0.963
9	35	2.771	1.352	2.514	1.095	4.429	1.170	2.571	1.399	3.171	1.339	2.429	1.170
10	30	3.600	1.329	3.533	1.196	4.267	1.048	3.733	1.143	4.400	1.192	3.267	1.437
11	32	3.344	1.578	3.156	1.526	4.438	1.413	2.469	1.391	4.469	1.760	1.938	1.217
12	34	4.118	1.343	3.618	1.371	4.529	1.051	3.794	1.610	4.559	1.397	3.412	1.794
13	29	3.793	0.816	3.517	0.688	3.838	0.539	3.379	0.820	4.379	1.293	3.414	1.376
14	30	3.900	1.517	3.833	1.724	4.467	1.106	4.167	1.802	4.500	1.676	3.333	1.954
15	30	3.700	1.418	3.400	1.404	4.067	1.048	3.267	1.617	3.867	1.592	3.233	1.756
16	31	3.581	1.089	3.484	1.092	4.129	0.718	3.613	1.308	4.645	1.330	3.387	1.407
17	32	3.250	1.391	3.094	1.785	4.094	1.201	3.406	1.563	3.906	1.573	2.781	1.560
18	34	5.029	1.547	4.706	1.508	5.588	1.131	3.677	1.571	4.735	1.864	3.735	2.234
Total	602	3.694	1.283	3.583	1.222	4.304	1.051	3.382	1.495	4.218	1.507	2.870	1.428

data appear in Chapter V.

Table 4.15 displays the data obtained from faculty subjects in the System-semantics Profile segment of the methodology. The bipolar scales which emerge from the data as being most divergent from the expected means are "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "USEFUL-USELESS," and "FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY." The most negative assessments occurred in the scales "OPEN-CLOSED," "HUMBLE-ARROGANT," "NEAR-REMOTE," and "FAST-SLOW." The greatest concentration of positive assessment occurred in the scale "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT." A review of the composite standard deviations suggests that "HUMBLE-ARROGANT" resulted in the least variance from the obtained mean.

Table 4.16 contains data obtained from subjects in the classified staff sample, and the observations are similar to those of the previous two samples. The scale "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT" appears as the most positively evaluated, and "HUMBLE-ARROGANT" is the most negatively evaluated. The most extreme positive evaluations appear within the scale "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT." The consistency of response patterns for those two scales is borne out by the standard deviations obtained across all lines of communication.

Table 4.17 reports data obtained from the administrative staff subjects. An observable difference in these data is the obtained mean for the scale "HUMBLE-ARROGANT," which equals the expected mean. "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT" again emerges as the most positively evaluated scale, and

TABLE 4.15

AFFECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS RELATED TO LINES OF COMMUNICATION,  
REPORTED BY SUBJECTS IN THE FACULTY SAMPLE

Line of communication	n	RELIABLE- UNRELIABLE		FAST- SLOW		FRIENDLY- UNFRIENDLY		USEFUL- USELESS	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1-University Administration	44	3.796	1.503	5.023	1.532	2.955	1.555	3.273	1.546
2-Office of Security & Parking	44	4.159	1.642	4.523	1.548	4.727	1.546	3.909	1.668
3-The Kansas Union Bookstore	47	4.329	1.795	4.936	1.621	3.426	1.625	2.745	1.496
4-Office of VC, Business Affairs	42	3.381	1.249	4.214	1.298	3.762	1.226	3.310	1.660
5-The Computation Center	37	4.054	1.268	4.568	1.237	3.757	1.039	2.838	1.344
6-Faculty & Staff Newsletter	43	2.209	0.940	3.000	1.512	2.721	1.120	3.140	1.670
7-Office of the Chancellor	46	2.630	1.162	3.239	1.463	2.587	1.166	2.500	1.378
8-The University Libraries	48	3.521	1.637	4.458	1.798	2.750	1.480	2.500	1.726
9-University Daily Kansan	44	4.023	1.162	3.250	1.527	3.500	1.110	2.818	1.603
10-Office of VC, Student Affairs	36	3.500	1.082	4.056	1.013	3.278	1.137	3.639	1.496
11-The K.U. Medical Center	35	3.114	1.255	3.743	1.221	3.486	1.401	2.400	1.376
12-"SEN-EX"	40	3.600	1.297	4.475	1.432	3.375	1.170	3.700	1.698
13-Office Executive V-Chancellor	40	2.725	1.240	3.200	1.265	3.426	1.260	2.775	1.593
14-Student Government	35	4.886	1.451	4.829	1.487	3.914	1.292	4.314	1.641
15-K.U. Alumni Association	37	2.838	1.281	3.162	1.500	2.703	1.579	2.405	1.404
16-Office of VC, Academic Affairs	43	3.605	1.650	4.558	1.750	2.907	1.556	3.163	1.758
17-Office of Affirmative Action	41	3.683	1.507	3.878	1.487	3.561	1.629	3.756	1.985
18-The Athletic Department	38	4.421	1.426	3.974	1.284	4.267	1.715	4.211	1.630
Total	740	3.570	1.241	4.061	1.267	3.320	1.349	3.167	1.781

TABLE 4.15 continued

Line	n	OPEN- CLOSED		RESPONSIVE- UNRESPONSIVE		HUMBLE- ARROGANT		EFFECTIVE- INEFFECTIVE		NEAR- REMOTE		IMPORTANT- UNIMPORTANT	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1	44	3.796	1.564	3.727	1.590	4.273	1.107	3.886	1.687	4.432	1.453	2.272	1.546
2	44	5.364	1.314	5.205	1.440	5.296	1.322	4.500	1.563	5.091	1.626	3.341	1.711
3	47	3.617	1.662	3.894	1.833	4.277	1.192	3.915	1.558	4.170	1.434	1.958	1.122
4	42	3.762	1.376	3.929	1.197	4.143	0.647	3.691	1.158	4.310	1.405	2.619	1.188
5	37	3.892	0.875	3.838	1.068	4.000	0.577	4.027	1.213	4.405	1.142	2.649	1.513
6	43	3.256	1.197	3.326	1.063	3.581	0.823	2.954	1.362	3.837	1.430	2.837	1.344
7	46	2.913	1.363	2.913	1.297	3.761	0.970	3.565	1.148	3.913	1.532	1.674	0.896
8	48	3.458	1.786	3.313	1.716	3.813	1.123	3.854	1.868	3.375	1.453	1.625	1.439
9	44	3.386	1.368	3.500	1.517	4.500	1.248	3.636	1.630	3.455	1.171	2.796	1.622
10	10	3.639	1.334	3.444	1.206	3.972	0.609	3.917	1.381	4.306	1.370	3.528	1.732
11	35	3.971	1.505	3.657	1.349	4.543	0.886	3.000	1.414	4.800	1.410	2.086	1.359
12	40	3.700	1.713	3.700	1.523	4.375	0.774	3.975	1.717	4.325	1.685	3.500	1.867
13	40	3.175	1.567	3.025	1.349	3.475	1.086	2.850	1.442	3.350	1.688	2.175	1.338
14	35	3.714	1.526	4.171	1.465	4.771	1.031	4.800	1.491	4.114	1.345	3.800	2.233
15	37	3.351	1.637	3.054	1.471	4.027	1.067	2.757	1.362	3.487	1.627	2.108	1.390
16	43	3.721	1.764	3.535	1.564	3.837	1.379	3.977	1.832	3.721	1.579	2.163	1.526
17	41	3.634	1.729	3.342	1.442	4.610	1.376	4.244	1.562	3.781	1.605	3.146	1.957
18	38	5.395	1.499	4.868	1.597	5.526	1.310	3.816	1.557	4.868	1.948	4.158	1.653
Total	740	3.748	1.452	3.680	1.434	4.428	0.945	3.679	1.511	4.077	1.489	2.652	1.536

TABLE 4.16

AFFECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS RELATED TO LINES OF COMMUNICATION,  
REPORTED BY SUBJECTS IN THE CLASSIFIED STAFF SAMPLE

Line of communication	n	RELIABLE- UNRELIABLE		FAST- SLOW		FRIENDLY- UNFRIENDLY		USEFUL- USELESS	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1-University Administration	22	3.318	0.681	4.273	1.201	2.955	1.523	2.818	1.798
2-Office of Security & Parking	22	4.409	0.612	4.682	1.381	4.682	1.547	3.682	2.192
3-The Kansas Union Bookstore	21	3.333	1.691	4.238	1.531	3.238	1.395	2.723	1.286
4-Office of VC, Business Affairs	20	3.050	0.740	3.550	1.151	2.800	0.941	2.900	1.003
5-The Computation Center	19	3.263	1.029	3.789	1.928	3.632	1.338	2.947	1.310
6-Faculty & Staff Newsletter	18	2.222	1.197	3.000	1.365	2.667	0.991	2.722	1.777
7-Office of the Chancellor	20	3.000	2.517	3.400	3.000	3.350	1.383	2.650	1.598
8-The University Libraries	18	3.167	1.733	3.833	1.624	3.500	1.077	2.556	1.199
9-University Daily Kansan	19	2.895	1.528	2.737	1.331	3.000	1.936	2.842	1.631
10-Office of VC, Student Affairs	16	3.250	0.888	3.625	1.193	3.063	0.734	3.063	1.600
11-The K.U. Medical Center	13	2.846	1.364	3.692	1.455	3.308	1.798	2.308	1.564
12-"SEN-EX"	15	3.800	0.688	4.267	1.328	4.067	1.315	3.933	1.278
13-Office Executive V-Chancellor	16	2.563	1.206	3.875	1.088	2.813	1.267	2.875	1.343
14-Student Government	17	3.765	0.648	4.059	1.232	3.471	1.180	3.941	1.047
15-K.U. Alumni Association	19	2.737	1.213	3.263	1.118	2.737	1.755	3.105	1.869
16-Office of VC, Academic Affairs	21	2.476	1.295	3.191	1.614	2.667	1.511	2.762	1.284
17-Office of Affirmative Action	23	3.348	1.119	3.783	1.098	3.565	1.509	3.826	1.911
18-The Athletic Department	21	3.760	1.481	3.670	1.496	3.619	1.634	3.809	1.687
Total	340	3.194	1.312	3.677	1.602	3.291	1.361	3.097	1.461



TABLE 4.16 continued

Line	n	OPEN-CLOSED		RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE		HUMBLE-ARROGANT		EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE		NEAR-REMOTE		IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1	22	3.591	1.457	3.409	1.310	4.227	1.161	3.136	1.639	3.773	1.522	2.000	1.466
2	22	4.909	1.593	5.136	1.688	5.000	1.417	4.500	1.375	4.955	1.502	3.455	2.319
3	21	3.381	1.552	3.095	1.285	4.048	1.072	3.286	1.841	4.143	1.226	1.905	1.296
4	20	3.700	1.007	3.500	1.113	4.050	0.889	3.150	1.009	4.150	1.229	2.050	0.888
5	19	3.368	1.348	3.474	1.301	3.842	1.267	3.632	1.683	3.895	1.068	2.368	1.448
6	18	3.167	1.069	3.222	1.003	3.778	0.414	2.667	1.611	4.333	1.386	3.167	1.910
7	20	3.500	1.616	3.250	1.683	3.850	1.513	2.950	1.279	3.950	1.711	2.100	1.135
8	18	3.556	1.214	3.500	1.194	3.944	0.888	3.500	1.598	3.500	1.689	2.111	1.401
9	19	2.632	1.207	2.474	1.340	4.105	1.247	2.947	1.682	3.105	1.553	2.842	1.821
10	16	3.375	1.500	3.000	1.080	3.688	1.136	3.063	1.025	3.625	1.201	2.813	1.420
11	13	3.535	2.008	3.462	1.591	3.923	1.677	3.231	1.852	4.462	2.070	2.000	1.506
12	15	4.200	1.206	3.733	1.500	4.667	1.032	3.733	1.029	4.067	1.356	3.600	1.317
13	16	3.500	1.801	2.938	1.243	4.250	1.256	3.000	1.418	3.688	1.560	2.563	1.283
14	17	3.882	1.223	3.588	1.189	4.353	0.815	4.000	1.111	3.882	0.829	2.882	1.420
15	19	3.474	1.342	3.105	1.209	4.211	0.838	2.684	1.246	3.895	1.666	2.895	1.833
16	21	3.143	1.702	2.619	1.387	4.095	0.770	2.667	1.251	3.762	1.635	2.619	1.293
17	23	3.969	1.446	3.478	1.513	4.522	0.978	3.739	1.511	3.739	1.571	3.739	1.949
18	21	4.333	1.750	4.408	1.556	4.810	1.548	3.238	1.560	4.667	1.223	3.714	1.793
Total	340	3.453	1.411	3.406	1.311	4.203	1.085	3.238	1.413	3.982	1.421	2.577	1.668

TABLE 4.17

AFFECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS RELATED TO LINES OF COMMUNICATION,  
REPORTED BY SUBJECTS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF SAMPLE

Line of communication	n	RELIABLE- UNRELIABLE		FAST- SLOW		FRIENDLY- UNFRIENDLY		USEFUL- USELESS	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1-The University Administration	24	3.000	1.351	3.583	1.586	2.583	1.100	2.250	1.152
2-Office of Security & Parking	23	3.044	1.186	3.609	1.305	3.391	1.672	2.739	0.964
3-Kansas Union Bookstore	21	2.905	1.338	3.429	1.207	3.095	1.338	2.143	1.108
4-Office of VC, Business Affairs	25	2.480	1.262	3.520	1.503	2.720	1.400	3.380	1.242
5-The Computation Center	23	4.217	1.536	4.870	1.604	3.913	1.164	2.565	1.409
6-Faculty & Staff Newsletter	25	2.360	1.036	2.600	1.258	2.600	1.225	2.720	1.646
7-Office of the Chancellor	25	2.040	1.172	2.520	1.159	2.240	1.362	1.760	0.969
8-The University Libraries	25	2.560	1.228	2.880	1.201	2.720	1.208	2.560	1.685
9-University Daily Kansan	27	5.148	1.770	3.185	1.570	4.111	1.908	3.778	1.783
10-Office of VC, Student Affairs	26	3.039	1.732	4.039	1.399	2.423	1.239	2.923	1.623
11-The K.U. Medical Center	23	2.870	1.036	3.565	1.532	2.957	1.522	2.478	1.163
12-"SEN-EX"	25	3.120	1.509	4.520	1.358	4.000	1.354	2.800	1.225
13-Office of Executive V-Chancellor	25	2.480	1.358	3.360	1.578	2.200	1.323	2.400	1.528
14-Student Government	25	4.360	1.777	4.800	1.384	3.440	1.387	3.640	1.655
15-K.U. Alumni Association	24	2.250	1.113	2.625	1.245	2.083	1.018	2.375	1.209
16-Office of VC, Academic Affairs	20	3.000	1.556	4.600	1.392	2.800	1.642	3.250	1.888
17-Office of Affirmative Action	24	3.583	1.692	3.750	1.481	3.208	1.414	3.167	1.494
18-The Athletic Department	22	3.818	1.402	3.591	1.436	2.909	1.231	3.091	1.151
Total	432	3.132	1.367	3.600	1.377	2.968	1.433	2.722	1.397

TABLE 4.17 continued

Line	n	OPEN-CLOSED		RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE		HUMBLE-ARROGANT		EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE		NEAR-REMOTE		IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1	24	3.625	1.583	3.042	1.367	3.833	1.129	2.833	1.404	3.375	1.583	1.667	0.963
2	23	3.739	1.453	3.087	1.535	4.130	1.254	3.348	1.229	3.422	1.442	2.391	1.196
3	21	3.333	1.354	2.952	1.203	3.762	0.625	2.810	0.981	3.429	1.434	1.952	0.921
4	25	3.160	1.434	3.040	1.306	3.560	1.228	2.760	1.300	3.360	1.578	2.200	1.528
5	23	4.087	1.311	3.826	1.466	4.174	0.984	3.609	1.234	4.609	1.118	2.391	1.616
6	25	2.800	1.291	2.440	1.044	3.200	1.225	3.040	1.567	3.040	1.369	2.800	1.683
7	24	2.880	1.616	2.360	1.350	3.560	1.357	2.320	1.215	3.160	1.700	2.720	0.980
8	24	3.080	1.470	2.240	0.779	3.760	1.012	2.640	1.036	3.320	1.435	1.360	0.638
9	27	4.148	1.936	4.296	1.938	5.348	1.477	4.037	1.721	4.000	1.881	3.111	1.761
10	26	2.962	1.536	3.192	1.767	3.346	1.441	3.615	1.878	3.308	1.619	2.346	1.384
11	23	3.565	0.992	3.087	1.443	3.913	1.346	3.044	1.364	4.044	1.461	2.304	1.222
12	25	4.040	1.881	3.280	1.487	4.800	1.384	3.560	1.474	4.520	1.262	2.920	1.441
13	25	2.840	1.795	2.760	1.508	3.240	1.341	2.880	1.641	3.040	1.695	1.720	0.737
14	25	3.720	1.430	3.600	1.500	4.680	1.314	4.160	1.573	3.960	1.541	3.320	1.600
15	24	2.625	1.439	2.333	1.341	4.000	1.560	2.208	0.977	2.958	1.459	2.292	1.489
16	20	2.700	1.689	3.250	1.552	3.150	1.599	3.350	1.226	3.100	1.294	1.900	1.210
17	24	3.458	1.383	2.833	1.308	4.167	1.465	3.667	1.341	3.375	1.209	2.792	1.641
18	22	4.636	1.560	3.818	1.763	5.091	1.306	3.273	1.121	4.636	1.529	3.000	1.069
Total	432	3.410	1.483	3.079	1.413	4.000	1.259	3.181	1.337	3.595	1.477	2.352	1.248

also contains the most positive evaluations. Scale assessments by this sample tend to be noticeably more positive than those obtained from the other samples. In addition, the variations around the obtained means are of smaller magnitudes than is the case in the other samples.

A summary of the evaluations of all subjects appears in Table 4.18. Three scales emerge in this composite summary in proximity to the expected mean: "NEAR-REMOTE," "HUMBLE-ARROGANT," and "FAST-SLOW." The scale "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT" is most positively assessed of all ten scales. The effects of combining all responses from all samples are reflected in the standard deviations.

The data presented in Table 4.19 reflect the distribution of responses to each of the ten bipolar scales, inclusive of all samples and all lines of communication. The data show that assessments at the negative extreme of each bipolar scale occurred infrequently, while assessments at the positive extreme of each bipolar scale were considerably more common. Clusters of responses around the expected means are characteristic of all scales except "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT."

The results of one-way analyses of variance for each of the ten bipolar scales appear in Tables 4.20 through 4.29. In each case the obtained  $F$ -ratio exceeds the level required for significance at the .01 level, and the implied null hypotheses of equal means of sub-groups are rejected.

TABLE 4.18

AFFECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS RELATED TO LINES OF COMMUNICATION,  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OBTAINED FROM ALL SAMPLES

Line of communication	n	RELIABLE- UNRELIABLE		FAST- SLOW		FRIENDLY- UNFRIENDLY		USEFUL- USELESS	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1-The University Administration	131	3.298	1.538	4.405	1.644	2.863	1.402	2.802	1.480
2-Office of Security & Parking	132	4.008	1.642	4.235	1.666	4.508	1.628	3.705	1.657
3-Kansas Union Bookstore	132	3.535	1.767	4.303	1.657	3.250	1.550	2.455	1.383
4-Office of VC, Business Affairs	118	3.186	1.212	3.924	1.255	3.322	1.219	2.949	1.279
5-The Computation Center	113	3.982	1.525	4.540	1.541	3.832	1.202	2.779	1.419
6-Faculty & Staff Newsletter	117	2.538	1.111	3.179	1.387	2.966	1.210	3.197	1.620
7-Office of the Chancellor	119	2.538	1.268	3.210	1.489	2.697	1.369	2.403	1.367
8-The University Libraries	126	2.881	1.500	3.635	1.728	2.825	1.357	2.389	1.559
9-University Daily Kansan	125	3.728	1.859	2.952	1.475	3.472	1.490	2.992	1.678
10-Office of VC, Student Affairs	108	3.324	1.345	4.037	1.199	3.074	1.251	3.481	1.580
11-The K.U. Medical Center	103	2.874	1.311	3.544	1.467	3.146	1.478	2.408	1.410
12-"SEN-EX"	115	3.600	1.394	4.357	1.358	3.765	1.286	3.643	1.687
13-Office of Executive V-Chancellor	110	2.836	1.223	3.318	1.219	2.736	1.376	2.973	1.541
14-Student Government	107	4.346	1.486	4.553	1.320	3.673	1.294	3.916	1.626
15-K.U. Alumni Association	110	2.836	1.324	3.164	1.331	2.682	1.427	2.709	1.461
16-Office of VC, Academic Affairs	115	3.313	1.541	4.139	1.605	2.991	1.478	3.113	1.594
17-Office of Affirmative Action	120	3.483	1.528	3.750	1.416	3.433	1.516	3.425	1.795
18-The Athletic Department	115	3.965	1.527	3.870	1.411	3.948	1.643	3.739	1.692
Total	2116	3.530	1.551	3.843	1.540	3.294	1.484	3.054	1.625

TABLE 4.18 *continued*

Line	n	OPEN- CLOSED		RESPONSIVE- UNRESPONSIVE		HUMBLE- ARROGANT		EFFECTIVE- INEFFECTIVE		NEAR- REMOTE		IMPORTANT- UNIMPORTANT	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1	131	3.611	1.497	3.450	1.510	4.198	1.179	3.260	1.596	3.931	1.545	2.092	1.338
2	132	4.803	1.545	4.742	1.679	4.932	1.366	4.273	1.573	4.674	1.628	3.250	1.745
3	132	3.402	1.548	3.432	1.593	4.083	1.153	3.265	1.538	3.879	1.538	1.871	1.022
4	118	3.703	1.335	3.669	1.184	4.034	0.924	3.458	1.181	4.271	1.605	2.627	1.319
5	113	3.788	1.199	3.832	1.231	4.088	0.931	3.779	1.328	4.301	1.209	2.558	1.451
6	117	3.325	1.143	3.299	1.147	3.667	0.991	3.205	1.417	3.812	1.414	3.179	1.540
7	119	3.076	1.508	2.866	1.420	3.714	1.201	2.697	1.286	3.924	1.708	1.857	1.027
8	126	3.302	1.586	2.984	1.448	3.810	1.071	3.135	1.631	3.349	1.540	1.659	1.174
9	125	3.264	1.556	3.240	1.623	4.632	1.365	3.320	1.659	3.440	1.461	2.768	1.551
10	108	3.426	1.435	3.343	1.382	3.861	1.148	3.667	1.460	3.991	1.463	3.065	1.596
11	103	3.631	1.495	3.350	1.467	4.291	1.288	2.874	1.453	4.485	1.638	2.078	1.370
12	115	3.991	1.614	3.617	1.496	4.574	1.077	3.826	1.591	4.426	1.522	3.391	1.771
13	110	3.309	1.495	3.082	1.242	3.627	1.116	3.018	1.361	3.600	1.632	2.455	1.412
14	107	3.794	1.426	3.850	1.497	4.598	1.089	4.246	1.567	4.150	1.426	3.411	1.893
15	110	3.309	1.501	3.000	1.408	4.064	1.136	2.764	1.394	3.545	1.583	2.591	1.638
16	115	3.400	1.594	3.304	1.440	3.843	1.268	3.530	1.563	3.870	1.553	2.530	1.495
17	120	3.508	1.512	3.200	1.515	4.367	1.302	3.808	1.536	3.725	1.484	3.092	1.787
18	115	4.948	1.577	4.470	1.645	5.330	1.342	3.565	1.482	4.748	1.706	3.730	1.798
Total	2116	3.647	1.559	3.491	1.527	4.211	1.253	3.435	1.549	4.002	1.587	2.667	1.618

TABLE 4.19

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO BIPOLAR SCALES:  
ALL SAMPLES, ALL LINES OF COMMUNICATION

Bipolar Scale		Response Level							Total	Mean	S.D.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
RELIABLE-	n	226	513	384	582	188	138	85	2116	3.530	<b>1.551</b>
UNRELIABLE	%	10.7	24.2	18.1	27.5	8.9	6.5	4.0			
FAST-	n	135	330	344	686	293	200	128	2116	3.843	1.540
SLOW	%	6.4	15.6	16.3	32.4	13.8	9.5	6.0			
FRIENDLY-	n	256	452	408	650	182	100	68	2116	3.294	1.484
UNFRIENDLY	%	12.1	21.4	19.3	30.7	8.6	4.7	3.2			
USEFUL-	n	386	540	405	437	138	125	85	2116	3.057	1.625
USELESS	%	18.2	25.5	19.1	20.6	6.5	5.9	4.0			
OPEN-	n	199	338	366	700	220	173	109	2116	3.647	1.559
CLOSED	%	9.4	16.0	17.3	33.6	10.4	8.2	5.2			
RESPONSIVE-	n	193	416	459	581	233	143	91	2116	3.491	1.527
UNRESPONSIVE	%	9.1	19.7	21.7	27.5	11.0	6.8	4.3			
HUMBLE-	n	50	136	197	1113	309	177	134	2116	4.221	1.253
ARROGANT	%	2.4	6.4	9.3	52.6	14.6	8.4	6.3			
EFFECTIVE-	n	194	453	502	521	195	153	98	2116	3.435	1.549
INEFFECTIVE	%	9.2	21.4	23.7	24.6	9.2	7.2	4.6			
NEAR-	n	124	293	289	733	276	227	174	2116	4.002	1.587
REMOTE	%	5.9	13.8	13.7	34.6	13.0	10.7	8.2			
IMPORTANT-	n	651	515	314	383	101	81	71	2116	2.667	1.618
UNIMPORTANT	%	30.8	24.3	14.8	18.1	4.8	3.8	3.4			

TABLE 4.20

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	190.9189	21	9.0914	3.8865*
Within Groups	4898.3718	2094	2.3392	
Total	5089.2906	2115		

\*p &lt; .01

TABLE 4.21

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF FAST-SLOW

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	192.1514	21	9.1501	3.9265*
Within Groups	4879.7578	2094	2.3304	
Total	5071.9092	2115		

\*p &lt; .01



TABLE 4.24

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF OPEN-CLOSED

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	145.2260	21	6.9155	2.8998*
Within Groups	4993.7703	2094	2.3848	
Total	5138.9963	2115		

\*p < .01

TABLE 4.25

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	244.4827	21	11.6420	5.1976*
Within Groups	4690.3284	2094	2.2399	
Total	4934.8110	2115		

\*p < .01

TABLE 4.26

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF HUMBLE-ARROGANT

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	138.3726	21	6.5892	4.3367*
Within Groups	3181.6220	2094	1.5194	
Total	3319.9946	2115		

\*p &lt; .01

TABLE 4.27

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	210.7172	21	10.0342	4.3203*
Within Groups	4863.4128	2094	2.3225	
Total	5074.1299	2115		

\*p &lt; .01

TABLE 4.28

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF NEAR-REMOTE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	256.8492	21	12.2309	5.0514*
Within Groups	5070.1388	2094	2.4213	
Total	5326.9880	2115		

\*p < .01

TABLE 4.29

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	204.1946	21	9.7236	3.8187*
Within Groups	5331.9165	2094	2.5463	
Total	5536.1111	2115		

\*p < .01

A step-wise method of discriminant analysis was utilized to determine the evaluative potency of each of the ten bipolar scales utilized in the semantic differentiation process of the System-semantics Profile (Fryer, 1966). Descriptions of the variables included in the discriminant analysis appear in Table 4.30.

The summary of the step-wise analysis is reported in Table 4.31. Those data reveal that seven of the ten bipolar scales were found to have achieved acceptable significance:

IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT  
 FAST-SLOW  
 HUMBLE-ARROGANT  
 RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE  
 RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE  
 NEAR-REMOTE  
 EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE

Three of the bipolar scales (FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY, OPEN-CLOSED, and USEFUL-USELESS) are reported as insignificant, according to the results of the analysis. The implications of these findings will be discussed in the following chapter.

#### Summary

This chapter has described the data obtained from the two segments of the system-semantics methodology utilized in this study of affective associations related to lines of communication within the University of Kansas. Data have been reported from each of the four samples of the University community, and have been reported in composite summaries as well.

TABLE 4.30

## VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF THE BIPOLAR SCALES

Step	Variable Entered	F to Enter	N Incl.	Wilk's Lambda	Sig.	Rao's V	Change in Rao's V	Sig. of Change
1	IMPORTANT	19.13415	1	0.86571	0.000	325.28057	325.28057	0.
2	FAST	16.07123	2	0.76588	0.000	599.85495	274.57438	0.
3	HUMBLE	15.35946	3	0.68100	0.000	869.00996	269.15501	0.
4	RELIABLE	8.21607	4	0.63842	0.000	1014.61507	145.60511	0.
5	RESPONSIVE	8.34138	5	0.59791	0.000	1157.60733	142.99226	0.
6	NEAR	5.27912	6	0.57332	0.000	1253.68288	96.07555	0.000
7	EFFECTIVE	5.47783	7	0.54887	0.000	1350.35886	96.67598	0.000
8	FRIENDLY	4.94077	8	0.52767	0.000	1437.50330	87.14444	0.000
9	OPEN	3.28546	9	0.51393	0.000	1496.84689	59.34360	0.000
10	USEFUL	2.949998	10	0.50187	0.000	1550.16959	53.32269	0.000

TABLE 4.31

## SUMMARY OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF THE BIPOLAR SCALES

Discr. Funct.	Variable Name	Relative %-age	Canon. Correl.	Functs. Derived	Wilks Lambda	Chi- Square	DF	Significance
1	IMPORTANT	34.30	0.450	0	0.5019	1447.762	170	0.
2	FAST	17.64	0.340	1	0.6291	973.243	144	0.
3	HUMBLE	16.15	0.327	2	0.7111	715.860	120	0.
4	RELIABLE	14.20	0.308	3	0.7961	478.959	98	0.
5	RESPONSIVE	8.69	0.246	4	0.8797	269.281	78	0.
6	NEAR	3.84	0.166	5	0.9361	138.563	60	0.000
7	EFFECTIVE	2.95	0.146	6	0.9627	79.839	44	0.001
8	FRIENDLY	1.24	0.095	7	0.9837	34.551	30	0.259
9	OPEN	0.69	0.071	8	0.9927	15.313	18	0.640
10	USEFUL	0.30	0.047	9	0.9978	4.618	8	0.797

Participation in the Grapevine Profile interviews was acceptably high across all samples. The highest ratio of participation was reported for the respondents from the classified staff sample, and the lowest level of participation occurred in the administrative staff sample.

Frequency of mention of lines of communication has been reported for each of the subject samples, and in composite summary form. Respondents from the administrative staff sample identified more lines of communication per respondent than did any other sample group. Student respondents identified the fewest number of lines of communication per respondent.

Valences assigned to each identified line of communication tended to be negative. Positive valences were assigned in only 14.14 percent of all responses, and neutral valences were assigned in 41.13 percent of all responses.

The valences related to comments from student respondents were heavily negative. Valences related to comments from faculty respondents were nearly evenly split between neutral and negative. More than one-half of the valence assignments related to comments from classified staff respondents were neutral, and slightly less than one-half of the valence assignments for comments from the administrative staff were neutral. In no sample did positive valences represent more than 20 percent of the valence assignments.

Data drawn from the semantic differentiation process, the System-semantics Profile, also have been reported in this chapter. The ratio of completed semantic differential instruments from each sample group exceeded 50 percent. The highest completion ratio occurred in the administrative staff sample, and the lowest in the student sample. Across all samples nearly 65 percent of all instruments were completed and returned.

Additional data from the System-semantics Profile reflect that certain of the ten bipolar scales account for much of the evaluation of the various lines of communication, while others of the scales showed little potency in the evaluation process. The scales "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "FAST-SLOW," and "HUMBLE-ARROGANT" are shown by the data to have been particularly rigorous as they were utilized by respondents from all samples. Analyses of variance for the ten bipolar scales revealed that the obtained variances within scales, across the eighteen lines of communication, were not attributable to similarity of sample populations.

Discriminant factor analysis of the responses to each of the ten bipolar scales in evaluating the lines of communication revealed that seven of the bipolar scales were acceptably robust for use in the semantic differentiation process, while three of the scales did not achieve statistical significance within that context.



## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Prior to the presentation of the conclusions derived from this study, some basic assumptions regarding the nature and role of communication in higher education should be reviewed.

1) The university community is not a homogeneous population; rather, it is the composite entity created by the existence and related efforts of at least four distinct sub-groups: students, faculty, classified staff, and administrative staff. To speak of the "the university" is to refer collectively to all four sub-groups.

2) Lines of communication within and among all four sub-groups are inherent in the organizational structure of the institution. Whether the lines of communication are utilized is unimportant to their existence and potential.

3) Perception is tantamount to action, and in the case of communicative behavior within the university community, the use of lines of communication is dependent on perceptions related to those lines of communication. It seems clear that people are unlikely to utilize or rely on a line of communication which is perceived by them to be negative or untrustworthy.

4) Identification of those lines of communication identified by each of the various sub-populations as being important or visible is one means of beginning to learn about the underlying dynamics of communicative behavior within the university setting.

5) Understanding some of the dynamics of communicative behavior within the university setting is a step towards a goal of more effective and efficient communication for the organization.

In consideration of these basic assumptions, this study had two purposes:

- 1) to obtain data relative to the affective associations related to various lines of communication within the composite community known as the University of Kansas, and
- 2) to employ the system-semantics methodology in an institution of higher education as a means of determining the efficacy of that methodology as a research tool for communication research in that setting.

To satisfy these objectives, data were collected regarding which lines of communication are most visible to each of the four sub-populations of the university community, and each sub-population was asked to assess the affective associations related to those lines of communication in an effort to determine which affective associations are most discriminating for each sub-population.

Interviews were completed with 547 subjects from the four sample populations. Frequency of mention of lines of communication within the university community was recorded, and valences--stated as "positive," "neutral," and "negative"--

were assigned to all codable comments related to each line of communication identified by each sample group.

Semantic differentiation procedures were utilized to obtain specific data related to the affective associations ascribed to selected lines of communication by each sample population. On the basis of the data obtained from the semantic differentiation procedures, it was possible to determine more specifically the criteria by which members of the university community evaluate various lines of communication.

Data collected and analyzed according to these specifications constitute the "substantive" or "institutional" aspects of this study. Interpretations of these data are specific to communicative behaviors at the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus.

Additional treatments of the obtained data were performed to provide a basis for evaluating the applicability of the research methodology within this specialized context. Those analyses, and the observations of this author, have resulted in several suggestions for changes in the methodology, none of which detract from its general attractiveness and suitability for organizational communication research.

Data collected and analyzed according to these specifications constitute the "methodological" aspect of this study. Interpretations of these data are the bases of the evaluation of the system-semantics technique of organizational communication research.

## Conclusions and Interpretation

### The Grapevine Profile

One of the general research questions on which this study is based is:

- 1) What lines of communication are perceived by members of the University community as receiving the most attention?

This question was designed to promote extensive exploration within each sub-group of the university community to determine which lines of communication receive the most attention by members of each sub-group. The methodology utilized to obtain data in response to this question also provided valence assignments for each line of communication identified by members of each sub-group.

### Students

The results of the Grapevine Profile interviews with members of the student sample indicate that students identified 96 lines of communication within the University. Of those, twelve account for more than 50 percent of the total comments received in response to the interviews:

- The Athletic Department
- The Office of Security and Parking
- Student Government
- The Faculty
- Athletic Teams
- The University Administration
- Student Involvement
- University Residence Halls
- The Student Senate
- The University Daily Kansan (U.D.K.)
- Student Union Activities (S.U.A.)
- The Academic Departments

Each of these twelve lines of communication is related closely to those concerns and aspects of campus life which are commonly identified by students (Craig, 1966; Greenleaf, 1967).

Valences assigned to each of these twelve lines of communication are predominantly negative (62.13 percent). For all lines of communication identified by students, negative valences are more than three times as frequent as are positive valences, and nearly twice as frequent as neutral valences. These observations lead to the conclusion that students are aware of a small but diverse number of lines of communication within the University, and perceive those lines of communication in decidedly negative ways. The valence assignments for lines of communication identified by students suggest a generally negative "mood" or "climate" within which students characterize the communicative behavior of the University.

### Faculty

Faculty respondents to the Grapevine Profile interview identified 123 lines of communication within the University, of which fifteen account for more than 50 percent of the total comments obtained from subjects in the faculty sample:

- The University Administration
- The Office of the Chancellor
- Office of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- The Budget
- The University Libraries
- The Athletic Department
- The Academic Departments
- The Office of Affirmative Action
- The Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor
- The Office of Security and Parking

The School of Fine Arts  
 The Athletic Teams  
 The Faculty  
 "SEN-EX"  
 Faculty Involvement

While 53.85 percent of the comments related to those fifteen lines of communication are assessed as negative, the proportion of negative valences drops to 43.00 percent when all 123 lines of communication are considered. Neutral valences account for 44.39 percent of all comments from faculty respondents, and positive valences account for only 12.61 percent of all comments from the faculty sample.

The fifteen lines of communication most frequently identified by faculty respondents may be characterized as being generally representative of the managerial and service functions of the University. In most cases, the lines of communication are external to the immediate environments of the faculty, perhaps qualifying as the "they" of the organization for this sub-group.

Faculty tend to be somewhat more reserved than students in their assessments of lines of communication, but negative valences are more than three times as frequent as positive valences, despite the relatively high percentage of neutral observations. It is suggested that faculty members are aware of a moderate number of lines of communication within the University, and further that they rarely perceive those lines of communication as descriptive of a positive mood or climate of campus communicative behaviors. The high percentage of neutral valences is interpreted to be suggestive of a desire

on the part of the faculty to maintain an objective perspective of many lines of communication. Even so, faculty members seem to have little hesitation in labeling several lines of communication negatively.

### Classified Staff

Respondents in the classified staff sample identified a total of 83 lines of communication. Of those, fourteen account for more than 50 percent of the total comments, and seem to be reflective of the daily activities and concerns of this sub-group of the University:

- The University Administration
- The Budget
- Bi-weekly Payroll Proposal
- The Athletic Department
- The Payroll Office
- The Office of Affirmative Action
- The Athletic Teams
- Buildings and Grounds (B & G)
- Office of "The Graduate School"
- The Office of the Chancellor
- Office of Admissions and Records
- Office of Security and Parking
- The School of Engineering
- The Computation Center

As was the case with faculty respondents, the most frequently mentioned lines of communication are closely related to managerial and service functions of the University.

More than one-half (53.20 percent) of all comments received from classified staff respondents were assessed as neutral valences, a feature of this sub-group which is unique among the four sample populations. Slightly more than one-third of the comments were assessed as negative, still nearly three times as many comments as were assessed as positive.

The conclusions drawn from this configuration of responses are that members of the classified staff of the University are affectively concerned with relatively few lines of communication, and tend to be less evaluative (more neutral) in their reflections about those lines than any other sub-group. The ratio of negative to positive valences, however, cannot be ignored and must be considered significant in characterizing the perceptions of classified staff personnel.

Members of the classified staff of the University do not seem to be compelled to label the climate of the institution's communicative behavior in any polarized fashion.

#### Administrative Staff

Members of the administrative staff sample identified a total of 96 lines of communication in their responses to the Grapevine Profile interview. More than 50 percent of the total comments were related to only fourteen lines of communication:

- The University Administration
- Office of Affirmative Action
- The Budget
- Office of the Chancellor
- The Athletic Department
- "SEN-EX"
- The K.U. Medical Center
- The Athletic Teams
- The University Libraries
- Office of Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Office of Security and Parking
- "Nunemaker Center"
- The Faculty
- "Personal Feelings about the University"

Those fourteen lines of communication are more representative of the community and functions of the University than is the



case for the primary lines of communication identified by respondents from the other samples.

Of all comments obtained from the administrative staff sample, 44.73 percent were assigned negative valences by the project research team. That figure is more than three times greater than the percentage of positive valences. Neutral valences were slightly less than three times as frequent as positive valences, and nearly equal (41.13 percent) to the negative assignments.

Accordingly, it is suggested that the administrative staff is particularly aware of lines of communication within the University, and tends to be nearly equally divided between neutral and negative valences in its perceptions of those lines of communication. The frequency of positive valences is quite low, as is the case with the other sub-groups.

The administrative staff, seemingly, perceives the communicative climate of the University to be generally neutral, with frequent indications of negativity.

#### The University Community

By compiling the data obtained from each of the four sample populations, composite data reflective of the University community are available for consideration in this study.

Members of the University community identified a total of 185 lines of communication, only 0.34 lines of communication per respondent. Of the total, twenty lines of communication account for more than 50 percent of the codable comments obtained in the Grapevine Profile interviews:

The University Administration  
 The Athletic Department  
 The Office of the Chancellor  
 The Budget  
 Office of Security and Parking  
 The Athletic Teams  
 Office of Affirmative Action  
 The Faculty  
 Student Government  
 The University Libraries  
 The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
 The Academic Departments  
 The University Daily Kansan (U.D.K.)  
 University Residence Halls  
 The School of Fine Arts  
 The K.U. Medical Center  
 "SEN-EX"  
 Student Senate  
 Student Involvement  
 Student Union Activiitis (S.U.A.)

Simple arithmetic means reflect that each of the twenty primary lines of communication identified by the 547 respondents was mentioned 2.21 times by each respondent. Clearly, those twenty lines of communication merit additional attention.

The 95 lines of communication identified by more than one percent of the respondents represent 93.00 percent of all comments obtained in the Grapevine Profile interview. Of those 95 lines of communication, 44.73 percent were assessed as negative; 41.13 percent of the comments related to those 95 lines of communication were assessed as neutral, and 14.14 percent were assessed as positive. The pattern of nearly three-to-one negative over positive valences is maintained in the composite summary of the data.

It is suggested, based on these data, that only twenty lines of communication are demonstrably prominent in the perceptions of members of the University community. In commenting on those twenty lines of communication, members of

the University community offered negative associations more than three times as often as they offered positive associations. Therefore, it is additionally suggested that the communicative mood or climate, as perceived by members of the University community, is generally negative.

By virtue of frequency of mention, a total of thirty lines of communication are within the listings of the most prominent lines of communication identified by the various samples:

The Athletic Department  
 Office of Security and Parking  
 Student Government  
 The Faculty  
 The Athletic Teams  
 The University Administration  
 Student Involvement  
 University Residence Halls  
 Student Senate.  
 The University Daily Kansan (U.D.K.)  
 Student Union Activities (S.U.A.)  
 The Academic Departments  
 The Office of the Chancellor  
 Office of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences  
 The Budget  
 The University Libraries  
 Office of Affirmative Action  
 Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor  
 The School of Fine Arts  
 "SEN-EX"  
 Faculty Involvement  
 Biweekly Payroll Proposal  
 The Payroll Office  
 Buildings and Grounds (B & G)  
 The Office of the "Graduate School"  
 Office of Admissions and Records  
 The School of Engineering  
 The K.U. Medical Center  
 The Office of the Vice-chancellor, Academic Affairs  
 "Nunemaker Center"

Four lines of communication were given considerable attention by all samples:

The Athletic Department  
 Office of Security and Parking  
 The Athletic Teams  
 The University Administration

Three samples--Faculty, Classified Staff, and  
 Administrative Staff--identified four lines of communication  
 within their respective primary listings:

Office of the Chancellor  
 The Budget  
 Office of Affirmative Action  
 The Faculty

Respondents from the faculty sample and the  
 administrative staff sample shared identification of three  
 lines of communication within their primary listings:

The University Libraries  
 "SEN-EX"  
 The Academic Departments

Student respondents were alone in identifying among  
 their primary lines of communication the following:

Student Government  
 Student Involvement  
 University Residence Halls  
 Student Senate  
 Student Union Activities (S.U.A.)

Faculty respondents were alone in identifying among  
 their primary lines of communication the following:

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
 Office of the Executive Vice-chancellor  
 The School of Fine Arts  
 Faculty Involvement

Members of the classified staff sample were unique  
 in their identification of the following within their listing  
 of primary lines of communication:

Bi-weekly Payroll Proposal  
 The Payroll Office  
 Buildings and Grounds (B & G)  
 The Office of "The Graduate School"

Office of Admissions and Records  
The School of Engineering

Only the respondents from the administrative staff sample identified the following lines of communication in their primary listing:

The K.U. Medical Center  
Office of the Vice-chancellor, Academic Affairs  
"Nunemaker Center"

By reviewing the preceding lists, it is generally apparent that there are no "surprises" which emerge for any sample or grouping of samples. There exists a discernable logic to the distillation of lines of communication along the various samples, a logic which may be obvious to most observers of communicative behaviors within the University of Kansas, but one for which these data provide visible support.

The suggestion by Conboy (1976) that a line of communication which is perceived negatively is not likely to be utilized and/or trusted is of particular importance at this point. If the twenty primary lines of communication which emerge across all samples are perceived negatively, then the possibility exists that neither the lines of communication nor the information conveyed along those lines will be utilized or trusted. For an organization for which information flow is both critical and characteristic, the discovery that the most visible lines of communication are highly suspect within the organization is indeed serious.

### The System-semantics Profile

The methodology utilized in this study provided a means of assessing in fuller detail the affective associations related to lines of communication. The System-semantics Profile is designed to provide data in response to the question:

- 2) What affective associations do members of the University community sustain in relation to those lines of communication?

This question is the second general research question which guided this study (see page 31, Chapter III). The question is important within the overall design of this study because it represents an effort to determine more specifically the "meanings" assigned to lines of communication by members of the University community. Clearer delineation of the affective associations related to lines of communication is seen as a way of understanding more fully the content and context of the assessments obtained in response to the Grapevine Profile interviews. Subsequent to that effort it is possible to identify--on the basis of obtained data--some of the variables which are components of the assessed meanings.

A total of eighteen lines of communication were extracted from the Grapevine Profile data and designated as stimulus items for the System-semantics Profile. The eighteen lines of communication were selected by the research team to satisfy one or more of three criteria:

- 1) The selected line of communication is

included in the list of lines of communication as one which accounts for more than 50 percent of all identifying comments from one or more of the sample populations.

- 2) The selected line of communication is one in which the project research team is particularly interested, based on evaluations of the Cartographic Profile.
- 3) The selected line of communication is one in which the project sponsor is especially interested.

Twelve lines of communication were selected because they satisfied the first criterion:

The University Administration  
 The Office of Security and Parking  
 The Office of the Chancellor  
 The University Libraries  
 The University Daily Kansan (U.D.K.)  
 The K.U. Medical Center  
 "SEN-EX"  
 The Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor  
 Student Government  
 The Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs  
 The Office of Affirmative Action  
 The Athletic Department

Two lines of communication were selected as having satisfied the second criterion:

The Kansas Union Bookstore  
 The K.U. Alumni Association

Four lines of communication were selected as having met both the second and third criteria:

The Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Business Affairs  
 The K.U. Computation Center  
 The Faculty and Staff Newsletter  
 The Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs

Members of each sample population evaluated the eighteen selected lines of communication according to the procedures for semantic differentiation, along ten bipolar scales. The results of those evaluations have been presented

in the preceding chapter. The conclusions drawn from those results are presented in the following five sections.

### Students

It has been reported that student respondents tend to be decidedly negative in their assessments of various lines of communication within the University. Specifically, student subjects demonstrated negative evaluations of the eighteen selected lines of communication in their responses to the scales "FAST-SLOW," "HUMBLE-ARROGANT," and "NEAR-REMOTE." These three scales account for the most negative evaluations obtained from student respondents. It is suggested that lines of communication perceived by students to be "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and/or "REMOTE" are most likely to be judged negatively in the perceptual capacities of students.

The lines of communication most representative of these negative assessments by students are:

The Office of Security and Parking  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Business Affairs  
 The Computation Center  
 The Faculty and Staff Newsletter  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs  
 "SEN-EX"  
 Student Government  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs  
 The Athletic Department

Conversely, students were most positive in their assessments of the eighteen lines of communication in their responses to the scales "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "USEFUL-USELESS," "EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE," and/or "RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE." Those lines of communication which students perceived as



"IMPORTANT," USEFUL," "EFFECTIVE," and/or "RELIABLE" received the most positive evaluations from students. The lines of communication most representative of these positive assessments are:

The University Administration  
 The Kansas Union Bookstore  
 The Office of the Chancellor  
 The University Libraries  
 The University Daily Kansan (U.D.K.)  
 The K.U. Medical Center  
 Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor

For students, then, the affective associations which seem to be pivotal in determining evaluations of various lines of communication are:

FAST - SLOW  
 HUMBLE-ARROGANT  
 NEAR-REMOTE  
 IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT  
 USEFUL-USELESS  
 EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE  
 RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE

### Faculty

Faculty respondents were slightly less extreme in their assessments of lines of communication than were student respondents. The fact that faculty responses to the bipolar scales of the semantic differentials clustered more closely around the expected mean for each scale is interpreted as an indication that faculty subjects are less likely to describe their affective associations at the polar extremes of each scale than are students.

There is, however, considerable similarity in the patterns of responses to the adjectival pairs between the student and faculty respondents. Faculty subjects, as did

their student counterparts in this study, demonstrated their strongest negative evaluations in their responses to the scales "FAST-SLOW," "HUMBLE-ARROGANT," and "NEAR-REMOTE."

It is suggested that any line of communication characterized by faculty respondents as being "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and/or "REMOTE" is likely to be perceived overall as negative.

The lines of communication most representative of these negative assessments are:

The University Administration  
 Office of Security and Parking  
 The Kansas Union Bookstore  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Business Affairs  
 The Computation Center  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs  
 The K.U. Medical Center  
 "SEN-EX"  
 Student Government  
 Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs  
 Office of Affirmative Action  
 The Athletic Department

In contrast to the student respondents, faculty subjects relied on the scales "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "USEFUL-USELESS," "FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY," "OPEN-CLOSED," and/or "RESPONSIVE-UNRESPONSIVE" to demonstrate positive evaluations. The additional scale (OPEN-CLOSED) suggests the possibility that faculty members assume a condition of easier access to lines of communication, and respond positively when perceptions align with that assumption. A line of communication perceived by faculty members to be "OPEN" typically is rated positively.

The lines of communication most representative of this positive assessment are:

The Office of the Chancellor  
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor

The pivotal scales for faculty respondents, then, are the same as those for student respondents with the addition of "OPEN-CLOSED" in the positive dimension.

Classified Staff

Preliminary valences obtained from the comments of the classified staff respondents were predominantly neutral. The results of the semantic differentiation process sustain that preliminary measure, and suggest that for this group only one scale ("HUMBLE-ARROGANT") is instrumental in determining negative evaluations and one scale ("IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT") is instrumental in determining positive evaluations. The lines of communication most representative of the negative assessment pattern for this sample are:

Office of Security and Parking  
The Kansas Union Bookstore  
The Faculty and Staff Newsletter  
"SEN-EX"  
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor  
Student Government  
Office of Affirmative Action  
The Athletic Department

The lines of communication most representative of the positive assessment pattern for this sample are:

The Computation Center  
Office of the Chancellor  
The University Libraries

That a line of communication might be perceived as negative if it is rated as "ARROGANT"--or less than "HUMBLE"--is a unique feature of the classified staff respondents. Similarly, it is unique among the sample populations that

only one scale, "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," seems to account for most of the positive assessments that occur within the classified staff sample.

It is suggested that a line of communication viewed as "IMPORTANT" and at least relatively "HUMBLE" will receive high evaluations from members of the classified staff, a suggestion supported by the examples above. Two other scales, "RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE" and "USEFUL-USELESS," are nearly as potent in the positive dimension as is "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," but not sufficiently so to be considered decisive.

#### Administrative Staff

The respondents from the administrative staff sample previously were described as being nearly evenly divided between neutral and negative valences in their assessments of lines of communication. Data obtained in the semantic differentiation process for this group are at variance with that earlier indication. In their responses to the bipolar scales for all selected lines of communication, the administrative staff respondents display a level of positive evaluation that is striking in comparison both with the System-semantics Profile data from other samples, and with the Grapevine Profile valences obtained from the administrative staff sample.

No single bipolar scale emerges from the responses as being closely linked to negative evaluations. It is assumed that this feature is related to the fact that the

System-semantics Profile contained a larger proportion of administrative offices as stimuli than had been the case with the data derived from the Grapevine Profile. The possibility exists that members of this sub-group reacted more favorably when confronted with some of their "own" lines of communication as stimuli than could have been predicted on the basis of their Grapevine Profile responses.

Overall positive assessments are most closely linked to positive ratings on three scales: "FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY," "USEFUL-USELESS," and/or "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT." These scales likely account for much of the positive skewedness of the scalar responses from administrative staff respondents, but that possibility is not distinctly supported by the data.

The lines of communication most representative of the positive assessment pattern for this sample are:

The University Administration  
The Office of the Chancellor  
The University Libraries  
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor

As has been mentioned, administrative staff respondents seem to have reversed their evaluations somewhat in the transition from the Grapevine Profile to the System-semantics Profile. What had been a neutral-negative profile after the Grapevine Profile interviews became a decidedly positive profile of perceptions in the System-semantics Profile. The data contain no specific clues on which explanations for this apparent reversal might be based.

It is suggested that the administrative staff tend to base their overall perceptions of lines of communication

within the University on three scales. Those scales, suggested here to be pivotal in the perceptual fields of administrative staff respondents are "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "USEFUL-USELESS," and/or "FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY."

#### The University Community

The University community, as represented by the four sample populations utilized in this study, was reported previously to have been consistently negative in its evaluations of valences associated with lines of communication within the University. That preview of the affective associations related to lines of communication is not entirely supported by the data obtained in the System-semantics Profile.

The apparent reversal of reported affective associations by respondents in the administrative staff sample is reflected further in the composite evaluations. Only three scales emerged as centrally related to positive evaluations of lines of communication: "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT," "USEFUL-USELESS," and "RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE." The lines of communication which reflect this positive assessment pattern most clearly are:

The Office of the Chancellor  
The University Libraries  
Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor  
The K.U. Alumni Association

A total of three scales emerge in the composite data as being descriptive of the negative perceptions previously reported by the various samples or by the University community overall. The scales are: "FAST-SLOW," "HUMBLE-ARROGANT,"

and/or "NEAR-REMOTE." While the composite data do not reflect the same magnitude of polarity for these three scales as was observed in individual samples, their comparative rigor is obvious. The lines of communication which reflect this negative assessment pattern most distinctly are:

The Office of Security and Parking  
Student Government  
The Athletic Department

It is suggested that members of the University community tend to respond with positive evaluations to those lines of communication for which they hold perceptions of "IMPORTANT," "USEFUL," and/or "RELIABLE." Further, it is suggested that a line of communication described by the University community as "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and/or "REMOTE" will be evaluated negatively by the members of the University community.

These conclusions, for each sample population and for the composite University community, are descriptive of the affective associations by which members of the University community evaluate various lines of communication within that organization. The conclusions are consistent with the results of the factor analytic treatment of the obtained data, which treatment will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

#### Implications for the University of Kansas

The University of Kansas, as the sponsoring agency and the focal organization of the overall research project of

which this study is a part, is confronted with the need to operationalize the results of this study. In an effort to clarify some of the intricacies of the data, the following are proposed for consideration:

1) It seems clear that students report the most consistently negative perceptions related to lines of communication within the University. While students seem to be aware of a small but diverse number of lines of communication, which represent many of the functions and objectives of the organization, their perceptions of those lines of communication suggest the possibility that neither the lines of communication nor the information conveyed along them will be trusted or utilized by a majority of students. Students characteristically react negatively to any line of communication which is perceived by them to be "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and/or "REMOTE." More positive reactions occur with respect to those lines of communication which are perceived as being "IMPORTANT," "USEFUL," "EFFECTIVE," and/or "RELIABLE."

Specifically, most students--according to the data obtained in this study--accept the University Administration as a dependable line of communication, but not without reservations, as evidenced by the elevated ratings on the "FAST-SLOW" and "HUMBLE-ARROGANT" scales. Similarly, students consider Student Government to be only moderately "IMPORTANT" and "USEFUL"; they see it as being decidedly "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and "REMOTE": it is an example of a line of communication to



which student reaction is nearly entirely negative. The Office of Security and Parking is categorically negative according to the perceptions reported by students; a review of the scalar responses reveals the reasons for this outcome. Also, the Athletic Department emerges clearly within the student sample data as a line of communication which is evaluated heavily negatively, generally on the basis of evaluations of "SLOW" and "ARROGANT."

2) Members of the faculty of the University seem generally to consider lines of communication to be neutral or negative, rarely positive. As a group, they respond negatively to any line of communication which is perceived as "SLOW," "ARROGANT," and/or "REMOTE," while they tend to react more positively to lines of communication which they perceive as "IMPORTANT," "USEFUL," "FRIENDLY," "OPEN," and/or "RESPONSIVE."

It is not clear what implications exist for a line of communication which is evaluated neutrally; whether that line of communication is utilized or trusted is a matter of speculation. It may be that faculty members operate with a considered opinion of "wait and see. . ." with respect to those lines of communication which they perceive neutrally.

Faculty members report favorable perceptions of three lines of communication within the University: The University Libraries, The K.U. Medical Center, and--to a lesser degree--The Office of the Chancellor. They report negative associations, emphatically, for four lines of

communication: The Office of Security and Parking, The University Daily Kansan, The Athletic Department, and "SEN-EX."

3) The several hundred members of the classified staff of the University seem to be the least judgmental of any of the four segments of the University community in their evaluations of lines of communication. As a group they seem to be negatively influenced by any perception of arrogance, and they are favorably impressed by perceptions of importance.

A line of communication such as the University Administration represents an evaluative dilemma for members of the classified staff: it is seen as important, but unquestionably arrogant. The Office of Affirmative Action is perceived as resolutely negative by this group, at least in part because of the arrogance ascribed to it. The Offices of the Executive Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs are reasonably well-received by classified staff members.

4) Members of the administrative staff of the University are somewhat enigmatic in their responses to the two instruments reported in this study. In the first collection of data the administrative staff personnel reported nearly equally neutral and negative evaluations for various lines of communication. They subsequently reported significantly increased positive evaluations of the eighteen selected lines of communication.

Lines of communication which are perceived by members of the administrative staff as "FRIENDLY," "USEFUL," and/or "IMPORTANT" are very likely to receive positive overall evaluations. The University Administration is seen as quite friendly, very important, and particularly useful by this group; it is evaluated favorably. This result cannot be surprising since it represents a group's effort to evaluate itself. In direct contrast, the University Daily Kansan is negated as an effective or trustworthy line of communication almost unanimously by members of the administrative staff. The results of the scales "FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY," "USEFUL-USELESS," and "IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT" seem to account for much of the negative response.

There seems to be a discernable cohesiveness within the administrative staff that is not present in the other sub-groups of the University community. The variances within the responses of administrative staff personnel are the lowest obtained for any group. It seems likely that the administrative staff is characterized by a greater degree of homogeneity than is true of any other sub-group. That the administrative staff is more homogeneous in its responses to the semantic differentiation scales is undeniable.

5) Within the entire University community, a few lines of communication seem to be perceived negatively by all segments of the University. The Office of Security and Parking is the most stridently negated line of communication within the entire University, as assessed in this study. The

Athletic Department is in a similar situation within the community. The Computation Center is only slightly less negatively perceived, and the University Daily Kansan is comparably assessed. The Senate Executive Committee (SEN-EX) is consistently reported so negatively that its communicative role as the primary agency of university governance must be questioned. The Office of the Chancellor and the K.U. Alumni Association are the two most uniformly positively-valued lines of communication within the University, yet it is only reasonable that these two entities cannot sustain the communicative load that would fall to them if it were decided to utilize exclusively the most "valued" lines of communication within the organization.

Efforts to improve the perceived levels of reliability, speed, friendliness, openness and humility of virtually any line of communication within the University community can serve only to improve the conditions described by this study. It seems likely that improvements in perceived levels of those factors can be accomplished only by actually increasing the reliability, speed, friendliness, openness, and humility of a given line of communication: efforts designed simply to give the appearance of improvements very probably will not alter the perceived associations of any sub-group. It also seems clear that failure to attempt such improvements as have been suggested can result only in a steady erosion of the existing situation.

### Observations and Suggestions Related to the Methodology

The utilization of the system-semantics methodology described in this study represents the first application of that methodology in a comprehensive study of communication within an institution of higher education. In light of that fact, this section is devoted to a discussion of the applicability of the methodology to this type of research.

#### The Cartographic Profile

While not reported in this study, for reasons previously outlined, the Cartographic Profile normally is considered to be the first step of the system-semantics methodology. Its purpose is to provide the investigator with a current and accurate description of the functional divisions and agencies of the organization under study.

The only comment offered in regard to the Cartographic Profile is a caution: the investigator must provide extensive and thorough external validation of the Cartographic Profile if it is to serve its intended purpose. Interviews with members of the organization, representative of all segments and functions of the organization, have proven to be worthwhile in validating the Cartographic Profile.

#### The Grapevine Profile

The Grapevine Profile provides an avenue for obtaining specific lines of communication on which the third and final stage of the methodology is based. As designed, the Grapevine

Profile can be constructed with data obtained either from interviews or questionnaires.

While no comparative studies exist in which the utility of interviews is compared with that of questionnaires, it is suggested that questionnaires do not characteristically permit the type of probing and follow-up questions which are possible in an interview setting. For that reason, it is recommended that preference be given to interviews as the mode of data collection for the Grapevine Profile.

In this study the development of the Grapevine Profile required extensive expenditures of time and money. Those expenditures seem amply justified, however, in consideration of the voluminous amounts of data generated by the interviews.

It must be reported that the interviewers utilized in the Grapevine Profile must be carefully trained in the purposes and procedures of the methodology, including full familiarity with the Cartographic Profile, and in the administration of the interview schedule. As has been discussed previously, a moderately-scheduled, open-ended, non-directive interview format is recommended.

A difficulty related to the Grapevine Profile, as utilized in this study, exists in the process wherein the research team assigned valences to the comments recorded by the interviewers. This arrangement created a dual level of subjective interpretation which is considered undesirable in the overall context of this study. To avoid this situation, it is recommended that interviewers be trained to assign

valences at the time that they record the interview responses. By eliminating the unnecessary subjectivity of this portion of the methodology--as it was adapted for use in this study-- a desirable possibility is created for measuring the extent of similarities between valences reported in the Grapevine Profile and affective associations obtained by the System- semantics Profile.

A shortcoming within the Grapevine Profile is the inability to distinguish among those lines of communication which are identified as being important, visible, foci of attention, and/or controversial. It is entirely possible that some of the lines of communication identified in this study are not actually significant in other than the short-run of the organization's existence. The ability to eliminate the identification of minor, but temporarily controversial or visible, lines of communication is seen as an important concern. This concern is treated more completely in subsequent paragraphs.

The most important recommendation related to the Grapevine Profile is one that greatly complicates this phase of the methodology. Because so many lines of communication may be of only fleeting significance within the organization at the time of identification, it is suggested that the Grapevine Profile interviews be conducted four times, over a period of three or four months. This procedure would serve to control for the temporal nature of many lines of communication. Also, this procedure would help to establish the

research project within the organization, a feature that may result in reduced resistance or more complete participation on the parts of the respondents.

By conducting the Grapevine Profile interviews four times, each time with the same or comparable samples, it would be possible to identify those lines of communication which are of lasting significance to the organization, as indicated by the frequency and duration of mention. Subsequent use of selected lines of communication as stimuli in the semantic differentiation process would be considerably more reliable as a result of this procedure. An additional advantage accruing from this procedure is related to the selection of bipolar scales for use in the System-semantics Profile, a consideration which is discussed in detail in the next section of this chapter.

As an alternative to the multiple administration of the Grapevine Profile interviews, it is possible that the use of particularly large samples would help to reduce the difficulties underlying these recommendations. A sample that represented a minimum of 30 percent of the population of the organization is suggested as a possible alternative. With such a large sample size, it would then be feasible to select for additional measurement only those lines of communication which are identified by at least 25-30 percent of the sample respondents. This alternative does not provide the additional advantages of the multiple-administration recommendation, and for that reason is the less preferred of the two suggestions.



### The System-semantics Profile

The System-semantics Profile is characterized by the use of semantic differentiation procedures to determine the affective associations related to lines of communication within an organization. The use of semantic differentiation for this purpose is adequately established in the literature, and has been reviewed in Chapter II of this study.

This phase of the methodology proved to be even more expensive in terms of time and money than was the case with the Grapevine Profile. The results seem to have justified the costs, however, in that the data collected were sufficient for, and amenable to, analysis.

One specific difficulty related to the System-semantics Profile--as it was utilized in this study--is that it is impossible to know with any certainty if connotative associations specific to each line of communication are in fact measured adequately by semantic differentiation of the lines of communication. No provision was made in this study to insure similarity or comparability of definition for each line of communication for all subjects. It is recommended that future applications of this phase of the methodology incorporate in the semantic differential instruments a description of each line of communication submitted for semantic differentiation. This recommendation may serve to minimize the probable denotative-connotative distortions inherent in this application of the System-semantics Profile.

If anonymity is a factor in this phase of the

methodology, as it was in this study, then it becomes impossible to correlate the identification of a line of communication in the Grapevine Profile with its semantic differentiation in the System-semantics Profile. This feature is considered a major shortcoming of the design of this study, but one that was dictated by the agreement to assure anonymity.

In order to avoid this deficiency in future designs, while retaining anonymity as a feature of the study, it is suggested that the following steps be considered:

- 1) On the basis of the first three administrations of the Grapevine Profile interviews, select those lines of communication which are mentioned consistently across all three administrations to be included in the System-semantics Profile.

- 2) Conduct the fourth Grapevine Profile interview, in person or by telephone, and give or mail to each respondent semantic differential instruments for each line of communication he/she identifies which has been derived from the first three interviews.

- 3) Request that the semantic differential materials, which should bear no identifying or distinguishing marks, be completed and returned within two days following the fourth interview.

This three-step addition to the procedure provides two additional features that were not included in the design of this study. It provides for the creation of a non-parametric

measure of the lasting nature of each line of communication over the time involved in the completion of the Grapevine Profile interviews. Such a measure would enhance the reliability of both the Grapevine and the System-semantics Profiles. Also, the addition would permit direct correlational analysis of a subject's mention of each line of communication with subject's semantic differentiation for each line of communication.

The construction of the semantic differential instruments requires the selection of bipolar adjectival scales. This process was accomplished in this study according to recommended procedures, yet the results proved to be somewhat unsatisfactory. As was noted in Chapter IV, discriminant analysis of the bipolar scale responses revealed that only seven of the ten scales achieved statistical significance. The loss of 30 percent of the potential discriminating potency of the semantic differential instrument is something that can and should be avoided in future utilizations of the methodology.

Two possibilities are suggested to correct the problem related to scale selection. The first suggestion is that a pilot study of the System-semantics Profile instruments be conducted with independent but comparable samples, and that bipolar scales be selected on the basis of factor analysis of the results. This suggestion adheres to traditional empirical procedures, but does not deal directly with the question of which scales to select in the first place.

The second suggestion, and the one which is preferred by this author, is that during each of the first three Grapevine Profile interviews respondents be asked to identify whichever adjectives they feel are descriptive of the lines of communication which they have identified. The adjectives obtained in this fashion should then be polarized, and established as the data pool. From that data pool would then be drawn the adjectival pairs to be used in the pilot study of the semantic differential instruments. Final selection of the bipolar scales would be based on factor analysis of the results of the pilot study.

It is apparent that the suggestions and recommendations in the preceding paragraphs related to the system-semantics methodology would, if implemented, result in a considerably more complicated methodology. The amount of time required to complete the methodology, the amount of money and number of personnel involved, likely would be increased by a factor of at least two. Some of the most appealing features of the current methodology, its relative clarity and ease of utilization, would be exchanged for nothing more substantial than the potential of a more rigorous methodology.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

##### The Purpose

Two purposes consistently have influenced the development, implementation, and conclusion of this study:

- 1) to employ and evaluate the system-semantics methodology in a descriptive research effort in an organizational setting, and
- 2) to implement a program of organizational communication research in the area of higher education, specifically that segment of higher education known as a university.

These two purposes have provided the methodological and substantive foundations of this study of lines of communication within the University of Kansas.

##### The Rationale

The theoretical basis of this study may be traced to the assertion by Clark Kerr (1975) that higher education has entered--not by choice--the Age of Survival. Documentation has been provided which identifies "communication" as as concept and process essential to the organizational buoyancy and effectiveness of institutions of higher education.

Support has been presented for the existence of

multiple elements within the university community, and the role of perception and its endemic relationship to communication within and among those elements has been identified. The need for regular, comprehensive self-study and analysis of communicative behavior and communication channels by insitutions of higher education has been established.

### The Procedures

This study has been presented as a part of a larger study, one which Sanders (1976) calls "The most extensive study of internal communication ever undertaken by the University of Kansas. . ." (p. 49). The overall project of which this study is a part is unique in the literature of research specific to higher education.

In the present study, descriptive data related to perceptions of lines of communication within the University of Kansas were derived from administration of the system-semantics methodology, developed by Conboy (1976), et al. Two phases of the methodology (the Grapevine Profile and the System-semantics Profile) were utilized to obtain data from research samples drawn from the four principle segments of the University population:

- 1) Student Sample (n=200)
- 2) Faculty Sample (n=200)
- 3) Classified Staff Sample (n=100)
- 4) Administrative Staff Sample (n=100)

The Grapevine Profile is designed to obtain participant reports from members of the organization regarding which

lines of communication within the organization are given the most attention, and how those lines of communication are regarded. Members of the organization are asked, in telephone interviews, to report what is active in the informal rumor networks of the organization, and to report the nature of comments related to those lines of communication. This procedure provides a non-threatening way in which to tap the informal networks of the organization. Data obtained in the Grapevine Profile are reported in frequency distributions of mention of lines of communication, and valence assignments--stated as "positive," "neutral," and/or "negative"--for each line of communication based on the evaluative comments recorded by interviewers.

The System-semantics Profile provides semantic differentiation data, along ten bipolar scales, of the affective associations related to selected lines of communication. The purpose of this phase of the methodology is to measure the "meanings" of the lines of communication, as perceived by members of the sample populations.

A total of eighteen lines of communication were selected for measurement according to the procedures and characteristics of the System-semantics Profile. Data obtained in the administration of the System-semantics Profile were analyzed according to sample, line of communication, and bipolar scale. Analysis of all System-semantics Profile data was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version, 5.02.

## The Results

The following sections provide a composite summary of the major findings of this study:

- 1) Of 185 lines of communication identified by members of the four research samples, twenty account for more than 50 percent of the total identifying comments. The twenty "primary" lines of communication represent a diverse array of functions and services of the university setting. Each sample group identified a sufficient number of lines of communication to conclude that each group is aware of a relatively large number of lines of communication within the organization.
- 2) Valences linked to the identification of the 185 lines of communication were predominantly negative. The greatest proportion of negative valence occurred within the student sample, the least within the classified staff sample. Faculty and administrative staff tended to provide comments that were assessed as neutral-to-negative, with administrative staff personnel slightly more negative than neutral.
- 3) Analysis of responses to the semantic differential procedure resulted in three bipolar scales emerging as centrally related to positive evaluations of lines of communication: IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT, USEFUL-USELESS, and RELIABLE-UNRELIABLE. Three additional bipolar scales emerged as central to negative evaluations: FAST-SLOW, HUMBLE-ARROGANT, and NEAR-REMOTE. Differences were found among the samples on scalar discrimination and potency.
- 4) Several lines of communication were found to be typically positively evaluated: The Office of the Chancellor, The University Libraries, Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor, and The K.U. Alumni Association. Three lines of communication were found to be typically negatively evaluated: The Office of Security and Parking, Student Government, and The Athletic Department. Variations in these patterns exist among sample groups.
- 5) The system-semantics methodology of organizational communication research is assessed as a valuable and appropriate research tool for use in higher-education-as-organization investigations. A minimal



number of refinements and/or procedural changes are suggested.

- 6) There is considerable value in measuring affective associations related to lines of communication within an organization as a prelude to more complete understanding of the communicative interactions and dynamics which characterize the organization.

#### Suggestions for Further Research

This study was the first to utilize the system-semantics methodology in a comprehensive organizational communication research project within an institution of higher education. Without question, the study raises as many questions as it answers. The possibilities for additional investigation and refinement are extensive and immediate. Those possibilities of special concern to this study are listed below.

- 1) A comparative study to determine the similarities and differences of the sub-populations of the University of Kansas community and those of other comparable and different institutions would provide a basis for generalizing the findings of this study beyond its specific locale.

- 2) Additional investigation of the feasibility and utility of Darnell's (1970) "BEST-WORST" response dichotomy for semantic differentiation is needed to determine the most appropriate procedures for assessing affective associations by semantic differentiation.

- 3) Is there a relationship between affective associations and utilization of lines of communication within an organizational setting? Research related to this question

is of critical importance to the continued delineation of organizational communication concepts and patterns. Additional research specific to institutions of higher education is required by the advent of the Age of Survival.

4) Is "good" communication even necessary in any but the administrative sector of institutions of higher education? A basic premise of this study has been that effective communication within and between all segments of the university community is necessary and desirable. Research designed to assess the role of effective and ineffective communicative behaviors within a university community is needed to support that basic premise.

5) Is there any correlation between the amount or flow of information and the affective associations related to a line of communication? Specifically, does a restricted flow of communication serve to elicit polar extremes of affective associations while an unrestricted flow of information tends to confuse and constrict affective associations around the expected mean?

6) Additional use of the system-semantics methodology is particularly called for. Utilization of the methodology as originally described by Conboy (1976), and utilization of the methodology as revised by the recommendations reported in this study are essential. As a relatively new, relatively untried methodology its potentials and limitations can only be subjects for speculations. Extensive and competent utilization of the system-semantics methodology is the only

means whereby its value to organizational communication research can be determined.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Floyd. Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure. New York: John Wiley, 1955.
- Andrews, James R. "Confrontation at Columbia: A Case Study in Coercive Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LV (February 1969): 9-16.
- Altbach, Philip G., Laufer, Robert S., and McVey, Sheila. "The Multiversity in Crises." In Education and Identity, pp. 1-28. Arthur W. Chickering. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Altbach, Philip G., Laufer, Robert S., and McVey, Sheila, eds. Academic Supermarkets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Ayers, Archie R., and Russel, John H. Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Balderston, Frederick E. Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Bennis, Warren G., ed. American Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Bennis, Warren G. The Leaning Ivory Tower. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- Bennis, Warren G., and Slater, Philip E. The Temporary Society. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Brown, R. "A Review of C.E Osgood, G.J. Suci, and P.H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning." Contemporary Psychology 3, 1958: 113-115.
- Carroll, J. B. "Review of C.E. Osgood, G.J. Suci, and P.H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning." Language, 35, 1959: 58-77.
- Cartier, Francis A., and Harwood, K.A. "On Definition of Communication." Journal of Communication, III (November, 1953): 74-83.

- Charters, W.W., Jr. "Stability and Change in the Communications Structure of School Faculties." Educational Administration Quarterly 5 (Fall, 1969): 15-38.
- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Cohen, M.D., and March, J.G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Conboy, William A. Personal correspondence to Drs. Haney, Harms, Harnack, and Pace. 17 April 1974.
- Conboy, William A. "Report to the Executive Vice-Chancellor." Internal report to the executive vice-chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 1975.
- Conboy, William A. Working Together. . .Communication in a Healthy Organization. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Craig, William G. "The Multiversity Neurosis on the Large and Small Campus: Are Student Residences the Answer?" Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., April, 1966.
- Dance, Frank E.X. "Toward a Theory of Human Communication." In Human Communication Theory, pp. 288-309. Edited by Frank E.X. Dance. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Darnell, Donald K. "A Technique for Determining the Evaluative Discrimination Capacity and Polarity of Semantic Differential Scales for Specific Concepts." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.
- Darnell, Donald K. "Concept Scale Interaction in the Semantic Differential." Journal of Communication 16, 1966: 104-115.
- Darnell, Donald K. "Semantic Differentiation." In Methods of Research in Communication, pp. 181-196. Edited by Philip Emmert and Wm. D. Brooks. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1970.
- Davis, Keith. "Channels of Personnel Communication Within the Management Group." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1952.

- Deegan, William L., McConnel, T.R., Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Stull, Harriet. Joint Participation and Decision Making. Berkeley, Cal.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970.
- Dember, William N., and Jenkins, James J. General Psychology: Modeling Behavior and Experience. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Deutsch, K.W. "On Communication Models in the Social Sciences." Public Opinion Quarterly 16 (1952): 365-380.
- Dolbeare, Kenneth M. "Faculty Power." In Education and Identity, pp. 157-169. Arthur W. Chickering. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Dressel, Paul L., and Faricy, William H. Return to Responsibility. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Dressel, Paul L., Johnson, F. Craig, and Marcus, Philip M. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Dressel, Paul L. and Pratt, Sally B. The World of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Earl, Elmer W., Jr. "Fundamentals of Communication." NICB Management Record XVI, No. 9 (September 1954): 330-333.
- Emmert, Philip, and Brooks, William D. (eds.). Methods of Research in Communication. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1970.
- Farnsworth, Dana. "Student Rootlessness and Restlessness." Manuscript presented to Illinois Conference on Higher Education, 1965.
- Fischer, B. Aubrey. Small Group Decision Making. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Fletcher, J.E. "Semantic Differential Type Scales in Communication Research." Western Speech XXXVI, No. 4 (Fall 1972): 269-275.
- French, Wendell L. and Hellriegel, Don. Personnel Management and Organization Development: Fields in Transition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1971.
- Fryer, H.C. Concepts and Methods of Experimental Statistics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

- Gerbner, George. "Mass Media and Human Communication Theory." In Human Communication Theory, pp. 40-60. Edited by Frank E.X. Dance. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Goetzinger, Charles, and Valentine, Milton. "Communication Channels, Media, Directional Flow and Attitudes in an Academic Community." The Journal of Communication 12, (March 1962): 23-26.
- Goldhaber, Gerald M. "Communication at the University." Western Speech 35, (Summer 1972): 169-180.
- Grambsch, Paul V. "Conflicts and Priorities." In The Troubled Campus, pp. 101-107. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Greenleaf, Elizabeth (ed.). Undergraduate Students as Members of the Student Personnel Staff. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1967.
- Gustad, John W. "Communication Failures in Higher Education." The Journal of Communication 12 (1962): 11-22.
- Haire, Mason. Psychology in Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.
- Hall, Norman P. Identifying Institutional Goals. Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.
- Harris, T. George. "Organic Populism: A Conversation with Warren Bennis." Psychology Today 3 (February 1970): 48-63.
- Hatfield, Mark O. "Public Pressures on Higher Education." In The Troubled Campus, pp. 75-84. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Haynes, Jack R. "The Effect of Double Standardized Scoring on the Semantic Differential." Educational and Psychological Measurement 35 (1975): 107-114.
- Henderson, Algo D. Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Henderson, Algo D. The Innovative Spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Huitson, Alan. The Analysis of Variance. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1966.

- Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.
- Kerr, Clark. "What We Might Learn from the Climacteric." DAEDALUS, Winter (1975): 1-7.
- Knowles, Asa S. Handbook of College and University Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Ladd, Dwight R. Change in Educational Policy. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Lahti, Robert E. Innovative College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- Laufer, Robert S., and McVey Sheila. "Generational Conflict." In Education and Identity, pp. 343-364. Edited by Arthur W. Chickering. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.
- Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization in Large Universities-- The Faculties and the Administration." The Journal of Higher Education 30 (7 & 9): 353-364, 489-504.
- McCauliff, Mary Lou. "Media Usage and Role Perception in Management: A Correlational Analysis." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Kansas, 1974.
- McDougall, G.H., and Fry, J.N. "Combining Two Methods of Image Measurement." Journal of Retailing 50, 4 (Winter 1974-75): 53-61.
- McGrath, Joseph E. Social Psychology: A Brief Introduction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- McGrath, Earl J. (ed.). Prospect for Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. The Literature of Higher Education 1971. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. The Literature of Higher Education 1972. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Millet, John D. Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968.
- Minnick, Wayne C. The Art of Persuasion. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.



- Murphy, Herta A., and Peck, Charles E. Effective Business Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.
- Nie, Norman, H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. For Your Information, 18 September 1970.
- Osgood, C. E. "Semantic Differential Techniques in the Comparative Study of Cultures." In Readings in the Psychology of Language, pp. 371-397. Edited by L.A. Jakobovitz and M.S. Miron. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Rice, A.K. The Modern University. London: Tavistock Publications, 1970.
- Richman, Barry M., and Farmer, Richard N. Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Riesman, David, Gusfield, Joseph, and Gamson, Zelda. Academic Values and Mass Education. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1970.
- Ross, Leslie W. "Communication in College Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.
- Ross, Raymond. Persuasion: Communication and Interpersonal Relations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Sanders, Janet S. "Utilization of Lines of Communication Within the Administration of the University of Kansas Described by ECCO Analysis." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Kansas, 1976.
- Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Schwartz, Donald F. "Liason Communication Roles in a Formal Organization." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

- Smith, G. Kerry (ed.). The Troubled Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Smith, M. Brewster. "The Communicative Act." The Journal of Social Psychology XXXI (1950): 271-281.
- Snider, J.G., and Osgood, C.E. (eds.). Semantic Differential Techniques: A Sourcebook. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Steiger, William A. "Congress and the Campus." In The Troubled Campus, pp. 85-93. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Steil, Lyman K. "The Relevance of Modern Organization Theory to Organizational Communication." Central States Speech Journal 22 (Summer 1971): 78-84.
- Stewart, Charles J., and Cash, William B. Interviewing: Principles and Practices. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., Publishers, 1974.
- Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Suczek, Robert F. The Best Laid Plans. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Thayer, Lee. "On Theory-Building in Communication: I. Some Conceptual Problems." The Journal of Communication 13, no. 4 (1963): 217-235.
- Thayer, Lee. "Communication and Organization Theory." In Human Communication Theory, pp. 70-115. Edited by Frank E.X. Dance. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Thayer, Lee. Communication and Communication Systems in Organization, Management, and Interpersonal Relations. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.
- Tompikins, Philip K., and Anderson, Elaine Vanden Bout. Communication Crisis at Kent State: A Case Study. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1971.
- Triandis, H.C. "A Comparative Factorial Analysis of Job Semantic Structures of Managers and Workers." The Journal of Applied Psychology 44 (1960): 297-302.
- Tucker, Charles O. "Faculty Communication and Academic Policy." Central States Speech Journal 24 (Fall 1973): 212-221.

- Tucker, Raymond K. "Reliability of Semantic Differential Scales: The Role of Factor Analysis." Western Speech 35 (1971): 185-190.
- Vardaman, George, and Vardaman, Patricia Black. Communication in Modern Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973.
- Wescoe, W. Clark. "Opening Convocation Address." Delivered at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 20 September 1965.
- Wingfield, Clyde J. The American University: A Public Administration Perspective. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1970.

APPENDIX A

GRAPEVINE PROFILE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_, a research assistant for Dr. William Conboy of the Speech Communication department. Dr. Conboy is conducting a survey of communication within the University, endorsed by the K.U. administration. Your name was in a sample drawn from the student/faculty/staff directory, and I'd like to ask you just a few questions. This interview shouldn't take more than 5 minutes, and the data will be completely anonymous--your name will not be connected with your responses in any way. Is it all right with you if we do a brief interview under those conditions?

*If not: "When may I call back (before Feb. 24)?"*

*If they have any questions concerning the legitimacy of the study, refer them to Jan Sanders, Asst. Dean of Women, 864-3552, or Bill Robinson, Acting Director, Nunemaker College, 864-4223.*

The University of Kaansas is a large and complex organization with many lines of communication. We are interested in finding out what students/faculty/staff at K.U. think about the lines of communication which affect them. You can help by telling us what you have heard others say recently.

- 1) Which parts of the University have you heard people discussing within the past few weeks?

*To clarify: "What committees, offices, boards, agencies, advisory groups, etc., have you heard people discussing during the past few weeks?"*

*To clarify a general "THEY..." or other uncertain attribution: "To whom would you complain about that?" or "Whom would you compliment/thank for that?"*

*To check for additional units: "Are there other parts of the University people have been talking about?"*

- 2) What have you heard people say about \_\_\_\_\_?

*To elicit value-laden comments: "How do people feel about that?"*

Thank you very much for your time and assistance. In a few days you'll be sent some follow-up questions with a pre-addressed stamped envelope to return them to the research team. As with the responses today, your responses to those questions will be absolutely confidential: no effort will be made to identify you or link your identity with your responses.

Do you have any questions you'd like to ask at this time?

Thank you very much for your help.

APPENDIX B

DR. SHANKEL'S LETTER ENCOURAGING COOPERATION



THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

MAIN CAMPUS, LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66045  
MEDICAL CENTER, KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66103Executive Vice-Chancellor  
Main Campus  
223 Strong Hall  
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Telephone 913-864-4904

March 3, 1975

Dear Colleague:

The enclosures are the final aspect of your involvement in the study of University communication channels, for which you recently were interviewed.

I encourage you to take the very few minutes required to complete these forms and return them, in the envelope provided, at your earliest convenience. As was the case with the interview, your responses to these forms will be totally confidential and your name will not be linked in any way to your responses. The data collected in this study will be presented only in composite form.

Thank you in advance for your continued assistance and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Delbert M. Shankel  
Executive Vice Chancellor

DMS :wm

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF EXPLANATION AND INSTRUCTION  
FOR THE SYSTEM-SEMANTICS PROFILE



March 14, 1975

Dear Respondent,

This survey, by nature of the data treatment, is anonymous. DO NOT put your name or other identification on the forms. Each form has been coded to indicate only your class, faculty rank, functional administrative unit, or civil service classification, and no other information about you is necessary. Data from these forms, and from the earlier interview conducted with you and many other members of the University community, will be analyzed along the above dimensions, and no individual respondents can or will be identified.

The purpose of this study is to determine the feelings people have about lines of communication and communicating units within the University of Kansas, using the standard "semantic differentiation" methodology. The particular lines of communication and units of communication to which you are asked to respond are a small randomized sample of a much larger list generated in the earlier interviews. The sample is being rotated among respondents in order to obtain an overall perspective, while not placing too great a burden on each respondent.

Each of the following six pages lists a line or unit of communication following by ten scales with adjectives at each end of the scale, as follows:

KIND:      :      :      :      :      :      :      CRUEL  
           1      2      3      4      5      6      7

In completing the forms, make your judgments on the basis of what the specified line or unit of communication means to you. Find that point on the scale which best describes your feelings about the line or unit of communication listed, and mark that point with an X above the number.

The intervals on these scales should be interpreted as follows:

extremely    quite    slightly                      slightly    quite    extremely  
 KIND:   kind   :   kind   :   kind   :            :   cruel   :   cruel   :   cruel   : CRUEL  
           1          2          3          4          5          6          7

If you consider the line or unit of communication to be neutral on the scale; that is, both sides are equally descriptive of your feelings about the line or unit, mark the middle space numbered "4."

Please return the six scale pages as soon as possible, in the envelope provided, and BEFORE MARCH 22. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

William Conboy  
 Prof., Speech and Drama  
 Research Coordinator

Janet Sanders  
 Asst. Dean of Women  
 Research Assistant

William L. Robinson  
 Acting Director, Nunemaker  
 Research Assistant

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

Fr	So	Jr	Sr	Gr	SP	O								
P	AsoP	AstP	L	I	AITA		M			F				
Sec	C1-2	C3-5	SM	Acct	CST									
CE	AVC	DD	ADD	S			EO	AA	BA	GS	O	SA		

---

### THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

RELIABLE:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : UNRELIABLE

FAST:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : SLOW

FRIENDLY:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : UNFRIENDLY

USELESS:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : USEFUL

OPEN:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : CLOSED

RESPONSIVE:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : UNRESPONSIVE

ARROGANT:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : HUMBLE

EFFECTIVE:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : INEFFECTIVE

REMOTE:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : NEAR

IMPORTANT:  $\frac{\quad}{1}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{2}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{3}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{4}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{5}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{6}$  :  $\frac{\quad}{7}$  : UNIMPORTANT

3207-6