

Charles N. Hakes  
Marketing & Research

17560 Coral Gables  
Lathrup Village, MI 48076  
313-559-8232

INFORMATION AND  
COMMUNICATION  
SURVEY REPORT

for

=====

Mary Comden  
Oakland Community  
College

=====

December 9, 1991

# C O N T E N T S

	Section.	Page
	-----	-----
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1.	1
Description of Study	1.	1
Summary and Perceptions	1.	1
The Bottom Line	2.	3
Key to Frequency Tables	2.	3
SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS	2.	1
Description of the Sample	2.	1
Preference for Information Dissemination	2.	3
Preference for Information Dissemination Tabulated by Faculty or Staff Job Description	2.	5
TWO-WAY CROSS-TABULATION TABLE EXAMPLE & INTERPRETATION	2.	5
Events Ratings	2.	16
Rating of Events by Faculty or Staff Job Classification	2.	26
Ratings of Usefulness and Quality	2.	37
Introduction	2.	37
Findings	2.	38
Subsection 1: Usefulness & Quality Ratings	2.	39
Subsection 2: Usefulness Ratings	2.	62
Subsection 3: Quality Ratings	2.	70
Ratings of Usefulness and Quality by Job	2.	78
Write-In Response Listing	2.	85

## SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The survey was designed and implemented by Campus Auxiliary Services of Oakland Community College. The population that was studied was the faculty and staff of the College. The purpose of the study was to assess communications problems and opportunities. Questionnaires were distributed and returned during the months of October and November, 1991.

Of 217 questionnaires sent, 101 were returned. The response rate of 47% is generally considered to be quite acceptable these days, for any type of survey. 100 questionnaires were found to be usable, and these were tabulated.

Containing six questions, the questionnaire contained a potential for 62 individual responses to parts of these questions. In that respect, it was a fairly lengthy questionnaire, and therefore there are many tabulation possibilities. We chose those that seemed to be the most straight forward in presenting the findings.

The research staff of O.C.C. had recommended asking two anchored and scaled questions concerning each of 23 sources of information. These were the usefulness of the information and its quality. This was good advice, as the respondents differentiated their ratings between usefulness and quality.

### SUMMARY AND PERCEPTIONS

There is a need for a single reliable written information source that tells everyone what they need to know. There were complaints about information coming from so many sources. A minority indicated they liked to get information from the originating source. Important information needs to be single source information.

Perhaps it is necessary for individual departments to have their own newsletters. Be aware that the information overload they cause can water down the effectiveness of all communications. If individual departments publish their own newsletters the recipients should be on a carefully culled list to ensure that the newsletter is something they want.

Whatever you publish it will work better if it is fun and enlightening, rather than a chore, to read. Information gathering for publication is only half of the task. The other half is to entice the reader to read it. This flavor comes from the write-in responses as much as anything else.

Non-faculty staff people were more likely than faculty to expect information to come through from their supervisors. This perhaps



## SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

suggests stronger awareness of an authority - accountability relationship on the part of non-faculty. A sizeable portion of faculty did not consider their supervisor as a useful source of information at all and/or did not respond to the question.

It is also suggested that communications concerning O.C.C. matters are best received at O.C.C. rather than at home. When mentioned at all, respondents stated they wanted communications sent to their offices.

It has been said that an army travels on its stomach. This can also be said about O.C.C. There was very strong agreement that the Rathskellar needed improvement (70%). J Building Cafeteria was a toss-up with almost equal number saying "improve it," "it's good," and having no opinion.

The findings concerning the Rathskellar were about the strongest agreement in the survey -- right up there with the (predictable) usefulness of the College Catalog.

There was strong sentiment that the Ridgewood Cafe was good (79%).

Special event dinners were considered good by 53%. The other 47% had no opinion. Likely, many of these had not gone to them.

Awards recognition lunches were rated high on both usefulness and quality.

In general, when activities -- such as the OCC Picnic, Holiday Gala, Graduation Reception, etc. -- are reviewed, the "no opinions" run high. Based on comments on the questionnaires it is suggested that a lot of OCC staffers and faculty don't get involved with these things. Where there are opinions offered, favorable sentiments run 4, 5, or 6 to one over unfavorable ones.

There seems to be a problem with involvement, perhaps related to the need for a single strong, authoritative source of information.

Co-worker contacts are rated good by 61%. Yet apparently a number of faculty and staffers do not avail themselves of all of the possible opportunities for co-worker contacts by participating in all of the available activities.

The orientation and social acclimation of new employees seems to work a little better for faculty than for staff, although high proportions of both groups do not have opinions about it -- probably because they have not experienced it for a number of years, or ever.

For specific in-place communications devices and methods the

## SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

College Catalog, schedule of classes, Awards Recognition Luncheons and immediate supervisor rate high as useful sources of information.

Futures, and Physics at the Ridge rate low for usefulness -- primarily by non-faculty staff. A lot of these people don't receive them.

Billboards are perceived to be of poor quality, especially the letters. There are a number of comments about these. What is said about them gives the impression that they are "ratty."

Not many people are familiar with Channel 30, radio, and leadership meetings.

### THE BOTTOM LINE

A strong comprehensive, interesting, reliable single source of information is needed to foster interaction by faculty and other staff with O.C.C. and its events. A lot of information is currently being missed or not provided.

For crying out loud, fix the Rathskellar!

### KEY TO FREQUENCY TABLES

This is an example of our type of frequency table and how to read it:

The job classifications were collapsed into two categories -- faculty and staff -- for use in cross-tabulations.

#### Q4 Job classification

JOB	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	98
Faculty	1	57	58.16	
Staff	2	41	41.84	

-----

The table is for question 4, Job classification. The JOB's are either Faculty or Staff. CODE is a computer value that identifies either faculty or staff. FREQ. is frequency, the number of respondents in each job. % of 98 identifies the number of respondents who are included in the table, and the base for the percentages (58.16 and 41.84) that are below it.

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

101 responses were obtained from a total of 217 questionnaires that were distributed, for a 47% response rate. This is a high response rate for voluntary responses.

One of the 102 questionnaires that was returned was blank. Another had only one page and was not included in the tabulations.

The faculty response rate was 52%. Highest returns were from administration (75%) and lowest from maintenance (6%).

The total responses by job classification were 98 -- 2 did not answer the job classification question.

Responses by Q4 Job classification

JOB	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 98	NUMBER SENT	RESPONSE RATE %
Faculty	1	57	58.16	109	52.29
Classified	2	26	26.53	52	50.00
Mgmt staff	3	6	6.12	12	50.00
Pub.Safety	4	1	1.02	4	25.00
Maint.	5	2	2.04	32	6.25
Admin.	7	6	6.12	8	75.00

The job classifications were collapsed into two categories -- faculty and staff -- for use in cross-tabulations.

Q4 Job classification

JOB	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 98
Faculty	1	57	58.16
Staff	2	41	41.84



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

94 responded to the question on area of service. Highest returns were from Instruction.

Q5 Area of service

AREA	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	94
Admin.	1	16	17.02	
Instruct'n	2	57	60.64	
Stu.Serv.	3	18	19.15	
All other	4	3	3.19	

---

These responses were collapsed into Instruction and All other areas. These were not used in further tabulations. 61% of the respondents were involved with Instruction.

Q5 Area of service

AREA	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	94
Instruct'n	1	57	60.64	
All other	2	37	39.36	

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

PREFERENCE FOR INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Respondents were asked two open-ended questions. These were:

Q2: "Please indicate where you prefer to obtain information."

Q4: "General comments.:"

Regardless of where on the questionnaire respondents indicated their preference for obtaining information -- questions 2 or 4, or marginal comments -- their responses were coded as follows:

Preferred Communications

PREFER	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Written	1	16	16.00
Too much	2	11	11.00
AdminSuper	3	9	9.00
Mail	4	7	7.00
My office	5	4	4.00
E-Mail	6	3	3.00
Source	7	3	3.00
Meetings	8	3	3.00
Status quo	9	1	1.00

-----

Answers to this question were in more than one context, indicating what was top-of-mind to the respondents. A handful of respondents were coded into more than one category in this multiple response compilation. 36 respondents gave one answer, 7 gave 2 answers, 1 gave 3 answers, 1 gave 4 answers.

Code 1: Written indicated a preference for written communications -- something published, tangible.

Code 2: Too much is a complaint that respondents received too much paper, too many communications from too many sources.

Code 3: AdminSuper is a preference for relevant communications to come from the administration or through the respondent's supervisor.

Code 4: Mail means in the mail. This response does not, by itself, indicate where the mail should be sent. Like "written" this is a request for communications in hard copy form.



## SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Code 5: My office means that these respondents specifically wanted communications sent to their offices, not their homes. There was some duplication with Code 1 -- written.

Code 6: E-Mail includes voice mail.

Code 7: Source means from the source that originates the communications. Apparently this means decentralized sources rather in contrast to having all communications come through the administration. This appears to be a preference for the present system.

Code 8: Meetings. Three respondents liked to be told relevant information in meetings.

Code 9: Status quo. What is currently being done is fine.

These findings suggest that there is an information overload with communications being sent from too many sources. The remedy is to centralize communications, have scheduled, written communications come through the administration so that faculty and staff know that one particular regularly scheduled news piece will tell them what they need to know.

Present communications appear to be decentralized.

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

PREFERENCE FOR INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, TABULATED BY FACULTY OR STAFF JOB CLASSIFICATION

TWO-WAY (CROSS-TABULATION) TABLE EXAMPLE & INTERPRETATION

The first appearance of the twoway contingency tables is in this section. The first of these tables is used as an example. Even though each of the tables is annotated, not all readers of this report may be familiar enough with the type of table that is used in this report to be able to readily interpret them. All cross-tabs take some getting used to. Here is how to read ours:

ROW QUEST.: Prefer mail.

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 62 Mail

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Mail	1	5	2 :	7
	COL.%	9.	5. :	7.
No mention	2	52	39 :	91
	COL.%	91.	95. :	93.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
		CHI SQ.=	.12 DF= 1	P= .7333

N= 98 The number of respondents in the table. This is the number who answered both the row and column questions.

ROW = 62 Mail. Rows represent those who preferred mail. "62" is the numerical equivalent of "Mail" used by our computer. It is called a variable.

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification. Columns are variable #72, job classifications, from question 4. These are 1 - Faculty, and 2 - Staff.

## SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW TOTAL, ROW%: (1st row) 7 respondents prefer mail. These are 7% of the 98 respondents in the table.

COLUMN TOTAL, COLUMN %: (1st column) 57 respondents are faculty. These are 58% of the 98 respondents in the table.

First cell, at the intersection of row 1 and column 1: 5 respondents are faculty and prefer mail. These are 9% of the 57 respondents who are faculty in the column 1 total.

The statistics, CHI SQ.= .12 DF= 1 P= .7333, are provided by the computer program at our specification and are useful to statisticians in analyzing the tables, because the interpretation of the P= figure has been made in the statement of FINDINGS that precedes each table.

If you care about it, the P= figure indicates the probability that differences between faculty and staff could have happened by chance. If the P= figure is .05 or less, we conclude that chance was not the cause of the differences. The technical jargon is that we rejected the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) at the 95% level of confidence (or the .05 level of significance), and have accepted the hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) that a real difference exists between the two population.

The FINDINGS point out the results of the foregoing analysis.

TABLE SCANNING: Compare across the COL.%'s, scanning for rows in which the individual columns vary from each other (and from the ROW%) by a great amount. These are where responses differ between faculty and staff.

In the case of the tables in this section it is only necessary to scan the first row in each table as the second row is "no mention" of the item in the first row.

In the cross-tabulations for question 3 it is necessary to scan more than one row.



## SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

TECHNICAL NOTE FOR THOSE WHO ARE INTERESTED IN IT: Technically, these differences are significant at the .05 level of chance, or less, if these findings had resulted from a sample of 98 from an infinite (for statistical purposes) population. Even though the O.C.C. sample was only 100, it is a large sample from a finite universe of 217 as long as those who responded are typical of those who did not. This is an assumption that is reasonable under these circumstances. There was an uncorrected chi square test performed for each contingency table, as shown. There were no adjustments made to the data or the results of the chi square tests for the finite sample, nor was a correction made for 1 degree of freedom. The effect of this is that a precise statistical test for significance was not performed but that the stated findings have a high, but not precisely known, probability of being correct in describing the entire faculty staff population at O.C.C.

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer E-Mail, voice mail

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 63 E-Mail Voice mail  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
E-Mail	1	3	0	3
	COL.%	5.	0.	3.
No mention	2	54	41	95
	COL.%	95.	100.	97.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.81	DF= 1 P= .3694

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer administration or supervisor source

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is a significant difference between faculty and staff. Staff is more likely to want communications from their supervisor.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 64 Administration Supervis.  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
AdminSuper	1	1	8	9
	COL.%	2.	20.	9.
No mention	2	56	33	89
	COL.%	98.	80.	91.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=	7.01	DF= 1	P= .0081



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS.

ROW QUEST.: Prefer to get it in my office

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 65 In my office

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
My office	1	3	1	4
	COL.%	5.	2.	4.
No mention	2	54	40	94
	COL.%	95.	98.	96.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.03	DF= 1 P= .8575

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer written communications

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 66 Written communcations  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1 Facul ty	2 Staff	ROW TOTAL ROW%
Written	1	10	6	16
	COL.%	18.	15.	16.
No mention	2	47	35	82
	COL.%	82.	85.	84.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.01	DF= 1 P= .9145

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer to have fewer, there are now too many.

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 67 Too much - Too many

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Too much	1	8	3	11
	COL.%	14.	7.	11.
No mention	2	49	38	87
	COL.%	86.	93.	89.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
CHI SQ.=		.51 DF= 1		P= .4747



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer the status quo.

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 68 Status quo is OK  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

	1	2	ROW
	Facul	Staff	TOTAL
	ty		ROW%
Status quo	1	0	1
COL.%	2.	0.	1.
No mention	56	41	97
COL.%	98.	100.	99.
COLUMN TOTAL	57	41	
COLUMN %	58.	42.	
CHI SQ.=	.03 DF= 1		P= .8679

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer to get information from the source.

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 69 From the source  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1 Facul ty	2 Staff	ROW TOTAL ROW%
Source	1	2	1 :	3
	COL.%	4.	2. :	3.
No mention	2	55	40 :	95
	COL.%	96.	98. :	97.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.08 DF= 1	P= .7710

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Prefer to get information in meetings.

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 70 In meetings

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Meetings	1	1	2 :	3
	COL.%	2.	5. :	3.
No mention	2	56	39 :	95
	COL.%	98.	95. :	97.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.08 DF= 1	P= .7710

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

EVENTS RATINGS

These ratings are based on responses to question 3:

"Rate each of the following events that you may have participated in:"

The ratings were scored this way:

Improve -- needs improvement	1
No opinion	2
Good	3

"No opinion" was sometimes accompanied by marginal comments that the respondent did not attend the event.

In reaching conclusions about the need for action for any of the events or facilities in this section of the report, it is well to review the following tables where all response frequencies for each event/facility are provided. This is because low frequencies of "good" ratings, or low frequencies of "needs improvement" ratings may result from a lack of opinions.

These are the results in questionnaire order.

Q3 New employee orient.

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	13	13.00
No opinion	2	68	68.00
Good	3	19	19.00

Q3 New employee recept'n

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	2	2.00
No opinion	2	69	69.00
Good	3	29	29.00



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Q3 Welcome back recept'n

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	15	15.00
No opinion	2	42	42.00
Good	3	43	43.00

---

Q3 Ridgewood Cafe

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	5	5.00
No opinion	2	16	16.00
Good	3	79	79.00

---

Q3 J Bldg. Lunch Room

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	37	37.00
No opinion	2	33	33.00
Good	3	30	30.00

---

Q3 Rathskellar

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	70	70.00
No opinion	2	21	21.00
Good	3	9	9.00

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Q3 Special event dinners

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF	100
No opinion	2	47	47.00	
Good	3	53	53.00	

---

Q3 December Holiday Gala

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Improve	1	8	8.00	
No opinion	2	60	60.00	
Good	3	32	32.00	

---

Q3 OCC College Picnic

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Improve	1	3	3.00	
No opinion	2	69	69.00	
Good	3	28	28.00	

---

Q3 Graduation reception

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Improve	1	7	7.00	
No opinion	2	58	58.00	
Good	3	35	35.00	

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Q3 Co-worker contacts

LABEL	VALUE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Improve	1	24	24.00
No opinion	2	15	15.00
Good	3	61	61.00

-----

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Of the 11 events that were listed, the most that anyone mentioned that needed improvement were 6; the least were 0. The average respondent marked 1.8 events that needed improvement. 79% of the respondents listed at least one event that needed improvement.

Q3 COUNT Needs improvement  
Count of number of mentions

NUMBER OF MENTIONS	FREQ.	% OF 100
0	21	21.00
1	26	26.00
2	22	22.00
3	18	18.00
4	7	7.00
5	4	4.00
6	2	2.00

---



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Places to eat were most in need of improvement. The Rathskellar needs it most, followed by J. Bldg. Lunch Room. Third was co-worker contacts, mentioned by one in four.

Events that need improvement

EVENT	FREQ.	% OF 100
Rathskellar	70	70.00
J Bldg. Lunch Room	37	37.00
Co-worker contacts	24	24.00
Welcome back recept'n	15	15.00
New employee orient.	13	13.00
December Holiday Gala	8	8.00
Graduation reception	7	7.00
Ridgewood Cafe	5	5.00
OCC College Picnic	3	3.00
New employee recept'n	2	2.00
Special event dinners	0	0.00

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Concerning whether or not opinions had been formed about the events and facilities (question 3) 2 respondents did not have opinions about 11 of them, and 2 respondents had opinions about all of them. The average respondents did not have opinions about 5 of the events and facilities. In general, this suggests lack of use or lack of attendance.

Q3 COUNT No opinion

NUMBER OF MENTIONS	FREQ.	% OF 100
0	2	2.00
1	8	8.00
2	13	13.00
3	13	13.00
4	9	9.00
5	12	12.00
6	9	9.00
7	13	13.00
8	13	13.00
9	2	2.00
10	4	4.00
11	2	2.00

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Social events were highest in the proportion of respondents who had no opinion about them.

Events about which there were no opinions

EVENT	FREQ.	% OF 100
New employee recept'n	69	69.00
OCC College Picnic	69	69.00
New employee orient.	68	68.00
December Holiday Gala	60	60.00
Graduation reception	58	58.00
Special event dinners	47	47.00
Welcome back recept'n	42	42.00
J Bldg. Lunch Room	33	33.00
Rathskellar	21	21.00
Ridgewood Cafe	16	16.00
Co-worker contacts	15	15.00

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Two respondents rated 10 of the events and facilities good. Five rated none of them good, however this includes 2 who did not have opinions about all 11 of the events. The three remaining respondents who rated all of the events and facilities in need of improvement may signify some form of discontent on the part of these respondents rather than about all of the facilities.

Q3 COUNT of "Good" mentions

NUMBER OF MENTIONS	FREQ.	% OF 100
0	5	5.00
1	8	8.00
2	13	13.00
3	19	19.00
4	13	13.00
5	10	10.00
6	11	11.00
7	14	14.00
8	4	4.00
9	1	1.00
10	2	2.00

---



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

The food is not all bad at Orchard Ridge. The Ridgewood Cafe was rated highest for events and facilities that were good. Co-worker contacts and some of the social events also had high "good" ratings.

In reaching conclusions about individual events and facilities, it should be remembered that an absence of a "good" rating does not indicate a "needs improvement" rating, but often indicates a lack of respondent experience with the event or facility. This is true of new employee orientation -- 19% rated it "good," 13% rated it "needs improvement," and 68% had no opinion about it. This is probably because, in many instances, it had been so long since they had been new employees or had oriented one.

On the other hand, there is the Rathskellar. Seldom are results any more conclusive than those concerning the need for improvement at the Rathskellar.

Events that were rated "Good"

EVENT	FREQ.	% OF 100
Ridgewood Cafe	79	79.00
Co-worker contacts	61	61.00
Special event dinners	53	53.00
Welcome back recept'n	43	43.00
Graduation reception	35	35.00
December Holiday Gala	32	32.00
J Bldg. Lunch Room	30	30.00
New employee recept'n	29	29.00
OCC College Picnic	28	28.00
New employee orient.	19	19.00
Rathskellar	9	9.00

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

RATING OF EVENTS BY FACULTY OR STAFF JOB CLASSIFICATION

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- New employee orientation

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is a significant difference between faculty and staff. If they have opinions, faculty is more likely to feel new employee orientation is good. Staff is more likely to feel it could be improved. Fewer staff than faculty are likely to have opinions.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 48 Q3 New employee orient.  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	4	9	13
	COL.%	7.	22.	13.
No opinion	2	35	31	66
	COL.%	61.	76.	67.
Good	3	18	1	19
	COL.%	32.	2.	19.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
CHI SQ.=		15.17	DF= 2	P= .0005

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- New employee reception

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is a significant difference between faculty and staff. If they have opinions, faculty is more likely to feel the new employee reception is good. Staff is more likely to have not formed opinions or to feel it could be improved.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 49 Q3 New employee recept'n

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	0	2	2
	COL.%	0.	5.	2.
No opinion	2	35	32	67
	COL.%	61.	78.	68.
Good	3	22	7	29
	COL.%	39.	17.	30.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=	7.48	DF= 2	P= .0238

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Welcome back reception

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is a significant difference between faculty and staff. Staff is less likely to have formed opinions. Faculty is more likely to feel it's good.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 50 Q3 Welcome back recept'n  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	13	1 :	14
	COL.%	23.	2. :	14.
No opinion	2	14	27 :	41
	COL.%	25.	66. :	42.
Good	3	30	13 :	43
	COL.%	53.	32. :	44.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
		CHI SQ.=	19.02 DF= 2	P= .0001



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Ridgewood Cafe

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.  
Everybody likes the Ridgewood.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
ROW = 51 Q3 Ridgewood Cafe  
COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	2	3 :	5
	COL.%	4.	7. :	5.
No opinion	2	10	6 :	16
	COL.%	18.	15. :	16.
Good	3	45	32 :	77
	COL.%	79.	78. :	79.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
		CHI SQ.=	.80 DF= 2	P= .6690

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- J. Bldg. Lunch Room

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 52 Q3 J Bldg. Lunch Room  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1 Facul ty	2 Staff	ROW TOTAL ROW%
Improve	1	23	14	37
	COL.%	40.	34.	38.
No opinion	2	16	16	32
	COL.%	28.	39.	33.
Good	3	18	11	29
	COL.%	32.	27.	30.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=	1.30 DF= 2		P= .5217

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Rathskellar

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff. Everybody thinks the Rathskellar could be improved.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 53 Q3 Rathskellar

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	43	25	68
	COL.%	75.	61.	69.
No opinion	2	11	10	21
	COL.%	19.	24.	21.
Good	3	3	6	9
	COL.%	5.	15.	9.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=	3.29	DF= 2	P= .1932

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Special event dinners

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 54 Q3 Special event dinners  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
No opinion	2	26	19	45
	COL.%	46.	46.	46.
Good	3	31	22	53
	COL.%	54.	54.	54.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
CHI SQ.=			.02	DF= 1 P= .8933

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- December Holiday Gala

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 55 Q3 December Holiday Gala  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	4	4 :	8
	COL.%	7.	10. :	8.
No opinion	2	35	23 :	58
	COL.%	61.	56. :	59.
Good	3	18	14 :	32
	COL.%	32.	34. :	33.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=		.38 DF= 2	P= .8267



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- OCC College Picnic

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 56 Q3 OCC College Picnic  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1 Facul ty	2 Staff	ROW TOTAL ROW%
Improve	1	1	2	3
	COL.%	2.	5.	3.
No opinion	2	43	24	67
	COL.%	75.	59.	68.
Good	3	13	15	28
	COL.%	23.	37.	29.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
	CHI SQ.=	3.34	DF= 2	P= .1881

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Graduation reception

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98

ROW = 57 Q3 Graduation reception

COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1	2	ROW
		Facul	Staff	TOTAL
		ty		ROW%
Improve	1	5	2 :	7
	COL.%	9.	5. :	7.
No opinion	2	36	21 :	57
	COL.%	63.	51. :	58.
Good	3	16	18 :	34
	COL.%	28.	44. :	35.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
		CHI SQ.=	2.81 DF= 2	P= .2449

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

ROW QUEST.: Q3 -- Co-worker contacts

COLUMN QUEST.: Faculty or staff job

FINDINGS: There is no real difference between faculty and staff.

TWOWAY TABLE N= 98  
 ROW = 58 Q3 Co-worker contacts  
 COL = 72 Q4 Job classification

		1 Facul ty	2 Staff	ROW TOTAL ROW%
Improve	1	15	9	24
	COL.%	26.	22.	24.
No opinion	2	10	4	14
	COL.%	18.	10.	14.
Good	3	32	28	60
	COL.%	56.	68.	61.
COLUMN TOTAL		57	41	
COLUMN %		58.	42.	
CHI SQ.=		1.77 DF= 2		P= .4121

## SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

### RATINGS OF USEFULNESS AND QUALITY

#### Introduction

These are ratings result from question 1: "For each of the following sources of information, please rate: (a) its overall usefulness and, (b): its overall quality.

There are three subsections of oneway frequency tables. In the first subsection each information source usefulness rating is followed by that source's quality rating. This is useful for simultaneously considering usefulness and quality.

In the second subsection usefulness ratings are presented in sequence for each information source. This is useful for scanning for usefulness.

In the third subsection quality ratings are presented in sequence for each information source. This is useful for scanning for quality.

O.C.C. was advised well by your research staff to ask for separate ratings of usefulness and quality. No statistical tests were needed to determine if respondents differentiated between usefulness and quality, as this was evident by inspecting the responses.

SCALE SCORING: The scales have been scored so that high = good; i.e., 5 = very useful or excellent.

"V" which precedes each heading identifies the computer variable number and has been left in as a source of reference. V1 is question 1A, V2 is question 1B, etc. They are in sequence.

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

FINDINGS: These are some of the relevant findings that are apparent by cursory inspection of the tables. There may be others as well.

Generally high marks are received by:

- The College Catalog -- usefulness
- The schedule of classes -- usefulness
- The Awards Recognition Lunch -- usefulness & quality
- Immediate Supervisor -- usefulness & quality

Generally low marks are received by:

- Futures -- usefulness
- Physics at the Ridge -- usefulness
- Billboards -- quality

Not many people use or are familiar with:

- Channel 30
- Radio
- Leadership meetings



SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

Subsection 1: Usefulness and Quality Ratings

V1 College Catalog

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Useful	3	18	18.00	
Some Useful	4	15	15.00	
Very Useful	5	65	65.00	
No Mention	10	2	2.00	

---

V2 College Catalog

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Very Poor	1	1	1.00	
Poor	2	6	6.00	
Average	3	26	26.00	
Good	4	33	33.00	
Excellent	5	22	22.00	
No Mention	10	12	12.00	

---

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

V3 Fall Promo Brochure

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Don't Rec.	1	14	14.00	
NotUseful	2	12	12.00	
Useful	3	16	16.00	
Some Useful	4	25	25.00	
Very Useful	5	24	24.00	
No Mention	10	9	9.00	

-----

V4 Fall Promo Brochure

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF	100
Very Poor	1	1	1.00	
Poor	2	6	6.00	
Average	3	11	11.00	
Good	4	28	28.00	
Excellent	5	19	19.00	
No Mention	10	35	35.00	

-----

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

V5 Winter Promo Brochure

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Don't Rec.	1	21	21.00
NotUseful	2	10	10.00
Useful	3	15	15.00
Some Useful	4	23	23.00
Very Useful	5	19	19.00
No Mention	10	12	12.00

-----

V6 Winter Promo Brochure

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Very Poor	1	1	1.00
Poor	2	5	5.00
Average	3	10	10.00
Good	4	28	28.00
Excellent	5	12	12.00
No Mention	10	44	44.00

-----

SECTION 2: ANNOTATED TABLES AND FINDINGS

V7 Schedule of Classes

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Don't Rec.	1	1	1.00
Useful	3	7	7.00
Some Useful	4	9	9.00
Very Useful	5	78	78.00
No Mention	10	5	5.00

---

V8 Schedule of Classes

RATINGS	CODE	FREQ.	% OF 100
Very Poor	1	1	1.00
Poor	2	12	12.00
Average	3	15	15.00
Good	4	36	36.00
Excellent	5	22	22.00
No Mention	10	14	14.00

---