PERSONALITY NEEDS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS
OF THE PRESS OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS:
AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Paul S. Campbell
1964

THESIS

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Personality Needs of Community College and
University Students and their Perceptions
Of the Press of their Institutions:
An Experimental Investigation

presented by

Paul S. Campbell

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

__Ph.D.__ degree in __Guidance__ & Personnel
Services
College of Education

Joh E. Jordan
Major professor

Date __February 5, 1964__

O-169

ABSTRACT

PERSONALITY NEEDS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR
PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESS OF THEIR
INSTITUTIONS: AN EXPERIMENTAL
INVESTIGATION

by Paul S. Campbell

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the
differences between community college students' and
university students' personality needs and differences in
their perceptions of the press of their respective
institutions. The study was limited to students living
within the service area (25 miles radius) of the community
college located in midwestern United States. The university
with which comparisons were made is within the service
area of the community college.

It was hypothesized that significant difference at the
.01 level would be found between students' perceptions of
the press of their respective institutions on 11 factors
measured by the College Characteristics Index. It was also
hypothesized that significant difference at the .01 level
would be found between the personality needs of the students
attending the two institutions. These personality needs
were compared on 12 factors as determined by the Stern

Activities Index. It was also hypothesized that significant difference at the .01 level would be found between the students from the two institutions on three additional variables: previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background.

The Sample

The sample for the study consisted of 90 freshmen enrolled at the university and 90 freshmen enrolled at the community college. The sample was randomly selected from students living within a 25 mile radius of the community college.

The Methodology

The students comprising the sample were administered the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index. Data were also gathered on the students' previous academic environments (size of high school graduating classes), socioeconomic status (fathers' occupations), and academic backgrounds (scores on College Qualification Tests). These data were collected from the students' records at their respective institutions.

The data collected from the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index were combined into 23 factors, 11 for the College Characteristics Index, and 12 for the Stern Activities Index. Tests for significant differences between the community college and the university were made on each of these factors by means of the t test.

Data on each of the variables, previous academic
environment, socioeconomic status, and academic back-
ground were tested for significant difference between the
community college and the university by means of the median
test.

The Findings

Hypotheses I through XI suggested that significant
difference would be found on each of the 11 factors per-
taining to students' perceptions of the press of their
respective institutions. These factors were: Aspirational
Level, Intellectual Climate, Student Dignity, Academic
Climate, Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life,
Academic Organization, Social Form, Play-Work, and Vocational
Climate. Significant difference was found for each of
these factors.

The mean scores were greater for university students
than community college students on the following factors:
Aspirational Level, Intellectual Climate, Academic Climate,
Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life, Social
Form, and Play-Work. The mean scores were greater for
community college students than university students on the
following factors: Student Dignity, Academic Organization,
and Vocational Climate.

Hypotheses XII through XXIII suggested that significant
difference would be found on each of the 12 factors
pertaining to the personality needs of the students from the

two institutions. Significant difference was found on each of the following factors: Self Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Motivation, Friendliness, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. No significant difference was found on each of the following factors: Intellectual Interests, Applied Interests, Orderliness, Submissiveness, Closeness, and Sensuousness.

The mean scores were greater for university students than community college students on the following factors: Self Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. The mean scores were greater for community college students than university students on the factors of Motivation and Friendliness.

Hypotheses XXIV through XXVI suggested that significant difference would be found between the students at the two institutions on their previous academic environment, socio-economic status, and academic background. Significant difference was found on each of the two variables, previous academic environment and academic background. No significant difference was found on the socioeconomic variable.

More community college students than university students were above the median on the previous academic environment variable. More university students than community college students were above the median on the academic background variable.

PERSONALITY NEEDS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE

AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESS OF THEIR

INSTITUTIONS: AN EXPERIMENTAL

INVESTIGATION

By

Paul S. Campbell

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

Guidance and Personnel Services

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator would like to acknowledge his genuine gratitude to Dr. John E. Jordan for his assistance in the preparation of this thesis and for his helpful guidance throughout the doctoral program. Appreciation is also extended to Drs. John X. Jamrich, Walter F. Johnson, and Archibold O. Haller for assistance and helpful criticism of the entire research.

The investigator is indebted to the officials of the community college and the university involved in this research who not only made possible the gathering of the data, but also assisted the investigator in his efforts.

The investigator is particularly grateful to his wife, Betty, who so ably and patiently assisted in the preparation of the various stages of the manuscript. Much credit is due the investigator's wife and his children Karen and Kevin, for their understanding, patience, and support through the years of the investigator's doctoral program.

The investigator also acknowledges the assistance of Dr. George G. Stern through telephone conversations and correspondence regarding the application of the instruments to the methodological design.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

    A.   Stern Activities Index, Form 1158

    B.   College Characteristics Index, Form 1158

    C.   Relevancy of the College Characteristics
        Index for Community College

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

When college students live within commuting distance
of both a community college and a major university, do
the students attending the community college differ from
those attending the major university with respect to
personality factors and are there differences in the
students' perceptions of their respective institutions?
These two interrelated problems constitute the object
of this research.

Specifically, the study entails a comparison of the
personality needs of students who come from the same
area but attend different institutions in the same area.
It also includes a comparison of these students' per-
ceptions of the environmental press exerted by their
respective institutions. It is hypothesized that there
are differences in both the students' personality needs
and their perceptions of the environmental press of their
respective institutions.

In addition to these main hypotheses having to do
with students' personality needs and their perceptions
of the environmental press of their respective institutions,

1

It is hypothesized that the students of a community
college (i.e., junior college) differ significantly from
those attending a university with respect to previous
academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic
background.

In order to research the problems proposed for this
study the personality needs of university students will
be compared with those of community college students.
Also, the university students' perceptions of the press
of their institutions will be compared with the community
college students' perceptions of the press of their
institution. If differences are discovered, support is
given to the theory that postulates a relationship between
personal and situational determinants of behavior. More
specifically, the theory is supported if there are
differences in the press of the two institutions and if
the students attending these two institutions differ with
respect to their personality needs.

What sort of model is needed to research these
differences? Essentially, the problem requires a com-
parison of the personality needs of students attending
the two institutions and their percpetions of the psycho-
logical climates of their respective institutions. An
instrument is needed which will measure these variables.
The instrument must be administered to students attending
a community college and to students attending a university.

These students must live within the service area of the community college and the university must also be located within the same service area. The students will be compared as to their previous academic environment, as determined by the size of their high school graduating classes; as to their socioeconomic status, as determined by their fathers' occupations; and as to their academic backgrounds as determined by their scores on the College Qualification Tests. The obtained data will be quantified and analyzed to discover whether or not significant differences exist.

Theoretical Basis for the Study

Underlying this study is the concept of situational and personal determinants of behavior.

The situational determinants of behavior proceed from the environment and those aspects of the environment which are significant for the determination of behavior may be conceptualized in terms of what Murray has referred to as "press" (25:6). Press, essentially, refers to the environmental pressures upon the individual.

These external pressures have internal counterparts which Murray called "needs." These needs refer to personal determinants of behavior. Murray proposed a system of constructs for classifying psychogenic needs and identified these constructs as "a force (the psychological nature of which is unknown) in the brain region,

a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation, and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, unsatisfying situation" (25:124).

The social psychological theoretical concepts which underlie the premises of this study are, therefore, situational determinants of behavior and personal determinants of behavior. It is necessary to examine briefly each of these concepts and their interrelatedness as they have relevance for this study. The concept of press may be applied to any situation in which the individual finds himself. Situational analysis or press analysis, then, may be undertaken for an individual's home, job, college, community, etc. In order to assess press it is feasible to restrict the press analysis to a particular environment or institution. In this study, the press analysis is restricted to the specific environments concerned, higher educational institutions. Stern has described the characteristics of institutional press, particularly the press upon an individual in an educational setting (50:38ff).

The goals and purposes of an institution function to determine the requirements which individuals must fulfill if they are to be selected for participation in the organization and are to be permitted to continue with their affiliation. It is in this sense that the goals

and purposes of an institution determine the press of
an institution or, in other words, situational deter-
minants of behavior.

Institutional roles, practices, and values logically
follow the goals and purposes of an institution and in
very much the same way contribute to its press. The
roles, practices and values are reflected in the
teaching procedures used, the kind of activity in which
students are expected to engage, the material which the
student is expected to use, and the contents of the
various subject matters.

The system of rewards and penalties represent another
aspect of the press in the institution of learning. While
most rewards and penalties may be subtle and not explicitly
codified, they usually are explicitly represented in the
grading system. Thus, the grading system has an effect
as a press on the student.

These statements relative to the press of an
educational institution agree with Murphy's statement that
"a study of situations that act upon persons should be
at least as full and as systematic as is a study of the
internal structures which respond to these situations"
(24:877).

Having examined how these situations within the
institution of higher education can act upon persons, the
"internal structures which respond to these situations"

must now be examined. It is not the purpose of this discussion to construct a theory of personality, but to discuss the major points which have been found useful particularly, by Stern, in understanding the individual in relation to the need concept (19, 50:46ff).

Man is a social being in that he is dependent on others for the satisfaction of his needs. In the course of this social transaction patterns of behavior appear. These patterns lead us to infer the presence of psychogenic needs which have a function in the motivational system of the individual.

As a consequence of the person's numerous experiences in the socialization process, he apportions his energies toward the satisfaction of his various needs. It can be said, since persons devote a good portion of their time and energy to some activities and a good deal less time and energy to others, that they develop a hierarchy of activities. Since there must be a driving or motivating force for these activities, it may be said that the person has a hierarchy of needs which may be inferred from his differentially cathected activities and objects.

This hierarchy of needs must be understood from the standpoint of the factors which serve to organize the person's behavior. These generally arise from the interaction process and include his self-concept, his

conception of others, conscious and unconscious motivation, and a multiplicity of roles.

Since a person's hierarchy of needs may be inferred from his differentially cathected activities and objects, one of the most effective ways to measure needs is to ask the individual to indicate his preferences among various possible activities offered for his consideration.

Thus far it has been shown that in attempting to understand behavior it is important to consider the situational determinants of behavior which are reflected in an analysis of the context within which performance is manifest, as well as the internal needs characterizing the individual. In other words, to understand behavior one should take into account the situational determinants of behavior and the personal determinants of behavior.

The integration of press and needs or situational and personal determinants of behavior have been made explicit by Murray in his more recent writings (30:434-464). Of course, basic to this integration of personal determinants of behavior is the concept of role which Parsons and others have demonstrated as strategic to the integration of the two levels of theoretical analysis, psychological and sociological.

Murray shows that by extending the concept of role (social role) to include personal roles, that a "personality action system and a social action system can be represented

as roughly homologous, at least in certain respects"
(30:451). Murray further states that "all social roles
require the execution of one or more kinds of actions; that
is, the habitual production of one or more kinds of effects,
and these effects (goals) can be classified in the same
manner as need-aims are classified. Indeed, the need-aim
and the role-aim may exactly correspond. . .Thus a man
may want to do exactly what he is expected to do" (50:451).

This is precisely the premise upon which Stern has
constructed the Stern Activities Index and the College
Characteristics Index. The former measures needs inferred
from things that the individual typically does. The latter
measures press inferred from things that are typically
done to the individual in a particular setting (42).
These Indexes, then, are based upon the theoretical position
of the integration of situational and personal determinants
of behavior. The psychological press is considered as
a composite of what appears to be objectively present as
well as what the individual feels subjectively to be
significant. The subjective meanings are in turn dependent
upon the internal frame of reference which characterizes
the individual. The prediction of performance is based
upon a study of the congruence between the environmental
press and the individual's personality (50:53,54).

It has been shown that the theory underlying this
study involves the concept of situational and personal

determinants of behavior. These concepts can be integrated
into the concept of role so that a personality action system
and a social action system can be classified in the same
way and their correspondence studied. Thus, in an
educational institution there may very well be a correspondence
between the needs of the students and the press of the
institution.

This study is designed to determine whether or
not students who live within commuting distance of both
a community college and a major university differ
significantly as to their personality needs and in their
perceptions of the two institutions. Since there are
obvious differences between the two institutions, the
students' perceptions of the press of the two institutions
should be quite different. If this is the case and if
the theory described above is true, it should then follow
that students within the vicinity of the two institutions
would attend the institution which, according to their
perceptions of its press, more nearly corresponds to
their needs. It can be expected, therefore that the
students attending the community college will perceive
the press of their institution much differently than the
university students perceive the press of the university.
It can also be expected that the needs of the community
college students will differ greatly from those attending
the university.

If difference is not found between all the needs of
the community college students and the university students
this lack of difference may be due to the fact that not all
of the students in the vicinity are free to choose between the
community college and the university. This is to say that
their choice of institutions may have been determined by
factors other than their needs and their perceptions of
the press of the two institutions. Such factors would likely
include previous academic environment, economic status
and academic background. Therefore, this study will not
only include a comparison of the students needs and their
perceptions of institutional press, but will also include
a comparison of the students on the three factors mentioned
above. These should help explain any lack of difference
between the needs of community college students and those
of university students.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are given for the various
factors which provide the basis for comparison of the
environmental press of the two institutions and were taken
verbatim from the sources cited (41:3; 43:18-21).

1. Aspirational Level: A high score on this
factor indicates that the college encourages students to
set high standards for themselves in a variety of ways.
These include opportunities for students to participate in

decision-making processes involving the administration
of the school, and administrative receptivity to change
and innovation, thus implying that a student's efforts to
make some impact on his environment have some probability
of being successful. But a high level of aspiration is
also encouraged by introducing students to individuals
and ideas likely to serve as models of intellectual and
professional achievement. This factor is determined by
the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for
Counteraction, Change, Fantasied Achievement and Understanding.

2. Intellectual Climate: All of the various items
contributing to this factor reflect the qualities of staff
and plant specifically devoted to scholarly activities
in the humanities, arts, and social sciences. This factor
is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic
Index scales for Reflectiveness, Humanities-Social Sciences,
Sensuality, Understanding, and Fantasied Achievement.

3. Student Dignity: This factor is associated with
institutional attempts to preserve student freedom and
maximize personal responsibility. Schools with high scores
on this factor tend to regulate student conduct by means
other than legislative codes or administrative fiat.
There is a minimum of coercion and students are generally
treated with the same level of respect accorded any mature
adult. This factor is determined by the scores on the
College Characteristic Index scales for Objectivity,
Assurance and Tolerance.

4. Academic Climate: This factor stresses academic excellence in staff and facilities in the conventional areas of the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Humanities-Social Sciences and Science.

5. Academic Achievement: Schools high in this factor set high standards of achievement for their students. Course work, examinations, honors, and similar devices are employed for this purpose. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Achievement, Energy, Understanding, Counteraction and Conjunctivity.

6. Self Expression: This factor is concerned with opportunities offered to the student for the development of leadership potential and self assurance. Among the activities serving this purpose are public discussions and debates, projects, student drama and musical activities, and other forms of participation in highly visible activities. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Ego Achievement, Emotionality, Exhibitionism and Energy.

7. Group Life: The four scales on this factor are concerned with various forms of mutually supportive group activities among the student body. These activities are of a warm, friendly character, more of less typifying

adolescent togetherness, but the items also reflect a more serious side to this culture as represented in activities devoted to the welfare of fellow students and less fortunate members of the community. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Affiliation, Supplication, Nurturance, Adaptiveness.

8. Academic Organization: The various components of this factor may be regarded as the environmental counterparts of the needs for orderliness and submissiveness in the individual. High scores on this factor are achieved by institutions which stress a high degree of organization and structure in the academic environment. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index sclaes for Blame Avoidance, Order, Conjunctivity, Deliberation, Deference, and Narcissism.

9. Social Form: In some respects this factor represents the formal institutionalization of those activities represented in Factor 7 (Group Life). There is in fact considerable overlap between these two factors, but Factor 9 minimizes the friendly aspects of Factor 7 while stressing its welfare components. Schools characterized by this factor also offer opportunities for the development of social skills of a formal nature and in some respects suggest the finishing school counterpart of the vocational climate represented in Factor 11 .

This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Narcissism, Nurturance, Adaptiveness, Dominance and Play.

10. Play-Work: Schools high in this factor offer opportunities for participation in a form of collegiate life reminiscent of the popular culture of the 1920's. These are the institutions sometimes referred to as the fountains of knowledge where students gather to drink. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Sexuality, Risktaking, Play, and Impulsiveness.

11. Vocational Climate: The items of Factor 11 emphasize practical applied activities, the rejection of aesthetic experience, and a high level of orderliness and conformity in the student's relations to the faculty, his peers, and his studies. This factor is determined by the scores on the College Characteristic Index scales for Practicalness, Puritanism, Deference, Order and Adaptiveness.

The following definitions are given for the various factors which provide the basis for comparison of the personality factors of students attending the two institutions and were taken verbatim from the scources cited (41:1; 43:13-18).

1. Self Assertion: This factor reflects a need to achieve personal power and socio-political recognition.

It is based on items which emphasize political action, directing or controlling other people, and the acceptance of roles involving considerable group attention. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Ego Achievement, Dominance, Exhibitionism, and Fantasied Achievement.

2. Audacity-Timidity: The second factor is more personally than socially oriented. The emphasis here is on aggressiveness in both physical activities and in interpersonal relationships. It is of interest that this personal aggressiveness should also be associated with a high level of interest in science. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Risktaking, Fantasied Achievement, Aggression, and Science.

3. Intellectual Interests: The factors with the highest loadings in this dimension are based on items involving various forms of intellectual activities. These include interests in the arts as well as the sciences, both abstract and empirical. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Reflectiveness, Humanities-Social Sciences, Understanding, and Science.

4. Motivation: This factor, like 1 and 2 above, represents another form in which need achievement may be expressed. Here, however, are the more conventional

forms of striving most recognizable among students, involving elements of competitiveness and perseverance as well as of intellectual aspiration. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Achievement, Counteraction, Understanding, and Energy.

5. Applied Interests: A high score on this factor suggests an interest in achieving success in concrete, tangible, socially acceptable activities. The items involve orderly and conventional applications in business and science. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Practicalness, Science, and Order.

6. Orderliness: People with high scores on this factor have indicated a marked interest in activities stressing personal organization and deliberativeness. Although some of the items are concerned with long range planning and relatively high level time perspective, the major emphasis here is on the maintenance of ritual and routine and the avoidance of impulsive behavior. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Conjunctivity, Sameness, Order and Deliberation.

7. Submissiveness: The preceding factor suggests a strong defensive system, based on rigid internal controls,

for guarding against the expression of impulses. The
Submissiveness factor also implies a high level of control,
but one which is based on social conformity and other-
directedness. The items emphasize humility, deference,
getting along with others, keeping in one's place, etc.
It is of interest that the Nurturance scale items should
appear in this context, suggesting that the submissive
individual's interest in supportive activities is based to
a considerable extent on his own unexpressed need for such
help. This factor is determined by the scores on the
Stern Activities Index scales for Adaptiveness, Abasement,
Nurturance, and Deference.

8. Closeness: This factor is closely related to
Factor 7, with which it shares both the Nurturance and
Deference scales. However, the abasive and self-denying
qualities implicit in Factor 7 are absent here. In their
place is an acceptance of items which recognize one's
needs for warmth and emotional supportiveness. This
factor is determined by the scores on the Stern Activities
Index scales for Supplication, Sexuality, Nurturance, and
Deference.

9. Sensuousness: The thirty items associated with
this factor are concerned with activities of a sensual
character. The items suggest a measure of self-indulgence
along with a delight in the gratifications which may be
obtained through the senses. This factor is determined

by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Sensuality, Narcissism, and Sexuality.

10. Friendliness: Persons with high scores on this factor are indicating an interest in playful, friendly relationships with other people. These interests involve simple and uncomplicated forms of amusement enjoyed in a group setting. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Affiliation and Play.

11. Expressiveness-Constraint: This factor stresses emotional ability and freedom from self-imposed controls. Individuals with high scores on this factor are outgoing, spontaneous, impulsive, and uninhibited. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Emotionality, Impulsiveness, Exhibitionism and Sexuality.

12. Egoism-Diffidence: This factor reflects an extreme preoccupation with self. The items are concerned with appearance and comfort, as well as with fantasies in which the self obtains unusually high levels of gratification. The responses to other items in this group suggests that reality itself is interpreted in egocentric terms, but this may be not so much a matter of autistic distortion as of narcissistic egoism. This factor is determined by the scores on the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> scales for Narcissism, Fantasied Achievement and Projectivity.

The following definitions are given for the various scales in the <u>Indexes</u> and were taken verbatim from the source cited (42).

1. Abasement-Assurance: Self-depreciation and devaluation as reflected in the ready acknowledgment of inadequacy, ineptitude, or inferiority, acceptance of humiliation, and other forms of self-degradation.

2. Achievement: Surmounting obstacles and attaining a successful conclusion in order to prove personal worth.

3. Adaptability --Defensiveness: Accepting criticism or advice publicly <u>versus</u> resistance and concealment, or justification of failure and humiliation.

4. Affiliation--Rejection: Close, friendly, reciprocal associations with others <u>versus</u> disassociation from others, withholding friendship and support.

5. Aggression--Blame Avoidance: Indifference or disregard for feelings of others as manifested in overt, covert, direct or indirect aggression <u>versus</u> the denial or inhibition of such impulses.

6. Change--Sameness: Variable or flexible behavior <u>versus</u> repetition and routine.

7. Conjunctivity--Disjunctivity: Organized, purposeful, planned activity patterns <u>versus</u> uncoordinated, diffuse, or self-indulgent behavior.

8. Counteraction--Inferiority Avoidance: Persistent striving to overcome difficult, frustrating, humiliating, or embarrassing experiences and failures versus avoidance, withdrawal or protective measures in situations which might result in such outcomes.

9. Deference--Restiveness: Sycophantic submission to the opinions and preferences of others perceived as superior.

10. Dominance--Tolerance: Ascendancy over others by means of assertive or manipulative control.

11. Ego Achievement (derived from Exocathection--Intraception): Self-dramatizing, idealistic social action; active or fantasied achievement oriented in terms of dominance or influence.

12. Emotionality--Placidity: Intense, open emotional display versus calm, serene, or restrained response.

13. Energy--Passivity: Intense, sustained vigorous effort versus sluggish inertia.

14. Exhibitionism--Inferiority Avoidance: Self-display and attention-seeking versus avoidance, withdrawal or protective measures in situations which might result in attention from others.

15. Fantasied Achievement: Daydreams of success in achieving extraordinary public recognition; narcissistic aspirations for personal distinction and power.

16. Harm Avoidance--Risktaking: Avoidance, withdrawal or protective measures in situations which might

result in physical pain, injury, illness or death <u>versus</u> indifference to danger; challenging or provocative disregard for personal safety; thrill-seeking.

17. Humanities--Social Sciences: The symbolic manipulation of social objects or artifacts through empirical analysis, reflection, discussion and criticism.

18. Impulsiveness--Deliberation: Impulsive, spontaneous or impetuous behavior <u>versus</u> careful, cautious, considered reflectiveness.

19. Narcissism: Preoccupation with self; erotic feelings associated with one's own body or personality.

20. Nurturance--Rejection: Supporting others by providing love, assistance, or protection <u>versus</u> disassociation from others, withholding support and friend-ship.

21. Objectivity--Projectivity: Detached, non-magical, unprejudiced, impersonal thinking <u>versus</u> super-stitious, autistic, irrational, paranoid, or otherwise egocentric perceptions and beliefs.

22. Order--Disorder: Compulsive organization of the immediate physical environment, manifested in a preoccupation with neatness, orderliness, arrangement, and meticulous attention to detail.

23. Play--Work: Pursuit of amusement and entertainment <u>versus</u> persistently purposeful, serious, task-oriented behavior.

24. Practicalness--Impracticalness: Useful, tangibly productive, nontheoretical applications of skill or experience, in manual arts, social affairs, or commercial activities.

25. Reflectiveness: Intraceptive activities; introspective preoccupation with private psychological, spiritual, esthetic, or metaphysical experience.

26. Science: The symbolic manipulation of physical objects through empirical analysis, reflection, discussion and criticism.

27. Sensuality--Puritanism: Indulgent, voluptuous sensory stimulation and gratification.

28. Sexuality--Prudishness: Erotic heterosexual interest or activity versus the denial or inhibition of such impulses.

29. Supplication--Autonomy: Dependence on others for love, assistance and protection versus detachment, independence, self-reliance.

30. Understanding: Detached intellectualization; problem-solving, analysis, theorizing or abstraction as ends in themselves.

The following definitions pertain to the institutions and students which supplied the comparative data for this study.

1. Community college: Community college is defined as a two-year public institution of higher

education offering curricula in the arts and sciences; business; technical; and health services. It is located in midwestern United States. Student population is derived from an area within a radius of approximately 25 miles of the college.

2. Service area: Service area pertains to the area from which the community college derives its students. This is an area within a radius of approximately 25 miles of the college.

3. Major university: The term "major university" in this study refers to a large land-grant state-supported university located within the service area of the community college and within the same metropolitan area.

4. Freshmen: Freshmen, whether community college or university freshmen, are students enrolled for the first time in a higher education institution. They were enrolled for their first term at the time the instrument was administered to them. They were enrolled in curricula which would lead to recognized higher education degrees.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF RELATED STUDIES

Early Studies of Needs and Press

The theoretical position as described in the previous chapter indicates that if behavior is going to be understood and predicted, it is necessary to consider not only the internal needs which characterize the individual, but also the situational determinants of behavior which are reflected in an analysis of the context within which performance is manifest.

Since Murray and others postulated this theory of understanding and predicting human behavior, there have been various attempts to assess both the internal needs of the individual and the situational determinants of behavior.

One of the first serious attempts of this nature was made by the German psychologists of the Third Reich to predict the general psychological readiness of the soldier to apply himself to a given military action (8). However, no assessment instrument is known to have been derived from these studies.

Another attempt was made by the War Office Selection Board programs for the British Army (11:VIII). The effectiveness of the British War Office Selection Board procedures was purportedly subjected to some validity studies,

however, to date the results of such an inquiry have not appeared.

By 1943 the United States established a psychological-psychiatric assessment unit in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). The OSS assessment staff was charged with the responsibility for developing a system of procedures which would review the personalities of OSS recruits to the extent of providing grounds for sufficient reliable predictions of their usefulness to their organization during the remaining years of the war (26). The procedures devised included interviews, intelligence tests, paper and pencil tests of personality, projective tests of personality, and a modified case conference to integrate the first data obtained.

Other studies were undertaken during World War II by the Army Air Force in an assessment program (18). An example of these studies is the psychological research on bombardier training.

Another study was made by Kelley and Fiske to derive predictive measures of potentially successful candidates for the Veterans Administration Clinical Psychology Program (17).

These studies provide examples of the studies which incorporated the theory concerning internal needs of the individual and situational determinants of behavior as postulated by Murray. While these studies did not point toward

a single definitive method of assessing personality needs
or the press of a particular environment, they are impor-
tant because they indicate that it was being recognized
that it is important to consider both of these variables
when assessing human behavior.

Studies of College Environment and Student Adaptation

One of the first publications to show extensive con-
cern with the interrelatedness of needs and press was Methods
in Personality Assessment by Stern, Stein, and Bloom, pub-
lished in 1956 (50). In this book Stern gave definite clues
to his interest in assessing college environments which led
to the development of the Stern Activities Index and the
College Characteristics Index. However, at about this time
several other researchers were showing interest in studying
the college environment.

Jacob was one of the first researchers to ascribe the
peculiar effect of some colleges to a distinctive institu-
tional atmosphere. He found little evidence that courses,
curricula, teaching methods or faculty had as much influence
as had been supposed (15). Riesman carefully reviewed Ja-
cob's report and indicated the distinctiveness of certain
colleges might be a reflection of the already existing view
of the students who chose to attend them (31). Jacob's
study which was methodologically studied by Barton caused
him to observe the need to study the college as a system of

interacting elements, as well as the differences between types of colleges and to determine their effects upon different types of students (2).

In a study by Dressel and Mayhew, it was noted that the schools in which the student made high gains on the Inventory of Beliefs and on the tests of critical thinking had certain institutional characteristics which were missing in the low-gain schools (5).

Eddy studied the over-all climate of 20 colleges by examining data from interviews and participant-observer notes. The character of the college was attributed to such factors as the style of personal relationships between students and faculty or among students, the physical arrangement of buildings, and the level of expectancy in performance (6).

In a series in which entrants to medical and law schools were compared, Thielens found that differences in environments resulted in differences in students' perceptions (52).

Reports from the Center for Study of Higher Education by McConnell and Heist (21) and by Heist (12) indicated that college atmosphere is fixed by the character of the student body. It was found that equating for scholastic aptitude was not adequate assurance of the similarity of student bodies. Scholastic aptitude was equated by scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test for students at 50 high-

productive schools with those from 50 low-productive schools
but it was found that students at these schools differed in
respect to several of the scales on the Omnibus Personality
Inventory and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values.
(The Omnibus Personality Inventory includes eight Minnesota
Multiphasic Inventory scales and a number of other scales
to measure intellectual interest and other attitudinal "sets"
supposedly related to scholarly activity.)

Holland asked parents to respond to a series of eight
dichotomies of college characteristics and·found that most
parents feel that there is a group of generally outstanding
institutions while about twenty percent believe that choos-
ing the "best" college must always be an individual matter
of finding a stimulating interaction between a particular
student and a particular college (14).

Holland also attempted to estimate college environment
by coding distributions of college majors at each college.
Codes of students were measured by a Parental Attitude Re-
search Inventory. He said that the findings did not lend
themselves to explicit interpretation, but suggested that
when codes of students and college correspond that change
is less likely to occur than when codes are discrepant (13).

Astin examined the Ph.D. producing rates of 36 col-
leges which were selected because they were attended by
large numbers of National Merit Scholars. It was shown that
a college's productivity rates are related to characteristics

of its entering students other than just academic ability;
namely, the percentage planning to major in the natural
sciences and the percentage aspiring to the Ph.D. degree (1).

These studies are indicative of the increased atten-
tion which was given to the study of college environments
at about the time Stern developed the <u>Activities Index</u> and
the <u>College Characteristics Index</u>. The methodologies and
instruments employed in these studies varied considerably,
but they generally indicated the importance of the college
climate.

<u>Studies which Employed the Stern Activities</u>
<u>Index and the College Characteristics Index</u>

Immediately following the development of the <u>Activi-</u>
<u>ties Index</u> and the <u>College Characteristics Index</u>, which are de-
scribed in the "Description of the Instruments" section of
this paper, they were employed in a number of studies of
college environments and students' needs. The <u>Indexes</u> have
met with rather wide acceptance as evidenced by their con-
tinued use by a sizeable number of researchers in assessing
the needs of students and college climates. These studies
will be cited as they have relevance to the reliability of
the instruments, their validity, their use in assessing col-
lege students' needs, and in the measurement of the environ-
mental press of colleges.

Studies Related to Reliability

The statements relative to reliability of the Stern Activities Index found in the Preliminary Manual are made with respect to profile patterns obtained by means of vector analysis. Stern states, "No convenient statistic exists for this purpose, although visual inspection of test-retest profiles suggests that a correlation based on a multivariate surface corresponding to the profile determinants should be quite high" (42:30). He cites a study made by Haring to substantiate this statement (10). In this study 122 school teachers were retested after seven months of participation in a workshop program. The pre-post correlations were based on a tetrachoric approximation and the average of the coefficients was .69. A smaller sample of 11 social workers involved in a two-week work shop yielded product-moment test-retest coefficients ranging from .67 to .94 with an average of .88.

The most extensive statement regarding the reliability of the Indexes is reported by Stern and is based on 1993 College Characteristic Indexes and 1078 Activities Indexes from undergraduates in 32 schools (40:706). Table 1 shows the reliability coefficients for each of the scales of the Activities Index and the College Characteristic Index.

Concerning the above Stern says, "...the scale means on both instruments average only slightly above the arbitrary midpoint of 5.0, with standard deviations which

TABLE 1.--Reliability coefficients for the scales of the
Activities Index and College Characteristic Index[a]

Scale	Reliability[b]	
	AI	CCI
Abasement	.51	.67
Achievement	.73	.81
Adaptiveness	.64	.58
Affiliation-rejection	.81	.69
Aggression-blameavoidance	.69	.72
Change-sameness	.67	.44
Conjunctivity-disjunctivity	.70	.72
Counteraction-infavoidance	.66	.50
Deference	.56	.60
Dominance	.77	.57
Ego-achievement	.80	.58
Emotionality-placidity	.64	.56
Energy-passivity	.40	.70
Exhibitionism-infavoidance	.75	.57
Fantasied achievement	.72	.40
Harmavoidance	.67	.70
Humanism	.83	.77
Impulsion-deliberation	.64	.50
Narcissism	.71	.74
Nurturance-rejection	.73	.70
Objectivity	.56	.70
Order	.82	.59
Play	.71	.75
Pragmatism	.74	.69
Reflectiveness	.68	.76
Scientism	.88	.77
Sentience	.53	.80
Sex-prudery	.78	.71
Succorance-autonomy	.67	.34
Understanding	.74	.75
MEAN	.69	.65

[a]Adapted from Table 1 (40:706).

[b]Kuder-Richardson Formula 20.

indicate that a considerable number of respondents are to be found with extreme scores at either end of the ten-point range. The average scale reliability of .67 (Kuder-Richardson) is close to the practical maximum for scales of such short length, corresponding to a value of .92 if increased from ten to thirty items" (40:707). While it is not expressly stated by the author, it is obvious that interitem consistency was measured to determine the reliability.

In another study, Stern, Schultz, and Naugle studied the Activities Index to determine its resistance to faking (49). One group was instructed to complete the test as if they were responding for self, for employment as salesman, and for employment as librarian. Another group was instructed to complete the test as if they were responding for self, for an aggressive person, and for a withdrawn person. Despite concensus on the vocational responses, differences were negligible between them and self. Response patterns for self and the two personality treatments were widely divergent and extremely significant. Stern concludes that responses to needs scale items appear to be resistant to faking.

Stern cites another study (46:46) which has not been published which showed that the social desirability of needs scale items is relatively homogeneous, none being considered important to accept or to reject by any significant number of subjects.

Merwin and DiVesta reported a study of need theory and career choice which supports the reliability of the Activities Index. Certain scales from this Index were used to measure needs of a teaching and non-teaching group. The subjects respond on a six-point scale instead of two. There was evidence of stability over a four month period in which there were attempts to influence the subjects through positive and negative communication. Coefficients obtained were .53 for Achievement; .53 for Affiliation; .64 for Dominance; and .60 for Exhibition (23).

The following study pertains mainly to the validity of the College Characteristics Index, but reference is also made to the support given to the reliability of the instrument.

Studies Related to the Validity
of the College Characteristics
Index

The difficulty of determining the validity of tests of personality is well known. Ideally, the data yielded by an instrument purporting to measure some personality characteristic should be correlated with a reliable criterion. Difficulty is encountered when a reliable criterion is not available. Essentially the same difficulty was encountered in establishing the validity of the College Characteristics Index which was designed to measure the climate or environmental press of colleges. No completely adequate criterion

exists with which to make correlations. The best criteria

seem to be judgments of qualified persons and the obvious

differences or measures of differences between different

types of institutions. Thus, if the data yielded by

the College Characteristics Index agrees with the judgments

of qualified persons regarding the press of a particular

institution, some degree of validity has been established.

Likewise, validity tends to be established if the Index

differentiates between colleges which are known to be

different, such as a small denominational college and a

large state university. Studies of such correlations have

been made and an account of them follows.

Immediately following the development of the College

Characteristics Index, it was administered to 423 students

and 71 faculty members at five institutions (29). Most

of the students were upperclassmen and most faculty members

were from upper academic ranks. It was argued that if a

dominant press really exists in a particular environment,

almost any group of people living in the environment would

probably identify it. Five institutions were chosen

because observers would probably agree that they differ

from one another with respect to the selection of students.

The following types of institutions were represented: a

large midwestern state university, a large midwestern

private university, a large eastern university, a large

moderate-size eastern private college for men, a publicly

supported college in metropolitan New York. The study was intended as a preliminary try-out of the model to provide some evidence of its reliability and construct validity.

In an item analysis each of the 30 scales was subjected to analysis in five different samples. The total number of item discrimination indexes obtained was 1500. Of these 1500, one percent was negative, 18 percent fell between .0 and .19, 30 percent fell between .20 and .39 and 51 percent were .40 or higher. In other words, 81 percent of the items had, on the average, moderate to high discrimination in their respective scales.

The part of this study which related to validity was based on arbitrary definitions of what levels of scores constituted a press. A press was identified when the mean scores for a particular institution fell in the upper or lower one-fourth of the total distribution. While no estimate of the validity of these descriptions was available, they did show quite clearly that they did identify different environments and that the test is capable of revealing some sharp distinctions between colleges which qualified observers would expect to be different. The evidence, therefore, was claimed to be relevant to the property of validity. For example, the rank order mean scores for college A correlates .06 with the rank order mean scores of college B.

Concerning this particular study, Pace and Stern said: "Perhaps the most important approach is one which treats reliability and validity as inseparable and deals with the institution as a whole. For example, do different people characterize the institution the same way? This involves the reliability of profiles, with all their interrelationships. As a first approximation of this, the rank order of mean scores from the students' responses can be compared with the rank order of the mean scores from faculty responses within the same institution. Thus, do these groups see the institution in relatively the same pattern? For the two colleges which had the largest number of faculty respondents, these rank order correlations were .96 and .88" (29:275).

A much more recent study was conducted by Stern (35) for the primary purpose of analyzing the intellectual climate in colleges, although other factors were also analyzed. The study included 1076 students located at 23 different colleges which included several large state universities, metropolitan schools, small private colleges both church-related and nondenominational, accredited and non-accredited, and a number of technical programs. They were most heavily concentrated in the midwest, but colleges from the northeast, the middle Atlantic states, the south, and the far northwest were also represented. Most of the schools were represented by one general upper-class sample.

Six distinctive factors associated with different
types of schools were identified by the College Characteristics
Index data which were gathered from the entire sample.
The schools which scored high on the Intellectual Orientation
factor were the elite liberal arts colleges. Social
Effectiveness was associated with these liberal arts
colleges and several of the select denominational colleges.
Play was most prominent at several large state universities
and several large private universities of a similar
character. Friendliness or informal social organization
was characteristic of a mixed group of schools. The
denominational colleges were characterized by the Constraint
or compliance factor. The state teachers colleges were
characterized by the Dominance-Submission or custodial
care factor.

Fifty schools were compared on the Intellectual
Climate score and the Knapp-Greenbaum Index, which is
based upon the number of various awards and doctorate
degrees awarded. The correlation between these measures
was .80.

The correlation between the Intellectual Climate
score and the percent of graduates receiving Ph.D. degrees
between 1936 and 1956 at 37 colleges was .76.

Forty-one colleges were compared on the Intellectual
Climate score and the percentage of National Merit
Scholarships Finalists among entering students. The

correlation was .49 on these measures, but the relation-
ship to the number of Merit Scholars at all class levels
was .59 at 25 schools. The National Merit Scholarship
Qualifying Test means at 38 schools correlated .71 with
the Intellectual Climate score.

There was a correlation of .83 with the College
Board Verbal mean scores and .34 for the College Board
Mathematical mean scores at 16 colleges.

Many other aspects of the environments of the colleges
were also studied and permited Stern to draw certain
conclusions about what constitutes a favorable intellectual
climate; however, correlations cited above are the most
pertinent to the validity of the College Characteristics
Index.

Two other studies by Stern (40,45) which show signifi-
cant relationships between press profiles and the types
of institutions will not be treated here as extensively as
the foregoing study. Rather, the findings as summarized by
Stern (46:47-50) will be given.

Most of the schools studied had high scores involving
various aspects of constraint and dependency. It was
found that the denominational schools were most extreme
in their emphasis on conformity, while the liberal arts
colleges were least so.

The private liberal arts colleges were highest in
intellectual press. Another group of schools were described

by their students as sources of social pleasure and togetherness, but lacking in academic strength or direction.

Stern claims that the essential details of the analysis given above was supported in a subsequent analysis by Pace (27) although a substantially different analytic model was used.

In this study (27) Pace studied College Characteristics Index data from groups of students at 32 institutions, consisting of liberal arts colleges (highly selective and relatively unselective, nonsectarian and denominational coeducational and non-coeducational), universities (public and private), and various professional schools (education, engineering, and business, some separate and some parts of larger universities). He found that there were basically five types of college environments: humanistic; scientific; practical, status-oriented; those characterized by human relations and group welfare; and those character- ized by rebelliousness. These patterns of environmental press were quite different at three types of colleges: high intellectual colleges, high practical colleges, and high social colleges.

McFee made a study (22) which she claims tends to confirm the College Characteristics Index as an objective indicator between colleges. In this study she used the College Characteristics Index and the Activities

<u>Index</u> to discover that the responses to 88 percent of the
300 <u>College Characteristics Index</u> items were independent
of the parallel needs of the respondent.

Stern cites certain other studies which have not been
published but which he claims support the validity of the
<u>College Characteristics Index</u>. He sayd, "Descriptions of
college environments based solely on press profiles appear
to be recognized and confirmed by academic participants
and observers" (40:710).

<u>Studies Related to the Validity of the</u>
<u>Stern Activities Index</u>

Most of the studies which have utilized the <u>College</u>
<u>Characteristics Index</u> and the <u>Activities Index</u> have been
for the express purpose of understanding the environmental
press of colleges and in these studies the validity of the
<u>Activities Index</u> seems to have been an assumed factor. This
assumption has probably been based upon the claims for its
validity in the <u>Preliminary Manual</u> (42). Since this manual
is preliminary in nature, the author implies that studies
cited therein which relate to validity will be discussed
fully in a later manual. To date, however, a revised manual
has not been published. It seems reasonable to expect that
when the revised manual is published, it will include inform-
ation substantiating the validity of the <u>Activities Index</u>.

Certain studies have been cited by the author of the
<u>Activities Index</u> (35,40,42,46) which he claims support the

validity of the instrument. Not all of these studies have been published, some are more pertinent to validity than others, and some do seem to support validity.

Certainly, the most extensive inquiry into the validity of the Activities Index was made by Scanlon (34). The 73 subjects for this study were medical school students who were administered the Index during the first week of medical school. The following spring, when a sufficient time has elapsed for the class members to become acquainted, sociometric questionnaires which were supposed to yield criteria for comparisons were administered. The data from the Activities Index were analyzed by vector analysis and behavior ratings were derived from the sociometric questionnaires which were called Data Verification Questionnaires. The Index profiles were classified by vector summaries and compared with student ratings of personality characteristics of classmates rated on the Data Verification Questionnaire. The following correlations were computed: Group A, N=2 (too small to test significance), r=1.00; Group B, N=7, r=.57; Group C, N=27, r=.16; Group D, N=12, r=.19; Group E, N=18, r=.13; Group F, N=7, r=.78; Total, N=73, r=.39. Scanlon felt that these findings did not permit an unequivocal acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. He said of his study, "It seems a more reasonable course to question the soundness of the design as to question the validity of the Index" (34:116). The flaw in

the design was felt to be in the grouping of the subjects'
responses on the Data Verification Questionnaire. Scanlon
said, "It is apparent from the overall correlation that
student and Activities Index rankings agree, at least on
a statistically significant level when the groupings are
eliminated" (34:116).

In a study cited by Stern (9; 40:708,709; 47) the
Inventory of Beliefs was used as the criterion for
classifying three groups of college freshmen (23 in each)
as anti-authoritarians, authoritarians, and rationals.
They were then administered the Activities Index and the
responses of the three groups were compared. The anti-
authoritarians appeared to be the most outgoing of the
three groups since their Activities Index responses suggested
a higher degree of self-assertiveness, emotional spontaneity,
and aggressiveness than either of the others. The
authoritarians appeared to be more submissive and with-
drawn. They also rejected intellectual activities. The
rationals seemed to be a more socialized version of the
anti-authoritarians in being socially outgoing but non-
aggressive, and in having even broader, less specific
humanistic intellectual interests. These descriptions
derived from the Index were claimed to "fit" the descript-
ions ascribed the various groups on the basis of the
Inventory of Beliefs.

In a study in which The Activities Index was used to discriminate between teachers from four elementary schools participating in a workshop program designed to change attitudes towards exceptional children, the assessment made by the Index was confirmed by independent analyses of workshop transcriptions (10).

The Activities Index was used by Wassertheil to study the need patterns of negative and positive individuals. He found significant differences on Index subscales between extreme scorers on positivity-negativity index of Thematic Apperception Test protocols. Also, differences suggested by Activities Index patterns were confirmed in independent TAT analysis (56).

Briggs used the Activities Index as a means of measuring social acceptability. Students at a summer reading camp were assessed by the Index and rated independently by counselors. Correlation of .59 was found between the Index scores and the independent counselor ratings (4).

The Activities Index was used successfully in differentiating between four vocational groups and four academic groups. Significant differences were found between medical doctors and medical students, between salesmen and business administration students, between research chemists and engineering freshmen, and between elementary education teachers and freshmen education majors (51). A similar study showed significant relationships between needs scale profiles and career choice (48).

Significant relationships have been shown to exist between needs scale profiles derived from the Activities Index and certain forms of overt behavior such as reading skills (4, 9, 42).

Stern cites various unpublished studies which he claims support the validity of the Activities Index. One such study used the Strong Vocational Interest Blank as the independent criterion (42:31). Another used the Rorschach, the Thematic Apperception Test and Sentence Completion protocols as independent criteria (42:31). Behavioral descriptions based on needs scale profiles derived from the Activities Index appeared to be recognized and confirmed by peers, psychiatrists, and administrators (35:7). Activities Index protocols from six parents of children under therapy were analyzed blindly. The unidentified descriptions were positively identified by an attending psychiatrist who noted agreement between the Index appraisal and clinical appraisal (42:34). Extensive differences were found between Activities Index patterns for 20 male neuro-psychiatric patients and 20 sanitation workers who were matched for age (42:34). In one study, the Activities Index itself was used as the criterion for "independent information about personalities" (16:312).

Studies of Students' Needs and Colleges' Press

In the analysis of studies which tend to establish the reliability and validity of the Activities Index and

the College Characteristics Index mention was made of
several studies which had to do with students' needs and
colleges' press. Not all of those studies will be re-
classified under this section of this paper, but studies
will be analyzed which have relevance for this study in
that they have also investigated students' needs and
colleges' press.

One such study, reported by Stern, involved an analysis
of 32 schools where both the College Characteristics Index
and the Activities Index were given. It was found that
the differences among institutional environments were
substantially greater than the differences among student
bodies. Some tendency was noted for students to be found
at institutions where the environmental press was compatible
with their personality needs (38).

Stern also cites unpublished data which indicates
that students describe their own institutions in terms of
press scale scores that are significantly more alike than
the corresponding scale means among different institutions.
It was also shown that students enrolled in the same
institution have needs scale scores significantly more
alike than students at different institutions (40:713).

Thistlethwaite reported (55) that certain scales of
the College Characteristics Index were found to be more
highly correlated with institutional productivity in natural
sciences, while other scales were highly correlated with

institutional productivity in social sciences, arts, and
humanities. The institutional productivity indexes were
equated for initial talent-supply differences, so that the
resulting correlations were presumably more clearly
dependent upon environmental characteristics than upon
student characteristics.

In another study reported by Thistlethwaite (53)
National Merit Scholarship winners or near-winners were
given the College Characteristics Index to discover
differences in institutional traits at 12 "most productive
institutions" and 12 "least productive institutions." The
percentage of difference in responses ranged as high as 58
percent, suggesting that the productivity measures had
substantial validity (28).

Thistlethwaite also studied changes in the study
plans of 987 men and 513 women from 327 different universi-
ties and found that the press of the faculty as measured
by a modified version of the College Characteristics Index
was associated with changes in student's plans to seek
advanced training. Traits attributed to teachers who were
most influential upon students varied considerably from field
to field (54).

Mauksch made a study based upon Murray's theory in
which he studied nurses' and student nurses' self per-
ceptions, and perceptions of the role of nursing. His
instruments were the Stern Activities Index and the

Professional Characteristics Inventory. He also analyzed
institutional factors and their effects on the nurse.
His findings showed that certain needs are characteristic
for the person in nursing, and that the role expectations
on the nurse are due to the institutionalization of
medical care, the complexity of the hospital, and the
controls demanded by illness (20).

An incoming class of more than 2,000 entrants at a
major eastern university were compared on their responses
to the High School Characteristics Index and the College
Characteristics Index (39). At least three distinctive
findings were reported: (1) Students with different high
school backgrounds including public school, private
preparatory, and parochial described their respective high
school press in ways which differ significantly from each
other. (2) The students' descriptions of the expected
press of the college were highly consistent with one
another, regardless of their high school backgrounds.
(3) Freshmen press profiles described the expected
intellectual activities at an unrealistically high level
as compared with senior press profiles from the same
institution (40:712).

Since the development of the Indexes normative data
have been gathered for both instruments. Average values
for each of the 30 scales have been reported for Liberal
Arts Colleges, Denominational Colleges, University Colleges,
Engineering Colleges, Business Administration Colleges,

and Teacher Training Colleges. Average values are also given for the total of the last three colleges mentioned above, and for all schools mentioned above. The total number of subjects tested on the College Characteristics Index was 1,993 and on the Stern Activities Index, 1,385 (36, 37, 43, 44).

In addition to these normative data other data have been compiled on large numbers of students from a variety of colleges. These data include: intercorrelations between Activities Index and College Characteristics Index means at 43 colleges (46:51, 52); College Characteristics Index stanine means for 573 senior men and 463 senior women at the same institution (46: 54-57); College Characteristics Index stanine means and Activities Index stanine means for a total senior class of 1,036 from a university-affiliated college (46: 59-61, 64-66); information regarding the College Characteristics Index and Activities Index scales contributing to differentiation between seniors in 16 different majors at the same institution (46:62, 67); mean distance between Activities Index and College Characteristics Index resultants for 32 schools of six general types (40:718); statistics showing the relationships between college environment and student personality (intellectual orientation, social relationships, and emotional expression) for 1,993 upperclassmen in 32 American colleges (35:16-18); and comparisons of schools at

opposite extremes of an intellectual climate score

(measured by the College Characteristics Index) and

various other factors such as financial assets, sources of

income, student activities, and types of institutional

control (35: 21-32).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Description of the Instruments

In 1938, H. A. Murray introduced a taxonomy for
classifying both the environmental pressures and the
characteristic ways in which an individual strives to
structure the environment for himself. The external
pressures were called "press" and their internal counter-
parts were called "needs" (25).

The Stern Activities Index and the College
Characteristics Index are questionnaires developed for
the measurement of needs and press, respectively. These
Indexes are based upon the rationale that the determination
of needs characterizing an individual can only be made from
an examination of the interactions in which he engages,
and needs may therefore be identified as a taxonomic
classification of the characteristic behaviors manifested
by individuals in their life transactions. Furthermore,
the assumption is made that in place of actual interactions
the individual can be asked to indicate his preferences
among various possible activities offered for his
consideration. Although the relationship between these
choices and actual behavior will be imperfect, a useful

approximation is obtained. This rationale applies to such instruments as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Kuder Preference Record, the Edwards Personal Preference Record, as well as to the Indexes being considered here (42).

The needs of an individual are inferred from the things that he typically does and are measured by the Stern Activities Index. This Index was prepared originally by George G. Stern in collaboration with B. S. Bloom, H. I. Stein, and H. Lane for use in the Chicago studies of student personality assessment (50). It consists of 300 items describing commonplace daily activities distributed among 30 scales of ten items each, to which the individual records his like or dislike (42).

The College Characteristics Index was developed by Stern in collaboration with C. R. Pace and has a design similar to that of the Activities Index (29). These items, however, describe activities, policies, procedures, attitudes, and impressions that might be characteristic of various types of undergraduate college settings. This Index also consists of 300 items distributed among 30 scales of ten items each, to which the individual records his like or dislike (42).

The 30 scales are identified by the same titles and definitions for both Indexes. Thus, for example, the Abasement scale on the Stern Activities Index

indicates the individual's abasement need; whereas the same scale on the College Characteristics Index indicates the student's perception of the pressure toward the development of student abasement responses at the school which he attends. For example, students with high needs for abasement might regard a school with a strong press for abasement as an especially congenial place to be. In the "Definitions" section of this paper each of the 30 scales was defined.

In the chapter on "Analysis of Related Studies" examples of studies have been cited which related to the reliability and validity of the Indexes.

Sample

In order to study the problem as developed in the "Statement of the Problems" the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index were administered to a sample of university students and community college students who reside within the service area of the community college.

The sample of community college students was obtained by administering the Indexes to all full-time students of a freshman class (356 in number). Each of these community college students was given a number and a table of random numbers was entered to obtain a random sample of community college students (7: 472-473). All community college students reside within the service area of the college.

The sample of university students was obtained by administering the Indexes to a group of randomly selected group of full-time students of a freshman class. Some of the students comprising this randomly selected group did not reside within the service area of the community college, therefore, it was necessary to select from this group only those who resided within the service area. This was done by sorting out every student whose address was within the service area. These comprised the sample of university students.

Procedures

The scales were combined to form 23 factors in the way described in the definitions section of this paper. For example: Ego Achievement, Dominance, Exhibitionism, and Fantasied Achievement raw scores were combined to form the Self Assertion factor for each student. These factors were derived by means of factor analysis and Stern, who developed the Indexes, verbally recommended to the writer that they be used in this research in the manner just described. The method has since been described in a paper by Saunders (33) and its application has been explained by Stern (43). The score for a given factor represents the total raw scores obtained from the scales which combined constitute a factor.

The factors which pertain to the community college and its students were compared with corresponding factors

for the university and its students. Tests for signifi-
cant differences for each of the 23 factors were made
by the t test.

In addition to studying the sample of university
students and community college students with regard to
their responses on the Indexes, they were also compared
as to the size of their high school graduating classes,
their fathers' occupations, and their scores on the
College Qualification Tests.

The father's occupation were determined by
referring to the student's application to his college or
university on which the student had recorded this
information. These data were quantified by using the
Socioeconomic Index Scale (32: 263-275).

The students' performance on the College Qualification
Tests were obtained from the students' records. Both
the community college students and the university students
took these tests prior to entering their respective
schools. The total raw score was used. This score is
obtained by combining the raw scores for each of the
three parts of the tests: Verbal, Numerical, and
Information (Science and Social Science) (3:10).

The size of the student's high school graduating
class was obtained from the high school record which
was submitted as the student made application to his
respective school.

For each of these variables: father's occupation, The <u>College Qualification Tests</u> Total score, and the size of high school graduating class, the median was calculated for the university and community college students combined. Both university students and community college students were then grouped according to their positions above or below the median on each of these three variables. The Chi square test was then applied to determine significant difference on each of the three variables.

<div align="center">Hypotheses</div>

The following hypotheses were tested within the framework of the foregoing design. The <u>t</u> test of means (two-tailed) was applied for Hypotheses I through XXIII and the median test was applied for hypotheses XXIV through XXVI. The .01 level of significance was used for both tests as the criterion to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis I: There is a significant difference between the Aspiration Level factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis II: There is a significant difference between the Intellectual Climate factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis III: There is a significant difference between the Student Dignity factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis IV: There is a significant difference between the Academic Climate factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis V: There is a significant difference between the Academic Achievement factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis VI: There is a significant difference between the Self Expression factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis VII: There is a significant difference between the Group Life factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis VIII: There is a significant difference between the Academic Organization factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis IX: There is a significant difference between the Social Form Factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis X: There is a significant difference between the Play factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis XI: There is a significant difference between the Vocational Climate factor at the community college and the same factor at the university.

Hypothesis XII: There is a significant difference between the Self Assertion factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XIII: There is a significant difference between the Audacity-Timidity factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XIV: There is a significant difference between the Intellectual Interests factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XV: There is a significant difference between the Motivation factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XVI: There is a significant difference between the Applied Interests factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XVII: There is a significant difference between the Orderliness factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XVIII: There is a significant difference between the Submissiveness factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XIX: There is a significant difference between the Closeness factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XX: There is a significant difference between the Sensuousness factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXI: There is a significant difference between the Friendliness factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXII: There is a significant difference between the Expressiveness-Constraint factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXIII: There is a significant difference between the Egoism-Diffidence factor for community college freshmen and the same factor for university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXIV: There is a significant difference between previous academic environment, as determined by size of high school graduating class, for community college freshmen and university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXV: There is a significant difference between socioeconomic status, as determined by fathers' occupations, for community college freshmen and university freshmen.

Hypothesis XXVI: There is a significant difference between academic background, as determined by College Qualification Tests, for community college freshmen and university freshmen.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The study was designed to provide comparisons of community college students and university students on five variables: perceptions of their respective institutions, personality needs, previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background.

It was found that 90 of the randomly selected university students who were given the Indexes resided within the service area of the community college. Ninety community college students who were given the Indexes were randomly selected in the manner previously described. These 90 university students and 90 community college students comprised the sample for the study.

The students' perceptions of their respective institutions were determined by their scores on the College Characteristics Index and data on their personality needs were obtained from their scores on the Stern Activities Index. These data were obtained for the total sample.

The students' previous academic environments were determined by the size of their high school graduating classes. Data on this variable were obtained for 90 university students and for 89 community college students.

Socioeconomic status was determined by the students'
fathers' occupations. Data on this variable were available
for 79 university students and 83 community college students
and were quantified by using the Socioeconomic Index
Scale (32:263-275).

Students' academic backgrounds were determined by
their scores on the College Qualification Tests. Data on
this variable were available for 90 university students and
86 community college students.

Tests for significant differences between community
college and university students on the Stern Activities
Index and the College Characteristics Index were made by
means of the t test while tests for significant differ-
ences as to previous academic environment, socioeconomic
status, and academic background were made by means of the
median test. The hypothesis in each case was that signif-
icant difference would exist.

The thirty scales of the College Characteristics Index
were combined to form eleven factors. These were: Aspir-
ation Level, Intellectual Climate, Student Dignity, Academic
Climate, Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life,
Academic Organization, Social Form, Play, and Vocational
Climate. Table 2 shows the mean scores and standard devi-
ations on these factors for community college and univer-
sity students, as well as the F and t values.

It will be noted that significant differences were ob-
tained between community college and university students on

each of the eleven <u>College Characteristics Index</u> factors.
Thus, all the hypotheses regarding the students' perceptions
of their respective institutions were supported.

The thirty scales of the <u>Stern Activities Index</u> were
combined to form twelve factors. These were: Self Assertion,
Audacity-Timidity, Intellectual Interests, Motivation, Applied
Interests, Orderliness, Submissiveness, Closeness, Sensuous-
ness, Friendliness, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Ego-
Diffidence. Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard devia-
tions on these factors for community college and university
students, as well as the F and $\underline{t}$ values. A test of means,
the $\underline{t}$, showed significant difference at the .01 level for
Self Assertion, Audicity-Timidity, Motivation, Friendliness,
Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. There was
significant difference at the .02 level for Submissiveness.
Thus, the hypotheses regarding the difference between the
personality needs of community college students and the
university students were supported for six of the twelve
factors. There were no significant differences in their
Intellectual Interests, Applied Interests, Orderliness, Close-
ness, and Sensuousness factors.

When community college students were compared with
university students as to the size of their high school
graduating classes, it was found that significant differ-
ences exist between these two groups. The common median
for the two groups was 194.5. Table 4 shows that 33 com-
munity college students were below this median, while 56

university students were below. Fifty-six community col-
lege students were above the median as compared to 33 uni-
versity students. When the Chi-square test was applied to
these data, the results showed significant difference at the
.01 level.

When the occupations of the fathers of community col-
lege and university students were translated to a socio-
economic index and then compared, it was found that there
was no significant difference between these two groups.
Table 5 shows that 39 community college students were below
the common median of 50, while 37 university students were
below. Forty-four community college students were above the
median as compared to 42 university students. The Chi-
square was .0003 for no significant difference.

When comparing the community college and university
students on the College Qualification Tests it was found
that significant differences exist at the .01 level between
these two groups. The common median for the two groups
was 114 on the College Qualification Tests Total score.
Table 6 shows that 52 community college students fell be-
low the median, as compared to 36 university students.
Thirty-four community college students were above the median,
while 54 university students were above. When the Chi-
square test was applied to these data, the results showed
significant difference at the .01 level.

It has been shown that significant differences exist
on seven of the twelve factors relating to the students'
personality needs and that significant differences exist
on all of the eleven factors relating to their perceptions
of their respective institutions. It has also been shown
that they differed significantly as to their previous aca-
demic environment and academic background, but that they
did not differ significantly as to their socioeconomic
status.

64

TABLE 2.--Comparison of mean scores on College Characteristics Index for community college and university freshmen

Factor	Community College N=90		University N=90		F	t Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Aspirational Level	19.87	5.83	29.19	3.69	2.50	12.81 sig at .01
Intellectual Climate	23.44	6.73	32.87	4.14	2.64	11.33 sig at .01
Student Dignity	23.03	3.14	17.71	2.40	1.72	-12.76 sig at .01
Academic Climate	11.30	3.51	14.53	2.74	1.63	6.88 sig at .01
Academic Achievement	32.90	5.20	36.23	4.34	1.43*	4.67 sig at .01
Self Expression	20.36	5.02	27.18	3.51	2.05	10.56 sig at .01
Group Life	19.61	4.76	25.08	3.42	1.93	8.86 sig at .01
Academic Organization	38.17	5.27	31.34	3.80	1.93	- 9.97 sig at .01
Social Form	20.39	5.97	33.27	3.93	2.31	17.10 sig at .01
Play-Work	17.77	4.63	24.33	2.80	2.73	11.49 sig at .01
Vocational Climate	28.98	3.73	25.67	3.49	1.14*	6.15 sig at .01

*Homogeneous

TABLE 3.--Comparison of mean scores on Stern Activities Index for community college and university freshmen

Factor	Community College N=90		University N=90		F	t Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Self Assertion	16.67	8.37	21.38	3.17	6.96	- 4.99 sig at .01
Audacity-Timidity	15.92	6.61	22.10	3.76	3.10	- 7.70 sig at .01
Intellectual Interests	21.02	7.59	20.47	3.55	4.58	.62 not sig
Motivation	23.46	7.43	21.13	3.11	5.71	2.74 sig at .01
Applied Interests	15.72	6.11	14.87	3.07	3.96	1.18 not sig
Orderliness	20.58	6.75	19.46	5.54	1.48*	1.36 not sig
Submissiveness	21.76	7.07	19.52	4.46	2.51	2.54 sig at .02
Closeness	23.41	7.46	22.57	4.09	3.33	.94 not sig
Sensuousness	14.33	5.99	15.59	3.31	3.27	- 1.75 not sig
Friendliness	12.78	4.26	9.72	2.48	2.95	5.89 sig at .01
Expressiveness-Constraint	16.16	7.17	21.19	3.81	3.55	- 5.88 sig at .01
Egoism-Diffidence	10.41	4.43	16.85	4.40	1.01*	- 9.78 sig at .01

*Homogeneous

TABLE 4.--Number of community college and university students
graduated from high school classes above and below
the common median of 194.5

Students	Below Median	Above Median	Total
Community college	33	56	89
University	56	33	89
Total	89	89	178

Chi-square = 11.89. Significant at .01 (.01 = 6.64)

TABLE 5.--Number of community college and university students
whose socioeconomic index fell above and below the
common median of 50

Students	Below Median	Above Median	Total
Community college	39	44	83
University	37	42	79
Total	76	86	162

Chi-square = .0003. No significant difference.

TABLE 6.--Number of community college and university students
who scored above and below the common median of 114
on the College Qualification Tests

Students	Below Median	Above Median	Total
Community college	52	34	86
University	36	54	90
Total	88	88	176

Chi-square = 7.37. Significant at .01 (.01 = 6.64)

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The theory underlying the hypotheses of this study indicates that if there are differences in the community college and university students' perceptions of the "press" of their respective institutions, then it should be expected that differences would also be found in the personality "needs" of the students attending the two institutions. This theory is tentatively supported in previous studies by Stern which show a decided relationship between the mean "needs" scores and mean "press" scores at 43 institutions. The average level of specific needs among students at a given college tends to match the average level of the corresponding press at the same college (45).

Furthermore, it was noted that if the students' choices of institutions were determined only by their needs and their perceptions of the press of the two institutions they should differ significantly on these factors. Since it was doubtful that their selections of institutions were determined by only these two factors, three other factors which could affect their choices were also studied. Therefore, if differences were not found between the students of the two institutions with respect to personality needs and their perceptions of their respective institutions,

then the three factors, previous academic environment, socio-economic status, and academic background could possibly explain the lack of difference.

Students' Perceptions of their
Respective Institutions

In the analysis of data it was seen that community college students did differ significantly from university students on each of the eleven factors of the College Characteristics Index. Thus, hypotheses I through XI were affirmed. It was stated that these differences could be expected because there is, in fact, great differences between the institutions. The differences which were confirmed by the perceptions of the students as determined by their responses on the College Characteristics Index will now be more closely examined.

One overriding characteristic of the differences should first be noted. Reference is made to the fact that on each of the eleven factors except three the university students perceived their institution to be "greater" or "more" than that perceived by community college students concerning their institution. This is shown in Table 2 where the mean scores for the university students on eight of the eleven factors are greater than the mean scores for community college students. These eight factors were: Aspirational Level, Intellectual Climate, Academic Climate, Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life, Social Form, and Play-Work. The three remaining factors had higher mean scores at the community college than at the university. These included:

Student Dignity, Adademic Organization, and Vocational
Climate.

What differences between these two institutions could
possibly explain these differences in the ways they are per-
ceived by their students? Perhaps these differences between
the institutions are obvious ones which become apparent upon
closer examination of the College Characteristics Index mean
scores.

It seems that the factors which had higher mean scores
for the university fall into two broad categories, those
which have some relationship to the academic climate and those
which have some relationship to the student or group life. The
first category includes the factors of Aspirational Level, In-
tellectual Climate, Academic Climate, and Academic Achievement.

The higher mean score for the Aspirational Level factor
at the university means that the university students perceive
their institution as encouraging them to set high standards
for themselves in a variety of ways. They also feel that they
will be introduced to individuals and ideas likely to serve as
models of intellectual and professional achievement.

The higher mean score for the Intellectual Climate
factor at the university implies that the university stu-
dents see the qualities of staff and plant specifically
devoted to scholarly activities in the humanities, arts, and
social sciences. Likewise, the higher Academic Climate fac-
tor indicates that they perceive excellent in staff and

facilities in the areas of the natural science, social science, and the humanities.

The higher mean score for the Academic Achievement factor implies that the university students perceive their institution as setting high standards of achievement for its students. These standards include course work, examinations, honors, and similar devices.

The university students feel that these things are more true of their institution than do the community college students concerning their institution. What obvious differences between the two institutions could account for this? One obvious difference is the selective admissions policy on admissions at the community college. This fact could easily account for the higher scores by university students on the Aspirational Level factor and the Academic Achievement factor.

Another obvious difference is the long and continued emphasis at the university on general education, including specific courses in the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities as compared to the short history and less explicit general education program at the community college. This helps to account for the higher scores by university students on the Academic Climate factor and the Intellectual Climate factor.

The university also has a wider variety of educational programs and these are offered at more depth than at the

community college. These programs obviously require more staff and facilities. These programs are probably equated with excellence and scholarly activity and possibly contributed to higher scores on the Academic Climate factor and the Academic Achievement factor.

The second broad category into which the higher College Characteristics mean scores for the university seem to fall has to do with student or group life and includes Group Life, Social Form, Play-Work, and Self Expression.

The higher scores on the Group Life factor by the university mean that the students perceive their institution as fostering various forms of mutually supportive group activities among the student body. The higher Social Form scores mean that the university students see rather formal institutionalization of the activities represented in the Group Life factor and opportunities for the development of social skills of a formal nature.

The higher scores on the Play-Work factor at the university mean that the university students see their institution as providing opportunity for the collegiate play activities typically associated with colleges. Closely related to this is the opportunity offered to the university student for the development of leadership potential and self assurance through participation in highly visible activities. This condition apparently contributed to their higher scores on the Self Expression factor.

What obvious differences between the two institutions could account for the higher scores by university students on these factors, Group Life, Social Form, Play-Work, and Self Expression, which relate to group or student life?

One difference is that the university has student housing, fraternities, and sororities while the community college does not. These could account for higher university scores on the Group Life and Social Form factors.

Another difference is that the university has many more highly developed intra-institutional and inter-institutional student organizations and activities than the community college. An example of these is the intercollegiate sports program in the major sports at the university while there is none at the community college. This difference could account for higher university scores for the Play-Work and Self-Expression factors.

Although the university students' scores were higher for the eight factors just discussed, the community college students' scores were higher on the factors of student Dignity, Academic Organization, and Vocational Climate.

Student Dignity is associated with institutional attempts to preserve student freedom and maximize personal responsibility. The community college is small as compared to the university and being small, apparently is seen as better able to preserve personal freedom and responsibility.

The small size of the community college probably also accounts for its students perceiving it as having a higher degree of organization and structure than is perceived by university students concerning their institution. This may be due to the fact that the academic organization is less complicated and consequently more clearly perceived in the small college.

The Vocational Climate factor score was higher for the community college than for the university. This corresponds well with what was discovered concerning the higher scores for the university on factors pertaining to academic climate. The community college was founded as a technical college and continues its emphasis upon vocational oriented programs. This rather simply accounts for the higher scores on this factor.

It has been seen that some very obvious differences between the university and the community college could contribute substantially to the differences between students attending the two institutions on every factor of the College Characteristics Index.

Students' Previous Academic Environment,
Academic Background, and
Socioeconomic Status

Since extreme differences were found between community college and university students in the ways they perceive their respective institutions, theoretically they should also

differ significantly as to their personality needs. It has
been previously stated that the differences could be expected
on all personality needs factors only if the students did
not differ significantly on other important factors such as
previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and
academic background. It was pointed out in the "Analysis
of Data" section that the students did differ significantly
on two of these three factors. Therefore, as could be ex-
pected, university and community college students did not
differ significantly on all the personality needs factors.
Before examining their differences on personality needs, it
will be helpful to analyze the possible reasons for differ-
ence or lack of it on the measures of previous academic
environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background.

It was found that the community college students dif-
fered from university students with respect to previous
academic environment as determined by the size of their
high school graduating classes and as to academic background
as determined by their scores on the College Qualification
Tests. They did not differ with respect to their socioecon-
omic status as determined by their fathers' occupations.

The difference between their academic backgrounds is
easily explained and their differences in previous academic
environment is at least partially explained by the admissions
practices of the two institutions. As has been noted pre-
viously, the university adheres to a selective admissions
policy, but the community college does not. It is quite

natural therefore, for the university students to rank higher
on scholastic ability tests such as the College Qualification
Tests. It also follows that the community college would have
more students from the larger high schools. This is also
due to selective admissions practices of the university.
This simply means that more students from any graduating
class could select the community college than the university
and evidently enough from the larger high schools do select
the community college to cause an imbalance.

Since it was found that students attending the
university have better academic backgrounds, it might be
assumed that they would also come from a higher socioeconomic
status. However, this was not the case. This might be
explained on the basis of the social pressure to attend
college which prevails in the metropolitan area of the two
institutions. This area has been described as having an
orientation toward intellectual pursuits and education.
Apparently, a number of somewhat academically deficient
students from the upper socioeconomic levels are under social
pressure to attend college. Enough of these students who
would not be admissible to the university enroll in the com-
munity college so that the socioeconomic level of the students
attending the two institutions is balanced.

Students' Personality Needs

A review of the analysis of data in the previous
chapter shows that the mean scores on the Stern Activities

Index factors can be classified in three ways: those which were greater for community college students, those which were greater for university students, and those for which there was no significant difference between the students of the two institutions. This classification leads to a description of the preponderant personality needs of the students at the two institutions.

The community college students' mean scores were higher than the university students' on two factors, Motivation and Friendliness. (While the hypothesis concerning significant difference at the .01 level on the Submissiveness factor was not supported, significant difference was found at the .02 level on this factor.) The university students' mean scores were greater than the community college students' on the following factors: Self Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. Significant difference at the .01 level was not found for the factors of Intellectual Interests, Applied Interests, Orderliness, Closeness, Sensuousness, and Submissiveness.

An examination will now be made of the ways in which the community college students are different from the university students as suggested by their greater personality needs. Their mean score on the motivation factor was higher than for university students. This is true even though the academic background which was higher for the university students might suggest that during high school the university students may

have been more highly motivated. It appears likely that the community college student's lack of academic background may actually contribute to his greater motivation. Between the time that he was graduated from high school and the time he enrolled in community college he may have experienced rejection by certain other colleges. He may have been unable to obtain the kind of employment expected and experienced more keenly social pressure to attend college. Therefore, as he enrolls in the community college, he feels to a greater extent than does the university student that he must be successful.

This strong motivation coupled with his somewhat weaker academic background apparently causes him to feel a need for being submissive--the feeling that he is willing to do anything required of him at this point, in order to achieve his goals.

The community college student seems to be so dominated by this "motivation-submissive" syndrome that his high need for friendliness might be interpreted as his needing others to be friendly toward him. This combination of high scores indicates that the community college student is motivated to the extent that he is willing to be submissive in order to achieve his goal, or goals.

Reference has already been made as to how academic background could relate to community college students' dominant personality needs. The fact that their median

socioeconomic index is only 50, probably means that the community college student is strongly motivated to rise above the occupational level of his father. Thus, his socioeconomic status likely contributes to his high level of motivation.

The ways in which the university students are different from the community college students as suggested by their greater personality needs will now be examined.

The mean scores for university students were greater than community college students for the Self-Assertion factor. This is probably related to the fact that the university students have better academic backgrounds and consequently feel more confident to express their needs for self-assertion. It may also be related to their previous academic environments in which they could have been more self-assertive in their smaller schools and classes.

The university students' higher scores on the Audacity-Timidity factor are explainable on the same basis as their higher scores on the Self-Assertion factor. Apparently, their abilities and backgrounds caused them to be more expressive of such needs as risktaking and aggression.

Their higher scores on the Expressiveness-Constraint factor means that they have greater needs for expressing themselves and less need to constrain themselves than do the community college students. These needs, like the two preceding ones, could be related to their better academic

backgrounds and their previous academic environments in
which they possibly felt less constraint.

The university students' mean scores were higher than
community college students' on the Egoism-Diffidence factor.
This means that the university student has a greater
tendency toward extreme preoccupation with self and to
interpret reality in egocentric terms. This is not sur-
prising since it has already been noted that he is more
self assertive, audacious, and less constrained. Perhaps
his better academic background and his less competetive
smaller high school caused him to score higher on these
factors.

Finally, the personality needs factors on which the
community college students did not differ from the university
students will be examined. The factors include Intellectual
Interests, Applied Interests, Orderliness, Closeness, and
Sensuousness. While it may be more difficult to explain
the lack of difference than to explain differences, it does
seem possible that these factors on which the students did
not differ could be related to the lack of difference in
their socioeconomic status.

The factors of Applied Interests, Orderliness, Close-
ness, and Sensuousness can be seen as needs which the
students derived from interaction with parents and other
significant persons within their socioeconomic strata. The
lack of difference in Intellectual Interests is difficult

to explain in view of the fact that there is a difference
in their academic backgrounds. It could be expected that
the university students who had better academic backgrounds
would also have higher intellectual interests. The only
apparent explanation is the one given to explain why there
was no difference in the socioeconomic status. This
explanation called attention to the fact that metropolitan
area around the two institutions has been described as
having an orientation toward intellectual pursuits and edu-
cation. It was also said that apparently a number of some-
what academically deficient students from the upper economic
levels are under social pressure to attend college and that
enough of these students attend the community college to
offset any imbalance in the socioeconomic status which
could be expected. It is possible that these somewhat
academically deficient students from the upper economic
levels also are from families which represent the "academic
community." This then could bring about the balance in the
intellectual interest of the students from the two institu-
tions.

It has been shown that the community college student
is characterized by higher needs in the areas of motivation,
friendliness, and submissiveness than the university student.
The university student has greater needs than the community
college student in the areas of self assertion, audacity,
expressiveness, and egoism. They appear to differ little

with respect to intellectual and applied interests, orderliness, and their needs for closeness and senusuousness.

It should be noted at this point that this investigation did not encompass a stringent study of the interrelationships of each school's students' perceptions of their institution, their personality needs, their previous academic environments, their academic backgrounds, and their socioeconomic statuses. Although these interrelationships were not studied they may, nevertheless, be very important. For example, it is conceivable that the academic backgrounds of community college students is related to their personality needs. There may be a preponderance of students with certain personality needs at the community college simply because the non-selective admissions practices of the college determines that students with weak academic backgrounds may be admitted.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The problem: The purpose of this study was to inves-
tigate the differences between community college students'
and university students' personality needs and differences
in their perceptions of the press of their respective
institutions. The study was limited to students living
within the service area (25 miles radius) of the community
college located in midwestern United States. The university
with which comparisons were made is within the service area
of the community college.

It was hypothesized that significant difference at the
.01 level would be found between students' perceptions of
the press of their respective institutions on 11 factors
measured by the College Characteristics Index. It was also
hypothesized that significant difference at the .01 level
would be found between the personality needs of the students
attending the two institutions. These personality needs
were compared on 12 factors as determined by the Stern
Activities Index. It was also hypothesized that significant
difference at the .01 level would be found between the

students from the two institutions on three additional variables: previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background.

The sample: The sample for the study consisted of 90 freshmen enrolled at the community college and 90 freshmen enrolled at the university. The sample was randomly selected from students living within a 25 mile radius of the community college.

The methodology: The students comprising the sample were administered the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index. Data were also gathered on the students' previous academic environments (size of high school graduating classes), socioeconomic status (fathers' occupations), and academic backgrounds (scores on College Qualification Tests). These data were collected from the students' records at their respective institutions.

The data collected from the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index were combined into 23 factors, 11 for the College Characteristics Index, and 12 for the Stern Activities Index. Tests for significant differences between the community college and the university were made on each of these factors by means of the t test.

Data on each of the variables, previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background were tested for significant difference between the community college and the university by means of the median test.

The findings: Hypotheses I through XI suggested that significant difference would be found on each of the 11 factors pertaining to students' perceptions of the press of their respective institutions. These factors were: Aspirational Level, Intellectual Climate, Student Dignity, Academic Climate, Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life, Academic Organization, Social Form, Play-Work, and Vocational Climate. Significant difference was found for each of these factors.

The mean scores were greater for university students than community college students on the following factors: Aspirational Level, Intellectual Climate, Academic Climate, Academic Achievement, Self Expression, Group Life, Social Form, and Play-Work. The mean scores were greater for community college students than university students on the following factors: Student Dignity, Academic Organization, and Vocational Climate.

Hypotheses XII through XXIII suggested that significant difference would be found on each of the 12 factors pertaining to the personality needs of the students from the two institutions. Significant difference was found on each of the following factors: Self Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Motivation, Friendliness, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. No significant difference was found on each of the following factors: Intellectual Interests, Applied Interests, Orderliness, Submissiveness, Closeness, and Senuousness.

The mean scores were greater for university students than community college students on the following factors: Self Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Expressiveness-Constraint, and Egoism-Diffidence. The mean scores were greater for community college students than university students on the factors of Motivation and Friendliness.

Hypotheses XXIV through XXVI suggested that significant difference would be found between the students at the two institutions on their previous academic environment, socioeconomic status, and academic background. Significant difference was found on each of the two variables previous academic environment and academic background. No significant difference was found on the socioeconomic variable.

More community college students than university students were above the median on the previous academic environment variable. More university students than community college students were above the median on the academic background variable.

Conclusions

1. The effect of this study has been to suggest that students living within the service area of the community college perceive the environmental press of the community college and the university to be extremely different.

2. Students living within the service area of the community college apparently determine whether they will

attend the community college or the university partially on the basis of their personality needs.

3. It also seems apparent that students' selection of institutions is influenced by other variables than personality needs, namely, previous academic environment and academic background.

4. The university students perceive the press of their institution as being greater (as determined by higher scores) on most of the institutional press factors, although community college students perceive the press of their institution as being greater on three of these factors.

5. Furthermore, the study suggests that the factors on which the university students scored higher fall into two broad categories: those pertaining generally to academic climate and those pertaining generally to student or group life.

6. The community college students apparently are characterized by high motivation and needs for friendliness and submissiveness.

7. The university students apparently are characterized by high needs pertaining rather directly to the self. Such needs include self assertion, audacity, expressiveness, and egoism.

Implications for Further Research

1. This study should be replicated in other metropolitan areas in the United States in which both a community college and a university are located. This would permit generalizations to be made regarding the college student population in this peculiar situation.

2. It would seem to be profitable to research a representative sample of community colleges with the College Characteristics Index and the Stern Activities Index in order that comparisons may be made with the existing norms for other types of institutions.

3. The extreme differences found between community college students' perceptions of their institution and the university students' perceptions of their institution suggest that community colleges are perceived differently than universities, a more traditional type of institution of higher education. This would seem to justify further research on the community college environment, particularly within the community college involved in this study.

4. Specific research on the community college environment probably should include a comparison of the students' and faculty's perceptions of their institution.

5. Further research should probably also include a comparison of the personality needs of students with their perceptions of the press of their institution.

6. Further research should probably also include a comparison of the entering freshmen at the community college

with its graduating sophomores on both their personality needs and their perceptions of their institution.

7. Specific research on the community college environment should also compare students' perceptions of the press of the institution with the stated objectives of the institution.

8. Another area of research which would apparently be fruitful is intra-institutional studies. It is quite possible that divisions within the community college would compare favorably with four-year institutions of similar type, or with colleges within universities.

9. Studies comparing graduating sophomores from the community college with those students beginning their junior year at the university should provide the community college with data useful in determining the readiness of community college students to transfer to the university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Astin, A. W. "A Re-Examination of College Productivity,"
    Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 173-
    178.

2. Barton, A. H. *Studying the Effects of College Education:*
    A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in
    College. New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Founda-
    tion, 1959.

3. Bennett, G. K., Bennett, M. G., Wallace, W. L., and
    Wesman, A. G. *College Qualification Tests Manual.*
    New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1961.

4. Briggs, D. A. "The Stern Activities Index as a Means of
    Predicting Social Acceptability and Improvement in
    Reading Skills." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,
    Syracuse University, 1958.

5. Dressel, P. L., and Mayhew, L. B. *General Education:*
    Explorations In Evaluation. Washington, D. C.:
    American Council on Education, 1954.

6. Eddy, E. C., Jr. *The College Influence on Student*
    Character: *An Exploratory Study in Selected*
    Colleges and Universities Made for the Committee
    for the Study of Character Development in
    Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council
    on Education, 1959.

7. Edwards, A. E. *Statistical Methods for the Behavioral*
    Sciences. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1960.

8. Farago, L. (ed.). *German Psychological Warfare Survey*
    and Bibliography. New York: Committee for National
    Morale, 1941.

9. Gladstein, G. A. "The Relationship Between Study Behavior
    and Personality for Academically Successful Stu-
    dents." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The
    University of Chicago, 1957.

10. Haring, N. G., Stern, G. G., Cruckshank, W. M. *Attitudes*
    of Educators Toward Exceptional Children.
    Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1958.

11. Harris, H. The Group Approach to Leadership Testing.
London: Rouledge and Keegan Paul, 1949.

12. Heist, P. A. "Diversity in College Students Charac-
teristics," Journal of Educational Sociology,
1960, 33, 279-291.

13. Holland, J. L. "Some Explorations with Occupational
Titles," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961,
8, 82.

14. Holland, J. L. "Parental Expectations and Attitudes
About Colleges," College and University Bulletin,
1959, 34, 164-170.

15. Jacob, P. E. Changing Values in College: An Explora-
tory Study of the Impact of College Teaching.
New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

16. Jackson, D. N., Messick, S. J., and Solley, C. M.
"A Multidimensional Scaling Approach to the
Perception of Personality," Journal of Psychology,
1957, 44, 311-318.

17. Kelley, E. L., and Fiske, D. W. The Prediction of
Performance in Clinical Psychology. Ann Arbor,
Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1951.

18. Kemp, E., and Johnson, A. Psychological Research on
Bombaradier Training, Report #9, Army Air Forces
Aviation Psychology Program Research Reports.
Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office,
1947.

19. Kluckhohn, C., and Murray, H. A. Personality in Nature,
Society and Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf,
1948.

20. Mauksch, Hans O. "The Nurse: A Study in Role Percep-
tion." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,
University of Chicago, 1960.

21. McConnell, T. R., and Heist, P. A. "Do Students Make
the College?" College and University, 1959, 34,
442-452.

22. McFee, A. "The Relation of Students' Needs to their
Perceptions of a College Environment," Journal of
Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 25-29.

23. Merwin, J. D., and DiVesta, F. J. "A Study of Need
Theory and Career Choice," Journal of Counseling
Psychology, 1959, 6, 302-308.

24. Murphy, G. Personality, A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper, 1947.

25. Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

26. OSS Assessment Staff. Assessment of Men. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1948.

27. Pace, C. R. "Five College Environments," College Entrance Examination Board Review, 1960, 41, 24-28.

28. Pace, C. R., and McFee, A. "The College Environment," Review of Educational Research, 1960, 30, 311-320.

29. Pace, C. R., and Stern, G. G. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 269-277.

30. Parsons, T., and Shils, E. A. Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

31. Riesman, D. "The Jacob Report," American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 732-738.

32. Reiss, A. J., Jr. Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

33. Saunders, D. R. "A Factor Analytic Study of the Activities Index and the College Characteristics Index." Unpublished, undated report, 447 Walnut Lane, Princeton, N. J.

34. Scanlon, J. "The Activities Index: An Inquiry Into Validity." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1958.

35. Stern, G. G. "Characteristics of the Intellectual Climate in College Environments," Harvard Educational Review, 1963, 33, 1, 5-41.

36. Stern, G. G. "College Characteristics Index: Description of Total School Population for Normative Data." Unpublished, undated paper, Syracuse University.

37. Stern, G. G. "College Characteristics Index Standard Score Means--Normative Sample, Average Values." Unpublished, undated paper, Syracuse University.

38. Stern, G. G.   "Congruence and Dissonance in the Ecology of College Students," _Student Medicine_, 1960, 8, 304-339.

39. Stern, G. G.   "Continuity and Contrast in the Transition from High School to College," _Orientation to College Learning, A Reappraisal_. Edited by N. C. Brown. Washington, D. C.:   American Council on Education, 1960, 33-58.

40. Stern, G. G.   "Environments for Learning," _The American College, A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning_. Edited by N. Sanford. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962, 690-730.

41. Stern, G. G.   _Need-Press Factor Summary_. Unpublished paper, Syracuse University, 1963.

42. Stern, G. G.   _Preliminary Manual: Activities Index-College Characteristics Index_. Syracuse: Syracuse University Psychological Research Center, 1958.

43. Stern, G. G.   _Scoring Instructions and College Norms, Activities Index, College Characteristics Index_. Syracuse: Psychological Research Center, 1963.

44. Stern, G. G.   "Stern Activities Index Standard Score Means--Normative Sample, Average Values." Unpublished, undated paper, Syracuse University.

45. Stern, G. G.   "Student Values and Their Relationship to the College Environment," _Research on College Students_. Edited by H. T. Sprague. Boulder Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960, 67-104.

46. Stern, G. G.   "The Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of Students and Learning Environment," _Measurement in Personality and Cognition_. Edited by S. J. Messick and J. Ross. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962, 27-68.

47. Stern, G. G., and Cope, H. A.   "Differences in Educability Between Steropaths, Authoritarians, and Rationals," _American Psychologist_, 11, 1956, 362.

48. Stern, G. G., and Scanlon, J. S.   "Pediatric Lions and Gynecological Lambs," _Journal of Medical Education_, 1958, 33, 12-18.

49. Stern, G. G., Schultz, D., and Naugle, G. "Resistance
         to Faking on the Activities Index," American
         Psychologist, 1957, 12, 7, 430.

50. Stern, G. G., Stien, M. I., and Bloom, B. S. Methods
         in Personality Assessment. Glencoe: Free Press,
         1956.

51. Tatham, D. F., Stellwagen, W., and Stern, G. G. "The
         Stern Activities Index as a Measure of Differences
         Among Vocational and Academic Groups," American
         Psychologist, 1957, 12, 7, 457.

52. Thielens, W., Jr. "Some Comparisons of Entrants to
         Medical and Law Schools," The Student Physician:
         Introductory Studies in the Sociology of
         Medical Education. Edited by K. Merton, G. G.
         Reader, and P. L. Kenall. Cambridge, Mass.:
         Harvard University Press, 1957, 131-152.

53. Thistlethwaite, D. L. "College Environments and the
         Development of Talent," Science, 1959, 130, 71-76.

54. Thistlethwaite, D. L. "College Press and Changes in
         Study Plans of Talented Students," Journal of
         Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 222-234.

55. Thistlethwaite, D. D. "College Press and Student
         Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology,
         1959, 50, 183-191.

56. Wassertheil, S. M. "A Study of the Need Patterns of
         Negative and Positive Individuals." Unpublished
         M. A. Thesis, Syracuse University, 1955.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

STERN ACTIVITIES INDEX, FORM 1158

STERN ACTIVITIES INDEX

Form 1158

George G. Stern, Syracuse University

This booklet contains a number of brief statements describing many different kinds of activities. You will like some of these things. They will seem more pleasant than unpleasant to you, perhaps even highly enjoyable. There will be others that you will dislike, finding them more unpleasant than pleasant. The activities listed in this booklet have been obtained from a great many different persons. People differ in the kinds of things they enjoy, like to do, or find pleasant to experience. You are to decide which of these you like and which you dislike.

DIRECTIONS

Print the information called for at the top of the special answer sheet: your name, the date, your age and sex, etc. Then, as you read each item, *blacken* space

> L — if the item describes an activity or event that you would like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

> D — if the item describes an activity or event that you would dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

Be sure to fill in the whole space between the dotted lines with a heavy, black mark, using the special pencil provided. You need not spend much time on any one item; go through the list quickly, being sure to answer *every* item. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Legend: L - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

1. Taking the blame for something done by someone I like.
2. Setting difficult goals for myself.
3. Concealing a failure or humiliation from others.
4. Having other people let me alone.
5. Getting what is coming to me even if I have to fight for it.

6. Being quite changeable in my likes and dislikes.
7. Scheduling time for work and play during the day.
8. Working twice as hard at a problem when it looks as if I don't know the answer.
9. Seeing someone make fun of a person who deserves it.
10. Persuading a group to do something my way.

11. Being a newspaperman who crusades to improve the community.
12. Listening to music that makes me feel very sad.
13. Taking up a very active outdoor sport.
14. Keeping in the background when I'm with a group of wild, fun-loving, noisy people.
15. Toughening myself, going without an overcoat, seeing how long I can go without
    food or sleep, etc.

16. Diving off the tower or high board at a pool.
17. Learning about the causes of some of our social and political problems.
18. Doing something crazy occasionally, just for the fun of it.
19. Imagining what I would do if I could live my life over again.
20. Feeding a stray dog or cat.

21. Taking special precautions on Friday, the 13th.
22. Washing and polishing things like a car, silverware, or furniture.
23. Making my work go faster by thinking of the fun I can have after it's done.
24. Being good at typewriting, knitting, carpentry, or other practical skills.
25. Understanding myself better.

26. Learning how to prepare slides of plant and animal tissue, and making my own
    studies with a microscope.
27. Holding something very soft and warm against my skin.
28. Talking about how it feels to be in love.
29. Belonging to a close family group that expects me to bring my problems to them.
30. Concentrating intently on a problem.

31. Suffering for a good cause or for someone I love.
32. Working for someone who will accept nothing less than the best that's in me.
33. Defending myself against criticism or blame.
34. Going to the park or beach with a crowd.
35. Shocking narrow minded people by saying and doing things of which they disapprove.

36. Getting up and going to bed at the same time each day.
37. Planning a reading program for myself.
38. Returning to a task which I have previously failed.
39. Doing what most people tell me to do, to the best of my ability.
40. Having other people depend on me for ideas or opinions.

41. Being an important political figure in a time of crisis.
42. Crying at a funeral, wedding, graduation, or similar ceremony.
43. Exerting myself to the utmost for something unusually important or enjoyable.
44. Wearing clothes that will attract a lot of attention.
45. Working until I'm exhausted, to see how much I can take.

46. Being careful to wear a raincoat and rubbers when it rains.
47. Studying the music of particular composers, such as Bach, Beethoven, etc.
48. Acting impulsively just to blow off steam.
49. Thinking about ways of changing my name to make it sound striking or different.
50. Discussing with younger people what they like to do and how they feel about things.

Legend: L - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
             like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

         D - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
             dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

51. Waiting for a falling star, white horse, or some other sign of success before I
    make an important decision.
52. Keeping my bureau drawers, desk, etc., in perfect order.
53. Spending most of my extra money on pleasure.
54. Learning how to repair such things as the radio, sewing machine, or car.
55. Thinking about different kinds of unusual behavior, like insanity, drug
    addiction, crime, etc.

56. Studying wind conditions and changes in atmospheric pressure in order to better
    understand and predict the weather.
57. Eating after going to bed.
58. Watching a couple who are crazy about each other.
59. Working for someone who always tells me exactly what to do and how to do it.
60. Finding the meaning of unusual or rarely used words.

61. Being polite or humble no matter what happens.
62. Setting higher standards for myself than anyone else would, and working hard to
    achieve them.
63. Admitting when I'm in the wrong.
64. Leading an active social life.
65. Doing something that might provoke criticism.

66. Rearranging the furniture in the place where I live.
67. Putting off something I don't feel like doing, even though I know it has to be done.
68. Having to struggle hard for something I want.
69. Listening to a successful person tell about his experience.
70. Getting my friends to do what I want to do.

71. Taking an active part in social and political reform.
72. Avoiding excitement or emotional tension.
73. Staying up all night when I'm doing something that interests me.
74. Speaking at a club or group meeting.
75. Imagining myself president of the United States.

76. Crossing streets only at the corner and with the light.
77. Listening to TV or radio programs about political and social problems.
78. Being in a situation that requires quick decisions and action.
79. Pausing to look at myself in a mirror each time I pass one.
80. Helping to collect money for poor people.

81. Paying no attention to omens, signs, and other forms of superstition.
82. Keeping an accurate record of the money I spend.
83. Dropping out of a crowd that spends most of its time playing around or having parties.
84. Helping to direct a fund drive for the Red Cross, Community Chest, or other organization.
85. Imagining life on other planets.

86. Reading articles which tell about new scientific developments, discoveries, or
    inventions.
87. Chewing on pencils, rubber bands, or paper clips.
88. Talking about who is in love with whom.
89. Being a lone wolf, free of family and friends.
90. Spending my time thinking about and discussing complex problems.

91. Trying to figure out how I was to blame after getting into an argument with someone.
92. Competing with others for a prize or goal.
93. Being ready with an excuse or explanation when criticized.
94. Meeting a lot of people.
95. Arguing with an instructor or superior.

96. Being generally consistent and unchanging in my behavior.
97. Going to a party where all the activities are planned.
98. Doing a job under pressure.
99. Going along with a decision made by a supervisor or leader rather than starting
    an argument.
100. Organizing groups to vote in a certain way in elections.

Legend: L - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

101. Living a life which is adventurous and dramatic.
102. Having someone for a friend who is very emotional.
103. Sleeping long hours every night in order to have lots of rest.
104. Playing music, dancing, or acting in a play before a large group.
105. Thinking about what I could do that would make me famous.

106. Riding a fast and steep roller coaster.
107. Comparing the problems and conditions of today with those of various times in the past.
108. Doing whatever I'm in the mood to do.
109. Daydreaming about what I would do if I could live my life any way I wanted.
110. Comforting someone who is feeling low.

111. Avoiding things that might bring bad luck.
112. Arranging my clothes neatly before going to bed.
113. Getting as much fun as I can out of life, even if it means sometimes neglecting
more serious things.
114. Learning how to make such things as furniture or clothing myself.
115. Trying to figure out why the people I know behave the way they do.

116. Doing experiments in physics, chemistry or biology in order to test a theory.
117. Sleeping in a very soft bed.
118. Seeing love stories in the movies.
119. Having someone in the family help me out when I'm in trouble.
120. Working crossword puzzles, figuring out moves in checkers or chess, playing
anagrams or scrabble, etc.

121. Admitting defeat.
122. Taking examinations.
123. Being corrected when I'm doing something the wrong way.
124. Belonging to a social club.
125. Teasing someone who is too conceited.

126. Moving to a new neighborhood or city, living in a different country, etc.
127. Finishing something I've begun, even if it is no longer enjoyable.
128. Staying away from activities which I don't do well.
129. Following directions.
130. Being able to hypnotize people.

131. Playing an active part in community affairs.
132. Going on an emotional binge.
133. Walking instead of riding whenever I can.
134. Doing something that will create a stir.
135. Thinking about winning recognition and acclaim as a brilliant military figure.

136. Standing on the roof of a tall building.
137. Studying different types of government, such as the American, English, Russian,
German, etc.
138. Doing things on the spur of the moment.
139. Having lots of time to take care of my hair, hands, face, clothing, etc.
140. Having people come to me with their problems.

141. Being especially careful the rest of the day if a black cat should cross my path.
142. Recopying notes or memoranda to make them neat.
143. Finishing some work even though it means missing a party or dance.
144. Working with mechanical appliances, household equipment, tools, electrical
apparatus, etc.
145. Thinking about what the end of the world might be like.

146. Studying the stars and planets and learning to identify them.
147. Listening to the rain fall on the roof, or the wind blow through the trees.
148. Flirting.
149. Knowing an older person who likes to give me guidance and direction.
150. Being a philosopher, scientist, or professor.

Legend: L - If the item describes an activity or event that you would
like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D - If the item describes an activity or event that you would
dislike, reject or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

151. Having people laugh at my mistakes.
152. Working on tasks so difficult I can hardly do them.
153. Keeping my failures and mistakes to myself.
154. Going to parties where I'm expected to mix with the whole crowd.
155. Annoying people I don't like, just to see what they will do.

156. Leading a well-ordered life with regular hours and an established routine.
157. Planning ahead so that I know every step of a project before I get to it.
158. Avoiding something at which I have once failed.
159. Turning over the leadership of a group to someone who is better for the job than I.
160. Being an official or a leader.

161. Actively supporting a movement to correct a social evil.
162. Letting loose and having a good cry sometimes.
163. Taking frequent rest periods when working on any project.
164. Being the only couple on the dance floor when everyone is watching.
165. Imagining situations in which I am a great hero.

166. Driving fast.
167. Talking about music, theater or other art forms with people who are interested
in them.
168. Controlling my emotions rather than expressing myself impulsively.
169. Catching a reflection of myself in a mirror or window.
170. Lending my things to other people.

171. Carrying a good luck charm like a rabbit's foot or a four-leaf clover.
172. Making my bed and putting things away every day before I leave the house.
173. Going to a party or dance with a lively crowd.
174. Managing a store or business enterprise.
175. Seeking to explain the behavior of people who are emotionally disturbed.

176. Going to scientific exhibits.
177. Chewing or popping gum.
178. Reading novels and magazine stories about love.
179. Having others offer their opinions when I have to make a decision.
180. Losing myself in hard thought.

181. Accepting criticism without talking back.
182. Doing something very difficult in order to prove I can do it.
183. Pointing out someone else's mistakes when they point out mine.
184. Having lots of friends who come to stay with us for several days during the year.
185. Playing practical jokes.

186. Doing things a different way every time I do them.
187. Keeping to a regular schedule, even if this sometimes means working when I
don't really feel like it.
188. Quitting a project that seems too difficult for me.
189. Listening to older persons tell about how they did things when they were young.
190. Organizing a protest meeting.

191. Getting my friends to change their social, political, or religious beliefs.
192. Yelling with excitement at a ball game, horse race, or other public event.
193. Having something to do every minute of the day.
194. Speaking before a large group.
195. Imagining how it would feel to be rich and famous.

196. Playing rough games in which someone might get hurt.
197. Finding out how different languages have developed, changed, and influenced
one another.
198. Letting my reasoning be guided by my feelings.
199. Dressing carefully, being sure that the colors match and the various details
are exactly right.
200. Taking care of youngsters.

Legend: L - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

201. Having a close friend who ignores or makes fun of superstitious beliefs.
202. Shining my shoes and brushing my clothes every day.
203. Giving up whatever I'm doing rather than miss a party or other opportunity
for a good time.
204. Fixing light sockets, making curtains, painting things, etc., around the house.
205. Reading stories that try to show what people really think and feel inside themselves.

206. Collecting data and attempting to arrive at general laws about the physical universe.
207. Sketching or painting.
208. Daydreaming about being in love with a particular movie star or entertainer.
209. Having people fuss over me when I'm sick.
210. Engaging in mental activity.

211. Making a fuss when someone seems to be taking advantage of me.
212. Choosing difficult tasks in preference to easy ones.
213. Apologizing when I've done something wrong.
214. Going to the park or beach only at times when no-one else is likely to be there.
215. Questioning the decisions of people who are supposed to be authorities.

216. Eating my meals at the same hour each day.
217. Doing things according to my mood, without following any plan.
218. Doing something over again, just to get it right.
219. Disregarding a supervisor's directions when they seem foolish.
220. Talking someone into doing something I think ought to be done.

221. Trying to improve my community by persuading others to do certain things.
222. Being with people who seem always to be calm, unstirred, or placid.
223. Giving all of my energy to whatever I happen to be doing.
224. Being the center of attention at a party.
225. Setting myself tasks to strengthen my mind, body, and will power.

226. Skiing on steep slopes, climbing high mountains, or exploring narrow underground caves.
227. Learning more about the work of different painters and sculptors.
228. Speaking or acting spontaneously.
229. Imagining the kind of life I would have if I were born at a different time in
a different place.
230. Talking over personal problems with someone who is feeling unhappy.

231. Going ahead with something important even though I've just accidentally walked
under a ladder, broken a mirror, etc.
232. Keeping my room in perfect order.
233. Being with people who are always joking, laughing, and out for a good time.
234. Being treasurer or business manager for a club or organization.
235. Imagining what it will be like when rocket ships carry people through space.

236. Reading scientific theories about the origin of the earth and other planets.
237. Eating so much I can't take another bite.
238. Listening to my friends talk about their love-life.
239. Receiving advice from the family.
240. Solving puzzles that involve numbers or figures.

241. Taking the part of a servant or waiter in a play.
242. Sacrificing everything else in order to achieve something outstanding.
243. Having my mistakes pointed out to me.
244. Going on a vacation to a place where there are lots of people.
245. Fighting for something I want, rather than trying to get it by asking.

246. Avoiding any kind of routine or regularity.
247. Organizing my work in order to use time efficiently.
248. Avoiding something because I'm not sure I'll be successful at it.
249. Carrying out orders from others with snap and enthusiasm.
250. Directing other people's work.

Legend: L - if the item describes an activity or event that you would
like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D - If the item describes an activity or event that you would
dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

251. Being a foreign ambassador or diplomat.
252. Seeing sad or melodramatic movies.
253. Avoiding things that require intense concentration.
254. Telling jokes or doing tricks to entertain others at a large gathering.
255. Pretending I am a famous movie star.

256. Swimming in rough, deep water.
257. Studying the development of English or American literature.
258. Being guided by my heart rather than by my head.
259. Making my handwriting decorative or unusual.
260. Taking care of someone who is ill.

261. Finding out which days are lucky for me, so I can hold off important things
to do until then.
262. Having a special place for everything and seeing that each thing is in its place.
263. Doing something serious with my leisure time instead of just playing around with
the crowd.
264. Learning how to raise attractive and healthy plants, flowers, vegetables. etc.
265. Thinking about the meaning of eternity.

266. Reading about how mathematics is used in developing scientific theories, such as
explanations of how the planets move around the sun.
267. Walking along a dark street in the rain.
268. Being romantic with someone I love.
269. Having people talk to me about some personal problem of mine.
270. Following through in the development of a theory, even though it has no practical
applications.

271. Telling others about the mistakes I have made and the sins I have committed.
272. Picking out some hard task for myself and doing it.
273. Concealing my mistakes from others whenever possible.
274. Inviting a lot of people home for a snack or party.
275. Proving that an instructor or superior is wrong.

276. Staying in the same circle of friends all the time.
277. Striving for precision and clarity in my speech and writing.
278. Giving up on a problem rather than doing it in a way that may be wrong.
279. Having friends who are superior to me in ability.
280. Influencing or controlling the actions of others.

281. Converting or changing the views of others.
282. Being unrestrained and open about my feelings and emotions.
283. Doing things that are fun but require lots of physical exertion.
284. Doing things which will attract attention to me.
285. Thinking about how to become the richest and cleverest financial genius in the world.

286. Being extremely careful about sports that involve some danger like sailing,
hunting, or camping.
287. Reading editorials or feature articles on major social issues.
288. Making up my mind slowly, after considerable deliberation.
289. Trying out different ways of writing my name, to make it look unusual.
290. Providing companionship and personal care for a very old helpless person.

291. Going to a fortune-teller, palm reader or astrologer for advice on something
important.
292. Keeping a calendar or notebook of the things I have done or plan to do.
293. Limiting my pleasures so that I can spend all of my time usefully.
294. Being efficient and successful in practical affairs.
295. Concentrating so hard on a work of art or music that I don't know what's going
on around me.

296. Studying rock formations and learning how they developed.
297. Reading in the bathtub.
298. Reading about the love affairs of movie stars and other famous people.
299. Being with someone who always tries to be sympathetic and understanding.
300. Working out solutions to complicated problems, even though the answers may have
no apparent, immediate usefulness.

APPENDIX B

COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS INDEX, FORM 1158

COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS INDEX

Form 1158

There are 300 statements in this booklet. They are statements about college life. They refer to the curriculum, to college teaching and classroom activities, to rules and regulations and policies, to student organizations and activities and interests, to features of the campus, etc. The statements may or may not be characteristic of your college, because colleges differ from one another in many ways. You are to decide which statements are characteristic of your college and which are not. Your answers should tell us what you believe the **college** is like rather than what you might personally prefer. You won't **know** the answer to many of these statements, because there may not be any really definite information on which to base your answer. **Your response will simply mean that in your opinion the statement is probably true or probably false about your college.** Do not omit any item.

DIRECTIONS

On the special answer sheet print your name, and the other information requested. Then, as you read each statement in the booklet, **blacken** space

T—when you think the statement is generally TRUE or characteristic of the college, is something which occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

F—when you think the statement is generally FALSE or not characteristic of the college, is something which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

Be sure to fill in the whole space between the dotted lines on the answer sheet with a heavy black mark, using the special pencil provided to you.

YOU MUST ANSWER EVERY ITEM.

Work rapidly, going through the entire list of statements as quickly as you can. Please do not make any marks in this booklet.

Legend: T - TRUE. Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

F - FALSE. Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

1.   Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices.
2.   The competition for grades is intense.
3.   In many courses grade lists are publicly posted.
4.   There are no fraternities or sororities.
5.   Students are conscientious about taking good care of school property.

6.   The students here represent a great variety in nationality, religion and social status.
7.   Most courses are very well organized and progress systematically from week to week.
8.   Professors often try to provoke arguments in class, the livelier the better.
9.   Students address faculty members as "professor" or "doctor".
10. There is a recognized group of student leaders on this campus.

11. Student pep rallies, parades, dances, carnivals or demonstrations occur very rarely.
12. Students here learn that they are not only expected to develop ideals but also to express
         them in action.
13. Discussions get quite heated, with a lot of display of feeling.
14. There is a lot of interest here in student theatrical groups.
15. Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussions, etc.

16. There is an extensive program of intramural sports and informal athletic activities.
17. Many of the social science professors are actively engaged in research.
18. In most classes there is very little joking and laughing.
19. Receptions, teas, or formal dances are seldom given here.
20. Many upperclassmen play an active role in helping new students adjust to campus life.

21. No one needs to be afraid of expressing extreme or unpopular viewpoints in this school.
22. In many classes students have an assigned seat.
23. Students really get excited at an athletic contest.
24. It's important socially here to be in the right club or group.
25. Books dealing with psychological problems or personal values are widely read and discussed.

26. The library is exceptionally well equipped with journals, periodicals, and books in the
         natural sciences.
27. On nice days many classes meet outdoors on the lawn.
28. There is lots of informal dating during the week--at the library, snack bar, movies, etc.
29. Students often help one another with their lessons.
30. There is a lot of emphasis on preparing for graduate work.

31. Resident students must get written permission to be away from the campus overnight.
32. It is fairly easy to pass most courses without working very hard.
33. Student organizations are closely supervised to guard against mistakes.
34. There is a lot of group spirit.
35. Most people here seem to be especially considerate of others.

36. Courses, examinations, and readings are frequently revised.
37. Instructors clearly explain the goals and purposes of their courses.
38. When students do not like an administrative decision, they really work to get it changed.
39. Many students try to pattern themselves after people they admire.
40. Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling.

41. Students and faculty are proud of their tough-mindedness and their resistance to pleaders
         for special causes.
42. Most students get extremely tense during exam periods.
43. Students put a lot of energy into everything they do--in class and out.
44. When students run a project or put on a show everybody knows about it.
45. Students spend a lot of time planning their careers.

46. Initiations and class rivalries sometimes get a little rough.
47. The school offers many opportunities for students to understand and criticize important
         works in art, music, and drama.
48. New fads and phrases are continually springing up among the students.
49. Students take a great deal of pride in their personal appearance.
50. There are courses which involve field trips to slum areas, welfare agencies, or similar
         contacts with underprivileged people.

Legend: T - TRUE.   Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

F - FALSE.   Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

51.   The values most stressed here are open-mindedness and objectivity.
52.   Students must have a written excuse for absence from class.
53.   The big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support.
54.   There are psychology courses which deal in a practical way with personal adjustment and
human relations.
55.   There would be a capacity audience for a lecture by an outstanding philosopher or theologian.

56.   When students get together they seldom talk about science.
57.   The college has invested very little in drama and dance.
58.   Student gathering places are typically active and noisy.
59.   There is a student loan fund which is very helpful for minor emergencies.
60.   The school is outstanding for the emphasis and support it gives to pure scholarship and
basic research.

61.   Students are seldom kept waiting when they have appointments with faculty members.
62.   Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class.
63.   Students are expected to play bridge, golf, bowl together, etc.. regardless of individual skill.
64.   There are many opportunities for students to get together in extra-curricular activities.
65.   Most students show a good deal of caution and self-control in their behavior.

66.   There are many students from widely different geographic regions.
67.   A lot of students who get just passing grades at mid-term really make an effort to earn a higher
grade by the end of the term.
68.   People here really play to win, not just for the fun of the game.
69.   Religious worship here stresses service to God and obedience to His laws.
70.   Students are expected to report any violation of rules and regulations.

71.   Many students here develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary
social and political life.
72.   The way people feel around here is always pretty evident.
73.   Few students here would ever work or play to the point of exhaustion.
74.   Students have many opportunities to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of others.
75.   Most students would regard mountain-climbing, rugged camping trips, or driving a car all night
as pretty pointless.

76.   Fire drills are held in student dormitories and residences.
77.   A lecture by an outstanding literary critic would be poorly attended.
78.   Many informal student activities are unplanned and spontaneous.
79.   Poise and sophistication are highly respected by both students and faculty.
80.   Most students here would not want pets (dogs, cats, etc.) even if they were allowed to have them.

81.   Most faculty members are liberal in interpreting regulations and treat violations with
understanding and tolerance.
82.   Student papers and reports must be neat.
83.   There are lots of dances, parties, and social activities.
84.   Many courses stress the speculative or abstract rather than the concrete and tangible.
85.   There are many facilities and opportunities for individual creative activity.

86.   A lecture by an outstanding scientist would be poorly attended.
87.   Student rooms are more likely to be decorated with pennants and pin-ups than with paintings,
carvings, mobiles fabrics etc.
88.   Most students here really enjoy dancing.
89.   The person who is always trying to "help out" is likely to be regarded as a nuisance.
90.   Most students have very little interest in round tables, panel meetings, or other formal
discussions.

91.   If a student wants help, he usually has to answer a lot of embarrassing questions.
92.   Personality, pull, and bluff get students through many courses.
93.   In many courses there are projects or assignments which call for group work.
94.   The professors seem to have little time for conversation with students.
95.   The faculty and administration are often joked about or criticized in student conversations.

96.   Everyone here has pretty much the same attitudes, opinions, and beliefs.
97.   Activities in most student organizations are carefully and clearly planned.
98.   Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily accessible.
99.   Students almost always wait to be called on before speaking in class.
100.   Personal rivalries are fairly common.

Legend: T - TRUE. Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
     occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

    F - FALSE. Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
       which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

101. Boy-girl relationships in this atmosphere tend to be practical and uninvolved, rarely becoming
   intensely emotional or romantic.
102. There is a lot of excitement and restlessness just before holidays.
103. There are so many things to do here that students are busy all the time.
104. Most students here would not like to dress up for a fancy ball or a masquerade.
105. Most students are more concerned with the present than the future.

106. Many students drive sports cars.
107. Few students are planning post-graduate work in the social sciences.
108. Dormitory raids, water fights and other student pranks would be unthinkable here.
109. Most students here enjoy such activities as dancing, skating, diving, gymnastics.
110. Students often run errands or do other personal services for the faculty.

111. Many students have special good luck charms and practices.
112. Campus architecture and landscaping stress symmetry and order.
113. There is very little studying here over the week-ends.
114. Students are more interested in specialization than in general liberal education.
115. Modern art and music get little attention here.

116. Few students are planning careers in science.
117. This is mainly a meat and potatoes community, with little interest in gourmets or
   anything unusual.
118. Students spend a lot of time talking about their boy or girl friends.
119. Students here are encouraged to be independent and individualistic.
120. A lot of students like chess, puzzles, double-crostics, and other abstract games.

121. For a period of time freshmen have to take orders from upperclassmen.
122. Students who work hard for high grades are likely to be regarded as odd.
123. In most classes every student can expect to be called on to recite.
124. The school helps everyone get acquainted.
125. Many students seem to expect other people to adapt to them rather than trying to
   adapt themselves to others.

126. Many students travel or look for jobs in different parts of the country during the summer.
127. Assignments are usually clear and specific, making it easy for students to plan their
   studies effectively.
128. People around here seem to thrive on difficulty--the tougher things get, the harder
   they work.
129. In talking with students, faculty members often refer to their colleagues by their
   first names.
130. The important people at this school expect others to show proper respect for them.

131. There are practically no student organizations actively involved in campus or
   community affairs.
132. Most students respond to ideas and events in a pretty cool and detached way.
133. There seems to be a lot of interest here in health diets, vitamin pills, anti-histamines, etc.
134. There are a good many colorful and controversial figures on the faculty.
135. Education here tends to make students more practical and realistic.

136. Students are frequently reminded to take preventive measures against illness.
137. A student who insists on analyzing and classifying art and music is likely to be regarded
   as a little odd.
138. Students often start projects without trying to decide in advance how they will develop
   or where they may end.
139. Students who are not properly groomed are likely to have this called to their attention.
140. The college regards training people for service to the community as one of its major
   responsibilities.

141. A well reasoned report can rate an A grade here even though its viewpoint is opposed to
   the professor's.
142. Professors usually take attendance in class.
143. New jokes and gags get around the campus in a hurry.
144. Family social and financial status may not be talked about but everyone knows who's who.
145. The student newspaper rarely carries articles intended to stimulate discussion of
   philosophical or ethical matters.

146. Course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are outstanding.
147. There is a lot of interest here in poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc.
148. Bermuda shorts, pin-up pictures, etc., are common on this campus.
149. There is a high degree of respect for nonconformity and intellectual freedom.
150. "Alma Mater" seems to be more important than "subject matter" at this school.

Legend: T - TRUE. Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

F - FALSE. Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

151. No one is expected to suffer in silence if some regulation happens to create a personal hardship.
152. Examinations here provide a genuine measure of a student's achievement and understanding.
153. Students' mid-term and final grades are reported to parents.
154. Students almost never see the professors except in class.
155. Students occasionally plot some sort of escapade or rebellion.

156. Most students dress and act pretty much alike.
157. Faculty advisers or counselors are pretty practical and efficient in the way they dispatch
their business.
158. If a student fails a course he can usually substitute another one for it rather than take
it over.
159. A lot of students here will do something even when they know they will be criticized for it.
160. There are no favorites at this school--everyone gets treated alike.

161. Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs.
162. An open display of emotion would embarrass most professors.
163. Students get so absorbed in various activities that they often lose all sense of time or
personal comfort.
164. It is easy to obtain student speakers for clubs or meetings.
165. There is little sympathy here for ambitious daydreams about the future.

166. Drinking and late parties are generally tolerated, despite regulations.
167. When students get together they seldom talk about trends in art, music or the theater.
168. There seems to be a jumble of papers and books in most faculty offices.
169. There are no mirrors in any of the public rooms or halls.
170. There is a great deal of borrowing and sharing among the students.

171. Some of the professors react to questions in class as if the students were criticizing them
personally.
172. The campus and buildings always look a little unkempt.
173. Everyone has a lot of fun at this school.
174. Many students enjoy working with their hands and are pretty efficient about making or
repairing things.
175. Special museums or collections are important possessions of the college.

176. Laboratory facilities in the natural sciences are excellent.
177. The library has paintings and phonograph records which circulate widely among the students.
178. There are several popular spots where a crowd of boys and girls can always be found.
179. Most of the faculty are not interested in students' personal problems.
180. Very few students here prefer to talk about poetry, philosophy, or mathematics as compared
with motion pictures, politics, or inventions.

181. Faculty members are impatient with students who interrupt their work.
182. Students set high standards of achievement for themselves.
183. Students quickly learn what is done and not done on this campus.
184. Faculty members rarely or never call students by their first names.
185. When students dislike a faculty member they make it evident to him.

186. There are many foreign students on the campus.
187. In most classes, the presentation of material is well planned and illustrated.
188. Everyone knows the "snap" courses to take and the tough ones to avoid.
189. Professors seem to enjoy breaking down myths and illusions about famous people.
190. Anyone who knows the right people in the faculty or administration can get a better break here.

191. Students are encouraged to take an active part in social reforms or political programs.
192. Graduation is a pretty matter-of-fact, unemotional event.
193. Faculty members put a lot of energy and enthusiasm into their teaching.
194. There is a lot of fanfare and pageantry in many of the college events.
195. Nearly all students expect to achieve future fame or wealth.

196. All undergraduates must live in university approved housing.
197. Humanities courses are often elected by students majoring in other areas.
198. Students who tend to say or do the first thing that occurs to them are likely to have a
hard time here.
199. There are definite times each week when dining is made a gracious social event.
200. A good deal of enthusiasm and support is aroused by fund drives for Campus Chest, CARE,
Red Cross, refugee aid, etc.

Legend: T - TRUE. Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
                    occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

         F - FALSE. Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
                     which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

201. There always seem to be a lot of little quarrels going on.
202. Most student rooms are pretty messy.
203. It's easy to get a group together for card games, singing, going to the movies, etc.
204. The academic atmosphere is practical, emphasizing efficiency and usefulness.
205. Tutorial or honors programs are available for qualified students.

206. A student who spends most of his time in a science laboratory is likely to be regarded as
      a little odd.
207. There are paintings or statues of nudes on the campus.
208. Students frequently go away for football games, skiing weekends, etc.
209. Students commonly share their problems.
210. Most of the professors are dedicated scholars in their fields.

211. The school administration has little tolerance for student complaints and protests.
212. Standards set by the professors are not particularly hard to achieve.
213. Frequent tests are given in most courses.
214. Students spend a lot of time together at the snack bars, taverns, and in one another's rooms.
215. Students are sometimes noisy and inattentive at concerts or lectures.

216. The history and traditions of the college are strongly emphasized.
217. Most students follow a systematic schedule for studying and recreation.
218. No one gets pushed around at this school without fighting back.
219   Faculty members and administrators see students only during scheduled office hours or
      by appointment.
220. Students exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to the expected codes of conduct.

221. National elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling on the campus.
222. Students here can be wildly happy one minute and hopelessly depressed the next.
223. Many lectures are delivered in a monotone with little inflection or emphasis.
224. Public debates are held frequently.
225. The faculty encourage students to think about exciting and unusual careers.

226. Students rarely get drunk and disorderly.
227. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding.
228. Spontaneous student rallies and demonstrations occur frequently.
229. Proper social forms and manners are important here.
230. Many church and social organizations are especially interested in charities and
      community services.

231. The faculty tend to be suspicious of students' motives and often make the worst
      interpretations of even trivial incidents.
232. Classrooms are kept clean and tidy.
233. There isn't much to do here except go to classes and study.
234. The college offers many really practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc.
235. Long, serious intellectual discussions are common among the students.

236. Many of the natural science professors are actively engaged in research.
237. In papers and reports, vivid and novel expressions are usually criticized.
238. Some of the most popular students have a knack for making witty, subtle remarks with a
      slightly sexy tinge.
239. The professors go out of their way to help you.
240. In class discussions, papers, and exams, the main emphasis is on breadth of understanding,
      perspective and critical judgment.

241. Students don't argue with the professor; they just admit they are wrong.
242. Learning what is in the text book is enough to pass most courses.
243. The professors regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are
      being carried out properly and on time.
244. Students frequently study or prepare for examinations together.
245. Students pay little attention to rules and regulations.

246. Old grads are always pleased to discover that few things have changed.
247. It is hard to prepare for examinations because students seldom know what will be
      expected of them.
248. The campus religious program tends to emphasize the importance of acting on personal conviction
      rather than the acceptance of tradition.
249. Student publications never lampoon dignified people or institutions.
250. People here are always trying to win an argument.

Legend: T - TRUE. Generally true or characteristic of the college, is something which
occurs or might occur, is the way people tend to feel or act.

F - FALSE. Generally false or not characteristic of the college, is something
which is not likely to occur, is not the way people typically feel or act.

251. There are a number of prominent faculty members who play a significant role in national or
local politics.
252. Students tend to hide their deeper feelings from each other.
253. Class discussions are typically vigorous and intense.
254. The college tries to avoid advertising and publicity.
255. The future goals for most students emphasize job security, family happiness, and good citizenship.

256. Few students bother with rubbers, hats, or other special protection against the weather.
257. The library is exceptionally well equipped with journals, periodicals, and books in the
social sciences.
258. There are frequent informal social gatherings.
259. Society orchestras are more popular here than jazz bands or novelty groups.
260. Chapel services on or near the campus are well attended.

261. The school has an excellent reputation for academic freedom.
262. Campus buildings are clearly marked by signs and directories.
263. Students are very serious and purposeful about their work.
264. Education for leadership is strongly emphasized.
265. Students who are concerned with developing their own personal and private system of values
are likely to be regarded as odd.

266. Introductory science or math courses are often elected by students majoring in other areas.
267. To most students here art is something to be studied rather than felt.
268. This college's reputation for marriages is as good as its reputation for education.
269. Students are expected to work out the details of their own program in their own way.
270. Most of the professors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of
their subjects.

271. There is a lot of apple-polishing around here.
272. Most courses are a real intellectual challenge.
273. Students have little or no personal privacy.
274. The professors really talk with the students, not just at them.
275. Students ask permission before deviating from common policies or practices.

276. Most students look for variety and novelty in summer jobs.
277. It is easy to take clear notes in most courses.
278. It is very difficult to get a group decision here without a lot of argument.
279. A controversial speaker always stirs up a lot of student discussion.
280. The student leaders here have lots of special privileges.

281. The expression of strong personal belief or conviction is pretty rare around here.
282. Very few things here arouse much excitement or feeling.
283. The professors really push the students' capacities to the limit.
284. Student parties are colorful and lively.
285. Quite a few faculty members have had varied and unusual careers.

286. Rough games and contact sports are an important part of intramural athletics.
287. In many courses the broad social and historical setting of the material is not discussed.
288. Students frequently do things on the spur of the moment.
289. Students think about dressing appropriately and interestingly for different occasions--classes,
social events, sports, and other affairs.
290. This school has a reputation for being very friendly.

291. Many faculty members seem moody and unpredictable.
292. Classes meet only at their regularly scheduled time and place.
293. Every year there are carnivals, parades, and other festive events on the campus.
294. Most students are interested in careers in business, engineering, management, and
other practical affairs.
295. There is considerable interest in the analysis of value systems, and the relativity of
societies and ethics.

296. There is a lot of interest in the philosophy and methods of science.
297. Concerts and art exhibits always draw big crowds of students.
298. Nearly everyone here has a date for the weekends.
299. Counseling and guidance services are really personal, patient, and extensive.
300. Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading student papers, reports,
or discussions.

APPENDIX C

RELEVANCY OF THE <u>COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS</u>

<u>INDEX</u> FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RELEVANCY OF THE <u>COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS</u>

<u>INDEX</u> FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

When it was ascertained that community college students and university students perceived the press of their respective institutions as being significantly different as determined by significantly different mean scores on all of the eleven factors measured by the <u>College Characteristics Index</u>, a question arose as to whether or not the <u>College Characteristics Index</u> was a valid instrument to have used in measuring the press of the community college. This question concerning the validity of the instrument involved certain items in the <u>Index</u> which conceivably did not pertain to the community college. Although the instructions given when the test was administered specified that an item was to be marked false when it was "not characteristic of the college" it was thought that if enough items were not characteristic of the college or did not pertain to it, and were consequently marked false by the students, that this could produce an artifact which could account for the significant differences which were found. Hence, an effort was made to determine whether or not there were enough of these questionable items and whether or not they pertained to specific factors in sufficient quantity to produce spurious results.

The first step in this aspect of the study was to ask judges who were knowledgeable regarding the particular community college being studied to judge all of the items on

the <u>College Characteristics Index</u> which pertained to two specific factors. The two specific factors were the Academic Achievement factor and the Social Form factor. These factors were selected for the study because the mean scores for community college and university students differed least for the Academic Achievement factor and most for the Social Form factor. It was felt that an examination of the items constituting these two factors would reveal whether or not there were a sufficient number of questionable items to produce spurious results.

Seven judges were asked to independently read all of the items pertaining to the two factors mentioned above and to mark those which they thought were not relevant to the community college. They were specifically directed not to judge an item according to whether or not they thought it was true or false concerning the community college, but to judge it according to whether they thought it was relevant or not relevant to the community college. A thorough examination of the items marked by the judges showed that none of them had judged enough items as "not relevant" to alter the results which had been found concerning the significantly different means for community college and university students.

Although this examination of the items which pertained to these two factors yielded strong evidence that an artifact was not producing spurious results, a second step in this aspect of the study was taken to produce more evidence.

In this second step two judges who were knowledgeable regarding the particular community college being studied were asked to independently judge every item on the College Characteristics Index as to its relevancy for the community college. When there was any doubt concerning the relevancy of an item for the community college, it was marked "not relevant." One judge marked 15 of the 300 items as not relevant, while the other judge marked 10. A thorough examination of these items showed that they were not concentrated in one or a few factors, but were distributed relatively evenly in each of the eleven factors. In no case were enough items judged "not relevant" to alter the results which had been found concerning the significantly different means for community college and university students.

A third step was taken to determine whether or not the College Characteristics Index was a valid instrument to have used in measuring the press of the community college. Other researchers who were currently using the Index to measure the press of community or junior colleges were consulted concerning their opinions on this matter. Two such researchers were consulted.

It was known that the Division of Research in Higher Education for The University of the State of New York was using the College Characteristics Index in a comparison of students from two- and four-year colleges.[a] The Index was

---

[a]At the time of this writing, this study has not been completed. An unpublished abstract by The University of the

being used to measure the "perception of college environment" in approximately 15 public two-year institutions, three from each of five states, representing 28 per cent of the two-year public schools in the United States. It was estimated that the total number of junior college students involved in this sample would approximate 10,000. The students were to be studied over a four-year period.

The director of this research project, Alex J. Ducanis, was asked his opinion regarding the relevancy of the College Characteristics Index for community college students. He stated that this question had been carefully considered by the research staff and that it had decided that the instrument was valid for measuring the press of the two-year colleges. He further stated that it was his opinion that the directions for administering the Index, which state that an item is to be marked false when it is "not characteristic of the college," were satisfactory. Such items, in his opinion, were valid in that they yield useful information regarding the press of the institution. Dr. Ducanis indicated that an item analysis might be included in the research project at some later date.

It was also known that the community colleges in Minnesota were being studied by means of the College Characteristics Index by a Mr. Richard White, Assistant to

---

State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Research in Higher Education, Albany, New York describes the proposed research.

the Vice President of the University of Minnesota.[b] Mr.
White was asked his opinion regarding the relevancy of the
College Characteristics Index for community colleges. He
stated that 2,831 junior college students from 10 public
and two private junior colleges in Minnesota had been
assessed by this instrument and that in his opinion it had
rather adequately assessed their perceptions of the press
of their respective institutions. He further stated that
an item analysis of the instrument is being made as a
separate research project. In Mr. White's opinion, the
instrument is more nearly valid if the student is instructed
to answer each item which might not be characteristic of his
college as if the item were characteristic of his college.

The results of each of the three steps in this aspect
of the study seem to support the position that the College
Characteristics Index is a valid instrument for measuring
students' perceptions of community or junior colleges. The
evidence gathered in these three steps seems to indicate that
an artifact which could account for the significant differ-
ences which were found was not produced by items which were
not relevant for the community college.

---

[b]At the time of this writing, this study has not been
completed. It will apparently be published as a Ph.D.
thesis by Richard White under the title "Patterns of Insti-
tutional Press by Selected Minnesota Junior College Students,"
University of Minnesota, 1964.

JAN 6 1996

JAN 1988

JUL 1967

SEP 1969

APR 13 1972