An Assessment of the Institutional Vision of Catholic Colleges and Universities

Robert Abelman
Cleveland State University
Amy Dalessandro
Kent State University

Institutional vision is a philosophical template—a concept of what, at its best, a college or university is like and the kinds of human beings that institution is attempting to cultivate. A content analysis of the institutional vision of a nation wide sample of Catholic schools was performed and key linguistic components found to constitute a well conceived, viable, and easily diffused mission and vision were isolated. The prevalence of these components in comparison to other types of religious schools and secular four-year institutions is discussed. Findings suggest that Catholic schools are vision-driven institutions that communicate their priorities and defining characteristics by employing clear, highly optimistic, and inspirational language. They do little to articulate effectively a unification among the community of students, faculty, and staff, or coordinate their vision of the institution with that of the administration. They are less likely than other types of religious and secular schools to address the pragmatic benefits of their education.

Although American Catholic higher education has existed for more than 200 years, what it means for Catholic colleges and universities to be Catholic has been an ongoing debate (see Bollag, 2004; Burtchaell, 1998; Garrett, 2006; Gleason, 1995; Green, 2008; Hellwig, 2000; O'Brien, 1994; Provost, 2000; Steinfels, 1997; Wilcox & King, 2000). In an effort to generate consensus on this issue, Pope John Paul II published the apostolic constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (John Paul II, 1990). The document listed four "essential characteristics" of the identity of Catholic colleges and universities (as cited in Estanek, James & Norton, 2006, p. 200): (a) a Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university community; (b) a continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute by its own research; (c) fidelity to the Christian message as it comes through the Church; and (d) an

institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family in their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal that gives meaning to life.

"Because our colleges and universities have various purposes, programs, and student bodies," noted Hellwig (2004), "it is very unlikely that a particular institution will match all of these elements and indicators" (p. 115). In response, the former president of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities provided institutional administrators with concrete and practical ways of implementing *Ex Corde*'s vision and realizing the Catholic mission of their institutions: (a) a public profession of the Catholic identity in institutional statements and public documents; (b) engagement with culture and scholarship by way of applying Catholic wisdom and critique to all aspects of human knowledge and the curriculum; (c) fidelity to the Gospel as it is transmitted in Catholic tradition not only by teaching Catholic tradition but by modeling it; (d) service to the Church and society by bringing to bear scholarly resources to respond to pastoral needs of the Church, to help with Catholic education at all levels, and to help solve problems of human suffering; and (e) transmission and exploration of the broader Catholic cultural heritage in philosophy and theology, in literature and the arts, in the study of nature and of society, in ritual and symbolism, in spiritual traditions, and the full celebration of the Christian calendar.

It is significant that the first of Hellwig's (2004) recommendations focused on Catholic identity as communicated through institutional statements and public documents. After all, suggests Morphew and Hartley (2006), "a shared sense of purpose has the capacity to inspire and motivate those within an institution and to communicate to external constituents. A clear and distinct mission helps distinguish between activities that conform to institutional imperatives and those that do not" (p. 457). Garrett (2006) reported that since *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* and Hellwig's (2004) provision of pragmatic guidelines, "mission statements, learning objectives, and strategic planning at Catholic colleges are focusing on their Catholic identity and how it is best portrayed" (p. 245) (see also Nichols, 2005; Woo, 2005). Estanek, James, and Norton (2006) reinforce this conclusion, confirming that "a vision for the distinct mission of Catholic institutions of higher education has been articulated and implemented" (p. 200). The purpose of this study is to assess the verbiage of institutional vision at Catholic colleges and universities, and address how these documents can best serve as guiding, governing, and promotional documents.

Institutional Vision

According to Senge (1990), learning organizations are "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together" (p. 3). For this to happen, it is argued, organizations need to "discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels" (p. 4). Colleges and universities are very much learning organizations and institutional vision is the means by which aspirations are identified, commitment is established, and expectations are reinforced (see Fox, 2003; Fox, Scheffler, & Marom, 2003; Pekarsky 1998). Institutional vision defines the kinds of human beings the academic establishment is attempting to cultivate (Abelman & Molina, 2006) and recognizes the skills, sensibilities, attitudes, and understandings students should be acquiring during their education (Fox, 1997).

For most colleges and universities, the public declaration of its institutional vision takes the form of a mission statement, a vision statement, or both. According to Morphew and Hartley (2006), these statements have become ubiquitous in higher education and strategic planning is predicated on their formulation. Mission statements typically define the physical, social, fiscal, and political contexts in which that institution exists. Vision statements complement these characteristics, but transcend them as well. They form a set of aspirations for enhancing the quality of higher education that is distinctive, coherent, and appealing (Marom, 1994; Miller, Bender, & Schuh, 2005). The mission statement "is about the here and now," suggested Lewis (2005), "but vision describes the future" (p. 5). While the mission statement is often revered as a historical text (see Banta, Lund, Black, & Oblander, 1995; Bryson, 2004; Marom, 2003) and displayed as a recruitment and marketing tool (see Kirp, 2003; Murphy, 1987; Welton & Cook, 1997), a vision statement is a living document (Abelman & Molina, 2006; Baum, Locke, & Kirkpatrick, 1998; Fox, 1997) that is intended to be employed. It has been suggested by Hartley (2002) that mission statements reflect the realities of their institutions' environments, whereas vision statements drive these realities.

More than 80% of all secular colleges and universities have made major revisions in their declarations of institutional vision within the last decade (see Association of American Colleges, 1994; Birnbaum, 2000) in response to new challenges and an increasingly competitive marketplace. Estanek, James, and Norton (2006) report that most religious schools have done the same, with Catholic colleges and universities making a conscientious effort to embed culturally an institutional understanding of Catholic identity (see

also Hughes & Adrian, 1997). This, suggests the authors, has been achieved through explicit references to foundational heritage and sponsorship, the groups of historical and current constituents the school serves, and how the institution defines its educational enterprise. Specific outcomes, such as intellectual development and the education of the whole person, service, leadership, and citizenship, are typically included in the mission statements of Catholic schools. Miller (2002) concurs, suggesting that "as varied as are the several hundred Catholic colleges and universities spread across the nation, their mission statements appear to have a common element: the heritage of Catholicism, particularly the faith-tradition" (p. 35). Young (2001) also found that Catholic-based mission statements mentioned service more often than did secular statements, followed by spirituality, truth, community, human dignity, equality, tradition, justice, and freedom.

Despite recent changes in the institutional vision statements of many Catholic colleges and universities, it has been suggested that such messages fail to resonate on these campuses and are not successfully reaching key constituents. According to Cernera (2005) and Sullins (2004), Catholic colleges continue to have weak Catholic cultures. Many administrators of these schools are no longer members of the highly visible and influential religious congregations and orders that founded the institutions. "Faculty responses to things Catholic," observes DiGiacomo (2007), "run the gamut from enthusiastic to indifferent to hostile….It is not easy to recover that sense of mission and to restore its lost vitality" (p. 78). Morey and Piderit (2006) suggest that "if the Catholic intellectual tradition is to positively influence the campus community…it must have traction with the students. Current and future students and their parents have to find merit" (p.117).

Although the focus and substance of institutional vision at Catholic schools has been assessed and analyzed, little attention has been paid to the manner in which this information is actually communicated to stakeholders within and outside the academic community. As Ayers (2002) suggested, "college leaders must not only formulate adaptive strategies if their schools are to respond to learner needs in this rapidly changing environment, they must also carefully and purposefully articulate these strategies" (p. 28).   Doing so may improve communication among campus constituents, improve communication between administrators and the faculty, and allow the academic and religious missions to be more central to the way the institution conducts its business (Guy-Sheftall, 2006). "Articulating a clear and authentic vision," notes Cesareo (2007), "remains an ongoing but essential challenge for Catholic institutions of higher education" (p. 18).

The Verbiage of Institutional Vision

A "well conceived vision," according to Pekarsky (1998), is "an informing idea that is shared, clear, and compelling" (p. 280). It is *shared* in that it addresses the critical stakeholders—students, faculty, and staff—as a community and attempts to unify their vision of the institution with that of the upper administration or executive body that wrote it. An institutional vision that is *shared* has the capacity to embrace, inspire, and motivate those within an institution by communicating the common characteristics of its key constituents (Hartley, 2002). As Meindl (1990) noted, institutional vision is a "rich web of negotiated meanings and contextual variables" (p. 159) between leaders and their cohorts, intended to generate a sense of collaboration, cohesion, and inclusion.

A vision must be *clear* and concrete enough to identify an institutional identity and offer genuine guidance in making educational decisions and setting priorities on all levels of the learning community (see Senge et al., 1999). A *clear* vision helps organizational members distinguish between and understand activities that conform to institutional identity and imperatives and those that do not (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). A *clear* institutional vision is unambiguous, easy to comprehend, and not convoluted or abstract.

An institutional vision that is *compelling* generates an enthusiasm among the stakeholders and stimulates them to transform vision into a pattern of meaningful activity (see Baum et al., 1998; Kirkpatrick, Wofford, & Baum, 2002). Bligh, Kohles, and Meindl (2004) have suggested that a compelling message is one of optimism and inspiration. Similarly, George (2000) noted that the ability to generate and maintain optimism is one of the essential components of effective leadership and vision in a learning community. Optimism in messages from administrative leaders, note Kelloway and Barling (2000), directly enhances organizational outcomes, particularly during times of transition, uncertainty, or turbulence (see also Bunker, 1985; Hart, Jarvis, & Lim, 2002; Pillai & Meindl, 1998).

Communication scholars have discovered that in order for any innovative, pioneering, or motivating idea such as institutional vision to be generally accepted, readily adopted, and widely distributed to others by its stakeholders, it must possess components above and beyond Pekarsky's (1998) notion of *shared*, *clear*, and *compelling*. Rogers (2003, 2004) and others (see, for example, Deffuant, Huet, & Amblard, 2005; Valente, 1995; Vishwanath & Goldhaber, 2003; Wejnert, 2002) have found that four additional attributes are salient and powerful predictors of adoption and diffusion: *relative advantage* (e.g., Are ideas or innovations presented in a way that they can be

successfully transformed into general or specific actions that generate bene-fits—that is, is what is to be gained from the idea or innovation well articu-lated?), *complexity* (e.g., Are the desired outcomes of the ideas or innovations solid and concrete—that is, is the idea or innovation fully and robustly ex-pressed?), *compatibility* (e.g., Are the desired outcomes of the ideas or in-novations suitable and appropriate to the target audience?), and *observability* (e.g., Are the desired outcomes of the ideas or innovations pragmatic—that is, is the abstract transformed into something practical or observable?).

Collectively, the existence of these linguistic components in innovative, pioneering, or motivating messages have served to explain the effectiveness of national health care communication campaigns (see Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004; Haider & Kreps, 2004), public-policy programs (see McLendon, Heller, & Young 2005; Valente, 1993), crisis man-agement initiatives (see Bligh et al., 2004), political persuasion (see Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001; Holladay & Coombs, 1994), and busi-ness and marketing strategies (see Mahajan, Muller, & Bass, 1990; Sevcik, 2004). To date, a limited but growing body of research has analyzed the lin-guistic components of institutional vision in higher education. Little has spe-cifically examined Catholic colleges or universities.

Early work by Chait (1979) reported that the verbiage of institutional vision at most schools tended to be vague and vapid. After all, asked the author, "Who cannot rally around 'the pursuit of excellence' or 'the discov-ery and transmission of knowledge'?" (p. 36). Similarly, Newsom and Hayes (1990), after conducting an analysis of 114 secular college and university mission statements in the United States, concluded that "most mission state-ments are amazingly vague, evasive, or rhetorical, lacking specificity or clear purposes" (p. 29). Carver (2000) also criticized college and university mis-sion statements for not clearly articulating specific outcomes. "One can only read the mission statements of some Catholic universities with some sense of regret," suggested Langan (1993, p. 76) shortly after the release of the *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. "The very vagueness of their language and the indetermi-nacy of the general commitments leave one with the sense that the decline of some institutions may be advanced, that the conjunction between a vibrant Catholicism or a Catholic culture and the university appears increasingly faint" (p.76).

According to Morphew and Hartley (2006), institutional vision statements now serve as icons that communicate with stakeholders who have specific ex-pectations of colleges and universities that "have important legitimizing roles, both normatively and politically" (p. 468). Abelman, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy, Janstova, and Pettey (2007) found that vision and mission statements at

secular academic institutions appear to serve different, albeit highly complementary, functions. Although mission statements are prevalent across most academic institutions, only one-third of all 4-year colleges and universities possess actual vision statements. Abelman and Dalessandro (2008) found that private schools in general and "religious" private schools in particular are more likely to have vision statements than public institutions, and 2-year colleges are more likely to have vision statements than 4-year institutions.

Morphew and Hartley (2006) report that the rhetorical flavor of mission statements for public and private colleges and universities tend to differ, emphasizing the distinct challenges faced by these types of institutions (see, also, Boerema, 2006). Abelman, Dalessandro et al. (2007) also found that mission statements tend to be less clear and less compelling than vision statements, and that the desired outcomes expressed in mission statements are less pragmatic than those expressed in vision statements. Conversely, mission statements tend to be longer and more complex, employing language that reflects more movement and change than vision statements and emphasizing (to a greater degree than vision statements) the implementation of ideas. The authors conclude that a well-conceived, carefully crafted mission and/or vision statement can and should be a powerful and useful communication tool for all types of colleges and universities.

The research reported here provides a comparative base-line measurement of the inspirational and pragmatic rhetoric in declarations of institutional vision at Catholic colleges and universities, other types of religious colleges and universities, and secular 4-year public and private institutions. By doing so, this content analysis reveals the current state of utility of institutional vision in Catholic schools, determining whether these schools are keeping pace in an increasingly competitive marketplace and using institutional vision to their best advantage during a time of turbulence and change. To this end, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: What constitutes institutional vision in Catholic higher education as compared with other types of academic institutions?

RQ2: To what extent are expressions of institutional vision in Catholic colleges and universities in possession of the linguistic components that facilitate acceptance, adoption, and wide diffusion by stakeholders?

   The literature on the diffusion of innovations suggests that the nature of the institution's social system—in particular, the size and complexity of its infrastructure—influences what is perceived to be innovative (see Rogers, 2004; Wejnert, 2002) and, thus, whether or not that innovation will be accepted, adopted, and relayed to others. Similarly, it has been suggested that an academic community's awareness of and access to any formal declarations by its leadership may be a function of the nature of the institution (Abelman, Atkin, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy & Janstova, 2007; Rozycki, 2004; Velcoff & Ferrari, 2006). This includes the size of its student enrollment (see Kuhtmann, 2004), its academic mission (e.g., highest degree granted; see Ayers, 2002; Baldwin, 2005) and its mode of operation (e.g., public or private; see Boerema, 2006; Bryson, 2004). It is also likely that the religious orientation of an institution may play a significant role. As such, the following research question is posed:

   RQ3:   Is there a relationship between the nature of an institution (e.g., religious orientation, academic mission, size, region, mode of operation) and the linguistic components of its institutional vision?

Methods

Using the Carnegie Foundation's Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005) as a guideline, a stratified, random sample of 30 schools each from public and private doctorate-granting, master's-granting, and baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities were selected from a population of all U.S. and Canadian institutions of higher education. This resulted in a total sample of 180 institutions.[1] From this sample, religious institutions (N = 45; see Appendix A) were identified through website references to religious/church affiliation by four trained coders with inter-coder reliability exceeding .95. Institutions with Roman Catholic affiliation (N = 21) were identified and verified using a roster of membership institutions provided by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. A list of secular colleges and universities in this sample can be found in Appendix B. The composition of sample institutions can be found in Table 1.

---

1   The sample was originally selected for Abelman, Dalessandro et al. (2007), an analysis of the academic advising operations of 4-year institutions as reflected in institutional vision documents. Consequently, the number of Catholic institutions reported here is the result of true random sampling that did not specifically isolate or purposefully target religious institutions.

Table 1

Sample Composition (n = 180)

	N	%
Institution Type		
Public	90	50.00
Private/religious	45	25.00
Private/secular	45	25.00
Highest Degree Granted		
Baccalaureate-granting	60	33.33
Master's-granting	60	33.33
Doctorate-granting	60	33.33
Campus Enrollment		
Less than 1000	22	12.22
1000 – 2,499	47	26.11
2,500 – 4,999	38	21.11
5,000 – 9,999	37	20.55
10,000 – 19,999	23	12.77
20,000 – 29,999	9	5.00
More than 29,999	4	2.22
Region		
Northeast	40	16.66
Mid-Atlantic	23	12.77
Mid-South	18	10.00
Southeast	18	10.00
Great Lakes	33	18.33
North Central	14	7.77
South Central	18	10.00
Northwest	9	5.00
Pacific	10	5.55
Rocky Mountain	7	3.88

Unit of Analysis

A school's web-based representation of its institutional vision served as the unit of analysis for this investigation. This information was accessed and downloaded from each school's website by four trained coders. This was accomplished by searching the home page for direct links to mission and vision statements. If none were accessible, the institution's search engine was utilized by typing "vision statement" and "vision" and selecting the option that contained the institution's vision statement. After the initial search, an

additional search for "mission statement" and "mission" was conducted. As with the previous search, the mission statement was included in the analysis. If no vision or mission statement, or equivalent document, could be found through the websites, electronic versions of school catalogs were accessed and searched. All searches were duplicated for quality control and inter-coder reliability exceeded .95 across all websites. The text of each school's institutional vision statement was classified as a "mission statement," "vision statement," or containing "both a mission and vision statement" by a team of two coders.

Computerized Content Analysis

The text of each school's institutional vision was processed through DICTION (Version 5.0), a text-analysis software program that codes and compares content using social scientific methods for determining the linguistic elements in a verbal message. This is the same methodology reported in Abelman, Dalessandro et al. (2007). Morris (1994) and West (2001) point out a number of advantages of computerized content analysis. They include: (a) perfect stability of the coding scheme; (b) explicit coding rules yielding comparable results; (c) perfect reliability (freeing the researcher to focus on issues of validity, interpretation, and explanation); (d) easy manipulation of the text to create output, such as frequency counts and key-word-in-context listings; and (e) the ability to uncover easily co-occurrences of important concepts. In addition, Bligh et al. (2004) and Neuendorf (2002) suggest that computerized content analysis facilitates the analysis and comparison of large volumes of data much more easily and less expensively than using human coders.

DICTION uses 33 predefined dictionaries, containing over 10,000 search words, to analyze a passage and compares texts to norms created through the analysis of 22,027 texts of various sorts written over a 50-year period. The construction of DICTION dictionaries was based on careful attention to linguistic theory (see Boder, 1940; Easton, 1940; Flesch, 1951; Hart 1984a, 2001; Johnson, 1946; Ogden, 1960). These dictionaries are expressly concerned with the types of words "most frequently encountered in contemporary American public discourse" (Hart, 1984b, p. 110). All of the dictionaries contain individual words only, and homographs are explicitly treated by the program through statistical weighting procedures, which are intended to correct partially for context (Hart, 2000a, 2000b). DICTION conducts its searches by computing "scores" based on these dictionaries.

The researcher can also create up to 10 customized dictionaries that can be adapted to specific research needs. On the basis of a thorough examination

of the words included in each DICTION dictionary, we examined 6 constructs that corresponded with what Pekarsky (1998) identified as *shared*, *clear* and *compelling* and what Rogers (2004) and his colleagues defined as *relative advantage*, *observability* and *complexity*. One relevant attribute from the literature, *compatible*, could not be measured by the software because the construct is based on highly subjective and contextual information that cannot be coded by computer. Because each construct is measured using a different formula comprised of different dictionaries, their respective DICTION scores per se are not comparable. Instead, comparisons relevant to the mean scores of each construct can be made. Each linguistic construct, along with its DICTION formula and examples of key words employed to compute scores, can be found in Appendix C.

Results

The first research question addressed the composition of expressions of institutional vision at Catholic colleges and universities. Of the 21 Catholic institutions in the sample, every institution (100%) presented a mission statement as part of its institutional vision and 10 institutions (47.6%) also presented a vision statement. Approximately 66.7% of the Catholic baccalaureate-granting institutions (n = 3), 45.5% of the Catholic master's-granting institutions (n = 11), and 42.8% of the Catholic doctorate-granting institutions (n = 7) presented a vision statement.

As a point of comparison, of the 24 non-Catholic religious colleges and universities in the sample, all (100%) presented a mission statement as part of its institutional vision. Only 7 institutions (29.2%) had a clearly identified and labeled vision statement. None of the doctorate-granting institutions (n = 3), 31.3% of the master's-granting institutions (n = 5), and 31.3% of the baccalaureate-granting institutions (n = 16) presented a vision statement.

Of the remaining 135 secular colleges and universities in the sample, 127 (94.1%) presented a mission statement as part of their institutional vision and 47 schools (34.8%) contained a vision statement, six as stand-alone documents. Approximately 46% of secular doctorate-granting institutions, 39.0% of baccalaureate-granting institutions, and 20.5% of master's-granting institutions provided vision statements.

The second and third research questions inquired about the linguistic components of these expressions of institutional vision. In order to investigate DICTION score differences in the expressions of institutional vision across Catholic schools, non-Catholic religious schools, and secular 4-year institutions, a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted.

Table 2

Institutional Vision: Religious and Secular Schools Mean DICTION Scores

Linguistic Components	M	SD	Range (H-L)
Shared			63.96-42.54
Religious	56.6	3.26	
Secular	50.3	4.77	
Clarity*			4.72-6.53
Religious	5.6	0.31	
Secular	6.3	0.39	
Compelling			74.92-50.73
Religious	58.2	3.30	
Secular	53.8	2.71	
Complexity			83.30-35.32
Religious	49.5	6.22	
Secular	48.2	4.72	
Relative Advantage			57.32-33.43
Religious	43.6	3.39	
Secular	46.9	3.67	
Observability			56.79-15.92
Religious	44.8	2.98	
Secular	43.6	3.19	

Note. *Low *score* is the equivalent to a high degree of *clarity*.

The means, standard deviations, and range for DICTION scores for each of the linguistic components, on which these analyses and other points of comparison are based, can be found in Tables 2 and 3.

Several statistically significant differences ($p \leq .05$) in the linguistic components of the composite institutional vision statements were found across institutions. The institutional vision presented by all religious colleges and universities was considerably more *clear* (F [1, 180] = 22.54), more *compelling* (F [1, 180] = 34.72), and more *shared* (F [1,180] = 19.21), but possessed less *relative advantage* (F [1,180] = 29.87) than the institutional vision offered by their secular counterparts. No significant differences were found based on institution size, region, or highest degree granted.

More specifically, the institutional vision of Catholic colleges and universities was considerably more *clear* (F [1, 156] = 28.67; F [1, 45] = 34.05), more *compelling* (F [1, 156] = 36.88; F [1, 45] = 36.34), and more *complex* (F [1, 156] = 17.32; F [1, 45] = 19.25) than the institutional vision of both secular and other types of religious colleges and universities, respectively. The institutional vision of Catholic colleges and universities was also less *shared* (F [1,156] = 22.54; F [1, 45] = 29.31) and possessed less *relative advantage* (F [1,156]

Table 3

Institutional Vision: Catholic, Affiliated, and Secular Schools Mean DICTION Scores

Linguistic Components	M	SD	Range (H-L)
Shared			63.96-42.54
Catholic	47.8	2.95	
Affiliated	55.9	2.91	
Secular	50.3	4.77	
Clarity*			4.72-6.53
Catholic	5.5	0.35	
Affiliated	5.8	0.43	
Secular	6.3	0.39	
Compelling			74.92-50.73
Catholic	65.2	3.57	
Affiliated	57.6	2.99	
Secular	53.8	2.71	
Complexity			83.30-35.32
Catholic	52.8	7.90	
Affiliated	48.3	4.08	
Secular	48.2	4.72	
Relative Advantage			57.32-33.43
Catholic	40.2	3.28	
Affiliated	44.8	4.56	
Secular	46.9	3.67	
Observability			56.79-15.92
Catholic	39.7	2.56	
Affiliated	44.5	3.01	
Secular	43.6	3.19	

Note. *Low *score* is the equivalent to a high degree of *clarity*.

$= 32.87$; F [1, 45] $= 19.72$) and less *observability* (F [1,156] $= 29.12$; F [1, 45] $= 18.54$) than the institutional vision of both secular and other types of religious colleges and universities, respectively. No significant differences were found based on institution size, region, or highest degree granted.

To assess best the desired linguistic components within mission and vision statements, these documents were isolated and extracted from the composite expression of institutional vision. They were then independently subjected to content analysis. The means, standard deviations, and range for DICTION scores for each of the linguistic components in mission statements and vision statements can be found in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

The mission statements employed by Catholic colleges and universities were found to be significantly ($p \leq .05$) less *shared* (F [1, 45] $= 34.22$) than those of other types of religious colleges and universities, and possessed less *relative advantage* (F [1, 156] $= 22.72$) than the mission statements of

Table 4

Mission Only: Catholic, Affiliated, and Secular Schools Mean DICTION Scores

Linguistic Components	M	SD	Range (H-L)
Shared			68.21-19.90
Catholic	49.8	2.95	
Affiliated	52.7	3.57	
Secular	50.6	3.92	
Clarity*			5.27-6.74
Catholic	5.5	0.36	
Affiliated	5.7	0.44	
Secular	6.2	0.52	
Compelling			78.01-49.57
Catholic	64.9	3.21	
Affiliated	57.7	3.57	
Secular	51.1	3.86	
Complexity			60.97-33.93
Catholic	53.8	7.90	
Affiliated	48.2	4.13	
Secular	51.1	4.72	
Relative Advantage			58.20-33.93
Catholic	43.2	3.41	
Affiliated	44.1	3.58	
Secular	47.0	3.47	
Observability			56.25-35.93
Catholic	45.1	2.98	
Affiliated	44.4	2.98	
Secular	44.1	3.14	

Note. *Low *score* is the equivalent to a high degree of *clarity*.

secular colleges and universities. However, these statements were more *clear* (F [1,156] = 26.55; F [1, 45] = 32.46), more *compelling* (F [1, 156] = 34.56; F [1, 45] = 29.56), and more *complex* (F [1, 156] = 26.54; F [1, 45] = 32.67) than the mission statements of both secular and other types of religious colleges and universities, respectively.

The vision statements employed by Catholic colleges and universities were found to be significantly ($p \leq .05$) more *clear* (F [1, 156] = 19.32; F [1, 45] = 21.77), more *compelling* (F [1, 156] = 32.55; F [1,45] = 39.45), and more *complex* (F [1, 156] = 34.22; F [1, 45] = 23.56) than the vision statements of both secular and other types of religious colleges and universities, respectively. The vision statements of Catholic colleges and universities were also less *shared* (F [1,156] = 27.57; F [1, 45] = 38.12) and possessed less *relative advantage* (F [1,156] = 39.65; F [1, 45] = 21.76) and less *observability* (F [1,156] = 34.49; F [1, 45] = 37.56) than the vision statements of both

Table 5

Vision Only: Catholic, Affiliated, and Secular Schools Mean DICTION Scores

Linguistic Components	M	SD	Range (H-L)
Shared			66.70-37.81
Catholic	41.1	3.09	
Affiliated	59.7	5.48	
Secular	51.6	6.34	
Clarity*			4.98-6.06
Catholic	5.6	0.49	
Affiliated	5.8	0.54	
Secular	5.9	0.58	
Compelling			75.19-51.71
Catholic	67.9	2.97	
Affiliated	58.4	2.02	
Secular	54.2	5.37	
Complexity			56.90-37.13
Catholic	52.9	9.06	
Affiliated	49.6	1.92	
Secular	46.3	4.33	
Relative Advantage			52.02-24.41
Catholic	37.2	8.76	
Affiliated	43.7	4.26	
Secular	46.9	10.23	
Observability			71.47-38.78
Catholic	34.7	5.34	
Affiliated	45.1	4.19	
Secular	46.3	5.34	

Note. *Low *score* is the equivalent to a high degree of *clarity*.

secular and other types of religious colleges and universities, respectively. No significant differences were found based on institution size, region, or highest degree granted.

To determine if the linguistic components of vision statements and mission statements for Catholic colleges and universities were significantly different, a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANOVA) was conducted. The dependent variables included the six predefined linguistic components, with the expression of institutional vision (mission or vision) as the independent factor. Significant differences in mission statements and vision statements on the dependent variables were found (Wilk's $\lambda = .67$, $F = 32.66$, $p = .01$), with vision statements being more *clear* ($p = .01$) and *compelling* ($p = .01$). Mission statements for Catholic colleges and universities were more *shared* ($p = .001$) and had greater *observability* ($p = .001$) and *relative advantage* ($p = .001$).

Discussion

Institutional vision is a philosophical template—a concept of what, at its best, a college or university is like and the kinds of human beings that institution is attempting to cultivate (Abelman & Molina, 2006; Marom, 1994). It reflects the nature of the learning community within the college or university and defines the institution's perceived purpose, priorities, and promises. "Institutional vision," note Morphew and Hartley (2006), "helps distinguish between activities that conform to institutional imperatives and those that do not…and serves to inspire and motivate those within an institution and to communicate to external constituents" (p. 457).

For Catholic colleges and universities, these documents also serve as a public profession of the institution's Catholic identity (Hellwig, 2004). According to Wilcox (2000), " 'without a vision, the people perish.' That utterance in the Book of Proverbs (29:18) goes to the heart of the current controversy surrounding the religious identity…of Catholic colleges and universities" (pp. xv-xvi). Estanek, James & Norton (2006) concur and suggest that:

> Twenty years after the advent of the assessment movement in higher education and the concurrent and related discussions of accountability for Catholic identity among the Catholic higher education community, we can arrive at three fundamental realities: (a) assessment is an operational reality for higher education in the United States; (b) among the various approaches to and criteria for assessment, mission is consistently identified as a critical feature; and (c) a vision for the distinct mission of Catholic institutions of higher education has been articulated. (p. 215)

Although the focus and substance of institutional mission and vision at Catholic schools have been assessed and analyzed, little attention has been paid to the manner in which this information is actually communicated to stakeholders within and outside the academic community. As Ayers (2002) suggests, "college leaders must not only formulate adaptive strategies if their schools are to respond to learner needs in this rapidly changing environment, they must also carefully and purposefully articulate these strategies" (p. 28). Doing so with these most public and most accessible of institutional documents may improve communication among campus constituents, improve communication between administrators and the faculty, and allow the academic and religious missions to be more central to the way the institution conducts its business. "Articulating a clear and authentic vision," notes Cesareo

(2007), "remains an ongoing but essential challenge for Catholic institutions of higher education" (p. 18).

The findings from this investigation suggest that the institutional vision of religious colleges and universities is significantly different from that of its secular counterpart. These vision and mission statements tend to be more *shared, clear,* and *compelling,* but possess less *relative advantage*, than those of secular schools. Collectively, religious institutions of higher education offer welcoming, highly optimistic mission and vision statements that possess language intended to inspire and generate enthusiasm among their stakeholders. They present an institutional vision that places emphasis on facilitating the provision of guidance in making educational decisions and setting priorities. They place less emphasis on informing stakeholders how their respective institutions will successfully transform an educational experience into general or specific actions that will generate benefits.

When the institutional vision of Catholic colleges and universities is compared with other types of religious institutions, several interesting findings emerge. The institutional vision of Catholic schools is significantly more *clear*, *compelling,* and *complex.* This suggests that Catholic schools do an excellent job of delineating the institution's priorities and defining its key characteristics to constituents. They do so by employing more highly optimistic and inspirational language than other religious schools, which, suggests George (2000) and others (see Kuh, 2001; McClenney, 2007; Senge, 1990), is an essential component of engagement in a learning community. According to Abelman and Molina (2006), students, faculty, and staff are more likely to be aware of institutional vision statements that are *clear* and *compelling* documents. The names of the Catholic colleges or universities whose institutional vision rated highest on each of the 6 linguistic constructs explored in this investigation, and relevant sample quotes from their mission or vision statements, can be found in Table 6.

It should be noted, however, that Catholic schools offer mission statements and vision statements that are significantly less *shared* when compared with other religious schools. Through these documents, Catholic colleges and universities communicate little to unify the community of students, faculty, and staff effectively, or coordinate their vision of the institution with that of the administration. The institutional vision of Catholic schools also exhibit significantly less *relative advantage* and *observability* than other religious schools. That is, there is less emphasis, when compared with other types of religious schools, on articulating the pragmatic or practical benefits of their institution's education. These findings reinforce Morey and Piderit's (2006) recommendation that a Catholic education "must have traction with

Table 6

Institutional Vision:Top Catholic Colleges and Universities By DICTION Scores

Shared	Saint Paul's College 57.16
	"Our Mission: A Cooperative quest. The College uses innovative approaches in the teaching-learning setting that expand the educational horizons for its students. In a cooperative quest to meet the demands for increased technological skill, faculty and students are encouraged to experiment, explore, and develop new approaches to learning leading to knowledge, mastery of technical and critical thinking skills, development of individual expression, and the discovery of truth."
Clarity	Marquette University 5.10
	"OUR VISION is to provide a Catholic, Jesuit education that is genuinely transformational, so that our students graduate not simply better educated but better people, and to do so with such excellence that when asked to name the three or four best Catholic universities in America, people will include Marquette as a matter of course."
Compelling	Rosemont College 66.64
	"Rosemont College is a community of learners dedicated to excellence and joy in the pursuit of knowledge. Rosemont college seeks to develop in all members of the community open and critical minds, as well as the ability to make reasoned moral decisions. Rooted in Catholicism, and guided by the educational principles of Cornelia Connelly and the Society of the Holy Child Jesus, Rosemont College values trust in and reverence for the dignity of each person, diversity in human culture and experience, persistence and courage in the promoting justice with compassion."
Complexity	Marian College 83.30
	"Marian College is committed to the education of the whole person, striving to nurture intellectual, spiritual, aesthetic, psychological, social, and physical dimensions. The College's personal concern for students serves as the foundation for academic and student life as well as professional experiences. College programs integrate professional preparation with a liberal arts foundation. The College embraces justice, compassion, and service to the local and global community."

Relative Advantage	**University of Notre Dame** 47.40
	"The University seeks to cultivate in its students not only an appreciation for the great achievements of human beings, but also a disciplined sensibility to the poverty, injustice, and oppression that burden the lives of so many. The aim is to create a sense of human solidarity and concern for the common good that will bear fruit as learning becomes service to justice."
Observability	**Emmanuel College** 49.19
	"Our Vision: To be recognized for the excellence of our academic and student life programs and for our achievements in educating students with the skills and values necessary to succeed professionally and personally. An Emmanuel education challenges students to become critical thinkers, ethical decision makers, and contributing members of the local community and the global society."

the students" (p.117) by more explicitly addressing the merits of a Catholic education. To date, the institutional vision of Catholic schools still lack traction and require additional attention if this is to be achieved.

Several years ago, a conference was held at Harvard University to address the future of religious higher education (see McMurtie, 2000). According to Mixon, Lyon, and Beaty (2004), the irony of the meeting's venue was that Harvard had been founded by Puritan Christians in 1636 and given the motto *Christo et Ecclesiae.* By the 19th century, the Calvinists were ousted from control of Harvard and replaced by Unitarians. By the end of that century, Harvard was transformed from a religious college into a prestigious secular university. "This shift in ideological allegiances," note the authors, "suggests to some that today's religious colleges and universities are on the horns of a dilemma—maintain a distinctive religious identity or move toward a strong academic reputation" (p. 400).

In response, Marsden (2001) has suggested that "religious colleges, instead of feeling that they are under pressure to become more like their secular counterparts, should take pride in the religious character of their education, attempting to strengthen it rather than weaken it" (p.11). This investigation suggests that the institutional vision of Catholic colleges and universities is significantly different from that of secular schools, and has taken a different approach to its institutional vision statements than other types of religious institutions. Catholic schools emphasize vision over mission, and employ inspirational language over references to more practical and pragmatic outcomes of education. Mission statements for most secular schools serve as recruitment and marketing tools (see Kirp, 2003; Murphy, 1987; Welton & Cook, 1997)

while vision statements are living documents (Abelman & Molina, 2006; Baum, et al., 1998; Fox, 1997; Lewis, 2005) intended to inform constituents and form a set of aspirations. The institutional vision of most secular colleges and universities reflect and emphasize the realities of their institutions' environments. The institutional vision of Catholic colleges and universities contains language that drives these realities and looks toward the future.

It can be argued that there is nothing at all problematic about Catholic school's de-emphasis of relaying the pragmatic or practical benefits of a religious education in their institutional vision documents, when compared with other types of religious colleges and universities. After all, this information is likely to be included in strategic planning documents and other internal reports, or communicated to students through academic advising and career counseling sessions. However, in the competitive sport of college selection, mission and vision statements are often the first point of reference for prospective students seeking a religious institution. The website of the National Association for College Admission Counseling (2008), for example, suggests that:

> To find out just how religiously-affiliated a college is, start by reviewing the school's mission statement. This will indicate how much emphasis the school puts on the academic, social, and spiritual aspects of college. (A College is Religiously-Affiliated if…, ¶2)

In addition, mission and vision statements are serving as the first point of comparison for prospective students considering a traditional Catholic school or one of the ultra-conservative Catholic schools that have recently emerged (see Drake, 2007). These institutions have quickly established themselves in opposition to what their leaders perceive as the secularization of many of the nation's Catholic colleges (Redden, 2007), and are employing their institutional vision documents to state their case. Ave Maria's School of Law, for example, purposefully and dramatically emphasizes *relative advantage* and *observability* in its mission statement:

> Ave Maria offers state-of-the-art facilities and technologies, and a curriculum enriched by a grounding in natural law and the enduring truths of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Graduates are prepared to practice law with the highest level of skill and professionalism in law firms, public service, business, higher education, the judiciary, and national, state, and local government. (cited in Skojec, 2003, ¶ 16)

Similarly, the Young American's Foundation (2007), the principal out-reach organization of the Conservative Movement, generates an annual "Top Ten Conservative Colleges" list that "features ten institutions that proclaim, through their mission and programs, a dedication to discovering, maintaining, and strengthening the conservative values of their students" (¶4). *Relative advantage* and *observability* have been identified by communication scholars as linguistic attributes that are salient and powerful predictors of the adoption and diffusion of institutional vision. Clearly, they are also attractive selling points for an institution, and their significance in mission and vision state-ments cannot be overemphasized.

The normative DICTION scores presented in Tables 2-5 provide the means for any college or university to assess its own institutional vision and determine how its inspirational and pragmatic rhetoric matches up with other institutions. The purchase and application of DICTION is required to gener-ate comparative scores. Of course, other software packages can be employed (e.g., LIWC, TextSmart, Wordstat) to assess institutional vision and provide pre- and post-revision scores on comparable versions of the linguistic compo-nents employed in this investigation.

Another option would be to visit the websites of the institutions identified as scoring high on specific linguistic components (see Table 6), access the institutional vision statements, and visually compare those documents with that of one's own institution. Stonehill College, for example, followed this protocol during the revision of its mission statement in 2006. According to the school's president, Rev. Mark T. Cregan (2008):

> We wanted to refine the Stonehill mission statement so that it is more concise, memorable, and, therefore, more usable. We wanted to do so in a way that was also consistent with our history. And, we wanted an aspirational mission statement—one that inspires and guides us as we execute our strategic plan. To generate a starting point, the Committee researched the mission statements of other Catholic colleges and universities including those sponsored by the Congregation of Holy Cross. (¶3)

To facilitate this process, the institutional vision statement of Loyola University of Chicago is presented in Appendix D. This is a good example of a well-balanced statement—that is, one that generated a high DICTION score on most of the 6 linguistic components. Its DICTION scores for the compos-ite statement, mission statement only, and vision statement only are provided, as are indicators of whether the score is above the mean for all Catholic insti-tutions and all non-Catholic religious institutions in the sample.

Limitations

Schools affiliated with Pentecostal, Baptist, Presbyterian, United Methodist, Evangelical Lutheran, United Church of Christ, Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints, and Southern Baptist churches are represented in this investigation's random sample. For the sake of comparison with Catholic institutions, these non-Catholic religious institutions were clustered under the umbrella category of "religious." This does a disservice to the differences that exist across these faith-based colleges and universities and the expression of those differences in their respective institutional vision. For example, the data suggest that the institutional vision of Evangelical Lutheran institutions such as Wartberg College are particularly *compelling*, while the institutional vision of United Methodist institutions such as Huston-Tillotson College are not. Future investigations may wish to pull a larger sample of religious schools, including Catholic colleges and universities and the new wave of ultra-conservative Catholic schools, so their individual differences and its potential impact on institutional vision can be better recognized and more fully explored.

Despite its strengths, a number of limitations of computerized content analysis have been described in the research literature (see Morris, 1994). These include: (a) a lack of natural language processing capabilities (including difficulties with ambiguous concepts and the loss of broader contextual cues); (b) an insensitivity to linguistic nuances such as negation and irony; (c) the inability of researchers to provide a completely exhaustive listing of key words; (d) the inability of software to resolve references back and forth to words elsewhere in the text; and (e) the danger of word crunching, or transforming rich meanings into meaningless numbers. In addition, the methodology presented here can produce a sterility of analysis (see Hart, 2000a, 2001; Winter & Stewart, 1977) and, as such, it is important to note that DICTION scores merely provide an objective measuring stick.

According to Alexa and Züll (1999), DICTION is specifically designed for elucidating the rhetorical characteristics and style of political discourse. In order to use DICTION, the user must accept the theoretical, categorization, and scoring assumptions it makes. Although DICTION has been promoted as an all-purpose program designed for use with any sort of English-language text, the norms that come with the program are based largely on political text materials. Its application to the institutional vision of colleges and universities in general and Catholic schools in particular is both innovative and exploratory.

References

Abelman, R., Atkin, D., Dalessandro, A., Snyder-Suhy, S., & Janstova, P. (2007). The trickle-down effect of institutional vision: Vision statements and academic advising. *NACADA Journal, 27*(1), 4-21.

Abelman, R., & Dalessandro, A. (2008). The institutional vision of community colleges. *Community College Review, 35*(4), 306-335.

Abelman, R., Dalessandro, A., Snyder-Suhy, S., Janstova, P., & Pettey, G. (2007). Charting the verbiage of institutional vision: Implications for academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *27*(1), 22-38.

Abelman, R., & Molina, A. (2006). Institutional vision and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *26*(2), 5-12.

Alexa, M., & Züll, C. (1999). *A review of software for text analysis*. Mannheim, Germany: ZUMA-Nachrichten. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from http://www.gesis.org/ Publikationen/Zeitschriften/ ZUMA_Nachrichten_spezial/documents/pdfs/znspezial5/pdf

Association of American Colleges. (1994). *Strong foundations: Twelve principles for effective general education programs*. Washington, DC: Author.

Ayers, D. F. (2002). Mission priorities of community colleges in the southern United States. *Community College Review, 30*(3), 11-30.

Baldwin, A. (2005). *The community college experience*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banta, T. W., Lund, J. P., Black, K. E., & Oblander, F. W. (1995). *Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998). A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication on venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 43-54.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation of President Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 562-574.

Boder, D. (1940). The adjective/verb quotient: A contribution to the psychology of language. *Psychology Record, 3,* 310–343.

Boerema, A. J. (2006). An analysis of private school mission statements. *Peabody Journal of Education, 81*(1), 180-202.

Bollag, B., (2004, April 9). Who Is Catholic. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(31), pp. A26-A29.

Bryson, J. M. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bunker, K. A. (1985). Coping with the "mess" of stress: An assessment based research project. *Journal of Management Development, 4*(4)*,* 68–82.

Burtchaell, J. T. (1998). *The dying of the light: The disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian churches*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2005). The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from http://www.carnegiefoundation. org/Classification/CIHE2000

Carver, J. (2000). Managing your mission. *About Campus*, *4*(6), 19-23.

Cernera, A. J. (2005). *Lay leaders in Catholic higher education: An emerging paradigm for the twenty-first century*. Fairfield, CT: Sacred Heart University Press.

Cesareo, F. C. (2007). Can Catholic colleges exist today? Challenges to religious identity in the midst of pluralism. *The Journal of New England Higher Education, 22*(20), 17-18.

Chait, R. (1979, July 19). Mission madness strikes our colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *18*(36), p. A36.

Cregan, M. T. (2008). President's letter on Stonehill's mission. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from http://www.stonehill.edu/president/missionletter.htm

Deffuant, G., Huet, S., & Amblard, F. (2005). An individual-based model of innovation diffusion mixing social value and individual benefit. *American Journal of Sociology*, *110*(4), 1041-1069.

DiGiacomo, J. (2007). [Review of the book *Catholic higher education: A culture in crisis*]. *Momentum*, *38*(2), 78-79.

Drake, T. (2007, September 23). The rise of the new Catholic college. *National Catholic Register, 83*(37). Retrieved May 20, 2008, from http://ncregister.com/site/article/4620

Easton, H. S. (1940). *Word frequency dictionary.* New York: Dover.

Emrich, C. G., Brower, H. H., Feldman, J. M., & Garland, H. (2001). Images in words: Presidential rhetoric, charisma, and greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*(3), 527-557.

Estanek, S., James, M. J., & Norton, D. A. (2006). Assessing Catholic identity: A study of mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, *10*(2), 199-217.

Flesch, R. F. (1951). *The art of clear thinking*. New York: Harper.

Fox, S. (1997). *Vision at the heart*. Cleveland, OH: Mandel Institute and the Council for Initiatives in Education.

Fox, S. (2003). The art of translation. In S. Fox, I. Scheffler, & D. Marom (Eds.), *Visions of Jewish education* (pp. 253-295). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, S., Scheffler, I., & Marom, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Visions of Jewish education.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Garrett, M. (2006). The identity of American Catholic higher education: A historical overview. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 10*(2), 229-247.

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations, 53*(8), 1027–1055.

Gleason, P. (1995). *Contending with modernity: Catholic higher education in the twentieth century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, E. (2008, March 7). Pope readies a challenge to Catholic educators. *New York Sun*. Retrieved May 22, 2008, from http://www2.nysun.com/new-york/pope-readies-a-challenge-to-catholic-educators

Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly, 82*(4), 581-629.

Guy-Sheftall, B. (2006). Shared governance, junior faculty, and HBCUs. *Academe*, *92*(6), 30-34.

Haider, M., & Kreps, G. L. (2004). Forty years of diffusion of innovations: Utility and value in public health. *Journal of Health Communication*, *9*(Supple. 1), 3-11.

Hart, R. P. (1984a). The language of the modern presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 14*(2)*, 249–264.

Hart, R. P. (1984b). *Verbal style and the presidency: A computer-based analysis.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hart, R. P. (2000a). *Campaign talk: Why elections are good for us.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hart, R. P. (2000b). *DICTION 5.0: The text-analysis program.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hart, R. P. (2001). Redeveloping DICTION: Theoretical considerations. In M. D. West (Ed.), *Theory, method, and practice in computer content analysis* (pp. 43-61). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Hart, R. P., Jarvis, S. E., & Lim, E. T. (2002). The American people in crisis: A content analysis. *Political Psychology, 23*(3), 417–437.

Hartley, M. (2002). *A call to purpose: Mission-centered change at three liberal arts colleges*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Hellwig, M. K. (2000). Higher education and the Catholic church: Some underlying assumptions. *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, *20*(2), 27-39.

Hellwig, M. K. (2004). Evaluating the mission and identity of a Catholic college or university. In Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, *Mission and*

identity: A handbook for trustees of Catholic colleges and universities (pp. 45-52). Washington, DC: Author.

Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1994). Speaking of visions and visions being spoken: An exploration of the effects of content and delivery on perceptions of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *8*(2), 165-189.

Hughes, R. T., & Adrian, W. B. (Eds.). (1997). *Models for Christian higher education: Strategies for success in the twenty-first century.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.

John Paul II. (1990). *Ex corde ecclesiae* [On Catholic universities]. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Johnson, W. (1946). *People in quandaries: The semantics of personal adjustment.* New York: Harper.

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2000). What we have learned about developing transformational leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(7), 355–362.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., Wofford, J. C., & Baum, J. R. (2002). Measuring motive imagery contained in the vision statement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(2), 139-150.

Kirp, D. L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the bottom line: The marketing of higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. *Change*, *33*(3), 10-16, 66.

Kuhtmann, M. S. (2004). Mission impossible? Advising and institutional culture. *NACADA Journal, 24*(1&2), 99-110.

Langan, J. P. (Ed.). (1993). *Catholic university in church and society: A dialogue on Ex corde ecclesiae.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lewis, C. (2005, November 24). Mission and vision statements. *The Times* (London), p. 5.

Mahajan, V., Muller, E., & Bass, F. M. (1990). New product diffusion models in marketing: A review of directions for research. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(1), 1-26.

Marom, D. (1994). *Developing visions for education: Rationale, content, and comments on methodology.* Cleveland, OH: Internal Mandel Institute Document.

Marom, D. (2003). Before the gates of the school: An experiment in developing educational vision from practice. In S. Fox, I. Scheffler, & D. Marom (Eds.), *Visions of Jewish education* (pp. 296-331). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Marsden, G. M. (2001). *The soul of the American university: From Protestant establishment to established non-belief.* New York: Oxford University Press.

McClenney, K. M. (2007). Research update: The community college survey of student engagement. *Community College Review, 35*(2), 137-146.

McLendon, M., Heller, D. E., & Young, S. (2005). State postsecondary policy innovation: Politics, competition, and the interstate migration of policy ideas. *Journal of Higher Education*, *76*(4), 363-400.

McMurtrie, B. (2000, October 20). Future of religious colleges is bright, say scholars and officials. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(8), A41.

Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 159–203). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Miller, E. J. (2002). Characteristics of the Catholic intellectual tradition. In S. Estanek (Ed.), *Understanding student affairs at Catholic colleges and universities: A comprehensive resource* (pp. 35-58). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, T. E., Bender, B. E., & Schuh, J. H. (Eds.). (2005). *Promoting reasonable expectations: Aligning student and institutional views of the college experience.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mixon, S., Lyon, L., & Beaty, M. (2004). Secularization and national universities: The effect of religious identity on academic reputation. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(4), 400-419.

Morey, M. M., & Piderit, J. J. (2006). *Catholic higher education: A culture in crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(3), 456-471.

Morris, R. (1994). Computerized content analysis in management research: A demonstration of advantages and limitations. *Journal of Management, 20*(4), 903–931.

Murphy, J. M. (1987). *Branding: A key marketing tool*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

National Association for College Admission Counseling (2008). Religiously-affiliated colleges and universities. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from http://www.nacacnet.org/MemberPortal/News/StepsNewsletter/Religiously-Affiliated+Colleges+and+Universities.htm

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Newsom, W., & Hayes, C. R. (1990). Are mission statements worthwhile? Lots of effort but do they say anything? *Planning for Higher Education, 19*(2), 28-30.

Nichols, J. P. (2005). Making the mission statement "real": The core curriculum at Saint Joseph's College (Indiana). *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, *24*(2), 39-48.

O'Brien, D. J. (1994). *From the heart of the American church: Catholic higher education and American culture.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Ogden, C. K. (1960). *Basic English dictionary.* London: Evans Brothers.

Pekarsky, D. (1998). Vision and education. In H. Marantz (Ed.), *Judaism and education: Essays in honor of Walter I. Ackerman* (pp. 277-291). Beersheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.

Pillai, R., & Meindl, J. R. (1998). Context and charisma: A "meso" level examination of the relationship of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis to charismatic leadership. *Journal of Management, 24*(5), 643–664.

Provost, J. H. (2000). The sides of Catholic identity. In J. R. Wilcox & I. King (Eds.), *Enhancing religious identity: Best practices from Catholic campuses* (pp. 18-26). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Redden, E. (2007, September 25). Catholic character. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/09/25/catholic

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th edition). New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E. M. (2004). A prospective and retrospective look at the diffusion model. *Journal of Health Communication*, *9*(Supple. 1), 13-19.

Rozycki, E. G. (2004). Mission and vision in education. *Educational Horizons*, *82*(2), 94-98.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Roth, G., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in learning organizations.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Sevcik, P. (2004). Innovation diffusion. *Business Communication Review*, *34*(9), 8-11.

Skojec, S. (2003). Forum: The resurrection of Catholic higher education. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from http://www.academia.org/campus_reports/2003/sept_2003_3.html

Steinfels, P. (1997). Catholic identity: Emerging consensus. In J. M. O'Keefe (Ed.), *Catholic education at the turn of the new century* (pp. 199-203). New York: Garland.

Sullins, D. P. (2004). The difference Catholic makes: Catholic faculty and Catholic identity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *43*(1), 83–101.

Valente, T. W. (1993). Diffusion of innovations and policy decision-making. *Journal of Communication*, *43*(1), 30-45.

Valente, T. W. (1995). *Network models of the diffusion of innovations*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Velcoff, J., & Ferrari, J. R. (2006). Perceptions of university mission statements by senior administrators: Relating to faculty engagement. *Christian Higher Education*, *5*(4), pp. 329-339.

Vishwanath, A., & Goldhaber, G. M. (2003). An examination of the factors contributing to adoption decisions among late-diffused technology products. *New Media & Society*, *5*(4), 547-572.

Wejnert, B. (2002). Integrating models of diffusion of innovations: A conceptual framework. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*(1), 297-326.

Welton, J., & Cook, B. (1997). Institutional vision: A prerequisite for fund raising success. *Fund Raising Management*, *28*(9), 28-31.

West, M. D. (Ed.). (2001). *Theory, method, and practice in computer content analysis*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Wilcox, J. R. (2000). Religious identity: A critical issue in Catholic higher education. In J. R. Wilcox & I. King (Eds.), *Enhancing religious identity: Best practices from Catholic campuses* (pp. xv-xvi). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Wilcox, J. R. & King, I. (Eds.). (2000). *Enhancing religious identity: Best practices from Catholic campuses*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Winter, D. G., & Stewart, A. J. (1977). Content analysis as a technique for assessing political leaders. In M. G. Hermann (Ed.), *A psychological examination of political leaders* (pp. 27–61). New York: Free Press.

Woo, C.Y. (2005). Get real: Making the mission statement operational. *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education, 24*(2), 25-37.

Young American's Foundation (2007). 2006-2007 top-ten conservative colleges. Retrieved on May 20, 2008, from http://media.yaf.org/latest/2006_2007_top_ten.cfm#franciscan

Young, R. B. (2001). Colleges on the cross roads: A study of the mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities. *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education, 21*(2), 65-81.

Robert Abelman is a professor in the School of Communication at Cleveland State University. Amy Dalessandro is a Ph.D. candidate in the School of Communication Studies at Kent State University. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Dr. Robert Abelman, School of Communication, Cleveland State University, 2121 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115.

Appendix A
Sample of Church-Affiliated Institutions

Catholic college or university italicized and in bold

Private Baccalaureate-Granting Institutions

Anderson College

Elizabethtown College

Holy Cross College

Illinois Wesleyan University

McPherson College

Mount Union College

Northland College

Saint Olaf College

Shorter College

Wartburg College

Bethune-Cookman College

Grand View College

Huston-Tillotson University

Macalester College

Mount Olive College

North Carolina Wesleyan College

Peace College

Saint Paul's College

Stonehill College

Private Master's-Granting Institutions

Clarke College

Edgewood College

Gannon University

John Brown University

LeMoyne College

Olivet College

Saint Joseph's College

Union University

Dominican University of California

Emmanuel College

Indiana Wesleyan University

King's College

Marian College

Rosemont College

Saint Thomas University

Wingate University

Private Doctorate-Granting Institutions

Brigham Young University

Liberty University

Loyola University of Chicago

Mount Saint Mary's College

Saint Mary's University of Minnesota

Elon University

Loyola Marymount University

Marquette University

Regis University

University of Notre Dame

Appendix B
Sample of Secular Institutions

Private Baccalaureate-Granting Institutions

Corcoran College of Art & Design   Dean College
Emily Carr Institute of Art & Design   Hartwick College
Hobart and William Smith Colleges   Lafayette College
Mount Ida College   Ringling School of Art and Design
Robert Morris College   University of Northwestern Ohio
Walden University

Private Master's-Granting Institutions

Bennington College   Columbia College Chicago
Converse College   Curry College
Drury University   Franklin University
International College   Laurentian University
North Central College   Quinnipiac University
Rider University   Saint Lawrence University
Southern California Inst. of Arch.   Thomas University
Washington College

Private Doctorate-Granting Institutions

American University   Arcadia University
Brandeis University   Clarkson University
Drake University   Drexel University
Johnson & Wales University   Western New England College
New York University   Northwestern University
Nova Southeastern University   Rochester Institute of Technology
Smith College   Springfield College
Tulane University   University of Denver
University of Miami   University of Regina
University of Rochester   Long Island University-CW Post

Public Baccalaureate-Granting Institutions

Brandon University   California State University–Channel Islands
Chipola College   Concord University
CUNY-York College   Dalton State College
Fairmont State University   Kansas State University–Salina
West Virginia University–Parkersburg   Lewis-Clark State College
Macon State College   Miami University–Hamilton Campus

Missouri Western State University   Nipissing University
Oregon Institute of Technology–Portland Penn State University–Lehigh Valley
Pennsylvania College of Technology   Purdue University-North Central
Red River College   Saint Mary's College of Maryland
SUNY-Delhi   United States Coast Guard Academy
University of Maine-Augusta   University of Montana–Western
University of Pittsburg–Johnstown   University of South Carolina–Beaufort
University of South Florida–Sarasota   Utah Valley State College

Public Master's-Granting Institutions

Arkansas Tech University   Bowie State University
Bridgewater State College   California State Univ.–Dominguez Hills
The College of New Jersey   CUNY-Hunter College
Evergreen State College   Fort Hays State University
Georgia College & State University   Indiana University Northwest
Minnesota State University–Moorhead   Missouri State University
Montana State University–Northern   Montclair State University
Ohio University-Lancaster   Saginaw Valley State University
San José State University   Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Sonoma State University   Southern Oregon University
SUNY-Purchase College   University of Alaska–Anchorage
University of Arkansas–Monticello   University of Maryland–University College
University of North Carolina–Wilmington University of Tennessee–Chattanooga
University of Wisconsin-Stout   Weber State University–Davis
West Texas A&M University   Western Washington University

Public Doctorate-Granting Institutions

Alabama State University   Bowling Green State University
East Tennessee State University   Eastern Michigan University
Florida International University   Grand Valley State University
Kansas State University   Mississippi State University
Northern Arizona University–Phoenix   Oklahoma State University–Tulsa
Rutgers State University–New Brunswick   Texas Southern University
University of Arkansas–Little Rock   University of California–Berkeley
University of California–San Diego   University of Colorado–Colorado Springs
University of Illinois–Chicago   University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa   University of Massachusetts–Boston
University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth   University of Missouri–St. Louis
University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill University of Pittsburgh
University of South Florida   University of Vermont
University of West Georgia   University of Wisconsin–Madison
Wichita State University   Wilfrid Laurier University

Appendix C
DICTION Constructs, Formulas, and Sample Words

Shared = *[Centrality + Cooperation +Rapport]*
– [Diversity + Exclusion + Liberation]

*Centrality (*e.g., model, basic, innate, paradigm, standardized, expected)
Cooperation (e.g., collaboration, unions, partner, sisterhood, mediate, teamwork)
Rapport (e.g., connection*,* congenial, approve, tolerant, equivalent, consensus)
Diversity (e.g., contrasting, non-conformist, unique, individualistic, extremist)
Exclusion (e.g., displaced, outlaws, privacy, discriminate, loneliness)
Liberation (e.g., autonomous, radical, eccentric, liberty, freedom)

Clarity = *– [Complexity]*

"A simple measure of the average number of characters-per-word and con-voluted phrasings that make a text's ideas abstract and its implications un-clear" Hart (2000b, p. 47). *Complexity* borrows Flesch's (1951) notion that convoluted phrasings make a text's ideas abstract and its implications un-clear. *Clarity*, then, is the opposite.

Compelling = *[Praise + Satisfaction + Inspiration]*
– [Blame + Hardship + Denial]

Praise (e.g., dear, delightful, mighty, successful, conscientious)
Inspiration (e.g., faith, honesty, self-sacrifice, courage, wisdom)
Satisfaction (e.g., fulfillment, cheerful, happiness, pride, excited)
Blame (e.g., accuse, censure, culpability, nervous, offensive)
Hardship (e.g., difficulty, privation, want, injustice, error)
Denial (e.g., aren't, shouldn't, not, nobody, nothing)

Complexity = *[Tenacity + Leveling + Collectives + Insistence]*
– [Numerical Terms + Ambivalence + Self Reference + Variety]

Tenacity (e.g., is, am, will, shall, he'll)
Leveling (e.g., everybody, everyone, always, inevitably, absolute)
Collectives (e.g., community, crowd, team, humanity, country, world)
Insistence (all words occurring three or more times that function as nouns or noun-derived adjectives are identified and then calculated)
Numerical Terms (e.g., one, tenfold, multiply, percentage, tally)

Ambivalence (e.g., allegedly, perhaps, almost, vague, hesitate)
Self Reference (e.g., I, I'd, mine, myself, my)
Variety (ratio that divides the number of different words by the total words)

Relative Advantage = *[Aggression + Accomplishment + Communication + Motion]*
– [Cognitive Terms + Passivity + Embellishment]

Aggression (e.g., explode, conquest, violation, challenging)
Accomplishment (e.g., achieve, finish, proceed, leader, manage)
Communication (e.g., share, listen, read, speak, translate, chat)
Motion (e.g., apply, circulate, momentum, wandering)
Cognitive terms (e.g., learn, consider, psychology, re-examine, estimate)
Passivity (e.g., tame, submit, yielding, silence, inhibit)
Embellishment (ratio of adjectives to verbs)

Observability = *[Familiarity + Spatial Awareness + Temporal Awareness*
+ Present Concern + Human Interest + Concreteness]
– [Past Concern + Complexity]

Familiarity (e.g., this, that, across, over, through)
Spatial Awareness (e.g., abroad, locale, campus, fatherland, disoriented)
Temporal Awareness (e.g., century, instant, nowadays, spontaneously)
Present Concern (e.g., touch, govern, make, meet)
Human Interest (e.g., he, ourselves, them, cousin, friend)
Concreteness (e.g., mass, solidarity, compact, outcome, objective)
*Past Concern (*the past tense forms of the verbs contained in the *Present Concern* Dictionary)
Complexity (the average number of characters-per-word)

Appendix D
Institutional Vision of Loyola University of Chicago

Mission

We are Chicago's Jesuit Catholic University—a diverse community seeking God in all things and working to expand knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice, and faith.

Vision

Loyola University Chicago is the school of choice for those who wish to seek new knowledge in the service of humanity in a world-renowned urban center as members of a diverse learning community that values freedom of inquiry, the pursuit of truth, and care for others.

Our Jesuit Catholic tradition of education prepares students for extraordinary lives that will reflect the following characteristics:

- Commitment to excellence: Applying well-learned lessons and skills to achieve new ideas, better solutions and vital answers
- Faith in God and the religious experience: Promoting well-formed and strongly held beliefs in one's faith tradition to deepen others' relationships with God
- Service that promotes justice: Using learning and leadership in openhanded and generous ways to ensure freedom of inquiry, the pursuit of truth, and care for others
- Values-based leadership: Ensuring a consistent focus on personal integrity, ethical behavior in business and in all professions, and the appropriate balance between justice and fairness
- Global awareness: Demonstrating an understanding that the world's people and societies are interrelated and interdependent

Table D1

Loyola University Chicago DICTION Institutional Vision Scores

	Shared	Clarity	Compelling	Complexity	Relative Advantage	Observability
Composite	50.28*	5.79	62.00#	47.50	44.32*	43.42*
Mission	45.23	5.57#	60.86#	48.14	40.48	44.85#
Vision	55.98*	5.78#	68.07*#	42.46	45.25*#	45.35*#

Note.   * = value is more than the mean (for "Clarity," less than the mean) calculated from all Catholic institutions
   # = value is more than the mean (for "Clarity," less than the mean) calculated from all non-Catholic religious institutions

Copied with permission of Loyola University of Chicago