

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF
STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY WITH
RESPECT TO STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN
UNIVERSITY POLICY FORMULATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ed. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Louis Frederick Hekhuis

1967



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A Comparison of the Perceptions of
Students and Faculty at Michigan State University
with Respect to Student Participation in
University Policy Formulation
presented by

Louis F. Hekhuis

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ed.D. degree in Education

Walter F. Johnson
Major professor

Date July 11, 1967

~~_____~~ **RJ**
~~_____~~ 147
~~_____~~ 166

~~_____~~ 5

APR 6 5 2003
122802

~~_____~~ 326
~~APR 1 10/1 1/54~~

M-720
W022

AUG 18 1953

MAY 12 1953

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY POLICY FORMULATION

by Louis Frederick Hekhuis

The primary purpose of this study was to compare perceptions of selected students and faculty members at Michigan State University with respect to student involvement in university policy formulation. Six sample groups were identified for the purpose of determining whether there was any relationship between membership in a group and the perception of the extent students should be involved in university policy formulation. The six sample groups were (1) student non-leaders, (2) student leaders, (3) faculty non-leaders, (4) faculty leaders, (5) academic administrators, and (6) student personnel administrators.

This study was conducted during the Fall Term of 1966. At that time the instrument which was used to compare perceptions was mailed to the sample population. Responses from the sample groups ranged from 80% to 96%.

The Design and Procedure of the Study

A 71-item questionnaire based on functionally identified policy areas of the university was designed to obtain individual perceptions. On each item individuals were asked to indicate the extent to which they thought students should be involved in university policy formulation. Responses were indicated on a five point scale. The statistic chi square was used in analyzing the data and the .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance. In all instances, however, where significant differences in perception among the comparison groups were found, use of the chi square statistic resulted in the .01 level of confidence being obtained.

Findings

Of the 71 items listed in the questionnaire significant differences among the comparison groups were found in 51 of the items. Most respondents tended to view student participation in policy formulation related to student personnel administration as either a shared responsibility with faculty and administrators or one in which students recommended or advised. Student participation in policy formulation relating to general institutional government or academic administration, however, was most often perceived as participation through recommending or advising.

Student personnel administrators more often agreed with students concerning the extent of student participation in university policy formulation than did faculty or academic administrators.

Although there was agreement that in certain areas university policy formulation should be the primary responsibility of either the faculty, the administration or the student body, university policy formulation in most areas, however, was not perceived as the sole prerogative of one group to the exclusion of others.

Further research concerning possible models for involving students and faculty in university policy formulation would be helpful. Although there is much agreement about the desirability of involving students in various areas of university policy formulation, there is considerable confusion and disagreement on how to best accomplish it.

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS
AND FACULTY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT PARTICIPATION
IN UNIVERSITY POLICY FORMULATION

By

Louis Frederick Hekhuis

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services
and Educational Psychology

1967

G47111
12-25-67

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to the members of his Guidance Committee, Dr. Walter Johnson, chairman, Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, Dr. Max Smith and Dr. Orden Smucker for their criticisms and suggestions. As chairman, Dr. Johnson was patient, understanding and helpful in his counsel.

A special note of thanks to Dr. Nonnamaker for his valued advice and encouragement and without whose help the study would not have been completed.

An additional note of thanks to Miss Pat Carter for typing and editing and overall assistance in working on the study.

Finally to my wife, Jean, and Karen, Mark and Susan, my everlasting gratitude for their help, encouragement and sacrifices in aiding me to complete the study.

Louis Frederick Hekhuis

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Date of Examination: July 11, 1967, 10:30 am, Erickson Hall.

Dissertation: A Comparison of the Perceptions of Students and Faculty
at Michigan State University with Respect to Student
Participation in University Policy Formulation.

Outline of Studies:

Major Area - Guidance and Personnel Services

Minor Area - Higher Education

Cognate Area - Sociology

Biographical Items:

Birthdate - September 14, 1928, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Undergraduate Studies - Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
Bachelor of Arts
1946-1950

Graduate Studies - Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
Master of Arts
1956-1958

Membership:

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
Phi Delta Kappa
Omicron Delta Kappa

Experience:

High school teacher and counselor, Grand Haven High School,
Grand Haven, Michigan, 1950-51, 1954-59; U.S. Army, 1951-53;
Assistant Director, Men's Division of Student Affairs, Michigan
State University, 1959-63; Director, Student Activities Division,
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, Michigan State
University, 1963-67.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Statement of the Problem	4
	Definition of Terms	4
	Hypothesis	6
	Limitations of the Study	7
	Delimitations of the Study	7
	Procedures Used in this Study	7
	Organization of the Study	8
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
	Historical Perspective	9
	Studies Relating to the Participation of Students in University Policy Formulation	15
	Articles and Reports Related to Student Participation in University Policy Formulation	27
III.	DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	37
	The Population and Method of Selection	37
	The Instrument and Procedures Used in Obtaining Data	38
	Analyzing the Data	40
IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	41
	Non-Significant Items	42
	Significant Items - Student Personnel Administration	44
	Significant Items - General Institutional Government	65
	Significant Items - Academic Administration	79

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

V.	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY	97
	The Problem	97
	The Design and Procedures of the Study	97
	Findings and Conclusions	98
	Areas of Agreement	98
	Areas of Disagreement	99
	Student Personnel Administration	99
	General Institutional Government	102
	Academic Administration	103
	Implications for Further Study	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY		109
APPENDICES		112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Response by Sample Group to the Questionnaire	39
2 Items Showing Agreement by Respondents	42
3 Intramural Athletics	45
4 Student Publications	46
5 Cultural Programs	47
6 Use of Student Records	48
7 Student Driving and Parking Regulations	49
8 Student Radio Stations	50
9 Off-Campus Speakers	51
10 Women's Closing Hours	52
11 Student Union Facilities	53
12 Placement Center Services	54
13 Scholarship and Financial Aids Assistance	55
14 Off-Campus Housing Services	56
15 Residence Hall Housing Services	57
16 Married Housing Services	58
17 Counseling Center Services	59
18 Student Health and Accident Insurance	60
19 Student Orientation Programs	61
20 Evaluation of Students	62
21 Promotion of Dean of Students Staff	63
22 Policies Relative to Student Conduct	64

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

23	Tuition Charges and Fees	65
24	Residence Hall Room and Board Rates	66
25	Design and Construction of New Buildings	67
26	Intercollegiate Athletics	68
27	Promotion of Administrative Officers	69
28	Budget Appropriations to Colleges and Departments Within the University	70
29	Faculty Driving and Parking Regulations	71
30	Solicitation of Funds by Faculty	72
31	Use of the University Mail Distribution System	73
32	Degree Requirements	74
33	Military Training (ROTC Program)	75
34	Faculty Sabbaticals	76
35	Library Resources and Procedures	77
36	Policies Relative to Faculty Conduct	78
37	Cheating in the Classroom	79
38	Faculty Evaluation	80
39	Faculty Selection	81
40	Course Content	82
41	Class Attendance	83
42	Methods of Instruction	84
43	Faculty Teaching Loads	85
44	Grading Practices	86
45	Selection of Graduate Assistants	87
46	Class Size	88

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

47	Textbook Selection	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	89
48	Academic Advising	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	90
49	Development of New Curricula	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	91
50	Course Scheduling	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	92
51	Curriculum Requirements	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	93
52	Scheduling of Final Examinations	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	94
53	Course Waivers	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	95

Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The present generation of college students is forcing universities to re-evaluate existing institutional controls and methods of policy formulation. The demonstrations at Berkeley served to illustrate in an extreme way the concerns of many students across the country. The formation in the past two years, for example, of a number of student protest groups, such as the Students for a Democratic Society, gives further evidence of a desire by students to question existing policies and the ways in which the policies are formulated. All of this is in marked contrast to the students of the "1950's." Jacob in his study Changing Values in College described the latter student in the following way:

There is a profile of values which hold for 75 to 80 percent of all American college students, a campus norm of values which prevails in the 1950's, coast to coast, a State university or denominational college, for the ivy leaguer or city commuter. The current student generation is gloriously contented in regard to its present day activity and its outlook for the future. Students are unabashedly self-centered in outlook, aspiring above all to material gratifications for themselves and their families. Though conventionally middle-class they have an easy tolerance of diversity and are ready to live in a society without racial, ethnic, or income barriers. The traditional moral virtues, such as sincerity, honesty, and loyalty are

highly valued, but there is little inclination to censor laxity, which students consider to be widespread. A need for religion is generally recognized, but students do not expect religious beliefs to govern decisions in daily living. Rather, they anticipate that these decisions will be socially determined. The general tendency is to be dutifully responsive toward government, but there is little inclination to contribute voluntarily to the public welfare or to seek an influential role in public affairs. Attitudes toward international affairs are strangely contradictory. Another war is predicted within a dozen years, yet international problems are the least of the concerns to which students expect to give attention in their immediate future. Finally, students tend to set great stock by college in general and their own college in particular, regarding vocational preparation and skills and experience in social relations as the greatest benefits of college education.¹

The student of the 60's, however, dares to deviate from his counterpart of the 50's, or at least a significant number do. As Horner and Horner point out "nonconformity is replacing conformity, passivism is being replaced by activism and effervescence is being substituted for acquiescence."²

Robert J. Wert, Dean of Undergraduate Education at Stanford University, reports, "Undergraduate students are now demanding that they receive a fair share of the university's effort. They are insisting that the university re-organize so that they will not feel isolated or

¹ Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New Haven, Connecticut: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959.

² Horner, James T. and Rosemary L. "Student Involvement in Governance and Administration of Higher Education," The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. Vol. 4, No. 2 (October, 1966) p. 60.

alienated from the university community."³ Wert perceives a more basic question, however, stemming from this increased concern on the part of students: who really is to be boss in tomorrow's university; the trustees, the president, the faculty, or the students? Perceived from this standpoint then the question is not "shall students participate" but more appropriately "how and to what extent shall they participate?" Consequently many universities have been forced to re-examine the methods and procedures used in policy formulation and to more carefully consider the role of the students in policy making.

The Purpose of the Study

The extent to which students have been involved in institutional policy making at various institutions has been dependent upon the established educational goals of the institution; i.e., whether student involvement in policy making is seen as desirable and/or appropriate. At large universities it is particularly difficult to gain some kind of consensus on the desirable and appropriate ways to involve students in policy making. The purpose of this study is to compare perceptions among selected students and faculty members with respect to student involvement in university policy formulation. Such a study can be of considerable help in developing procedures for involving students in a more

³ Wert, Robert J. "Our Restless," Think, November-December, 1965, p. 26.

significant way in policy making by pointing out the areas of agreement and disagreement among faculty and students. In addition, the results of the study can have implications for student leadership training programs and the orientation of new faculty members.

Statement of the Problem

In this study the perceptions of selected faculty and student groups at Michigan State University are compared with respect to student involvement in the formulation of policy in 71 functionally identified areas of the university. An attempt will be made in analyzing the data to determine whether there is any relationship between membership in selected student and faculty groupings with respect to the extent students should be involved in university policy formulation.

Definition of Terms

Student leader: A junior or senior student who holds any of the following positions:

living unit president

major governing group president (a president of

Associated Women Students

Panhellenic Council

Intercooperative Council

Off Campus Council

Men's Halls Association

Women's Inter-Residence Council

Interfraternity Council

Associated Students of Michigan State University Board
member (one of fifteen members of the governing
body of student government at Michigan State
University)

Associated Students of Michigan State University Cabinet
president

Associated Students of Michigan State University Cabinet
vice-president or director (individuals appointed
by the Cabinet president and approved by the
Student Board to be responsible for various areas
in the executive branch of student government)

Student non-leader: A junior or senior not holding one of the
above named positions.

Faculty leader: A member of the faculty not holding an adminis-
trative position but who has served within the past two years on any
of the following councils or committees:

Academic Council

Educational Policies Committee

Lecture-Concert Series Committee

Faculty Committee on Student Affairs

University Curriculum Committee

University Traffic Committee

University Forum Committee

Board of Publications

Faculty Tenure Committee

University Library Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty non-leader: A member of the faculty not holding an administrative position and who presently is not serving and has not served within the past two years on any of the above stated committees.

Student personnel administrator: Full-time professional staff members of the Dean of Students Office.

Academic administrator: A member of the faculty holding an administrative position of dean or assistant dean.

Hypothesis

The study is concerned with the perceptions of students and faculty at Michigan State University with respect to student participation in university policy formulation. It is hypothesized that there is a relationship between membership in selected student and faculty groups with respect to the extent students should be involved in university policy formulation. The basis for this hypothesis is that through participation or non-participation in student or faculty governments or through being a student personnel or academic administrator an individual would have a different perception of the extent to which students should be involved in university policy formulation. The chi square test for independence will be used in testing the hypothesis.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited by the factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire. These include the difficulties in tabulating, validating and securing the complete cooperation of the respondents.

Delimitations of the Study

The principle delimitation of this study is that it is concerned only with the perceptions of students and faculty at Michigan State University.

Procedures Used in this Study

The population of this study consisted of the students and faculty members of Michigan State University during Fall Term of 1966. Six sample groups based on the degree of participation in, and administrative responsibility for policy formulation were identified and defined. The six sample groups selected were: student leaders, student non-leaders, faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders, student personnel administrators, and academic administrators.

In order to adequately compare the six groups a questionnaire listing policy areas related to particular functions of the University was developed. In answering the questionnaire individuals were asked to select one response for each item listed from the following scale: students (1) are primarily responsible for policy formulation without faculty or administrative participation, (2) share responsibility with

faculty and/or administrators through serving on joint committees, (3) have opportunity to advise or recommend to faculty and/or administrators with respect to the policy involved, (4) would not normally participate, and (5) no opinion or comments.

Organization of the Study

For the purpose of convenience and systematic consideration, this study is reported in five chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction of the study, the purpose of the study, a statement of the problem, the population examined and limitations of the study. Chapter II includes an historical perspective of student involvement in university policy formulation and a review of research related to this study. Chapter III consists of a detailed report of the methodology used in developing the questionnaire and the procedures used in analyzing the data. The findings are reported in Chapter IV. A summary of the findings along with the conclusions and implications for further study are found in Chapter V.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Perspective

Student participation in college government as Klopff points out is "neither a novelty nor a modern idea." Most writers refer to the medieval universities of the 12th and 13th century as examples of institutions where strong student controls existed. According to Klopff

Student government in the Middle Ages developed from a genuine need on the part of students. Scholars came from foreign lands and were thrown on their own resources. Because of oppression they were forced to form "nations" or guilds for their own protection. These organizations first appeared during the later part of the twelfth century. In no other university did they acquire so much prestige or power as they did at the University of Paris. It was from here that the idea of guilds spread throughout Europe and into England.⁴

Student government in the medieval university developed for different reasons, however, than student government in American universities. As Klopff further points out

Student government in the medieval university was essentially different from our present form in that a pressing social and

⁴ Klopff, Gordon. College Student Government. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 37.

economic need lay at the base of the medieval organization, while in America it arose as the application of a democratic ideal to education.

Student government has also developed in the United States as a result of students wanting a means of organizing and channeling their opinion concerning programs, services, issues, fees, and charges, particularly those areas which affect student welfare. Student government is also seen by student personnel workers as a means of teaching not only citizenship skills but effective human relations and group procedures.⁵

Even though initially students exercised much influence and control in the medieval universities, the faculties soon found themselves in a position of dominance.

The balance was to swing to the faculties within a few hundred years as a result of the new favored position they gained over the transient student population through acquisition of permanent facilities and tenure and also because of the excesses of student action. While some vestiges of student control persisted (the system of paying fees to the individual professor, for instance, was one of the most potent faculty rating devices ever instituted), the general atmosphere became one of faculty dominance.⁶

Falvey further points out the swing from student to faculty control

As the universities acquired books and property, the masters tended to remain with them and in time began to determine policies and to assume control. As residence in university halls was enforced, student powers and privileges were curtailed. In time, the power of the "nations" declined, for by the sixteenth century the head officials had become

⁵ Klopff, op. cit., p. 38.

⁶ Lunn, Harry H. The Student's Role in College Policy-Making. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1957, p. 1.

merely political appointees. Thus schools eventually became complete autocracies administered by the masters. By the time of the Reformation, the democratic university of the Middle Ages had been converted into a "narrow oligarch."⁷

Colonial America

In colonial America the first colleges (Harvard, 1636; William and Mary, 1693; Yale, 1701) were patterned after the English college and were designed primarily to train students for the ministry. The first recorded example of student participation in American college administration was at William and Mary

Probably the first example of student participation in American colleges was at William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., in 1779, after the college had been in existence for more than three-quarters of a century. The political break with England and the emergence of the democratic idea were undoubtedly responsible for this development. The students elected representatives to a central body and this handled lesser details of "general improvement," routine discipline. The plan was very simple, but it was a beginning. Probably it had some influence on its famous alumnus, Thomas Jefferson, who later organized the University of Virginia after an earlier movement to make a state university out of William and Mary had failed.⁸

William and Mary was also the first college to adopt an honor system and to introduce the elective system as well.⁹ The University of

⁷ Falvey, Frances E. Student Participation in College Administration, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1952, p. 36.

⁸ Falvey, op. cit., p. 39.

⁹ Falvey, op. cit., p. 39.

Virginia under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson early involved students in its administration

The University of Virginia was very liberal from the start. Outstanding features of its organization were an elective curriculum, freedom from religious tests and practices, equality of professors, and rotation election of department chairmen. A system of self-government includes an honor system for all examinations, control of most student activities, and the handling of ordinary cases of discipline.¹⁰

Findlay reports that Oberlin College founded in 1893 helped foster the development of student government

Students of all races were admitted; women were permitted the same educational opportunities as men; the faculty, not the administrators alone, had a large part in the administration; and there was provision for student participation and cooperation in institutional management. Not only did Oberlin flourish from the start, but students from the Atlantic seaboard traveled to Oberlin to enroll instead of attending Harvard or Yale. These students were the "first ancestors of student government in American higher education."¹¹

Sheldon surveyed 40 institutions in 1899 in an attempt to determine the extent of student government in American colleges. Included in the survey were 20 of the smallest colleges in New England and the West and 20 of the largest American universities. Five classes of student participation were found: (1) student courts for those caught cheating on examinations, (2) advisory committees to the faculty,

¹⁰ McKown, Harry C. The Student Council. McGraw Hill, New York, 1944, p. 12.

¹¹ Findlay, F. J. "Student Government: Medieval, Colonial and Modern Style," School Activities (April 1940), p. 316.

(3) general disciplinary, (4) committees for the maintenance of order in dormitories, and (5) student body associations that differed from the four preceding forms.¹² In summary Sheldon pointed out that the majority of the plans had been moderate successes but that the success was by no means uniform. More specifically he concluded that

These student self-governing bodies must be regarded as incidental rather than essential creations of the American student spirit. Many of the most representative colleges have been without them. They do not belong to the class of great representative student institutions, with the class organizations, the debating society, the fraternity, and the athletic club.¹³

In the early 1900's Falvey reports that the work of the Natural Self-Government Committee, Inc. (Richard Willing, Chairman) was of considerable influence in the further development of student participation in college administration. Generally the Committee was concerned with the education for citizenship with student participation being a means to this end.¹⁴ One of the more important studies in the early part of the twentieth century was completed by Edwards, Artman, and Fisher in 1928. The authors studied 23 colleges and were able to identify three types of student government: paternalistic or limited student government, thorough student government, and joint faculty-student government. These three types of student

¹² Sheldon, Henry D. Student Life and Customs. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1901, p. 148-151.

¹³ Ibid., p. 271.

¹⁴ Falvey, op. cit., p. 148-151.

government were described in the following way:

Paternalistic government not only induces passive resistance but tends to suppress the initiative of the more alert students... (It) is obviously not a stimulant to self-government..Wherever in the colleges studies thorough student government was practiced, students and faculty alike spoke of a "sense of personal responsibility," "practice in self-imposed control," "initiative," and "interest in government," the sense of a "student community," "confidence between students and faculty," and of "holding office in the council as a responsibility"...

The authors believe that it (student-faculty government) tends to develop a unified community in which faculty and students, old and young, share in the problems and in the efforts to solve them. It intensifies the sense of individual responsibility for the community, and of community responsibility for the individual. Service on the government board by students is looked upon as an honor and a public trust. The significance of such experience as a training ground for participation in political government is obvious.¹⁵

Of note at this time also was the development of a campus community government primarily at Antioch and Benningston. Falvey reports that:

In a system of campus community government, all members of the campus community (faculty, students, administration, and often maintenance staff) participate cooperatively and work together in respect to the aims, interests, problems, and difficulties of all members of the community. There is no longer a separation of student activities into academic, extra-curricular, and personal categories. Through joint committees of faculty and students, all community matters are considered, and it is felt by schools practicing this type of government that it affords rich and vital experiences in sharing, in cooperation, and in participation in democratic living.¹⁶

¹⁵ Edwards, R.H., Artman, J.M. and Fisher, Galen M. Undergraduates: A Study of Morale in Twenty-three American Colleges and Universities. New York: Doubleday Doran Company, 1928.

¹⁶ Falvey, op. cit., p. 46.

Strang in 1937 noted a trend toward student-faculty cooperation in curricular as well as extra-curricular phases of school life.¹⁷ Her recommendations for future development of student cooperation in government included participation by all members of the student body, improvement of lines of communication to obtain a "two-way" interchange of ideas and education of administrators, teachers, and students.

With the founding of the United States National Student Association in 1947 further impetus was given toward strengthening student participation in university government. As Schodde reports

Its catechism was a Student Bill of Rights, later strengthened by a list of student responsibilities, which was a frontal assault upon the time-honored college tradition of "in-loco-parentis!" Its program, according to the Association's Report of the Constitutional Convention, was to represent an American student viewpoint at home and abroad.

...At its annual Congress, delegates meet with other student government leaders. Leading educators and national figures are invited to address the Congress.

Seminars and discussions are held on such topics as academic freedom, student government, international student affairs, and the role of the American student in today's society. As a result of this two week experience, students often gain new insights into and acquire personal commitment for the part student government might play on this campus.

They return and encourage students to enlarge their role in the educational enterprise by participating in curriculum planning, instructor evaluation, and institutional policy making. They ask student government to subordinate its preoccupation with calendaring social activities, planning dances, and supervising

¹⁷ Strang, Ruth. Group Activities in College and Secondary School. New York: Harper and Bros., 1941.

student parking in favor of a more responsible role in university affairs.¹⁸

The USNSA has enjoyed continued growth since its inception and there is little doubt concerning the impact it has had on the development on student government in particular and higher education in general.

The first half of the twentieth century saw student government evolve with a primary function of supervising social activities. However as Klopff rather prophetically pointed out in 1950

In many institutions the role of student government will perhaps always remain as that of dealing with student activities. Some colleges may add various conduct and honor system responsibilities. But as higher education progresses in America, there will be more thought given to increasing the responsibility of the student in governing his college.¹⁹

Studies Relating to the Participation of

Students in University Policy Formulation

A number of studies in recent years have dealt with student participation in university policy formulation. Some are compilations of questionnaires surveying the degree of participation by students in various policy areas. Others discuss more specifically the reasons for or against student participation in university policy formulation.

¹⁸ Schodde, Stephen C. "The NSA and Student Government," Journal of Deans of Students and Student Personnel Administrators, October, 1964, p. 15.

¹⁹ Klopff, op. cit., p. 42.

Relevant findings and conclusions of selected studies will be reported in this section.

One of the more loosely structured studies concerning student participation in university government was instituted by the United States National Student Association during the early 1950's and compiled by Friedson in 1955.²⁰

Student government leaders and deans of students in over 400 schools were questioned concerning student participation in a variety of areas. One of the more interesting questions asked related to the committee structure and major actions of student governments.

Four hundred and eighty-six student governments were asked to list their standing committees. Among those listed most frequently were: elections, student social and economic welfare needs, calendar-ing student activities and publications. Among the committees infrequently mentioned were: curriculum, debate or forensics and student housing. In the same study student government presidents were asked to identify "those areas for which the student government body has originated a study group or initiated a program." The areas of interest and actions most frequently cited were: social policies, charity drives, student discipline and training of college leaders. The areas of interest infrequently mentioned were: curriculum, tuition policies,

²⁰ Friedson, Eliot. Student Government, Student Leaders and the American College (Philadelphia: U.S. National Student Association, 1955).

student loans, location and need of new buildings.

In another question deans of students were asked to indicate areas in which students should have control or as the replies indicated areas in which students should have a voice in participation. There were few, if any, areas where the deans felt that students should have final control. The areas most often cited were: promoting student participation in extra-curricular activities, planning charity campaigns, problems of student apathy, conducting freshman orientation and selecting speakers. Those areas infrequently mentioned by the deans were: college calendar, intercollegiate athletics, academic policy, admissions policy and tuition.²¹

In this instance there appeared to be more agreement than disagreement concerning the areas in which student government was actually involved and the areas in which deans of students thought students should participate.

Other areas were surveyed in the study. With respect to the evaluation, selection, and promotion of faculty members and administrative officers for example

The USNSA study showed that 72 student governments (out of 486) had taken action to initiate such programs during the 1953-54 year and perhaps suprisingly, revealed 274 deans of students felt this to be an activity in which students are capable of a positive contribution.²²

²¹ Friedson, op. cit., chapter 1.

²² Lunn, op. cit., p. 35.

In the area of student government finances the report states that

... 72% of 449 deans indicated that the major source of the financial support for student government is an activities fee levied by the college on every student and disbursed to student government." The implication thus is that student government does not have the power to levy its own taxes. Deans also were asked to indicate all parties who must approve the student government budget. Two out of three of the major approving agencies included the administration.²³

With respect to student participation in policy formulation related to institutional grounds and facilities, the study showed that

...actions related to better use of existing campus facilities rated seventh in order of importance and traffic programs eighth, though no student government reported taking action on the need or location of new buildings. In a ranking of areas of student competence in planning and administration of thirty-five areas of college policy derived from the USNSA questionnaire to deans, safety programs ranked tenth, controlling dormitory policies, eleventh; parking regulations twelfth; direction of college unions, fifteenth; library policies, nineteenth; and selecting sites for new buildings, twenty-ninth.²⁴

Student publications were also a concern of this study and in general it was concluded that

Student government activity in the publications field is established on many campuses--214 of the 486 student government presidents reporting in the USNSA study indicated that their organizations had standing committees in this area. Student policy participation centers in three areas on campus-- student newspaper and other periodicals, college public relations, and institutional publications.²⁵

²³ Friedson, op. cit., p. 15.

²⁴ Lunn, op. cit., p. 48.

²⁵ Lunn, op. cit., p. 52.

In the area of intercollegiate and intramural athletics, the study revealed

...intercollegiate athletics ranked eleventh in the list of areas covered by student government action in the 1954-55 year, 63 of the 486 responding governments indicating action during that year. Deans were not optimistic about the validity of student policy participation in this area, however. They ranked it thirty-second out of thirty-five areas in which they felt students were competent to act.²⁶

Student participation in curriculum planning was also surveyed and 514 of the 424 deans who participated expressed the view that

...students have a contribution to make in the area of curriculum planning. It is notable that more than one in seven of the responding student government heads (69 of 470) reported the existence on their campuses of student curriculum committees.²⁷

Finally in the area of discipline, the study showed that

...64 percent of the 486 student body president queried in 1954 indicated there was some formal disciplinary body on campus in which students participate. Many of these are all-campus bodies and in most cases include students, faculty, and administration representatives. Rarely is the court composed of students alone. In 67 percent of 311 cases the student members were selected by the student government or student body. In most instances the student or student-faculty disciplinary body decision is attested in the study by the fact that at 97 percent of the 163 institutions in which the administration had reviewed recent cases, the verdict of the student court was upheld.²⁸

In another study supportive of the USNSA findings, Hynes, in a survey of 70 co-educational colleges and universities, reported

²⁶ Lunn, op. cit., p. 59.

²⁷ Friedson, op. cit., Table A-66.

²⁸ Friedson, op. cit., pp. 8, 9, 16.

increased student representation, since 1945, on university committees of an administrative nature. The committees most frequently cited as having student representation were: fiscal policies and procedures, scholarship and admissions.²⁹

One of the more comprehensive reports on student participation in college administration was compiled by Harry H. Lunn for the American College on Education. Of particular note is Lunn's discussion of problem areas in developing student participation in policy making. Lunn noted four problems specifically

- (1) establishment of avenues for student participation,
- (2) definition of scope and degree of student participation,
- (3) development of effective student participation, and
- (4) overcoming of traditional thinking and procedures as well as the development of adequate inter-personnel relationships.³⁰

Lunn then covers student participation in (1) the general government of the institution, (2) academic administration, and (3) student personnel administration. Much of his material is drawn from the Student Government Research Study of 1955 by the United States National Student Association and from various college and university programs.

With respect to faculty evaluation, for example, Lunn quotes

²⁹ Hynes, Dorothy. "A Study of the Range of Student Government Function at Seventy Coeducational Colleges and Universities" (Masters thesis, Cornell University), p. 46.

³⁰ Lunn, op. cit., p. 11.

Mueller as reporting in the American Association of University Professors Bulletin in 1951 that

...more than a quarter of the 804 colleges and universities which replied to his questionnaire were using student ratings and planned to continue them.³¹

In the area of university public relations Lunn cites an experience at the University of Minnesota. Taken from Minnesota Senate meetings the report states that

In the 1951 University of Minnesota faculty committees, at the request of President J. L. Morrill, surveyed the possibilities of student participation. In deciding to add student representation, the Senate Committee on the Relations of the University to Other Institutions of Learning replied through its chairman to the president:

...the Senate Committee...has discussed the desirability of adding student members and increasing communications with students at its first two fall quarter meetings. Because certain activities of our committee involve the accreditation of Minnesota high schools and colleges and the various institutional relationships which this involves, we did not feel willing to extend voting privileges to student members. We did however agree that students ought to participate in discussion and all other committee activities and have defined this condition as "associate membership."

With this background I was requested to inform you that the Senate Committee on Relations is willing to extend associate membership to two students for two-year overlapping terms; the students to be chosen in such a way as to represent the student body. As in the past the Committee will endeavor to secure and increase

³¹ Lunn, op. cit., p. 38.

student cooperation and aid in our high school-university conference on problems of transition and other activities of a similar nature.³²

In discussing the participation of students in the chartering of student organizations Lunn reports that

The USNSA research project obtained the information shown in the tabulations below from answers to a questionnaire to student government presidents, revealing the great extent to which students, alone or with the faculty and administration, have influence over the chartering and review of major campus groups:

Granting of Charters

Method	Number
Student governing body, subject to administrative review.	114
Student governing body, without administrative concurrence necessary	112
Student governing body after administrative approval	74
Joint student-faculty committee on student organizations	73
Administration without consultation with student government body necessary	72
Other	17

Review Power Over Major Organizations

Area	Percent of those reported
Residence hall organizations	77
Interfraternity or Panhellenic Council	53
Newspaper or other student publications	52 ³³

In the area of scholarships Lunn feels that

Student participation in policy-making on scholarships and other financial aids is more likely to develop through student

³² Lunn, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

³³ Lunn, op. cit., p. 93.

interest in establishing certain types of aids than through their concern over selection of recipients of such aid. Innumerable examples could be cited of small scholarship funds originated by students within departments or colleges, many times to symbolize the work of a particularly respected faculty member or a student killed in wartime.³⁴

Finally with respect to student participation in the area of health insurance Lunn cites a procedure at the State College of Washington where the Campus Health Advisory Committee includes three students who work with seven faculty and staff members. The committee

1. Serves as a resource committee in recommending policies of student health, college community sanitation, and student health education to the college administration.
2. Promotes greater awareness on the part of students, faculty and the administration of the importance of health protection for students and faculty.
3. Serves as an advisory group for the dean of students, the director of student health, and the campus sanitarian on matters of student health and campus sanitation.
4. Advises the Education Policies Committee on organization and scope of health and hygiene (mental and physical) courses for inclusion in the curriculum.³⁵

More recently Cowan and Williamson surveyed 1000 regionally-accredited four-year baccalaureate-degree granting institutions of more than 100 students with respect to student freedom of expression. Five individuals in each university were questioned: president, dean of students, student body president, student newspaper editor, chairman of the faculty committee on student affairs. Cowan and Williamson proceeded in this fashion because as they state

³⁴ Lunn, op. cit., p. 95.

³⁵ Lunn, op. cit., p. 96.

We assumed that each of these people could respond in three capacities. Each was a perceiver of the status quo: he could tell us how much freedom he perceived on his campus with respect to the specific issues we designated. He was a leader who could speak with authority about the forces which influenced him in making decisions and the principles which he personally tried to apply. He was also in a position to assess the strength of the forces at work to expand or restrict the extent of student freedom, and to judge whether these forces were increasing or diminishing.³⁶

Of importance to this study, of course, was the information compiled concerning the role of the student leader. Cowan and Williamson report that in 61 percent of the schools responding to our survey, according to deans, students hold membership in administrative policy-making committees and in almost 85 percent of these schools this membership brings with it the right to vote. In order to appraise the efficacy of student participation in these committees, they asked the president and dean of students: "How relevant or helpful do you appraise the contributions of such participation to be?" They also asked the student body president, "In your opinion, what, if any, benefits accrue to the university and students by their participation in policy making?" Again, there was a wide range of response including agreement, qualification, and disagreement with the ideas that participation is beneficial. A considerable number of benefits and disadvantages were identified by both students and administrators.³⁷

³⁶ Williams, E.G. and Cowan, John L. "Students and Academic Freedom," A Report of Commission VIII, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Washington, D.C., 1965.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 134-135.

The following reasons were offered by students who felt their participation in policy making was useful:

First, student participation in policy-making enables the administrator to "preview" student opinion, while students have an opportunity to change "unrealistic" administration-proposed policies. Second...the usual faculty communications between students and administration are improved; students are less likely to protest policy changes which are as much theirs as the administrations.

(The student) point of view, though often lacking years of experience, can provide a fresh approach to college problems.

The students learn the complexities which affect policy-making decisions. Actually, the arrangement makes sense when one considers that the administration wants to offer the environment for the best education. The student wants the best education available to him.

This "responsible freedom" allows opportunity for the full growth of the student.³⁸

College presidents were also quoted as being enthusiastic in describing the benefits of this student participation:

They (students) often shed a different light on a given situation and assist the administration in gaining the proper perspective on problems of policy. It also serves as training in citizenship for the student representatives...We have a good deal of respect for the serious thinking of our student leaders.³⁹

Cowan and Williamson conclude

Students participate in policy-making committees in a majority of schools and have the opportunity to suggest changes in many more. They have pressed for change or clarification of policy at about half the schools and have been successful in about one-third. Some formal channels of student participation in policy-making seem to be open at nearly all schools. Whether

³⁸ Williamson and Cowan, op. cit., p. 135.

³⁹ Williamson and Cowan, op. cit., p. 136.

this participation is useful to students and/or administrators is a highly individual matter, and is probably the result of the design of the formal framework, the weight of tradition, and the prejudices and tact of both students and administrators. Where the participation works it seems to work to the immense satisfaction of all concerned and where it fails the administrators' remarks are intolerant, and the students' comments are bitter and sarcastic.⁴⁰

Golden and Rosen determined the areas of college administration where students desired to participate and investigated the relationship between attitudes toward such participation and authoritarianism as a personality trait by surveying three separate college campuses in New York State.

The findings indicated that: (1) students seem to be the most concerned with those areas which have an immediate influence on their everyday campus lives; i.e., policies affecting where they live, when, where and how they study and how they are evaluated in their endeavors. (2) Students that perform better academically are likely to be more favorably disposed toward student participation in university decision-making than are their more poorly performing counterparts. They conclude by stating that "students like employees in industry are a force to be reckoned with and that recognition of this fact by faculty and administrative officials, in our opinion, must not be long in coming."⁴¹

⁴⁰ Williamson and Cowan, op. cit., p. 142.

⁴¹ Golden, Patricia M. and Rosen, Ned A. "Student Attitudes Toward Participation in University Administration: An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Prerogatives," Journal of College Student Personnel. November 1966, pp. 323-330.

Additional Articles and Reports Related to
Student Participation in University Policy Formulation

A number of articles and reports have appeared in various periodicals during the last few years discussing student participation in university policy making. Those articles pertinent to this study will be reviewed.

Recently, Martin identified the principle arguments of those opposed to substantive student participation in academic policy formulation and institutional governance. An abstract of responses selected from a stratified sample of full-time faculty members by Martin indicated that:

1. Students are immature and lacking in experiences appropriate to such responsibilities, impressionable at best, at worst they are irresponsible.
2. Students have a short-term connection with the school and correspondingly limited loyalty. They lack a sense of history or tradition and can bear no legal responsibility for the institution.
3. Students would be bored and impatient with what goes on at most faculty committee meetings and should thank God they are not obliged to attend. Furthermore, they have nothing positive to contribute to them.
4. Finally, if students can do a better job than faculty, they ought to be doing the teaching.⁴²

⁴² Martin, Warren B. "Student Participation in Academic Governance." Paper presented to Group 5 on "Student Participation in Governance of the Institution" at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association of Higher Education, Chicago, March 6, 1967.

Martin feels that the implication is that there would be no objection to greater student involvement if students could measure up to the standards of educated adults. His immediate response is, first, students measure up well enough to make important contributions to the community of learning and second, if they are not granted participation, it will not be because of their inadequacies but because faculty and administrators do not want arrangements disrupted that now work to their convenience and advantage.⁴³

Williamson feels that if student participation is to be effective, the issues must be of consequence to the students.

We cannot create imaginary problems and inconsequential activities to keep them occupied and "out-of-our-hair." It is not enough to give students responsibilities for other students, as in student government, without giving them any participating responsibility for the institution which sets limits for the students to enforce through judiciary processes.

Really, then, the secret of "training" students in leadership is to involve them in important campus administration and to accept them as worthwhile individuals. The experience they gain will be used in their post-college lives and participation in local, national, and international affairs and government. Students must, therefore, be accepted as a part of the academic institution, and not as merely passive recipients of instruction, who pay their fare and passively ride the route to graduation, then to be handed a transfer to life in the community at large.

⁴³ Martin, op. cit.

We must early identify the gifted few and persuade them to become actively involved so that they, in turn, may cultivate the desire for participation and leadership in all students for the full development of humane persons.⁴⁴

Jacob supports Williamson's viewpoint in stating

That when students are given significant responsibility in their educational experience, they gain a far better understanding of the function of the academic community and its role in the larger community. They perceive the university's responsibility to society in a new light and with this perception comes a new appraisal of their own responsibility as a citizen.⁴⁵

Henderson also feels that students do not participate meaningfully because "authority has not been sufficiently delegated to enable the student government to assume genuine responsibility."

He discusses three models of university governance (1) governance as a vertical hierarchy of power and authority, (2) governance as mediation among subgroups, and (3) governance through group participation in decision-making. In discussing the latter model he notes that

If one looks at the classroom or the laboratory where the education and the research take place, it is clear that the professor must play a strong role in determining goals and methods. It can also be contended that since the student is the learner, he too will do a better job of learning if he

⁴⁴ Williamson, E.G. "Training Student Leaders," Paper presented to Group 15 on "Finding and Developing Student Leaders" at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 6, 1967.

⁴⁵ Jacob, Philip E. "Student Leadership," Education for Social Responsibility, Washington, D.C. The American Red Cross, May 1961, p. 19.

helps map out the goals and the methods. Thus it can be reasoned that the professors and also the students should have a wider participation in determining the overall goals, the program, and the evaluation procedures.⁴⁶

Henderson concludes by stating

The group participative plan among the three models described takes the best account of the complexity of the individual and group interests. It is the best means of resolving problems that arise because of influences that come from the sociometric pattern, from the processes of informal communication, and through the utilization of various forms of power exercised by individuals or subgroups. The group participative plan is an orderly pattern for the involvement of people in relation to their ability to contribute, with all efforts being coordinated and with the final control appropriately vested in the administration and the governing board.⁴⁷

Gardner feels that the question of anonymity and impersonality of student life is a real issue in many institutions. Consequently he feels:

We need new patterns for the organization of student life. There must be orderly channels for the expression of student grievances. There must be opportunities for students to work off their idealistic urges in constructive projects--preferably projects of their own devising and under their own management. There must be opportunities for them to exercise emerging capacities for leadership and decision.⁴⁸

Gardner concludes that

⁴⁶ Henderson, Algo D. "Effective Models of University Governance," Paper presented to Group 34 at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 7, 1967.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Gardner, John W. "Agenda for the Colleges and Universities," The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 36, No. 7, (October 1956).

The problem of the student's place on the campus might be simpler if the college or university community were a coherent whole. But on many, perhaps most, campuses there is a breakdown of communication among various elements of the university community: trustees, administration, faculty, and students. The resulting cleavages trouble me, because I believe that most academic institutions are going to have some difficulty in surviving as coherent and significant communities. The difficulty will be magnified if they are expending their best energies in civil war.⁴⁹

Falvey reports that in the 1950's Bluffton College in Ohio revised its policy concerning organizational relationships between the faculty and the student body. Under the new plan:

Students were to become full-fledged members of all standing committees, including the administrative committee. In turn, to the student council were added two faculty members with full voting power. Students on the committees do not merely sit in on meetings but have all the privileges of discussion, of initiating resolutions, and of voting. Faculty members on the student council are not merely advisory but are bonafide members of the council.⁵⁰

McGuire has reported on some of the available research on areas in higher education in which students have been able to participate and in which they prefer to participate. He includes: "academic standards, admissions, curriculum planning, discipline, finances, public relations, faculty selection and evaluation, and student activities."⁵¹ The student association of the University of

⁴⁹ Gardner, op. cit., p. 67.

⁵⁰ Falvey, op. cit., p. 38.

⁵¹ McGuire, Edward C. "The Role of the Student in College Policy Making," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 38, January 1960, pp. 378-384.

Minnesota adopted a new constitution in 1960 which rejected the traditional autonomous structure of student government and created a structure of student government which combines leaders, staff and faculty members in a co-participant relationship quite different from the customary student-advisor relationship.⁵²

Not all colleges and universities, however, have gone to this extent in involving students in policy formulation nor do many deem it advisable. Kerins, for example, believes that conflicts between students and administrators in college affairs are not only inevitable but also desirable. He opposes the pseudo-participation by students in decision making and advocates that administrators should make clear the actual scope of student autonomy and should do so with neither apology nor deception.⁵³ Kate Mueller also appears to have some reservations concerning the total involvement of students in university policy making. She lists three principle difficulties encountered in student participation in policy making. These are "(1) the distrust which both students and administration have of each other, (2) the failure of students to distinguish between

⁵² Bloland, Paul A. "A New Concept in Student Government," Journal of Higher Education, Volume 32, February 1961, pp. 94-97.

⁵³ Kerins, Frances J. "Student Autonomy and Administration Control: The Fallacy of Absolute Cooperation Between Student and Administrator," Journal of Higher Education, Volume 30, February 1959, pp. 61-66.

freedom and license, and (3) the failure to differentiate policy from the decision making which flows from it."⁵⁴

Virginia Gildersleeve feels that the function of the faculty and the administration is to decide what measure of self-government or student government is conducive to good education. If the faculty, for example, thinks that a stern disciplinary regime would be most effective educationally, then it is the duty of the faculty to impose such a system. If the faculty, however, believes that a considerable measure of self-government gives experience to students of genuine educational values, then it's the duty of the faculty to provide the largest measure of self-government conducive to these educational ends.⁵⁵

Schoen points out that confusion concerning the student's role in policy making occurs when the basic dichotomy between citizenship rights and student privileges is not clearly understood. The basic problem he feels is

One of communicating to the many college publics those areas of responsibility that the university reserves and for which it has complete authority, those areas of endeavor that may be delegated to students, and those areas in which joint faculty-student consultation and

⁵⁴ Mueler, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1961, pp. 307-394.

⁵⁵ Gildersleeve, Virginia C. "The Abuse of Democracy," The Saturday Review, Volume 39, November 24, 1956, pp. 15, 16.

discussion may result in the most judicious decision-making process. It should be noted that this separation of responsibilities is in no way concerned with nor does it affect the individuals' basic constitutional rights.⁵⁶

Schoen concludes by stating

We must ensure students freedom of expression and self-government, and above all the freedom to think, to act, and to make mistakes. We must in addition inform them of their areas of responsibility, however broad or narrow those areas are, and allow them to exercise their prerogatives freely. All concerned must be equally clear on just what areas are reserved for faculty and administrative jurisdiction. Let us not, however, confuse nor equate laissez faire with democracy, nor the just administration of one's duty with tyranny.⁵⁷

In reviewing the literature relative to student participation in university policy formulation there was an occasional reference to similar problems in business management and the labor-industrial relations area. One reference merits mentioning: Organization and Innovation by Chris Argyris. Argyris suggests that most organizations have a pyramidal structure and that such organizations imply a strategy of effective human relationships emphasizing

(1) the centrality of organizational objectives, (2) the suppression of relevant feelings and the emphasis upon intellectual, cognitive thinking, and (3) the use of power and control to obtain the compliance of the participants.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Schoen, Walter Thomas. "Clarification and Delineation of Areas of Student and Faculty Responsibility," The Journal of College Student Personnel, (June 1965), p. 245.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 246.

⁵⁸ Argyris, Chris. Organization and Innovation. Dorsey Press, 1965, Homewood, Illinois, p. 239.

Such a strategy he feels implies basic values about effective human relationships that result in the following consequences:

People will focus primarily upon "selling" their ideas. Contribution made by others would not be heard as intended.

Frustration will be high, but not dealt with because feelings are not admissable.

Struggle will be frequent for "air time" to get across one's view and/or to defend an already made position.

Listening will be primarily in terms of those views one can agree with or one can safely compete against.⁵⁹

Argyris poses no specific solution but concludes

To my knowledge, there is no single plan available that can be used by organizations to become less compulsive and more effective in their problem solving. Each organization must examine itself. It must be able to look within, at precisely those factors that it has been unable to date, to discuss openly. An organization can go from one that is problem creating to problem solving, if its members are able to own up to how they really feel, become more open and receptive, take more risks and support the norms of individuality, concern, and trust. In short, again I return to the requirement that (assuming high intellectual and technical competence) the first step toward increasing organizational health is for the top to increase its interpersonal competence.⁶⁰

One other reference was made to Argyris by Mulford in discussing self actualization. Mulford states

Argyris has found that "job enlargement," or the broadening of the roles industrial workers play in the organization, leads to increased self-actualization. No one knows for certain

⁵⁹ Argyris, op. cit., p. 240.

⁶⁰ Argyris, op. cit., p. 241.

what the results of this would yield in an educational setting. The implications, however, clearly suggest that maximum personal development will not occur until students are given significant roles to play in the organization's life.⁶¹

In this chapter a brief history of student participation in university policy formulation was presented along with a review of relevant studies. In addition a number of articles and reports discussing student participation in university policy formulation were discussed. It is apparent that although a number of surveys have been conducted with respect to student participation in university policy formulation there has not been a specific attempt to compare perceptions of selected student and faculty groups at a particular university with respect to the extent that students should participate in university policy formulation. Such a study should be of help in more accurately determining areas of conflicting perceptions and could provide a basis for more realistic planning in considering student involvement in university policy formulation.

In the next chapter the design and methodology of the study will be discussed.

⁶¹ Mulford, Charles L. "Self Actualization in a Small College Environment," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 8, #2, March 1967.

Chapter III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The Population and Method of Selection

The population of this study consisted of the students and faculty at Michigan State University during the academic year 1966-67. The following six sample groups were identified: student leaders, student non-leaders, faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders, student personnel administrators, and academic administrators.⁶²

In the student leader group 308 students were identified as meeting the definition and 100 were picked at random from the sample. Of the 100 chosen 96 returned the questionnaire.

The student non-leader sample of 100 was selected through random procedure from the Michigan State University Fall Term 1966 Student Directory. The Student Directory is published each fall term and lists the student's address, sex, major, and class standing (freshman, sophomore, junior or senior). If a student selected did not meet the criteria as defined, his name was eliminated and another name

⁶² Operational definitions are found in Chapter I.

selected. Of the 100 selected in this way, 89 responded.

Eighty-four leaders were identified as defined in Chapter I. Because of the relatively small number, the total population was sampled with 72 responding.

One hundred faculty non-leaders were selected from a list including assistant professors, associate professors and professors. Faculty identified as administrators (department heads, directors, assistant deans and deans) that did not having teaching as a primary responsibility were not included in the sample selected. Of the 100 selected, six were on leave or away from the university during fall term of 1966. Eighty out of the sample of 94 responded.

Forty-four individuals were identified as academic administrators (deans and assistant deans) and 36 responded by returning a completed questionnaire.

Forty-nine individuals were identified as being student personnel administrators and 44 responded.

The Instrument and Procedures Used in

Obtaining the Data

The final questionnaire of 71 items was developed in the following way.⁶³ Policy formulating areas were suggested by other researchers,

⁶³ A complete copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

specifically Lunn,⁶⁴ Falvey,⁶⁵ and Cowan and Williamson.⁶⁶ In addition selected student personnel administrators, university officials, faculty and students at Michigan State University were interviewed to gain their ideas. Finally current practices at Michigan State University as indicated in the University Catalogue, the Ordinance Book, and the Student Handbook were reviewed. To aid the respondents in determining the extent to which they thought students should be involved in university policy formulation, a definition of university policy formulation was developed. University policy formulation was defined as a step in the decision-making process designed to develop a consensus of thought concerning a function or area of the university resulting in a course of action or a set of procedures to be adopted. A five-point response scale was then developed to present an opportunity for the respondent to indicate the degree or extent of student participation in policy formulation rather than a forced yes-no answer.

Through personal interviews with selected faculty and students, student personnel administrators, university officials, and academic administrators, individuals were invited to criticize the questionnaire as to content, clarity and purpose.

The Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University was helpful in pointing out policy areas where one might logically expect

⁶⁴ Lunn, op. cit., pp. 33-99.

⁶⁵ Falvey, op. cit., pp. 53-135.

⁶⁶ Cowan and Williamson, op. cit., pp. 39-150.

agreement or disagreement with respect to student participation. This office was also helpful in developing the definition of policy formulation and in refining the response scale.

A personal letter along with the questionnaire, a five place answer sheet, and instructions in completing the questionnaire was sent to each respondent. To assure a minimum 80 percent response in all categories, a follow-up letter was sent to individuals in the academic administrators and faculty leader samples. The responses by sample groups are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Response by Sample Group to the Questionnaire

	Number in sample	Number responded	Percent responded	Follow-up letter sent
Student leader	100	96	96	no
Student non-leader	100	89	89	no
Faculty leader	89	72	85	yes
Faculty non-leader	94	80	85	yes
Student personnel administrator	49	44	90	no
Academic administrator	44	36	80	yes

Analyzing the Data

In developing the instrument the questionnaire was designed so the data could be processed on the IBM 3600 computer.

The basic research hypothesis for the study was stated in Chapter I. To be tested statistically it is formulated into an operation or null hypothesis. It is:

There is no relationship between membership in selected student and faculty groups and the extent to which students should be involved in university policy formulation.

The statistic chi square was employed in determining independence of relationship. In interpreting the statistical data the .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance.

The responses by all sample groups were also reported in percentages in order to more easily draw conclusions concerning the perceptions of the extent to which students should be involved in university policy formulation.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter includes an analysis of the data concerning the perception of selected faculty and student groups with respect to the extent of student participation in university policy formulation.

Specifically the null hypothesis tested in the part of the study was:

There is no relationship between membership in selected student and faculty groups and the extent to which they believe students should be involved in university policy formulation.

The statistic chi square was employed in determining independence of relationship and the .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance in interpreting the data. In addition all items are reported in percentages as well as raw scores.

As indicated in Chapter III a questionnaire covering 71 policy areas within the university was sent to selected student and faculty groups. A total of 419 individuals from six sample groups responded.

In analyzing the data items were grouped under three main headings (1) General Institutional Government, (2) Student Personnel Administration, and (3) Academic Administration. The items that were not statistically significant will be discussed first followed by an examination of those items in which the null hypothesis was rejected.

Non-Significant Items

Of the 71 items covering functional areas of university policy formulation listed in the questionnaire, the responses to 17 items revealed no statistically significant differences among groups and consequently the null hypothesis was accepted. In order to further test the hypothesis an additional computation omitting response 5 (no opinion) was completed for all items. This resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis for three additional items. Table 2 summarizes the results for those items that were not statistically significant. The most frequently selected response from the total sample is given along with the percentage of the total sample.

TABLE 2

Items Showing Agreement by Respondents

Item No	Policy Formulation Related to:	Most Frequently Selected Response*	Percent of Total Sample
STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION			
20	Solicitation of funds by students	2	46.5
33	Student organizations financial accounts	2	44.7
34	Student government structure and function	1	82.2
38	Chartering or registration of student organizations	2	54.2
39	Selling or advertising of activities, goods, or services by students	2	51.3
40	Supervision of social events	2	61.6

Item No	Policy Formulation Related to:	Most Frequently Selected Response*	Percent of Total Sample
41	Health Center services	3	64.7
50	Student employment services	3	46.8
57**	Student sponsored conferences	1	52.2
62	Eligibility for membership in fraternities and sororities	1	55.6
64**	Functions of religious advisors	3	46.6
66	Selection of dean of students staff	4	62.0
GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT			
1	Admission of new students	4	85.4
2	Selection of administrative officers (i.e., president, vice president, provost, deans of colleges)	4	83.6
18	Campus police services	3	52.5
19	Alumni programs	3	42.9
26**	Selling or advertising of activities, goods, or services by faculty	4	47.4
55	Registration and enrollment procedures	3	64.0
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION			
31	Faculty salaries	4	84.9
70	Faculty promotion	4	74.7

* Response scale; students: (1) primarily responsible, (2) share responsibility, (3) recommend or advise, (4) would not normally participate, (5) no opinion

** When response 5 (no opinion) was omitted from the computation

An examination of Table 2 shows that 12 of the items indicating agreement by respondents are found in the area of student personnel administration; 6 are found in the area of general institutional government and 2 are found in the area of academic administration. Further inspection of the table reveals that the most frequently selected response for student personnel administration items was response 2 (students share responsibility), while responses 3 (students recommend or advise) and 4 (students would not normally participate) were the most frequently selected responses in the areas of general institutional government and academic administration.

Significant Items - Student Personnel Administration

Of the 71 items listed in the questionnaire 51 were found to be statistically significant. Those items categorized under the heading of student personnel administration will be discussed first.

Item 7 in the questionnaire dealt with policy formulation in the area of intramural athletics. An examination of Table 3 reveals that student leaders and student non-leaders differed from the other sample groups by more frequently selecting response 1 (students are primarily responsible). The four remaining sample groups largely agreed in selecting response 2 (students share responsibility) with much smaller percentages selecting response 3 (students recommend or advise).

TABLE 3⁶⁷

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	39	43.8	40	44.9	6	6.7	2	2.2	2	2.2	89	100
SL	42	43.7	40	41.6	13	13.5	0	0.0	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	25	31.2	47	58.7	8	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	16	22.2	47	65.2	7	9.7	0	0.0	2	2.7	72	100
AA	7	19.4	24	66.6	4	11.1	0	0.0	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	6	13.9	30	69.7	5	11.6	2	4.6	0	0.0	43	100

DF 20

 χ^2 41.197

Significant at .01 level

⁶⁷ SNL - Student non-leaders
 SL - Student leaders
 FNL - Faculty non-leaders
 FL - Faculty leaders
 AA - Academic administrators
 SPA - Student personnel administrators

1-PR - Primarily responsible
 2-SR - Share responsibility
 3-RA - Recommend or advise
 4-WNNP - Would not normally participate
 5-NO - No opinion

With respect to student publications (Item 9) Table 4 reveals an even greater difference of opinion between student leaders and student non-leaders and the other sample groups. Both student groups by large majorities selected response 1 (students are primarily responsible) while respondents in the remaining sample groups most frequently selected response 2 (students share responsibility).

TABLE 4

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	62	69.6	26	29.2	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	89	100
SL	77	80.2	16	16.6	3	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	33	41.2	41	51.2	5	6.2	1	1.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	32	44.4	36	50.0	4	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	72	100
AA	16	44.4	18	50.0	2	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	17	38.6	25	56.8	1	2.3	0	0.0	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20 χ^2 62.122 Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 10 (cultural programs) listed in Table 5 suggests that faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders are more reluctant than the other sample groups to involve students in sharing the responsibility for policy formulation in the cultural program area. Academic administrators tend to agree with student non-leaders and student personnel administrators more nearly agree with student leaders.

TABLE 5

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	16	17.8	55	61.1	17	18.9	1	1.1	1	1.1	90	100
SL	17	17.7	69	71.9	10	10.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	2	2.5	43	53.7	33	41.2	2	2.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	41	56.9	31	43.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	72	100
AA	5	13.9	22	61.1	6	16.7	2	5.6	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	4	9.1	34	77.3	6	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 72.908

Significant at .01 level

Item 12 in the questionnaire was listed as use of student records. As inspection of Table 6 reveals that student leaders and student non-leaders most frequently selected either response 1 (students are primarily responsible) or response 2 (students share responsibility). The majority of individuals in the remaining sample groups selected response 3 (students recommend or advise).

TABLE 6

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	18	20.0	32	35.6	21	23.3	15	16.7	4	4.4	90	100
SL	13	13.5	43	44.8	22	22.9	12	12.5	6	6.2	96	100
FNL	5	6.2	16	20.0	42	52.5	16	20.0	1	1.2	80	100
FL	1	1.4	12	16.7	42	58.3	16	22.2	1	1.4	72	100
AA	1	2.8	12	33.3	19	52.8	4	11.1	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	1	2.3	9	20.4	25	56.8	9	20.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 49.232

Significant at .01 level

Item 13 in the questionnaire concerned student driving and parking regulations. As indicated in Table 7 respondents from all but two of the sample groups (faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders) most frequently selected response 2 (students share responsibility). The majority of the faculty respondents selected response 3 (students recommend or advise). Student leaders and student personnel administrators were almost identical in their responses to this item. The results leave little doubt that the majority of the respondents feel that students should share in the responsibility for formulating policy with respect to student driving and parking regulations.

TABLE 7

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	7	7.8	46	51.1	32	35.6	5	5.6	0	0.0	90	100
SL	6	6.2	60	62.5	28	29.1	2	2.1	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	2	2.5	25	31.2	42	52.5	11	13.8	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	23	32.4	44	62.0	4	5.6	0	0.0	71	100
AA	2	5.6	19	52.8	14	38.9	1	2.8	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	1	2.3	28	63.6	13	29.5	2	4.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 49.232

Significant at .01 level

In Table 8 the responses to Item 16, student radio stations, are listed. An inspection of the table quickly reveals why the null hypothesis was rejected. Student leaders and student non-leaders most frequently felt that students should have primary responsibility while the respondents with remaining groups most frequently felt that this should be a shared responsibility.

TABLE 8

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	61	67.8	25	27.8	3	3.3	0	0.0	1	1.1	90	100
SL	67	69.8	29	30.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	28	35.0	40	50.0	11	13.7	1	0.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	28	38.9	41	56.9	3	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	72	100
AA	15	41.7	19	52.8	1	2.8	0	0.0	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	16	36.4	26	59.1	1	2.3	0	0.0	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 66.221

Significant at .01 level

Item 17 was concerned with off-campus speakers. As indicated in Table 9 student leaders and student non-leaders differed from the other sample groups by more frequently selecting response 1 (students are primarily responsible). The remaining sample groups, however, felt that this should be a shared responsibility. A significant percentage of the faculty non-leaders (30%) and of faculty leaders (25%), however, selected response 3 (students recommend or advise).

TABLE 9

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	40	44.4	26	28.9	14	15.6	3	3.3	7	7.8	90	100
SL	41	42.7	41	42.7	7	7.3	1	1.0	6	6.2	96	100
FNL	14	17.5	40	50.0	24	30.0	2	2.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	11	15.2	41	56.9	18	25.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	72	100
AA	4	11.1	28	77.8	3	8.3	0	0.0	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	9	20.4	31	70.4	4	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 81.403

Significant at .01 level

The responses given for Item 32, women's closing hours, are found in Table 10. Although student leaders and student non-leaders selected response 2 (students share responsibility) most frequently, 37.8% of student non-leaders along with 33.3% of the student leaders felt that students should be primarily responsible. Academic administrators and student personnel administrators, however, in their responses felt that students should share in the responsibility while faculty non-leaders more frequently indicated (45%) that students should recommend or advise.

TABLE 10

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	34	37.8	43	47.8	12	13.3	1	1.1	0	0.0	90	100
SL	32	33.3	52	54.1	11	11.5	1	1.0	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	17	21.2	24	30.0	36	45.0	3	3.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	9	12.5	34	47.2	26	36.1	2	2.8	1	1.3	72	100
AA	4	11.1	22	61.1	9	25.0	1	2.8	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	5	11.4	30	68.2	9	20.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 68.183

Significant at .01 level

Item 36 concerned the use of student union facilities. Although an inspection of Table 11 reveals that response 2 (students share responsibility) was the most frequently selected response by all sample groups, 33.3% of the student non-leaders and 42% of the student leaders felt that students should be primarily responsible. Consequently the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 11

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	30	33.3	53	58.9	5	5.6	0	0.0	2	2.2	90	100
SL	41	42.7	48	50.0	7	7.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	11	13.7	56	70.0	12	15.0	1	1.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	13	18.1	47	65.3	11	15.3	1	1.4	0	0.0	72	100
AA	6	17.1	26	74.3	2	5.7	1	2.9	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	5	11.4	35	79.5	4	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 48.919

Significant at .01 level

The responses for Item 43, the Placement Center, are listed in Table 12. Academic administrators and student personnel administrators differed from the remaining sample groups by more frequently selecting response 3 (students recommend or advise). Faculty leaders had the highest percentage (40.3%) of individuals selecting response 2 (students share responsibility) while student leaders and student non-leaders had the highest percentage of individuals selecting response 4 (students would not normally participate).

TABLE 12

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	3	3.3	28	31.1	42	46.7	12	13.3	5	5.6	90	100
SL	2	2.1	31	32.3	48	51.0	11	11.5	3	3.3	96	100
FNL	5	6.2	25	31.2	47	58.7	3	3.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	1	1.4	29	40.3	37	51.4	5	6.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	9	25.7	25	71.4	0	0.0	1	2.9	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	5	11.4	34	77.3	5	11.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 40.492

Significant at .01 level

Item 44 was concerned with scholarships and financial aids. An inspection of Table 13 reveals that student leaders differed from the other sample groups by more frequently selecting response 4 (students would not normally participate). Faculty leaders on the other hand selected response 4 less frequently than any other sample groups and had the highest percentage (66.7%) of individuals that felt students should recommend or advise. Student non-leaders tended to agree with student leaders that students should not be primarily responsible or even share responsibility for policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 13

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	20	22.2	39	43.3	29	32.2	2	2.2	90	100
SL	2	2.1	18	18.9	34	35.8	38	40.0	3	3.2	95	100
FNL	0	0.0	14	17.5	49	61.2	17	21.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	14	19.4	48	66.7	10	13.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.9	5	14.3	21	60.0	8	22.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	4	9.1	23	52.3	16	36.4	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 39.301

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 46, off-campus housing, are found in Table 14. Once again the differences are a matter of degree. Student non-leaders and student leaders felt that students should be either primarily responsible or share the responsibility. Individuals in the other sample groups were more inclined to feel that students should recommend or advise with respect to policy formulation in off-campus housing.

TABLE 14

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	23	25.6	33	36.7	25	27.8	3	3.3	6	6.7	90	100
SL	14	14.6	42	43.7	33	34.4	3	3.1	4	4.1	96	100
FNL	7	8.7	27	33.7	39	48.7	3	3.7	4	5.0	80	100
FL	8	11.1	26	36.1	33	45.8	1	1.4	4	5.6	72	100
AA	3	8.6	9	25.7	18	51.4	4	11.4	1	2.9	35	100
SPA	2	4.5	17	38.6	25	54.5	1	2.3	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 36.991

Significant at .01 level

The responses for Item 47, residence hall housing services, are listed in Table 15. Student leaders and student non-leaders were more inclined to feel that students should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. The majority of individuals in the other sample groups, however, felt that students should recommend or advise.

TABLE 15

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	7	7.8	43	47.8	27	30.0	9	10.0	4	4.4	90	100
SL	1	1.0	51	53.1	41	42.7	2	2.1	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	4	5.0	25	31.2	48	60.0	2	2.5	1	1.2	80	100
FL	0	0.0	30	41.6	39	54.1	2	2.8	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	12	34.3	20	57.1	2	5.7	1	2.9	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	17	38.6	25	56.8	2	4.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 44.543

Significant at .01 level

Item 49 is listed in the questionnaire as married housing services.

An inspection of Table 16 reveals that the majority of respondents in all the sample groups with the exception of the student leaders and student non-leaders felt that students should recommend or advise with respect to policy formulation in this area. Student non-leaders were more inclined than student leaders to favor greater participation on the part of students. It is interesting to note, however, that 10% of the student non-leaders and 14.6% of the student leaders felt that students would not normally participate in policy formulation for this area.

TABLE 16

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	12	13.3	33	36.7	26	28.9	9	10.0	10	11.1	90	100
SL	4	4.1	27	28.1	42	43.7	14	14.6	9	9.4	96	100
FNL	6	7.5	27	33.7	42	52.5	4	5.0	1	1.2	80	100
FL	2	2.8	26	36.1	40	55.6	2	2.8	2	2.8	72	100
AA	0	0.0	12	34.3	19	54.3	3	8.6	1	2.3	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	11	25.0	30	68.2	3	6.8	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 52.918

Significant at .01 level

The responses for Item 52, Counseling Center services, are listed in Table 17. The most frequently selected response by all sample groups was response 3 (students recommend or advise). Student leaders and student non-leaders, however, felt to a greater extent than the other sample groups that students should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. It is interesting to note that student personnel administrators more frequently selected response 4 (students would not normally participate) than any of the other sample groups.

TABLE 17

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	4	4.4	18	20.0	50	55.6	14	15.6	4	4.4	90	100
SL	4	4.2	30	31.2	50	52.1	11	11.4	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	4	5.0	12	15.0	60	75.0	4	5.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	14	19.4	53	73.6	5	6.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	3	8.6	31	88.6	1	2.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	32	72.7	10	22.7	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 54.962

Significant at .01 level

The responses given for Item 53, student health and accident insurance, are found in Table 18. An inspection of the table reveals that faculty non-leaders and faculty leaders more frequently selected response 1 (students primarily responsible) than did student leaders and student non-leaders. Similarly academic administrators and student personnel administrators along with faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders selected response 2 (students share responsibility) more frequently than student leaders and student non-leaders. On the other hand student leaders and student non-leaders more frequently selected response 4 (students would not normally participate) than any of the other sample groups. It is interesting to note that at Michigan State University student leaders are in fact primarily responsible for policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 18

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	9	10.0	22	24.4	35	38.9	18	20.0	6	6.7	90	100
SL	14	14.6	23	24.0	31	32.3	18	18.7	10	10.4	96	100
FNL	11	13.7	31	38.7	32	40.0	6	7.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	12	16.7	29	40.3	27	37.5	1	1.4	3	4.1	72	100
AA	7	20.0	17	48.6	10	28.6	1	2.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	9	20.4	20	45.4	13	29.5	2	4.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 53.626

Significant at .01 level

Item 56 was concerned with student orientation programs. An inspection of Table 19 reveals that the majority of student leaders and student personnel administrators felt that students should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. Student non-leaders, faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders and academic administrators, however, favored students recommending or advising with respect to policy formulation.

TABLE 19

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	5	5.6	30	33.3	44	48.9	6	6.7	5	5.6	90	100
SL	12	12.5	53	55.2	28	29.1	2	2.1	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	7	8.7	28	35.0	36	45.0	9	11.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	1	1.4	27	37.5	42	58.3	2	2.8	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.9	13	37.1	20	57.1	1	2.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	1	2.3	29	65.9	13	29.5	1	2.3	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 59.693

Significant at .01 level

The responses given for Item 59, evaluation of students, are listed in Table 20. Student leaders and student non-leaders in comparison with the other sample groups more frequently felt that students should either be primarily responsible or should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. Faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators more frequently felt, however, that students should recommend or advise. Faculty non-leaders most frequently felt that students would not normally participate.

TABLE 20

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	11	12.2	30	33.3	16	17.8	26	28.9	7	7.8	90	100
SL	10	10.4	39	40.6	24	25.0	15	15.6	8	8.3	96	100
FNL	2	2.5	12	15.0	29	36.2	36	45.0	1	1.2	80	100
FL	0	0.0	14	19.4	30	41.7	23	31.9	5	6.9	72	100
AA	0	0.0	8	22.8	18	51.4	8	22.8	1	2.9	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	14	31.8	21	47.7	9	20.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 74.754

Significant at .01 level

Item 68 concerned the promotion of dean of students staff. The responses are listed in Table 21. The most frequently selected response by individuals in all sample groups was response 4 (students would not normally participate). However, 28.5% of the academic administrators and 26.2% of the faculty non-leaders along with 20.8% of the student leaders felt that students should recommend or advise with respect to policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 21

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	3	3.4	7	7.9	13	14.6	59	66.3	7	7.9	89	100
SL	0	0.0	7	7.3	20	20.8	67	69.8	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	8	10.0	21	26.2	48	60.0	3	3.7	80	100
FL	1	1.4	1	1.4	14	19.4	53	73.6	3	4.1	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	28.5	24	68.5	1	2.9	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	1	2.3	5	11.4	38	86.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 32.163

Significant at .05 level

The responses given for Item 69, student conduct, are listed in Table 22. Response 2 (students share responsibility) was the most frequently selected response by all the sample groups. Twenty-three percent of the student non-leaders along with 17.7% of the student leaders, however, felt that students should be primarily responsible. Forty percent of the faculty non-leaders and 34.7% of the faculty leaders felt that students should recommend or advise.

TABLE 22

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	21	23.3	50	55.5	15	16.7	4	4.4	0	0.0	90	100
SL	17	17.7	69	72.0	7	7.3	3	3.1	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	11	13.7	32	40.0	32	40.0	5	6.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	3	4.1	42	58.3	25	34.7	2	2.8	0	0.0	72	100
AA	2	5.7	22	62.9	9	25.7	2	5.7	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	2	4.5	30	68.2	11	25.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 52.693

Significant at .01 level

Significant Items - General Institutional Government

The responses to Item 3, tuition charges and fees, are found in Table 23. Although a majority of the respondents in all the sample groups but one felt that students would not normally participate in policy formulation dealing with tuition charges and fees, significant percentages felt that students should recommend or advise. Student non-leaders and student leaders specifically felt that students should be involved to a greater degree by either having the responsibility or recommending and advising with respect to policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 23

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	14	15.6	33	36.7	39	43.3	4	4.4	90	100
SL	1	1.0	11	11.5	31	32.3	51	53.1	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	4	5.0	24	30.0	52	65.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	27.8	52	72.2	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.1	32	88.9	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	27.9	31	72.1	0	0.0	43	100

DF 20

χ^2 54.495

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 4, residence hall room and board rates, are given in Table 24. An inspection of the table reveals that both student leaders and student non-leaders felt that students should be involved to a greater degree with respect to policy formulation in this area than the other sample groups. Academic administrators and student personnel administrators were the most reluctant to involve students while faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders were more inclined towards greater student participation.

TABLE 24

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	17	18.9	37	41.1	33	36.7	3	3.3	90	100
SL	1	1.0	15	15.6	32	33.3	47	49.0	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	7	8.7	32	40.0	41	51.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	1	1.4	32	44.4	39	54.2	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	33.3	24	66.7	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	11	25.0	31	70.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 43.901

Significant at .01 level

Item 5 dealt with the design and construction of new buildings. An inspection of Table 25 reveals that the majority of both student leaders and student non-leaders felt that students should be involved in either sharing the responsibility or recommending and advising with respect to the design and construction of new buildings. The majority of faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders felt that students should not normally participate although many indicated that students should recommend or advise. The high number of student personnel administrators that selected response 3 (students recommend or advise) undoubtedly recognized the contribution students can make with respect to the design of living units.

TABLE 25

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	12	13.3	40	44.4	36	40.0	2	2.2	90	100
SL	0	0.0	8	8.3	55	57.3	32	33.3	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	3	3.7	35	43.7	42	52.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	33	45.8	39	54.2	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	44.4	18	50.0	2	5.6	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	36	81.8	6	13.6	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 51.874

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 6 (intercollegiate athletics) in the questionnaire are found in Table 26. Student non-leaders most frequently felt that students should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area although many (24.7%) felt that students should not normally participate. Student leaders along with faculty non-leaders most frequently selected response 3 (students recommend or advise). The majority of faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators felt that students should recommend or advise although rather significant percentages felt that the responsibility should be shared.

TABLE 26

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	4	4.5	31	34.8	30	33.7	22	24.7	2	2.2	89	100
SL	10	10.4	32	33.3	38	39.6	14	14.6	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	1	1.2	30	37.5	38	47.5	10	12.5	1	1.2	80	100
FL	1	1.4	26	36.1	39	54.1	4	5.6	2	2.8	72	100
AA	0	0.0	10	27.8	23	63.9	3	8.3	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	11	25.6	23	53.5	8	18.6	1	2.3	43	100

DF 20

 χ^2 39.232

Significant at .01 level

Item 8 in the questionnaire dealt with the promotion of administrative officers. An inspection of Table 27 reveals that a majority of the respondents in all the sample groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. Student non-leaders along with student leaders and faculty non-leaders, however, selected response 4 in lesser numbers than the other sample groups and indicated a desire to involve students through recommending or advising.

TABLE 27

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	9	10.0	16	17.8	64	71.1	1	1.0	90	100
SL	0	0.0	2	2.1	24	25.0	69	71.9	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	6	7.5	12	15.0	62	77.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	13.9	62	86.1	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.3	32	88.9	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	1	2.3	0	0.0	5	11.4	38	86.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 38.881

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 11, budget appropriations to colleges and departments within the university are found in Table 28. An inspection of the table reveals that the majority of respondents in all sample groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. Significant percentages, however, in the student non-leader group (23.3%) and the student leader group (24%) felt that students should recommend or advise. Academic administrators and faculty leaders in particular felt that students had little to offer by participating in policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 28

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	6	6.7	21	23.3	61	67.8	1	1.1	90	100
SL	0	0.0	3	3.1	23	24.0	68	70.8	1	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	3	2.5	6	7.5	72	90.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.8	70	97.2	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.8	35	97.2	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.7	41	93.3	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 53.020

Significant at .01 level

Item 14 was listed in the questionnaire as faculty driving and parking regulations. An inspection of Table 29 reveals that faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders by substantial majorities felt that students should not be involved in policy formulation in this area. Student non-leaders and student leaders along with academic administrators and student personnel administrators, however, were more inclined to involve students through recommending or advising or sharing the responsibility for policy formulation.

TABLE 29

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	21	23.3	25	27.8	43	47.8	0	0.0	90	100
SL	0	0.0	21	21.9	30	31.2	44	45.8	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	8	10.0	11	13.7	61	76.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	5	7.1	15	21.1	51	71.8	0	0.0	71	100
AA	0	0.0	7	19.4	12	33.3	17	47.2	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	9	20.4	15	34.1	20	45.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 38.682

Significant at .01 level

In Table 30 the responses to Item 15, solicitation of funds by faculty, are summarized. The most frequently selected response by individuals in all six sample groups was response 4 (students would not normally participate). Student non-leaders, student leaders, and student personnel administrators, however, by their selections, indicated strong support for involving students either by having students share the responsibility or through students recommending or advising in this area of policy formulation. The greater number of responses in the no opinion category for this item as compared with other items could indicate a lack of concern on the part of many of the respondents for this area of policy formulation.

TABLE 30

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	3	3.4	15	16.8	19	21.3	38	42.7	14	15.7	89	100
SL	0	0.0	18	18.7	19	19.8	41	42.7	18	18.7	96	100
FNL	2	2.5	6	7.5	15	18.7	45	54.2	12	15.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	6	8.6	39	55.7	23	32.8	70	100
AA	0	0.0	3	8.3	2	5.6	19	52.8	12	33.3	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	7	15.9	11	25.0	21	47.7	5	11.4	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 43.997

Significant at .01 level

Item 21 was listed in the questionnaire as use of the university mail distribution system. The results are presented in Table 31. An inspection of the table reveals that student non-leaders, student leaders and student personnel administrators largely agree that students should either share in this responsibility or should recommend or advise. Faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders and academic administrators, however, are more inclined to involve students through recommending or advising. A significant number of respondents in the latter three groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 31

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	4	4.5	35	39.3	28	31.5	17	19.1	5	5.6	89	100
SL	4	3.2	44	46.3	33	34.7	13	13.7	2	2.1	95	100
FNL	0	0.0	15	18.7	35	43.7	28	35.0	2	2.5	80	100
FL	0	0.0	11	15.3	34	47.2	22	30.6	5	6.9	72	100
AA	0	0.0	6	16.7	18	50.0	12	33.3	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	17	38.6	19	43.2	8	18.2	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 55.704

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 32, degree requirements, are listed in Table 32. The majority of the respondents in all the sample groups with the exception of the student leaders and student non-leaders felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. The majority of respondents among both the student leaders and the student non-leaders felt that students should either recommend and advise or share the responsibility for policy formulation with respect to degree requirements. It can also be observed that while the majority of the respondents in non-student groups felt that students should not normally participate, significant numbers selected response 3 (students recommend or advise).

TABLE 32

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	9	10.0	38	42.2	42	46.7	1	1.1	90	100
SL	0	0.0	15	16.0	41	43.6	36	38.3	2	2.1	94	100
FNL	0	0.0	2	2.5	27	33.7	51	63.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	19	26.4	51	70.8	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	36.1	23	63.9	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	15	34.1	27	61.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 38.237

Significant at .01 level

Item 29 was listed in the questionnaire as military training (ROTC programs). The responses are given in Table 33. Student leaders and student non-leaders differed from the other sample groups by more frequently indicating that students should be primarily responsible or should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. Faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators on the other hand were more inclined to involved students through recommending or advising.

TABLE 33

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	18	20.2	19	21.3	24	26.9	16	18.0	12	13.5	89	100
SL	14	14.6	21	21.9	30	31.2	16	16.7	15	15.6	96	100
FNL	6	7.5	16	20.0	37	46.2	18	22.5	3	3.7	80	100
FL	1	1.4	8	11.1	33	45.8	21	29.2	9	12.5	72	100
AA	1	2.8	5	13.9	20	55.6	9	25.0	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	9	20.4	22	25.0	11	25.0	2	4.5	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 53.092

Significant at .01 level

The responses given for Item 35, faculty sabbaticals, are found in Table 34. An inspection of the table reveals that the large majority of the respondents in all sample groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. Student leaders, however, frequently indicated (20%) that students should be involved through recommending or advising. To a lesser degree student non-leaders (10.1%) and student personnel administrators (11.3%) also indicated a preference for involving students through recommending or advising.

TABLE 34

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	3	3.4	9	10.1	72	80.9	5	5.6	89	100
SL	2	2.1	2	2.1	19	20.0	60	63.2	12	12.6	95	100
FNL	0	0.0	1	1.2	7	8.7	72	90.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.6	67	93.1	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6	32	91.4	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	1	2.3	5	11.3	38	86.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 49.599

Significant at .01 level

Item 61 was listed in the questionnaire as library resources and procedures. The responses are listed in Table 35. In examining the table it is clear that the majority of the respondents felt that students should be involved in policy formulation for this area through recommending or advising. Student non-leaders, however, were almost equally divided in their thinking between involving students through recommending or advising. Academic administrators, on the other hand, by a large majority (85.7%) indicated their preferences for involving students through recommending or advising with respect to policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 35

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	2	2.2	37	41.1	40	44.4	8	8.9	3	3.3	90	100
SL	3	3.1	20	20.8	62	64.6	8	8.3	3	3.1	96	100
FNL	1	1.2	15	18.7	54	67.5	10	12.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	13	18.1	55	76.4	3	4.2	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	4	11.4	30	85.7	1	2.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	9	20.4	33	75.0	2	4.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 41.671

Significant at .01 level

The responses for Item 30, faculty conduct, are found in Table 36. An inspection of the table reveals that faculty leaders in particular felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation for this area. Although the majority of faculty non-leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators agreed with the faculty leaders, many of the former felt that students should be involved through recommending or advising. The majority of both the student leaders and student non-leaders felt that students should be involved either through sharing the responsibility or through recommending and advising with respect to policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 36

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	14	15.6	34	37.8	37	41.1	4	4.4	90	100
SL	1	1.1	16	16.7	45	46.9	29	30.2	5	5.2	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	4	5.0	32	40.0	43	53.7	1	1.2	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	18	25.0	51	70.8	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	2	5.6	14	38.9	19	52.8	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	1	2.3	14	31.8	28	63.6	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 46.186

Significant at .01 level

Significant Items - Academic Administration

Of the 51 items listed in the questionnaire that were found to be statistically significant, 17 can be categorized under the heading of academic administration. The first item under this heading in the questionnaire was Item 23, cheating in the classroom. The responses are found in Table 37. Student leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators pretty much agree that students should be involved in policy formulation in this area through sharing the responsibility. Student non-leaders and faculty non-leaders, however, were not as strong in their support of students sharing the responsibility as the other sample groups. Of the student non-leaders, for example, 44.5% felt that students should recommend or advise or should not normally participate. A similar percentage can be observed in viewing the responses of the faculty non-leaders.

TABLE 37

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	17	18.9	32	35.6	25	27.8	15	16.7	1	1.1	90	100
SL	16	17.0	59	62.8	14	14.9	5	5.3	0	0.0	94	100
FNL	6	7.5	34	42.5	28	35.0	12	15.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	2	2.8	45	62.5	20	27.8	4	5.6	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	24	66.7	12	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	2	4.5	25	56.8	12	27.3	5	11.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

χ^2 55.581

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 24, faculty evaluation, are listed in Table 38. An inspection of the table reveals that faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators largely agree that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Student leaders and student non-leaders, on the other hand, strongly indicate that students should share in this responsibility. Many student non-leaders (28.9%) felt that students should have primary responsibility for policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 38

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	26	28.9	45	50.0	15	16.7	4	4.4	0	0.0	90	100
SL	14	14.9	60	63.8	14	14.9	6	6.4	0	0.0	94	100
FNL	5	6.2	25	31.2	38	47.5	11	13.7	1	1.2	80	100
FL	5	6.9	24	33.3	38	52.8	5	6.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	3	8.3	13	36.1	19	52.8	1	2.8	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	17	38.6	25	56.8	2	4.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 93.600

Significant at .01 level

Item 25 in the questionnaire dealt with faculty selection. The responses are given in Table 39. There is little question that faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. Student leaders and student non-leaders, however, were not as strongly inclined to favor this position with many of the respondents indicating that students should be able to participate through recommending or advising. For example, 37.8% of the student non-leaders and 36.5% of the student leaders selected response 3 (students participate through recommending or advising).

TABLE 39

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	8	8.9	34	37.8	47	52.2	0	0.0	90	100
SL	0	0.0	9	9.4	35	36.5	51	53.1	1	1.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	1	1.2	15	18.7	64	80.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	12.7	62	87.3	0	0.0	71	100
AA	0	0.0	1	2.8	4	11.1	30	83.3	1	2.8	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	12	27.3	30	68.2	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 53.613

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 27, course content, are given in Table 40. With the exception of the faculty leader sample, the majority of the respondents in all the sample groups felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. The majority of the faculty leaders felt that students should not normally participate. Student leaders, on the other hand, had a significant number (27.1%) that felt that students should share the responsibility for policy formulation in this area.

TABLE 40

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	14	15.7	55	61.8	19	21.3	0	0.0	89	100
SL	1	1.1	26	27.1	58	60.4	11	11.5	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	1	1.2	2	2.5	43	53.7	34	42.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	29	40.3	41	56.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	2	5.6	24	66.7	10	27.8	0	0.0	36	100
SPA	0	0.0	4	9.1	25	56.8	15	34.1	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 72.135

Significant at .01 level

Item 28 in the questionnaire was concerned with class attendance. The responses are listed in Table 41. Differences in the perception of student involvement in policy formulation in this area are clearly apparent. Student non-leaders and student leaders were strong in their support of students being primarily responsible or in sharing the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. Faculty non-leaders and faculty leaders, on the other hand, were more inclined to support the position that students should not normally participate. The majority of academic administrators and student personnel administrators, however, felt that students should participate in policy formulation through recommending or advising.

TABLE 41

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	34	37.8	20	22.2	24	26.7	12	13.3	0	0.0	90	100
SL	32	33.3	32	33.3	24	25.0	6	6.2	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	6	7.5	21	26.2	21	26.2	30	37.5	2	2.5	80	100
FL	15	20.8	7	9.7	24	33.3	25	34.7	1	1.4	72	100
AA	1	2.8	8	22.2	21	58.3	4	11.1	2	5.6	36	100
SPA	1	2.3	6	13.6	26	59.1	9	20.4	2	4.5	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 107.408

Significant at .01 level

The responses given for Item 37, methods of instruction, are listed in Table 42. Respondents in all the sample groups primarily agreed that students should be involved in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Student non-leaders and student leaders, however, who did not perceive recommending or advising as a means of participation in policy formulation felt that students should share in the responsibility. On the other hand faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators who did not perceive students as participating in policy formulation through recommending or advising most frequently felt that students should not normally participate.

TABLE 42

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	18	20.0	59	65.6	13	14.4	0	0.0	90	100
SL	1	1.1	24	25.0	65	67.7	6	6.2	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	1	1.2	8	10.0	50	62.5	21	26.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	1	1.4	4	5.6	45	62.5	22	30.6	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.8	3	8.6	23	65.7	8	22.8	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	3	6.8	29	65.9	12	27.2	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 37.732

Significant at .01 level

Item 42 in the questionnaire was concerned with faculty teaching loads. The responses are summarized in Table 43. The majority of respondents in all sample groups agreed that students should not normally participate in policy formulation in this area. Through an inspection of the table, however, it can be observed that many student leaders, student non-leaders and student personnel administrators in particular felt that students should be involved in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising.

TABLE 43

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	0	0.0	3	3.3	24	26.7	58	64.4	5	5.6	90	100
SL	0	0.0	9	9.4	33	34.4	50	52.1	4	4.2	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	2	2.5	18	22.5	60	75.0	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	19.7	57	80.3	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	17.1	29	82.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	1	2.3	13	29.5	30	68.2	0	0.0	44	100

DF 15

 χ^2 37.069

Significant at .01 level

In Table 44 the responses to Item 45, grading practices, are given. The majority of respondents in all sample groups, with the exception of the faculty non-leaders, felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Student leaders who did not perceive students as participating in policy formulation through recommending or advising most often felt that students should share this responsibility with faculty and administrators. On the other hand, faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators who did not perceive students as participating through recommending or advising most often felt that students should not normally participate.

TABLE 44

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	2	2.2	20	22.2	47	52.2	21	23.3	0	0.0	90	100
SL	0	0.0	28	29.2	55	57.3	11	11.5	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	5	6.2	37	46.2	38	47.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	4	5.6	40	55.6	28	38.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.9	3	8.6	19	54.3	12	34.3	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	3	6.8	28	63.6	13	29.5	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 65.785

Significant at .01 level

Item 48 in the questionnaire was selection of graduate assistants. An inspection of Table 45 reveals that the majority of respondents in all the sample groups, except the student leader group, felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation concerning the selection of graduate assistants. Although student leaders most frequently selected response 4 (students would not normally participate), 34.4% felt that students should participate through recommending or advising. Significant percentages of student non-leaders (32.2%) along with student personnel administrators (29.5%) also felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising.

TABLE 45

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	6	6.7	29	32.2	52	57.8	2	2.2	90	100
SL	1	1.0	11	11.5	33	34.4	46	47.9	5	5.2	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	1	1.2	22	27.5	57	71.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	16.7	59	81.9	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	2	5.7	6	17.1	27	77.1	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	29.5	31	70.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 44.883

Significant at .01 level

Item 51 in the questionnaire was concerned with policy formulation as related to class size. The responses are summarized in Table 46. With the exception of the academic administrator group, the majority of respondents in all the sample groups felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Of the academic administrators, 45.7% felt that students should participate through recommending or advising with 40% indicating that students should not normally participated in policy formulation related to class size. A further examination of the table reveals that 25% of the student leaders felt that students should be involved in policy formulation through sharing the responsibility. Student personnel administrators had the lowest percentage of respondents among the non-student groups that felt that students should not normally participate.

TABLE 46

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	3	3.3	18	20.0	50	55.6	19	21.1	0	0.0	90	100
SL	3	3.1	24	25.0	63	65.6	5	5.2	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	1	1.2	11	13.7	47	58.7	21	26.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	45	62.5	25	34.7	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	3	8.6	16	45.7	14	40.0	2	5.7	35	100
SPA	1	2.3	3	6.8	28	63.6	11	25.0	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 58.699

Significant at .01 level

The responses to Item 54, textbook selection, are found in Table 47. The majority of faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders and academic administrators felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation related to textbook selection. The majority of student leaders and student personnel administrators, however, felt that students should participate either through recommending and advising or through sharing the responsibility. Although student non-leaders most frequently (47.8%) selected response 4 (students would not normally participate), 37.8% selected response 3 (students recommend or advise) and 11.1% selected response 2 (students share the responsibility).

TABLE 47

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	2	2.2	10	11.1	34	37.8	43	47.8	1	1.1	90	100
SL	0	0.0	14	14.6	47	49.0	35	36.5	0	0.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	2	2.5	28	35.0	50	62.5	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	29.2	51	70.8	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	2	5.7	8	22.9	25	71.4	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	22	50.0	20	45.4	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 50.250

Significant at .01 level

Item 58 was listed in the questionnaire as academic advising.

The responses are listed in Table 48. An inspection of the table reveals that a majority of the respondents in all the sample groups, with the exception of the student non-leaders, agree that students should be involved in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. A majority of the student non-leaders felt that students should participate either through recommending and advising or through sharing the responsibility for policy formulation as related to academic advising.

TABLE 48

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	7	7.8	26	29.2	40	44.9	15	16.8	1	1.1	89	100
SL	3	3.1	26	27.1	53	55.2	11	11.4	3	3.1	96	100
FNL	2	2.5	16	20.0	54	67.5	7	8.7	1	1.2	80	100
FL	0	0.0	9	12.5	53	73.6	10	13.9	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.9	10	28.6	22	62.9	2	5.7	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	4	9.1	34	77.3	6	13.6	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 37.703

Significant at .01 level

Item 65 in the questionnaire was concerned with student participation in policy formulation as related to the development of new curricula. The responses are summarized in Table 49. A majority of the respondents in all the sample groups agreed that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Student non-leaders and student leaders, however, who did not perceive students as participating in policy formulation through recommending or advising most frequently felt that students should share in the responsibility for policy formulation. On the other hand, faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators who did not perceive students as participating in policy formulation through recommending or advising most frequently felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation related to the development of new curricula.

TABLE 49

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	21	23.8	46	52.3	15	17.0	5	5.7	88	100
SL	1	1.0	20	20.8	63	65.6	10	10.4	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	6	7.5	43	53.7	31	38.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	1	1.4	42	58.3	29	40.2	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	57.1	15	42.9	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	5	11.4	29	65.9	10	22.7	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 69.717

Significant at .01 level

Item 67 in the questionnaire was listed as course scheduling. The responses are summarized in Table 50. An inspection of the table reveals that only in the faculty leader group did the majority of members agree upon a particular response; i.e., 59.7% of the faculty leaders felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation related to course scheduling. Respondents in the other sample groups were almost equally divided in their selections between students should recommend and advise or students should not normally participate in policy formulation related to course scheduling. Student leaders and student non-leaders in their selections, however, were more inclined to involve students to a greater degree in policy formulation than the other groups.

TABLE 50

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	4	4.5	15	16.8	37	41.6	33	37.1	0	0.0	89	100
SL	8	8.3	10	10.4	38	39.6	38	39.6	2	2.1	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	7	8.7	34	42.5	39	48.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	27	37.5	43	59.7	0	0.0	72	100
AA	1	2.8	0	0.0	17	48.6	17	48.6	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	20	45.5	21	47.7	1	2.3	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 41.484

Significant at .01 level

A summarization of the responses to Item 60, curriculum requirements, is found in Table 51. A majority of faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders and academic administrators felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation related to curriculum requirements. The majority of student leaders, student non-leaders and academic administrators, however, felt that students should participate through recommending and advising or through sharing the responsibility for policy formulation.

TABLE 51

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	15	16.7	44	48.9	28	31.1	2	2.2	90	100
SL	0	0.0	11	11.6	44	46.3	40	42.1	0	0.0	95	100
FNL	1	1.2	4	5.0	28	35.0	47	58.7	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	1	1.4	20	27.8	51	70.8	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	40.0	21	60.0	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	2	4.5	21	47.7	21	47.7	0	0.0	44	100

DF 20

 χ^2 50.666

Significant at .01 level

Item 63 in the questionnaire was concerned with student participation in policy formulation as related to the scheduling of final examinations. An inspection of Table 52 reveals that a majority of the respondents in all the groups felt that students should either participate through recommending and advising or through sharing the responsibility for policy formulation in this area. Academic administrators in particular (74.3%) felt that students should be involved in policy formulation through recommending or advising. In all sample groups members who did not perceive students as participating in policy formulation through recommending or advising most frequently felt, however, that students should not normally participate.

TABLE 52

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.1	22	24.7	34	38.2	30	33.7	2	2.2	89	100
SL	2	2.1	19	19.8	42	43.7	32	33.3	1	1.0	96	100
FNL	0	0.0	9	11.2	34	42.5	37	46.2	0	0.0	80	100
FL	0	0.0	1	1.4	41	56.9	30	41.7	0	0.0	72	100
AA	0	0.0	2	5.7	26	74.3	7	20.0	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	6	13.9	18	41.9	18	41.9	1	2.3	43	100

DF 20

 χ^2 43.291

Significant at .01 level

A summary of the responses to Item 71 in the questionnaire, course waivers, is found in Table 53. Student leaders and student non-leaders primarily perceive students as participating in policy formulation in this area through recommending and advising or through sharing the responsibility. The majority of faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders and academic administrators felt that students should not normally participate although substantial minorities felt that students should participate through recommending or advising. Student personnel administrators were almost evenly divided in their selections between involving students through recommending and advising or not normally involving students.

TABLE 53

Scale:	1-PR		2-SR		3-RA		4-WNNP		5-NO		TOTAL	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SNL	1	1.2	21	24.7	35	41.2	25	29.4	3	3.5	85	100
SL	5	5.4	21	22.8	49	53.3	17	18.5	0	0.0	92	100
FNL	0	0.0	4	5.1	31	39.7	42	53.8	1	1.3	78	100
FL	0	0.0	2	2.8	29	40.3	40	55.6	1	1.4	72	100
AA	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	45.7	19	54.3	0	0.0	35	100
SPA	0	0.0	3	7.0	18	41.9	20	46.5	2	4.6	43	100

DF 20

 χ^2 76.976

Significant at .01 level

An analysis of the data was presented in this chapter. In discussing the data the items were grouped under three main categories: student personnel administration, general institutional government, and academic administration. Of the 71 items listed on the questionnaire, significant differences among the comparison groups were found in 51 of the items. A discussion of each significant item was presented. A summary of the findings along with the conclusion and implications for further study are found in the next chapter.

Chapter V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUMMARY

The Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to compare perceptions of selected students and faculty members at Michigan State University with respect to student involvement in university policy formulation. Six sample groups were identified for the purpose of determining whether there was any relationship between membership in a group and the perception of the extent students should be involved in university policy formulation. The six sample groups were (1) student non-leaders, (2) student leaders, (3) faculty non-leaders, (4) faculty leaders, (5) academic administrators, and (6) student personnel administrators.

The study was conducted during the Fall Term of 1966. At that time the instrument which was used to compare perceptions was mailed to the sample population. Responses from the sample groups ranged from 80% to 96%.

The Design and Procedure of the Study

A 71 item questionnaire based on functionally identified policy

areas of the university was designed to obtain individual perceptions. On each item individuals were asked to indicate the extent to which they thought students should be involved in university policy formulation. Responses were indicated on a five point scale. The statistic chi square was used in analyzing the data and the .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance. In all instances, however, where significant differences in perception among the comparison groups were found, use of the chi square statistic resulted in the .01 level of confidence being obtained.

Findings and Conclusions

Findings of the study will be reported in the following way: First those functionally identified areas where there was agreement among students and faculty will be discussed. Secondly, those functionally identified areas in which there was disagreement among students and faculty will be discussed under the three headings: student personnel administration, general institutional government, and academic administration.

Areas of Agreement

Based on the responses to the items listed in Table 2, it may be concluded that only in certain functionally identified areas was there agreement among students and faculty at Michigan State University with respect to the extent students should be involved in university policy formulation. Generally, the areas of agreement represented the

traditionally accepted role of students in university policy formulation. For example, students were perceived as (1) being primarily responsible for policy formulation related to student government structure or for membership in fraternities and sororities; (2) sharing the responsibility for policy formulation relating to the supervision of social events; and (3) not normally participating in policy formulation relating to the promotion of faculty. It should also be noted that there were more functionally identified areas that students and faculty agreed upon relating to student personnel administration than to either general institutional government or academic administration.

Areas of Disagreement

Student Personnel Administration

Student leaders and student non-leaders, with few exceptions, felt that students should be more involved in university policy formulation than did faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders, academic administrators and student personnel administrators. Students, for example, tended to view their participation in university policy formulation more in terms of shared responsibility with faculty and administration. Faculty and administrators, however, were more inclined to perceive students as participating in university policy formulation through recommending or advising.

Academic administrators and student personnel administrators more often agreed with student leaders and student non-leaders concerning

the extent that students should participate in university policy formulation than did faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders. Academic administrators and student personnel administrators, being more familiar with the problems relating to policy formulation in the area of student personnel administration, were more receptive towards student participation.

In only one instance (Item 68, promotion of dean of students staff) did a majority of the respondents from any of the sample groups feel that students should not normally participate. In considering those items dealing with general institutional government, however, there were ten instances where a majority of the respondents from a given sample group felt that students should not normally participate. In the area of academic administration there were eight instances where a majority of the respondents from a given sample group felt that students should not normally participate. It is clearly evident that student participation in university policy formulation in the area of student personnel administration is perceived as desirable by students and faculty alike. In the areas of general institutional government and academic administration, however, there was considerable reluctance to involve students in policy formulation. Perhaps some of the reluctance to involve students in policy formulation stems from a tradition of non-participation in certain areas. More importantly, however, university faculties and administrators may not have carefully enough (1) identified areas where students may meaningfully participate and contribute in

policy formulation or (2) developed procedures for participation that result in a learning experience not only for the student but for the faculty member and administrator.

Faculty non-leaders, as compared with the other sample groups, more frequently felt that students should not normally participate in university policy formulation. Perhaps this attitude on the part of faculty non-leaders stems from insufficient information about problem areas or a lack of experience in utilizing student ideas and concerns with respect to policy formulation.

Student non-leaders as compared with student leaders more frequently felt that students should be primarily responsible for university policy formulation in a given area. Most student leaders after becoming involved in some area of policy formulation became less strident in their demands for primary responsibility. Largely this is a result of gaining greater insight into the complexities of policy formulation and a greater understanding of the problems involved.

Most respondents tended to view student participation in policy formulation related to the student personnel administration area as either a shared responsibility with faculty and administrators or one in which students recommended or advised.

In the student personnel area it would appear that the question is not whether students should be involved in policy formulation but rather should students be involved as equals or as advisors.

General Institutional Government

In ten of the fourteen items in this area indicating disagreement among students and faculty concerning the extent of student participation in university policy formulation, a majority of the respondents from one or more of the sample groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation. In only four instances out of the ten, however, did a majority of the student leaders or student non-leaders feel that students should not normally participate. Students, traditionally, at most colleges and universities have not been actively involved in policy formulation concerning tuition, the design and construction of new buildings and budget appropriations. When students have been involved in a recommending or advising role, however, significant contributions have been made. The question seems to be one of how best to involve students in gaining their ideas and insights and at the same time recognizing their limitations.

In no instances did the majority of respondents from any of the sample groupings feel that students should be primarily responsible for policy formulation in a given area.

Student personnel administrators more often agreed with student leaders and student non-leaders concerning the extent that students should participate in institutional policy formulation than did faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders, and academic administrators. This was particularly true in those areas concerning faculty and administrators when there were specific student regulations; i.e., driving and parking,

solicitation of funds, use of university mail system.

Faculty leaders, as compared with other sample groups, more frequently felt that students should not normally participate in university policy formulation related to general institutional government.

Such a perception could well be the result of faculty leaders feeling that students do not have available either the information or the knowledge necessary to make meaningful contributions towards policy formulation in this area. In addition many faculty leaders may feel that students have no business concerning themselves with areas of policy formulation affecting only faculty.

Student leaders and student non-leaders most often felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending and advising. The non-student sample groups, as reported previously, most often felt that students should not normally participate. Students in general seem to recognize their limitations in participating in policy formulation in this area. At the same time, however, they want to be consulted with or at least communicated with concerning policy formulation in the area of general institutional government.

Academic Administration

There were 19 items listed in the questionnaire related to policy formulation in the area of academic administration. Responses to 17 items indicated disagreement among students and faculty with respect to the extent students should participate in policy formulation.

In eight instances a majority of the respondents from one or more sample groups felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation. This finding compares with one instance in the area of student personnel administration and ten instances in the area of general institutional government where a majority of the respondents from one or more sample groups felt that students should not normally participate.

Faculty leaders and faculty non-leaders more often felt that students should not normally participate in policy formulation than student personnel administrators and academic administrators. There were no instances concerning items in this area that a majority of student personnel administrators felt that students should not normally participate. There were four instances in which a majority of the academic administrators felt that students should not normally participate. Students in most American colleges and universities have not participated in the formulation of policy in the academic areas to the extent they have in the student personnel area. Recently, however, many students in universities across the country have asked for greater participation in academic policy formulation. Much of their concern seems to stem from an honest desire to improve the educational experience. A comment from one of the faculty leaders in responding to the questionnaire expresses perhaps the feeling of many faculty

"I believe it is the responsibility of the administration and faculty to operate the university in general. In some instances student thinking should be taken into account but in general

they are not capable or mature enough to participate in most of the policy formulation. The university was established by the tax payers of the state and the students should spend their time in obtaining the education available to them. There are adequate means of handling protests or abuses in the present administration and faculty procedures when a student feels he has not been treated fairly."

Student personnel administrators more often agree with student leaders and student non-leaders concerning the extent of student participation in university policy formulation than do faculty leaders, faculty non-leaders and academic administrators. Perhaps this perception on the part of the student personnel administrator emphasizes again his experience in working with students in the formulation of policy in the student personnel area. The student personnel administrator appears to be the middleman between the student and faculty with respect to student involvement in academic policy formulation. His training and experience lead him to believe that much can be gained by having student participation. Interpreting the concerns of students, however, to faculty and suggesting just how students might become involved in policy formulation is no easy task.

In only three instances did a majority of the student leaders or the student non-leaders feel that students should not normally participate in policy formulation. These three areas were: faculty selection, faculty teaching loads and selection of graduate assistants. Student leaders and student non-leaders most often felt that students should participate in policy formulation in this area through recommending or advising. Hopefully, as one student leader wrote, "I mean advise with the

guarantee that student recommendations would be seriously invited and considered."

In general it may be concluded that there was greater agreement among students and faculty concerning the extent to which students should participate in university policy formulation in the areas of student personnel administration than in the areas of general institutional government and academic administration.

In addition the majority of students and faculty felt that university policy formulation in most areas was not the sole prerogative of one group to the exclusion of others. In general there is agreement that in certain areas university policy formulation should be the primary responsibility of either the faculty, the administration or the student body. For the most part, however, policy areas have not been identified and defined in this way. Nor have those policy areas in which it would seem desirable for student, faculty and administrator alike to participate jointly been identified. The problem appears to be one of structure and communication. Unfortunately in many schools procedures have not been developed to allow for even a discussion between faculty, student and administrator about controversial policies. Frequently faculty or administrators are reluctant to involve students in policy formulation for fear of losing control. Consequently when students do become involved, it is frequently a result of a student rights movement and not a result of a desire to involve students for educational and developmental reasons. Considerable more effort must be expended

in developing those procedures that will be most productive in providing an opportunity for all segments of the university to participate effectively in policy formulation. Not only have universities failed in developing appropriate procedures with respect to university policy formulation but there has also been a failure in communicating the intent of a policy once it has been developed. With the constant turnover in the student population, communication concerning university policy should not be left to chance. Additional ways should be explored in communicating with students. It is no longer possible at most schools to depend upon the traditional methods of communication for accurate interpretation of university policy. Structure and effective communication are really inseparable. One depends upon the other. In this respect Henderson's concept of university governance through an organizational structure with overlapping circles and the representation of various groups through a system of interlinking pins has much to offer.⁶⁸ Such a structure promotes greater interaction between groups and consequently greater opportunity for consensus.

Implications For Further Study

This study concerned itself only with students and faculty at Michigan State University. Perceptions of students and faculty with respect to student participation in university policy formulation at other

⁶⁸ Henderson, op. cit.

universities would be helpful. Differences based on the educational philosophy of the school, the composition of the student body of the size of the school might become very apparent. With the continued rapid expansion of community junior colleges throughout the country, a comparison between junior colleges and four-year institutions might also be revealing with respect to student participation in university policy formulation.

A study utilizing in-depth interviews with selected students and faculty to gain further insight into the causes for differences in perceptions would be helpful in further understanding the complexities of university policy formulation.

An historical study tracing the development of student participation in university policy formulation at selected universities would be helpful in identifying those factors that have been the most influential in determining the extent of student participation.

Certainly further research concerning possible models for involving students and faculty in university policy formulation would be helpful. Although there is much agreement about the desirability of involving students in various areas of university policy formulation, there is considerable confusion and disagreement on how to best accomplish it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. Organization and Innovation. Dorsey Press, 1965, Homewood, Illinois.
- Boland, Paul A. "A New Concept in Student Government," Journal of Higher Education. Volume 32, February 1961, pp. 94-97.
- Edwards, R. H., Artman, J. M. and Fisher, Galen M. Undergraduates: A Study of Morale in Twenty-three American Colleges and Universities. New York: Doubleday Doran Company, 1928.
- Falvey, Frances E. Student Participation in College Administration. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1952.
- Findlay, F. J. "Student Government: Medieval, Colonial, and Modern Style," School Activities. (April 1940), p. 316.
- Friedson, Eliot. Student Government, Student Leaders and the American College. (Philadelphia: U.S. National Student Association, 1955).
- Gardner, John W. "Agenda for the Colleges and Universities," Journal of Higher Education. Volume 36, No. 7, (October, 1956).
- Gildersleeve, Virginia C. "The Abuse of Democracy," The Saturday Review. Volume 39, November 24, 1956, pp. 15-16.
- Golden, Patricia M. and Rosen, Ned A. "Student Attitudes Toward Participation in University Administration: An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Prerogatives," Journal of College Student Personnel. November, 1966, pp. 323-330.
- Henderson, Algo D. "Effective Models of University Governance," Paper presented to Group 34 at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 7, 1967.

- Horner, James T. and Rosemary L. "Student Involvement in Governance and Administration of Higher Education," The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. Volume 4, No. 2, (October, 1966) p. 60.
- Hynes, Dorothy. "A Study of the Range of Student Government Function at Seventy Co-educational Colleges and Universities," (Masters thesis, Cornell University), p. 46.
- Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New Haven, Connecticut: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959.
- _____. "Student Leadership," Education for Social Responsibility. Washington, D.C., The American Red Cross, May 1961, p. 19.
- Kerins, Frances J. "Student Autonomy and Administration Control: The Fallacy of Absolute Cooperation Between Student and Administrators," Journal of Higher Education. Volume 30, February, 1959, pp. 61-66.
- Klopf, Gordon. College Student Government. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960.
- Lunn, Harry H. The Student's Role in College Policy-Making. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1957.
- McGuire, Edward C. "The Role of the Student in College Policy Making," Personnel and Guidance Journal. Volume 38, January, 1960, pp. 378-384.
- McKown, Harry C. The Student Council. McGraw Hill, New York, 1944.
- Martin, Warren B. "Student Participation in Academic Government," Paper presented to Group 5 on "Student Participation in Governance of the Institution" at the 22nd National Conference of Higher Education, Chicago, March 6, 1967.
- Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1960.
- Mulford, Charles L. "Self Actualization in a Small College Environment," Journal of College Student Personnel. Volume 8, No. 2, March, 1967.
- Schodde, Stephen C. "The NSA and Student Government," Journal of Deans of Students and Student Personnel Administrators. October 1964, p. 15.

Schoen, Walter Thomas. "Clarification and Delineation of Areas of Student and Faculty Responsibility," The Journal of College Student Personnel. (June, 1965) p. 245.

Sheldon, Henry D. Student Life and Customs. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1901.

Strang, Ruth. Group Activities in College and Secondary School. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.

Wert, Robert J. "Our Restless," Think. November-December, 1965, p. 26.

Williamson, E. G. "Training Student Leaders," Paper Presented to Group 15 on "Finding and Developing Student Leaders" at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 6, 1967.

Williamson, E. G. and Cowan, John L. "Students and Academic Freedom," A Report of Commission VIII, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Washington, D.C., 1965.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENT PARTICIPATION
IN UNIVERSITY POLICY FORMULATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain your opinion with respect to student involvement in university policy formulation. For purposes of this questionnaire university policy formulation is defined as a step in the decision-making process. This step is designed to develop a consensus of thought concerning a function or area of the university resulting in a course of action or a set of procedures to be adopted. Policy areas related to particular functions of the university have been selected and are listed as numbered statements 1 through 71. In answering the questionnaire you should determine the extent to which you think students should be involved in university policy formulation.

In answering the questionnaire one response should be selected for each numbered function from the following scale:

1. Students are primarily responsible for policy formulation without faculty or administrative participation.
2. Students share responsibility with faculty and/or administrators through serving on joint committees.
3. Students have opportunity to advise or recommend to faculty and/or administrators with respect to the policy involved.
4. Students would not normally participate.
5. No opinion or comments. (You do not choose to select any of the previous responses or you have comments that would better express your opinion.)

Comments should be written on the reverse side of the answer sheet and numbered appropriately. In addition comments can be used to qualify responses 1 through 4.

QUESTIONNAIRE

SCALE:

- Students: (1) Primarily responsible (2) Share responsibility
(3) Recommend or advise (4) Would not normally participate
(5) No opinion or comments

Policy Formulation Related To:

1. Admission of new students
2. Selection of administrative officers (i.e., president, vice-president, provost, deans of colleges)
3. Tuition charges and fees
4. Residence hall room and board rates
5. Design and construction of new buildings
6. Intercollegiate athletics
7. Intramural athletics
8. Promotion of administrative officers (i.e., president, vice-president, provost, deans of colleges)
9. Student publications
10. Cultural programs (Lecture-Concert Series)
11. Budget appropriations to colleges and departments within the university
12. Use of student records
13. Student driving and parking regulations
14. Faculty driving and parking regulations
15. Solicitation of funds by faculty
16. Student radio stations
17. Off-campus speakers

18. Campus police services
19. Alumni programs
20. Solicitation of funds by students
21. Use of university mail distribution system
22. Degree requirements
23. Cheating in the classroom
24. Instructor evaluation
25. Faculty selection
26. Selling or advertising of activities, good, or services by faculty
27. Course content
28. Class attendance
29. Military training (ROTC program)
30. Policies relative to faculty conduct
31. Faculty salaries
32. Women's closing hours
33. Student organizations financial accounts
34. Student government structure and function
35. Faculty sabbaticals
36. Use of student union facilities
37. Methods of instruction
38. Chartering or registration of student organizations
39. Selling or advertising of activities, goods, or services by students
40. Supervision of social events
41. Health Center services

42. Faculty teaching loads
43. Placement Center services
44. Scholarship and financial aids assistance
45. Grading practices
46. Off-campus housing services
47. Residence hall housing services
48. Selection of graduate assistants
49. Married housing services
50. Student employment services
51. Class size
52. Counseling Center services
53. Student health and accident insurance
54. Textbook selections
55. Registration and enrollment procedures
56. Student orientation program
57. Student sponsored conferences
58. Academic advising
59. Evaluation of students (residence assistants' evaluations, letters of recommendations)
60. Curriculum requirements
61. Library resources and procedures
62. Eligibility for membership in fraternities and sororities
63. Scheduling of final examinations
64. Functions of religious advisors
65. Development of new curricula

- 66. Selection of dean of students staff
- 67. Course scheduling
- 68. Promotion of dean of students staff
- 69. Policies relative to student conduct
- 70. Faculty promotion
- 71. Course waivers

APPENDIX B

INITIAL LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing 48823

Office of the Dean of Students

Dear

I would appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire concerning student participation in university policy formulation. Most individuals have found that it takes only 15 to 20 minutes of their time. It is neither necessary nor desirable for you to complete the heading on the answer sheet. Please read the cover sheet before completing the questionnaire. If, for some reason, you cannot complete the questionnaire, please return it along with any comments in the enclosed envelope. A copy of the tabulated findings will be available upon your request. I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Louis F. Hekhuis
Director
Student Activities Division

LFH:plc

Enclosures

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing 48823

Office of the Dean of Students

Dear

Earlier this term a questionnaire concerning student participation in university policy formulation was mailed to you. If, for some reason, you did not receive the questionnaire or have misplaced it, I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to my office at your earliest convenience. If you have already completed the questionnaire and returned it, please disregard this letter. Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Louis F. Hekhuis
Director
Student Activities Division

LFH:plc

Enclosures

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293006949022