ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FACULTY AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF THREE DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS AT A COMPLEX UNIVERSITY USING THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE: AN EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE, A CONVENTIONAL LIVING-LEARNING RESIDENCE HALL AND A COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

By

Charles Calvin Spence, III

James Madison College is one of three experimental and residential colleges at Michigan State University and is now in its third full year of operation. Its curriculum is an experimental social science one using the policy problems approach. Students in Madison live and take their Madison classes in the same building. Madison faculty also have their offices within the same building.

This researcher attempted to discover in which ways the environment in Madison College differed from other comparable environments at Michigan State University. Two other environments were selected for comparative purposes. One of the environments contained the basic college at Michigan State University, the University College. This two-year college is located in a coeducational living-learning residence hall which has classroom facilities and

faculty offices. The residential college concept is similar to the living-learning idea as both have students who live and take classes in the same building which also has their faculty members' offices.

The second environment selected for comparison was the College of Social Science. This unit was selected because of the curricular similarity to Madison College: Social Science.

Faculty and sophomore students in each of the three environments were administered the College and University Environment Scale, Second Edition, developed by C. Robert Pace. The CUES consists of the following scales: (1) Practicality; (2) Propriety; (3) Awareness; (4) Scholarship; and (5) Community; as well as two sub-scales: (1) Campus Morale, and (2) Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships.

The CUES did discriminate between the three environments. Madison students and faculty perceived the lowest level of Practicality in all six groups, but the highest level of Scholarship and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships.

On the Community and Awareness scales, Madison faculty attained the highest scores followed by Madison students and then University College students and faculty.

There was very little difference between the six groups on the Propriety scale.

Residential college students perceive the same level of Campus Morale as students in living-learning residence halls. Madison faculty demonstrated the highest level on this scale while University College faculty had the lowest score. Madison faculty generally had the most idealized view of their environment.

The literature reviewed experimental colleges and the role which they can play in higher education. The problems of residential college living was also discussed. A listing of residential experimental colleges was provided. Environmental studies which had used the CUES were also discussed.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FACULTY AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF THREE DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS AT A COMPLEX UNIVERSITY USING THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE: AN EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE, A CONVENTIONAL LIVING-LEARNING RESIDENCE HALL AND A COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

By

Charles Calvin Spence, III

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Higher Education

1970

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, Isabelle, who gave me so much of herself during these past five years of graduate work. Her love, respect, and support have been my greatest sources of motivation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a great deal of thanks to Dr. Laurine Fitzgerald, my thesis advisor, who gave me constant encouragement from the first time I inquired about the doctoral program at Michigan State and right on through the completion of this thesis. I admire her deeply as a person and as a professional student personnel worker and have been grateful to work with her.

Dr. Edward Blackman, a member of my thesis committee, taught the first course I took at Michigan State. I was awed by his warmth, dedication, and brilliance at that time and feel very fortunate to have had his assistance in completing my doctoral program. Unfortunately, he became too ill to read this thesis. Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker graciously read for him.

I also am thankful that I have had the opportunity to study under Dr. Max Raines. His commitment to education for all people inspired me and he has had a lasting affect on my thinking. His membership on my thesis com-committee has meant much to me.

Dr. Gary Stollak in the Psychology Department taught me a great deal about critical thinking in his classes. I am happy to have worked under him and to have had him on my committee.

Dr. Paul Dressel encouraged me in the initial stages of this study and gave me the institutional approval which I needed.

Finally, I am grateful to my closest friend, Gary Frost, who has had so much to do with my personal and professional growth over the past two years. He supported me continuously during the long writing of this thesis. Now I hope I can do the same for him!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

VITA

Oral Examination: June 3, 1970

Dissertation:

Perceptions of Selected Faculty and Undergraduates of Three Different Environments at a Complex University Using the College and University Scale: An Experimental Social Science Residential College, A Conventional Living-Learning Residence Hall and a College of Social Science.

Outline of Studies:

Henry Ford Community College, 1961-1963. Emphasis on History and Psychology.

Ohio State University, 1963-1965. Emphasis on English and Psychology.
B.Sci.

Yale University, Summer 1964
Certificate in Spanish

Wayne State University, 1965-1967. Emphasis on Counseling and Guidance
M.Sci. in Education

Michigan State University, 1967-1970. Emphasis on Student Personnel Work and Psychology. Ph.D. in Higher Education

Biographical Information:

Born in Detroit, 1943. Lived in Detroit and surrounding suburbs until graduation from Henry Ford Community College. Participated in Foreign Exchange Program to Europe in 1960. Was active in high school and college student government.

Married in 1965 to Isabelle Owen Spence. A son, Bradley, was born in December 1966. A daughter, Emily, was born in March 1970. My wife is presently completing a Master's Degree in Family Studies at Michigan State University.

Experience:

Undergraduate Resident Advisor at Ohio State University, 1964-1965

Financial Aids Counselor at Wayne State University where I recruited low income students for Wayne and counseled them after they were admitted, 1965-1967.

Head Advisor for a men's residence hall at Michigan State University, 1967-1968.

Head Advisor in Case Hall and Assistant Director of Student Relations in James Madison College, 1968-1969.

Assistant Director of Student Relations in James Madison College, 1969-1970.

Travels:

Canada, Europe, Puerto Rico

Professional Organizations:

Founding member of The Association for the Developmental Guidance of Adults in Detroit, Michigan, 1966

Student memberships in ACPA, APGA, and MCPA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research in higher education during the past few years has begun to focus on the nature of the college student and the impact which college has upon him. During this same period, many universities have begun to experiment with a variety of learning environments such as cluster colleges which are small semi-autonomous colleges within a larger university. Unfortunately, the empirical data available emphasizes the more traditional college environment and not the more experimental units consisting of innovative curriculums and unique environments. The most comprehensive compilation of research on college students, The Impact of College on Students, discusses research on students living in fraternities and conventional residence halls but is unable to discuss experimental environments because of the paucity of research in this area (7).

This study examines three sub-units of Michigan State University, two of which would be considered experimental environments in higher education.

Description of Madison College

James Madison College is one of the environments examined and also serves as the primary focus of this study. Madison College is a four-year semi-autonomous residential college housed in a Michigan State University co-educational residence hall. It is presently in its third year of operation. Madison faculty teach their classes and have offices within the same residence hall where Madison students live. Madison College's curriculum is based in multi-disciplinary social science, utilizing the policy approach in examining contemporary world and national problems such as the problems of ethnic minority groups, world peace, problems of the urban community, and problems of justice in American Democracy. Madison students take approximately one-half of their course work in other departments at Michigan State University while concentrating their Madison coursework in one of the five major core areas offered in Madison College.

Madison College is one of three residential colleges at Michigan State University. Justin Morrill College, now completing its fourth year, is also housed completely within one residence hall and has a curriculum which emphasizes a cross cultural liberal education. The third residential college, Lyman Briggs College, which opened at the same time as James Madison in 1967, emphasizes the physical and biological sciences as well as mathematics.

Description of University College

The second environment to be examined in this study is Wilson Hall, which is a co-educational living-learning residence hall. It has faculty offices and classrooms in the residence hall for the University College curriculum, the two-year general education college at Michigan State University. The University College has existed for over twenty-five years but made an innovative change in 1961 when it placed its faculty and classrooms in a new co-educational residence hall. Until that time students lived in traditional residence halls and went to classroom buildings for their University College courses. This innovation has been widely acclaimed as a very progressive method to decentralize large universities, make faculty-student contact more frequent, and to create a more intellectually stimulating environment for undergraduates. Since that first unit was completed in 1961, other living-learning residence halls have also been built at Michigan State and a former conventional residence hall complex was converted to more closely approximate the living-learning concept.

The curriculum in the University College consists of four areas:

1. American Thought and Language. This three-sequence course aims " . . . to improve the student's ability to read and write and acquaint him with his American heritage" (26,

p. 42). These courses are taken during the freshmen year.

2. Natural Science. This three-part sequence of courses is also taken during the freshman year and deals with " . . . the nature of scientific knowledge, the way this knowledge is constantly modified and changed and its impact on man's culture" (26, p. 43).
3. Social Science. This sequence of three courses is usually taken during the sophomore year. "Analytical tools and concepts of the several social sciences are applied to selected problems of change and development in modern mass society" (26, p. 44).
4. Humanities. A sequence of three courses is taken during the sophomore year which deals with history, literature, philosophy, and the arts. "They focus on man's beliefs and values, on the creative insights and forms of expression through which he tries to understand himself and his relation to the world and his fellow-men" (26, p. 44).

The University College has honors sections in each of these four course areas. Students may take independent study exams to waive any of the courses in University College. Students remain in University College formally until the end of their sophomore year although they may

de

ve

ye

in

a

th

ma

m

e

g

w

declare a major in other departments at Michigan State University at any time during their freshmen and sophomore years. In the winter of 1970, there were 14,629 students in the University college, 3,106 of which had not declared a major (27).

Description of the College of Social Science

The third environment examined in this study is the College of Social Science. A student may declare a major in any area of social science as a freshmen but he must formally remain in the University College until the end of his sophomore year. There are over 5,000 undergraduate students in the nine colleges and departments which make up the College of Social Science:

1. Multi-disciplinary Social Science
2. Department of Anthropology
3. Department of Geography
4. School of Police Administration and Public Safety
5. Department of Political Science
6. Department of Psychology
7. School of Social Work
8. Department of Sociology
9. School of Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture (26)

Thus at the present time students interested in the social sciences have several different alternatives available to them at Michigan State University in both curriculum and living arrangements. They may choose a major in one of the social sciences and live off-campus, or on campus in a living-learning or a conventional residence hall. Another alternative now open is the residential college in which students live in the designated residence hall housing the residential college or off-campus after they have reached the age of twenty-one.

These alternatives represent different environments for learning. The residential college is not identical to a living-learning center or to a larger college, such as the College of Social Science. It is important to determine just how these environments do differ in order to help students make decisions about where they will live and how they will study their area(s) of interest. It is also important to provide an objective description of these environments for faculty so that they can choose most logically the situation in which they would enjoy teaching the most. Furthermore an analysis of these environments is extremely valuable for college self-evaluations. This self-examination is critical for new and developing programs, such as Madison College.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the ways in which the three environments are perceived differently by faculty and students in these academic units. Analysis of the data will determine if three academic sub-units of a large university are also three distinct environments, or are seen so similarly to be considered one large environment.

The proponents of both the living-learning units and the residential colleges believe they have created unique environments, more satisfying to students than the larger departments found in most big universities. This study attempts to ascertain in what ways these environments differ from each other.

Nature of Study

This study examines the following three environments at Michigan State University from the perspective of faculty and sophomore students: (1) an experimental social science residential college, (2) a living-learning residence hall, and (3) a college of social science.

Sophomore students were chosen to provide comparable groups in each of the colleges. Pace advises that freshmen do not always adequately represent the most accurate perceptions of college environments because they are not fully aware of all aspects of their environment immediately upon arrival at the college. Pace advises

therefore that sophomores or upperclassmen be given the CUES (29). Since the University College courses go only through the sophomore year, it was decided to use sophomores in all three colleges.

Faculty were chosen because of their interaction with, and influence upon, students. This study is interested in determining if faculty in different environments perceive these environments differently and how close their perceptions are to those of students. Non-teaching administrators in these colleges were not selected for this study because their numbers were so low.

This study utilizes the College and University Environment Scale (CUES), Second Edition, developed by C. Robert Pace in 1969. This instrument is fully described in Chapter III. It consists of 160 true-false items about college life:

> . . . features, and facilities of the campus, rules and regulations, faculty, curricula, instruction and examinations, student life, extra-curricular organizations, and other aspects of the institutional environment that help to define the atmosphere or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the college as students see it (29, p. 9).

These 160 items are summarized in five basic scales and two sub-scales. The Basic Scale areas include: (1) Practicality; (2) Community; (3) Awareness; (4) Propriety; and (5) Scholarship. The Sub-Scales describe: (1) Campus Morale; and (2) Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships. These scales are fully described in Chapter III.

Hypotheses

The ten hypotheses were developed by examining the validity data in the CUES Technical Manual and comparing that with the general characteristics and goals of the three sub-units and Michigan State. The terms used in the hypotheses came from the titles of the seven scales used in CUES. These terms are described and explained in Chapter III.

1. Students and faculty in Madison College perceive more of a community than do students and faculty in University College or the College of Social Science.
2. Students perceive a higher degree of campus morale in Madison College than in University College or the College of Social Science.
3. A higher degree of awareness is perceived by faculty and students in Madison College than in University College or the College of Social Science.
4. Students and faculty in the College of Social Science and University College perceive a higher degree of practicality than do students and faculty in James Madison College.
5. Students and faculty in University College perceive more propriety in their environment than do students and faculty in the College of Social Science or in James Madison College.

6. Students and faculty in James Madison College perceive a higher quality of teaching and faculty-student relationships than do students in University College or in the College of Social Science.
7. Students high high grade-point averages perceive the Madison College environment as more scholarly than students with high grade-point averages in University College and the College of Social Science.
8. There will be a greater agreement on environmental perception among students and faculty in James Madison than within the College of Social Science and the University College.
9. There is a greater agreement on environmental perception among faculty teaching in different colleges than among students in these same colleges.
10. Students enrolled in a large department of social science, an experimental social science residential college, and a living-learning basic college curriculum perceive their environments differently.

Theory Behind CUES

The CUES examination of the environment is partially based upon the Murray "need-press" theory:

> Just as the concept of "need" represents the significant determinants of behavior within the person so the concept of "press" represents the effective or significant determinants of behavior in the environment. In simplest terms, a press is a property or attribute of an environmental object or person which facilitates or impedes the efforts of an individual to reach a given goal. Press are likened to persons or objects that have direct implications for the efforts of the individual to satisfy his need strivings. The press of an object is what it can do to the subject or for the subject in one way or another.
>
> By representing the environment in terms of press the investigation hopes to extract and classify the significant portions of the world in which the individual lives. Clearly we know a great deal more about what an individual is likely to do if we have a picture not only of his motives or directional tendencies but also a picture of the way in which he views or interprets his environment. It is this later function which the press concepts are designed to fulfill (14, p. 178).

For example, a person who needs order in his life and in his surroundings would be happier and function better in an environment characterized by order, than in one which is disorderly. Also, a person who has a need for affiliation would be unhappy in an environment which encourages and stresses individuality and privacy. Such a person would be less frustrated in an environment which has a press for community norms and encourages affiliative behavior.

Overview

In Chapter II, the review of the literature is limited to the discussion of residential colleges as an innovation in higher education, and studies in which students and faculty have assessed their environment using the CUES.

In Chapter III, the methodology and procedures employed in this study, as well as the methods of comparing data, are presented.

The results of this study are analyzed in the fourth chapter.

Chapter V summarizes and discusses the data, draws conclusions, suggests implications for educators, and makes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

DISCUSSION OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, the rationale for the development of residential colleges will be discussed. The advantages of this concept for the decentralization of large universities, and the resulting improvement in teaching, as well as the advantages for student development will be presented.

Residential colleges have met with some resistance. The reasons for this resistance will also be discussed, as well as the countering arguments for even more innovation. Residential colleges create some problems for students and faculty. These concerns will also be discussed. A listing of the experimental colleges in this country will conclude the discussion of residential colleges.

A second part of the chapter describes the need for more environmental research and some of the findings at other schools where the College and University Environment Scale has been employed for research purposes.

Experimental Colleges

Many critics of higher education believe that American universities should further encourage the essence of Oxford College at our large and growing multiversities. "Features of the ancient English Universities have been imitated in this country for at least a generation, ranging from the residential colleges of Yale and houses of Harvard, in the East to the associated colleges at Claremont, in the West" (17). Imitation of the Oxford College model is increasing now at many universities which are experimenting with different learning environments.

The predictions made about higher education in The American Campus--1980, support the fact that " . . . large institutions will feudalize themselves to add a personal element to the urban-like wealth of resources their size has already given them" (23, p. 203).

As a part of this feudalizing process, Harold Riker, a noted writer on the topic of college residences, believes that the thrust of the future will be the development of identifiable living communities on campuses, which will support the curricular goals of the institutions through increased student-faculty contact (37, p. 4). Riker is supported by Mayhew who believes that:

> We have come to the beginning of the end of that time-hallowed approach to campus planning which dictates, through a series of tidy zones, that the student works "downtown" in the academic core and lives in a dormitory "suburb," with something vaguely labeled "activities" taking place in the interstices. Instead colleges will organize campus functions and

> facilities in ways that are architecturally and administratively less tidy but socially and educationally more functional--more responsive to the ways people do in fact operate as opposed to the way planners think they should (23, p. 283).

Herbert Garfinkel, Dean of James Madison College, the residential college examined in this study, was concerned about many of these issues when he and a planning committee developed Madison College. In a speech to the Michigan State University Academic Senate in May of 1967, before the College had opened, the Dean stated that:

> Youngsters, fresh out of high school may experience difficulty in relating individual identity to the university as a community. To this end, our program strives to create a smaller residential community within the larger university where the advantages of small Liberal Arts Colleges may be combined with the advantages of a major university. A greater degree of integration between curricular and extra-curricular portions of student life can be realized where classrooms, dormitory, cultural programs, faculty offices, and students are housed in a residential college setting. Experimentation with undergraduate programs is facilitated, too, by the semi-autonomous structure of the "cluster" college vis a vis the regular departmental sturcture of subject matter disciplines (11).

Many other writers see the sheer problem of institutional size as being a significant alienating factor for college students. Goodman (12), Baskin (3), Newcomb (28), Martin (21), Pace (32), Mayhew (24), and John Gardner (10) have each spoken to this issue in recent years. John Gardner wrote that the growing size of universities is a threat to the internal health of colleges and he therefore encourages the cluster college concept as a means of decentralizing large universities (10, p. 5). Goodman stresses the need for a return to face-to-face relationships

on campuses and he encourages self-contained and self-administered smaller colleges to attain that goal (12, p. 297). Newcomb encourages the creation of curricular alternatives to the large self-sufficient departments on most campuses. The aim of this, which he says " . . . can hardly fail, is to make more probable the student's sense of a personal-institutional identity that includes academic as well as social expectations . . . " (28, p. 115). Martin calls this scheme " . . . a harbinger of hope . . . " (21, p. 144), and Baskin states that " . . . whether new or old, the concept of size limitation or division seems to be taking hold in many colleges and universities across the nation" (3, p. 169).

One of the primary thrusts of the residential college movement is the improvement of undergraduate teaching. Pace believes that the multiple purposes of large universities--excellence in teaching, training for the professions, research, public service, postgraduate study,--are perhaps too many purposes for one large institution to do well (31, p1 93). What is needed instead are smaller units working towards each of these goals separately. If excellence in undergraduate teaching is desired, then such small centers should exist for that purpose alone. An issue of Saturday Review three years ago with articles on cluster colleges spoke to this concern about teaching:

> The plan does offer a way of restoring a sense of community within the institutions of higher education. At a time when liberal education is gravely threatened by the emphasis on research, specialization, and vocational training, it refocuses the emphasis on undergraduates and the men and women who teach them. At a time when the status symbols of academia are rigged against teaching, it again makes the teaching of undergraduates an honored vocation for scholars. If it does no more than that, it may well be the most vital innovation in higher education today (39, p. 81).

Most educators believe that the learning environment is a major factor in motivating students to learn and to develop a worthwhile character (46, p. 23). In order to learn, however, most students must feel that they "belong" somewhere. "For the multitudes of students that swarm on university campuses, there can be much loneliness and isolation, and the young person's hunger for deeper involvements is, to a considerable extent unsatisfied . . . " at the many large multiversities (42, p. 49).

Concerned about students' need to belong and grow personally, the Committee on the Student in Higher Education reports that universities must become more concerned about the development of students and make the necessary major shift of values which would make innovations dealing with student development unquestioned (42, p. 49). In a challenge to student personnel workers, Arthur Sandeen states that " . . . if education is going to have the developmental influence we hope for, it should be carried out in a community; a student must feel that he knows or could know nearly everyone else" (38, p. 398). Such an arrangement helps the student accept the university as an

intellectual and cultural community (18, p. 314). The environment is then small enough, Mayhew believes, to be "operative on each student," and have some primary group values to be achieved (22, p. 138).

In order for residential colleges to be effective innovators, many writers feel they should be given as much autonomy as possible. As Joseph Axelrod states, "change in form alone--old content poured into new molds--has been a trap for many colleges during the first half decade of the new era" (1, p. 164). Many of the innovations in higher education regressed towards conformity or into oblivion over the years, such as Bennington College and the college organized by Meiklejohn at Wisconsin (45, p. 114).

One of the reasons for a lack of innovation, even in experimental residential colleges, is the fact that the sponsoring universities of these experiments are not necessarily amiable to innovation. "Established institutions with proud traditions, they know that change is not synonymous with gain, and they are not prepared to repudiate the past in the name of novelty" (19, p. 74).

The need for experimentation in higher education is too great, however, to be overly dismayed by the critics. Innovation in the residential colleges has the potential for the "development and testing of holistic models that may prove appropriate for the future of higher education" (20, p. 239).

Martin states that while there:

> . . . is growing agreement that the patterns of the past will not be adequate for the future, not because the past was necessarily bad but because the future will be radically different, there is no agreement on what changes would be best. The option open is the structuring of alternative models where innovative or experimental probes may be carried out in the hope that the direction and mechanisms needed for learning in the future will thus become known. When a few prestigious universities are setting the academic style and enforcing the standard, the cluster college idea encourages the hope that these key institutions might now, under the developing awareness of current urgencies, spin off colleges commissioned to innovate radically (20, p. 239).

At a conference for experimental colleges sponsored by Florida State University in 1964, there was general agreement by those attending that the experimental college must be in a constant state of change and flux (1, p. 162). This process is hindered by overly detailed outside supervision. "Standardized and uniform criteria of efficiency, economy, and 'maximum utilization' only retard such experiments and their potential growth" (8, p. 66).

There are many critics of residential colleges. Paul Dressel noted that when the residential college concept was proposed to the faculties at Michigan State University, the reactions against it were very strong. Dressel felt that the threat posed by the experimental colleges to existing structures might have been too great (6, p. 128). Purdue University vice-president Paul Chenea, arguing against residential colleges, stated in Time Magazine that "no matter what the size of a school, a student tends to become familiar with only half a dozen teachers

and a score of students" (43, p. 46). UCLA Dean Franklin Rolfe stated that the "diversity of relationships at a big university is one of its glories, not handicaps. Most students will not go out into the world and settle in small towns" (43, p. 47). Therefore the big university represents the civilization more accurately.

Whether these are valid criticisms or not, there are some real problems with the residential college concept. One problem is that of the pressures on faculty members to do research. With the emphasis on teaching, little time is left for the residential college professor to do research and publish (41, p. 182). Another problem is that of cost. The costs of experimental programs are usually higher than traditional ones. This problem is not necessarily eliminated by the initial grants given by foundations to experimental colleges, as the sponsoring university must eventually pick up the costs (41, p. 183).

The very intimacy of residential colleges may present problems to faculty members. They then become vulnerable to criticism by students that they might not otherwise experience (21, p. 147). Students also know each other well and gossip can result. There is also an absence of physical as well as psychological privacy in most residential colleges. Most colleges are in typical institutional buildings with little unused space so it is oftentimes difficult to be alone (25; 21, p. 148).

Many residential colleges become involved in criticisms of social and personal values. Some students, however, find this type of criticism personally overwhelming and end up with few strongly held values or norms (21, p. 147).

Any college which is new and experimental also has the chance of failing. Students and faculty in these colleges obviously have a vested interest in them not failing, but this possibility is nevertheless a source of anxiety. Any college which is different and innovative arouses criticism. Those who participate in such colleges are often placed on the defensive by those outside the college. Constant criticism can create unnecessary anxiety and doubts for those in experimental colleges.

Listing of Experimental Colleges

There are many residential colleges already developed in universities across the United States. Called experimental colleges, houses, colleges-within-a-college, cluster colleges and residential colleges, they demonstrate a variety of curriculums but share a value for smallness and faculty-student relations. Following is a partial listing of some of these experimental colleges, divided up between those which are residentially based and those which are not (9).

Residentially based:

1. The Residential College, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

2. New College, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

3. Charter College, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

4. James Madison College, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

5. Justin Morrill College, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

6. Lyman Briggs College, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

7. Crown College, University of California at Santa Cruz.

8. Merrill College, University of California at Santa Cruz.

9. Cowell College, University of California at Santa Cruz.

10. Stevenson College, University of California at Santa Cruz.

11. Elbert Covell College, University of Pacific, Redlands, California.

12. Callison College, University of Pacific, Stockton, California.

13. Raymond College, University of Pacific, Stockton, California.

14. Hampshire College, Amherst, Massachusetts.

15. Residential Colleges at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (6 colleges).

16. Colleges with the College Program, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas (5 colleges).

17. State University of New York at Old Westbury, New York.

18. Project Ten, South Residential College, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.

19. Orchard Hill, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.

20. Livingston College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

21. Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont.

22. New College, Sarasota, Florida.

23. Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg, Flordia.

24. Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri.

25. Inner College, Antioch, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

26. Fairhaven College, Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington.

27. The College of Letters, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

28. Bensalem College, Fordham University, New York City.

Other experimental colleges which are not housed in a residence hall:

1. Monteith College, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

2. Johnston College, University of Pacific, Redlands, California.

3. Experimental Program at the University of California at Berkeley.

4. New College, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.

5. The College of Social Studies at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

Other schools now planning more residential or experimental colleges are:

1. New York University, Washington Square Branch.

2. University of Connecticut.

3. University of Kentucky.

4. Tufts University.

5. Colby College.

6. Grand Valley College in Michigan.

Discussion of CUES and the Need for Environmental Study

C. Robert Pace, the developer of the CUES, states that:

> One of the weaknesses of educational research has been the frequent effort to assess the impact of only a small segment of the learning environment--a particular class size or teaching method for example. The results of such efforts are usually inconclusive or insignificant (34, p. 311).

The total press of the college environment represents all things which must be faced by and dealt with by students. Pace believes " . . . it is possible that the total pattern of congruence between personal needs and environmental press will be more predictive of achievement, growth, and change than any single aspect of either the person or the environment" (35, p. 276). In order to more effectively assess the impact of college environments on students, the environment must be viewed as a complex social system, with a variety of influencing interactions and having varying normative standards.

The CUES is one of the most commonly used measures of environment in higher education today. There has been, however, very little research on the impact of experimental living environments in higher education. An examination of the research on living arrangements in The Impact of College

on Students by Newcomb and Feldman, demonstrates that most of the research is based upon fraternity housing with even less on the traditional residence hall (7).

A much further review of the research in higher education on environment evaluations of experimental colleges resulted in few comparable studies. The paucity of research might be related to the relative newness of experimental colleges in higher education. Theodore Newcomb, who is Director of Research at the Residential College at the University of Michigan, indicated to me during a personal conversation in April, 1970 that several studies are now underway and will be published in the near future.

A study was conducted at Hofstra to determine how the environment at its experimental college, New College, differed from its main campus. There were no significant differences between student perception of the campus climate at either New or the main college, despite the hoped for closer student-faculty relationships. Faculty perceptions in the experimental college, however, were more favorable than their colleagues' perceptions at their main college (40).

Pace has reported that faculty generally perceive the environment as having a stronger scholastic press than the students perceive it to have. This is true for other than the Scholarship scale on the CUES. Faculty scores are typically 1-2 points higher than student scores (32).

John Centra used the CUES to determine differences between major field perceptions at Michigan State University. He did not include the College of Social Science in his study but found differences on the community and scholarship scales between other major fields (5). Centra's study also involved a comparison of conventional residence halls with the living-learning halls at Michigan State University. He found little difference on the CUES Intellectual (now Scholarship) scale between these halls. He suggests that better facilities alone in the living-learning halls is not enough. Of more importance is how these facilities are used. Even if faculty offices are in the buildings and classes are taught there, if students do not interact more with faculty and seek their help, the goal of the living-learning centers are only partially met (5, p. 8).

Reiner and Robinson (36) as well as Pace (32) present evidence to demonstrate that at large complex institutions, major field environments are perceived as being different from the institution as a whole.

The CUES has been used in a variety of ways to evaluate students' perceptions (33). Pace suggests that it can be given to high school students to determine what they expect from a college environment. If the results of students perceptions on the CUES were available from a larger number of institutions, high school students would be able to match their environmental needs with an institution which would meet those needs.

Ralph Berdie has given the CUES to new freshmen, at the end of the freshman year, and at the end of the sophomore year to determine how perceptions change (4). He found in general that expectations go down in the intellectual areas. He concludes that the professors are not as exciting as the students had hoped.

A similar method was used by Walsh and McKinnon at Ohio State University to determine what expectations freshmen had of an experimental curriculum. They administered the CUES to incoming freshmen and again after the students had been in the program for five months and found the expectations of college to be decreased (44).

Heskett and Walsh used the CUES to compare environmental perceptions of student personnel staff, managers to a residence hall and student officers at one university to determine if groups working together saw the environment differently. The managers perceived a stronger press on all five scales of the CUES (15).

Comparisons between successful and unsuccessful students have also utilized the CUES. In general, students who are doing poorly in college do not view the environment differently from those who are not (30).

Summary

There is a great deal of support for the development of cluster or experimental colleges now in American higher education. Many writers cite the cluster concept as

the only viable model of decentralizing the large multiversities into personally and intellectually meaningful communities. Such models provide far better means of encouraging good undergraduate teaching, personal student development as well as administrative decentralization. The other important factor about the cluster college is the opportunity it provides for innovations and experimentations which might later be applied to the larger universities.

There are a number of disadvantages with residential colleges which come with being a part of an experimental and close-knit community. The lack of faculty time to publish and a lack of personal privacy are just a few.

There is very little published research on the impact of the residential college environment and how it differs from other environments. The uses of the CUES in environmental research was discussed. It can be used to test the perceptions of different sub groups on a campus, to test the expectation of incoming freshmen, and to see how closely those expectations are met.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR STUDY

Objective

This study is an examination of three environments at Michigan State University as perceived by faculty and sophomore students in each unit. The three sub-units include: (1) the College of Social Science; (2) James Madison College, a residential college with an experimental curriculum in the social sciences, and (3) Wilson Hall, a coed living-learning residence hall for the University College.

The examination of these three environments was accomplished by administering the College and University Environment Scale, Second Edition, to faculty and selected students.

Selection of the Three Environments

As was stated in Chapter I, the primary focus of this study is to compare Madison College to two other related environments at Michigan State University. Since Madison is located in a coed living-learning residence hall

and has a social science based curriculum, two comparative groups were needed.

Wilson Hall, the University College living-learning residence hall was chosen because it provided a comparison for Madison with another unit which had similar characteristics to Madison, namely faculty offices and classrooms in the same buildings where the students lived. There are other similar living-learning units at Michigan State University. Wilson Hall was chosen because all four curricular areas of University College are taught there. Not all other living-learning units have all four areas taught within them. The choice of University College as a comparative group limited the selection of students in all three environments to sophomores since the curriculum of the University College extends only through the sophomore year.

Since Madison College's curriculum is experimental within the social sciences, the second comparative group selected was the College of Social Science, which has over 5,000 students. Even though students must stay in the University College through their sophomore year, they may declare a major in any department in the College of Social Science as freshmen. Therefore, sophomores who had declared majors in the College of Social Science were chosen for comparison with University College sophomores and Madison sophomores.

Faculty who taught in each of these three areas were chosen to determine if faculty and student perceptions of their environment were similar, and in what ways the sample groups might differ.

Total Population

The student sample of the population consisted of sophomores in each of the three respective colleges who had matriculated as freshmen in 1968 at Michigan State University and had progressed normally through their freshman year.

The faculty sample consisted of all faculty teaching courses in Madison College, all faculty teaching University College courses in Wilson Hall, and faculty teaching courses at the 399 level and below during the winter term, 1970, in the College of Social Science.

The total population is listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Total student and faculty population from which samples were drawn.

	Male	Female	Total
Students			
James Madison College	95	73	168
University College (Wilson Hall)	169	209	378
College of Social Science	465	300	765
Faculty			
James Madison College	26	6	32
University College (Wilson Hall)	15	1	16
College of Social Science	47	4	51

Selection of Samples

The student sample was drawn from the winter term, 1970, student lists provided by each of the three colleges. One hundred students in each college were chosen randomly on such a basis that reflected the ratio of males and females of the total sophomore college population. After the ratio of male and female sophomore students had been determined in each of the colleges, the number needed in each of the categories was set. These numbers are found in Table 2. The sample was then chosen by randomly selecting

TABLE 2.--Total faculty and student samples.

	Male	Female	Total
Students			
James Madison College	56	44	100
University College (Wilson Hall)	45	55	100
College of Social Science	61	39	100
Faculty			
James Madison College	26	6	32
University College (Wilson Hall)	15	1	16
College of Social Science	47	4	51
Total for all groups			399

that number of students in each college, using the determined ratio as a base. Thus in the College of Social Science, one out of every seven males was selected by

choosing every seventh male. The total sample is reflected in Table 2.

The faculty sample consisted of the entire teaching faculty in Madison, all faculty who taught University College courses and had offices in Wilson Hall, and all faculty teaching courses at 399 level and below in the College of Social Science during the winter term, 1970. These numbers are reflected in Table 2.

Method of Collecting Data

The data was gathered by sending each person in the sample a copy of CUES, a T-F answer sheet, a scoring pencil, a return envelope, and a cover letter explaining the purpose of this study. Each individual was requested to return the completed CUES and answer sheet within a week. Students were also requested to indicate their overall grade point average in order to determine if their grade point average was above or below a three point overall average.

The first mailing was completed by February 12, 1970. Two weeks later a reminder was sent to those persons who had not yet responded. The total response percentage is reflected in Table 3.

Three per cent of the total responses were unusable because they were not completed properly. The unusable answer sheets were evenly divided among all groups, except for the Madison faculty who had no unusable responses.

TABLE 3.--Total responses from the selected samples.

College	Total Sample	Number Respondents	Percentage
Madison Students	100	70	70%
University College Students	100	73	73
Social Science Students	100	68	68
Madison Faculty	32	23	75
University College Faculty	16	12	75
Social Science Faculty	51	32	68.6

The Measuring Instrument

This study uses the second edition of The College and University Environment Scale, developed by C. Robert Pace in 1969. It is a shortened and improved version of the first edition published by the Educational Testing Service in 1963, printed under the same title.

This first edition of the CUES was based heavily on an earlier instrument developed by Pace and George Stern in 1958 entitled The College Characteristics Index. In this earlier instrument, it was hoped that a personality test would measure personality needs which corresponded to a set of environmental demands or supports found in the CCI. Analyses of the results obtained from the College Characteristics Index did not confirm the hoped for parallelism

(29). "In other words, the dimensions along which environments differed from one another were not the same as the dimensions along which students, or student bodies, differed from one another" (29, p. 9).

> The first edition of CUES, then consisted of 150 of the 300 items in the CCI, selected because they successfully discriminated between environments and organized into five scales that reflected, from a factor analysis of 50 college and universities, the main dimensions along which the environments differed: Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, and Scholarship (29, p. 9).

The second edition of the CUES, used in this study, eliminated some of the items from the first edition but kept the 100 most discriminating items. The basic five scales were retained with the twenty most discriminating items in each scale. Items were up-dated to reflect changes in colleges over the past few years. Two new sub-scales were also developed: Campus Morale and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships.

The five scales and two sub-scales are defined as follows in the Technical Manual:

> Scale 1. Practicality. The 20 items that contribute to the score for this scale describe an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities. There are both vocational and collegiate emphases. A kind of orderly supervision is evident in the administration and the classwork. As in many organized societies there is also some personal benefit and prestige to be obtained by operating in the system--knowing the right people, being in the right clubs, becoming a leader, respecting one's superiors, and so forth. The environment, though structured, is not repressive because it responds to entrepreneurial activities and is generally characterized by good fun and school spirit.

Scale 2. Community. The items in this scale describe a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty that encompasses the college as a whole. The atmosphere is congenial; students, are interested in their problems, and go out of their way to be helpful. Student life is characterized by togetherness and sharing rather than by privacy and cool detachment.

Scale 3. Awareness. The items in this scale seem to reflect a concern about, and emphasis upon, three sorts of meaning--personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggests the search for personal meaning. A wide range of opportunities for creative and appreciative relationships to painting, music, drama, poetry, sculpture, architecture, and the like suggest the search for poetic meaning. A concern about events around the world, the welfare of mankind, and the present and future conditions of man suggests the search for political meaning and idealistic commitment.

Scale 4. Propriety. These items describe an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. There is an absence of demonstrative, assertive, argumentative, risk-taking activities. In general, the campus atmosphere is mannerly, considerate, proper, and conventional.

Scale 5. Scholarship. The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline. The emphasis is on competitively high academic achievement and a serious interest in scholarship. The pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific or philosophical, is carried on rigorously and vigorously. Intellectual speculation, an interest in ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline--all these are characteristic of the environment.

The two new sub-scales are: Campus Morale and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships:

Campus Morale: The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by acceptance of social norms, group cohesiveness, friendly assimilation into campus life, and, at the same time, a commitment to intellectual pursuits and freedom of expression. Intellectual goals are exemplified and widely shared in an atmosphere of personal and social relationships that are both supportive and spirited.

Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships. This scale defines an atmosphere in which professors are perceived to be scholarly, to set high standards, to be clear, adaptive, and flexible. At the same time, this academic quality of teaching is infused with warmth, interest, and helpfulness toward students (29, p. 11).

Scoring of CUES

The scoring of CUES indicates when there is a consensus greater than two-to-one among the respondents on any item. The score for the five scales are obtained as follows:

1. Add the number of items answered by 66 percent or more of the students in the keyed direction.
2. Subtract the number of items answered by 33 percent or fewer of the students in the keyed direction.
3. Add 20 points to the difference, so as to eliminate any possibility of obtaining a negative score (29, p. 13).

The scoring of the Campus Morale sub-scale is accomplished by examining the responses to the twenty-two items, using the 66+/33- method described above and adding a constant of 22 to keep from getting a negative response. A constant of 11 is also added in scoring the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship Scale to avoid a negative score.

Thus the scores for the scales range as follows:

Basic Scales:

1. Practicality: 0-40
2. Community: 0-40
3. Awareness: 0-40

4. Propriety: 0-40

5. Scholarship: 0-40

Sub-scales:

1. Campus Morale: 0-44

2. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships: 0-22

The rationale for scoring CUES is based on the fact that it is an opinion poll. The most common method of reporting opinion poll results is stating what per cent of the people responding agreed or disagreed with a statement. Because it attempts to describe what is characteristic of an environment, only those items on which there is considerable consensus (two-to-one) are included in scoring each scale.

Reliability of CUES Scores

The Technical Manual for the Second Edition reports the reliability estimates based upon Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

> This formula takes into account the sum of the variances of each item rather than the average or mean; also each item is scored in exactly the same manner as the total scale is scored--that is, +1, 0, or -1 (plus a constant to eliminate the negative) (29, p. 42).

These reliabilities range from .89 to .94 and, thus, provide evidence of a high degree of internal consistency for all these scales:

Reliability Estimates: CUES Second Edition

Scale	Coefficient Alpha
Practicality	.89
Community	.92
Awareness	.94
Propriety	.89
Scholarship	.90

(29, pp. 42-44).

> Perhaps more convincing evidence of the stability of CUES scores at single institutions is the evidence from experience itself. Test-retest comparisons made from comparable samples of reporters over a one- or two-year period, or comparisons of scores from different groups judged to be qualified reporters (such as sophomores, juniors, and seniors), have been tabulated and summarized for 25 different colleges and universities. With 5 scale scores for each of 25 institutions, there are 125 comparisons. Of this number 80 percent have differed by 3 points or less and 90 percent have differed by 4 points or less. From this empirical evidence it seems reasonable to say that, in general, a given score is probably quite stable within a margin of 3 points; and the chances are 3 out of 5 that it will not differ by more than 2 points (29, p. 45).

CUES Validity

The validity data consists of correlations between CUES scores and various characteristics of students and institutions as determined through a number of studies.

The CUES Technical Manual heavily utilizes the research done by Astin and reported in his book Who Goes Where to College. Examination of the extensive data on the many schools Astin studied results in significant correlations with the various scales of CUES. This data is presented fully in the Technical Manual (29).

Pace suggests that one of the most important ways to assess the validity of CUES is to determine how closely the characteristics of students, campus atmosphere and activities are congruent (29, p. 53). To assess this, the behavior of the students should be examined and compared with the general campus atmosphere. For example, one could expect more church attendance by students at strongly denominational colleges than at other less religious institutions. Pace reports that studies which have utilized this form of examination resulted in significant correlations when the College and University Environment Scale was used (29, pp. 46-54).

Procedures for Examining CUES Data

There are three different methods of analyzing CUES data: (1) overall scale score comparisons; (2) comparing individual college scores with normative data on the 100 college and universities described by Pace in the Technical Manual; and (3) internal comparisons based upon grade point averages.

On the overall scale comparisons, Pace has indicated that:

> . . . a given score is probably quite stable within a margin of three points. The chances are 4 out of 5 that, with a comparable sample, the obtained score will not differ by more than 3 points; and the chances are 3 out of 5 that it will not differ by more than 2 points (29, p. 45).

Scale scores between different groups can thus be compared on this basis.

The second method of comparison uses the normative scale scores developed by Pace and discussed in the Technical Manual. The reference group is 100 institutions divided into the following eight categories:

1. High Selective Liberal Arts Colleges.
   Examples: Radcliffe, Oberlin, Beloit
2. High Selective Universities--public and private.
   Examples: University of Michigan, University of California at Los Angeles, Stanford University.
3. General Liberal Arts Colleges.
   Examples: Albion College, Denison University, Rollins College.
4. General Universities--public and private.
   Examples: University of Colorado, Michigan State University, Wayne State University.
5. State Colleges and Other Universities.
   Examples: Western Michigan University, San Diego State College, Brooklyn College.
6. Teachers Colleges and Others with Major Emphasis on Teacher Education.
   Examples: Ball State University, Slippery Rock State College, Central Connecticut State College.
7. Strongly Denominational Liberal Arts Colleges.
   Examples: Pepperdine College, Manhattanville College, Bluffton College.
8. Colleges and Universities Emphasizing Engineering and the Sciences.
   Examples: Harvey Mudd College, Wabash College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (29, p. 17).

Comparisons with the normative data can be completed by examining mean scale scores in each of the eight categories and through the entire reference group of 100 colleges and universities.

A third method of comparison is based upon the internal comparison of students in the three colleges above and below a three point overall academic average.

This comparison involves the differences in scale scores internally between students in the same college as well as comparisons with the national normative data.

Summary

The College and University Environment Scale (CUES), was sent to all faculty members and selected sophomore students located in Wilson Hall, in the College of Social Science, and in James Madison College in order to determine how each of these three environments differed. The validity and reliability of CUES has been determined to be sufficiently high for the purposes of this study. The resulting data will be analyzed by examining the differences between colleges from both a faculty and student perspective and then comparing the six Michigan State scores with the established national norms.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE CUES DATA

Overview of Study Design

Three related environments at Michigan State University were examined by using the College and University Environment Scale. The purpose of the examination was to determine how Madison College, a residential college with an experimental four-year curriculum in the social sciences, differed from two other related environments at Michigan State University. Madison students live and take their Madison courses in Case Hall, a co-educational residence hall. All Madison faculty also have offices in Case Hall. The Madison curriculum is designed so that Madison students take up to one-half of their coursework in Madison and the other half in various Michigan State University departments, but especially in the College of Social Science.

One of the comparative units selected was Wilson Hall, a co-educational living-learning residence hall in which the University College is located. The University College curriculum has the general education courses which

all freshmen and sophomores at Michigan State University must complete. Students in the residential colleges take similar courses within their own colleges. University College faculty teach their classes in Wilson Hall and also have offices there. The University College living-learning hall is similar to Madison College in that students take courses in their own residence hall which are taught by faculty who also have offices there. The basic difference is that Madison offers a four-year specialized curriculum while University College extends only through the sophomore year and has a general education curriculum.

The second unit selected for comparison with Madison College was the College of Social Science. This was selected because of the similarity in curriculum to Madison. If Madison College did not exist, the students with interests in social science would be in the various departments of the College of Social Science.

One hundred sophomore students in each of the three colleges were mailed the College and University Environment Scale, developed by C. Robert Pace. The CUES was also mailed to thirty-two Madison faculty, sixteen University College faculty teaching in Wilson Hall and fifty-one faculty in the College of Social Science. The response rate varied from a low of 68 per cent of the Social Science students to a high of 75 per cent of the Madison and University College faculty. (See Table 3, Chapter III for complete return rate data.)

The College and University Environment Scale consists of five basic scales and two sub-scales. These are fully described in Chapter I. The titles are score ranges on these scales are:

Five Basic Scales	Score Range
1. Practicality	0-40
2. Community	0-40
3. Awareness	0-40
4. Propriety	0-40
5. Scholarship	0-40
Sub-scales	
1. Campus Morale	0-44
2. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	0-22

The scoring of the CUES involves determining which items 66 per cent of each group responded to in the keyed direction for each of the separate scales. From this total number of items are subtracted the number of items answered by 33 per cent or fewer of the respondents in the keyed direction. A constant number of 20 for each of the five scales, 22 for the Campus Morale scale, and 11 for the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship scale is added to avoid negative scale scores. The Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State University gave assistance by doing a frequency count on each of the items for all six separate groups. This analysis indicated the 66/33 split. The final analysis of adding and subtracting

the significant items to determine each scale score was completed by hand. Pace indicates that a difference of three points in a scale score between comparable groups is significant (29, p. 45).

The following hypotheses were tested and the results of that analyses are presented in this chapter:

Hypotheses

1. Students and faculty in Madison College perceive more of a community than do students and faculty in University College or the College of Social Science.
2. Students perceive a higher degree of campus morale in Madison College than in University College or the College of Social Science.
3. A higher degree of awareness is perceived by faculty and students in Madison College than in University College or in the College of Social Science.
4. Students and faculty in the College of Social Science and in University College perceive a higher degree of practicality than do students and faculty in James Madison College
5. Students and faculty in University College perceive more propriety in their environment than do students and faculty in the College of Social Science or in James Madison College.

6. Students and faculty in James Madison College perceive a higher quality of teaching and faculty-student relationships than do students in University College or in the College of Social Science.
7. Students with high grade point averages perceive the Madison College environment as more scholarly than students with high grade point averages in University College or in the College of Social Science.
8. There will be a greater agreement on environmental perception among students and faculty in James Madison than within the College of Social Science and the University College.
9. There is a greater agreement on environmental perception among faculty teaching in different colleges than among students in these same colleges.
10. Students enrolled in a large department of social science, an experimental social science residential college and a living-learning basic college curriculum perceive their environments differently.

Each of these hypotheses are analyzed separately in the following pages. The analyses consists of comparing the scale scores between the six selected groups as

well as determining the difference between students and faculty within each college.

The scale scores for each of the groups will also be compared with a reference group of 100 colleges and universities established by Pace (29). This reference group is based upon CUES scores at those institutions on the five basic scales of CUES. The two sub-scales are not included in that reference data because of their recent development.

Hypothesis Number One

> Students and Faculty in Madison College perceive more of a community than do students and faculty in University College or the College of Social Science.

The items in the community scale describe a friendly group-oriented campus. There is a congenial atmosphere in which faculty members care about the students and make many attempts to be helpful.

The results of the CUES scale on community are presented in Table 4.

One of the goals of residential colleges is to create a greater sense of community than might be possible in larger departments. The Madison faculty clearly perceive more emphasis on community but Madison student perceptions are much like students in a living-learning residence hall.

TABLE 4.--Comparison of scale scores and reference group percentiles on the community scale.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	19	23
Madison Faculty	26	57
University College Students	19	23
University College Faculty	18	20
Social Science Students	17	19
Social Science Faculty	13	8

The Madison faculty scale score of 26 is considerably higher than the Madison student score of 19, and also much higher than the other four groups indicated in Table 4.

The greatest consensus on the scale exists in the University College where the students score of 19 differs only by one point with the faculty score of 18.

There is also a lack of consensus on the community scale in the College of Social Science as well as significantly lower scores, than in the other two colleges.

The Social Science student community score at 17 is two points lower than the students' scores in the other two colleges.

When these scale scores are converted into percentile scores, based on Pace's reference group of 100

colleges and universities, the largest difference is between Madison faculty who fall into the 57th percentile and the College of Social Science faculty who are in the 8th percentile (29, p. 20).

Hypothesis Number Two

> Students and faculty perceive a higher degree of campus morale in Madison College than do the students and faculty in both the University College and College of Social Science.

The campus morale sub-scale describes an environment in which intellectual goals are valued and shared as well as an acceptance of social norms and a friendly assimilation into campus life.

The CUES results on the campus morale scale are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5.--Comparison of students and faculty scores on the campus morale sub-scale with CUES reference group percentiles.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	20	22
Madison Faculty	27	72
University College Students	20	22
University College Faculty	14	8
Social Science Students	15	8
Social Science Faculty	17	12

As a group, Madison faculty and students do score higher on the campus morale sub-scale than do the other two Colleges. The Madison faculty score of 27 is significantly higher than the other five groups. The Madison students' score of 20 is identical to the University College student score but is significantly higher than the other remaining groups. The living-learning residence hall apparently stimulates as much sharing of intellectual goals and social norms as the residential college does.

University College faculty and Social Science students perceive the lowest degree of campus morale with respective scores of 14 and 15. Both these groups fall into the 8th percentile in the reference group of 100 colleges and universities which is significantly different from the Madison College faculty percentile of 72.

The greatest consensus on the scale exists in the College of Social Science where the scores differ by only two points. This college is also the lowest on the scale.

Hypothesis Number Three

> A higher degree of awareness is perceived by faculty and students in Madison College than in University College or in the College of Social Science.

The items in this scale stress an awareness of society, of self, and of aesthetic stimuli. There is also an encouragement of questioning and dissent as well as a tolerance of nonconformity.

The CUES results on the Awareness scale are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6.--Comparison of student and faculty scores on the awareness scale with CUES reference group percentiles.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	22	64
Madison Faculty	26	76
University College Students	21	62
University College Faculty	22	64
Social Science Students	21	62
Social Science Faculty	20	55

Madison faculty and students as a group have the highest scores on the Awareness scale. However, except for the high score of 26 for the Madison faculty, all other groups perceive a very similar press towards awareness. The range in reference group percentile is from a high of 76 representing Madison faculty to a low of 55 from the Social Science faculty. All other groups have percentiles of 62 or 64.

A stated goal of Madison College for their students is to develop a greater sense of self awareness through significant interactions with other students and faculty. The results on this scale indicate that Madison students

do not perceive themselves as having a greater awareness than the other student groups.

Hypothesis Number Four

> Students and faculty in the College of Social Science and in University College perceive a higher degree of practicality than do students and faculty in Madison College.

The items in the practicality scale describe an environment having both vocational and collegiate emphasis. The environment supports enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities.

The CUES results on the practicality scale are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7.--Comparison of student and faculty scores on the practicality scale with CUES reference group percentiles.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	10	16
Madison Faculty	7	8
University College Students	19	49
University College Faculty	18	44
Social Science Students	16	36
Social Science Faculty	17	41

The results indicate that Madison students and faculty do perceive a lower degree of practicality in the Madison environment.

The Madison student score of 10 is six points below Social Science students. The Madison faculty score of 7 is eleven points below University College faculty and ten points below Social Science faculty. These are all significant differences.

There is more consensus within the Social Science College and the University College on the level of practicality than there is within Madison College as Madison students differ by three points from Madison faculty where the other two colleges differ only by one point.

The results of Madison students and faculty on this scale indicate that students do not see the Madison curriculum simply as a means to getting a good job after graduation. The other two colleges have a greater stress on the value of their education for the students' occupational goals.

Hypothesis Number Five

> Students and faculty in University College perceive more propriety in their environment than do students and faculty in the College of Social Science or in James Madison College.

Items in this scale describe an environment that is polite, conventional, and considerate. There is an absence of demonstrative, assertive, risk-taking activities.

The CUES results on the propriety scale are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8.--Comparison of student and faculty scores on the propriety scale with reference group percentiles.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	9	15
Madison Faculty	8	12
University College Students	10	25
University College Faculty	5	2
Social Science Students	8	12
Social Science Faculty	13	37

University College students and faculty as a group do not perceive more propriety in their environment than the other two groups. University College students do have the highest student scale score of 10 but University College faculty have the lowest propriety scale score of 5, with a resulting percentile of 2.

Social Science faculty have the highest propriety score with a 13 but their reference percentile score remains low at 37.

On this scale, Madison students and faculty have the highest degree of consensus since they differ by only one point.

In general, all groups perceive their environments as allowing risks and not repressing assertive or argumentative behavior.

Hypothesis Number Six

> Students and faculty in James Madison College perceive a higher Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships than do students in University College or in the College of Social Science.

The items in this scale describe an atmosphere of scholarly and friendly student-faculty relationships. Professors are warm to students and interested in giving them help while maintaining high scholarly standards.

The CUES results in the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships Scale are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9.--Comparison of student and faculty scores on the quality of teaching and faculty-student relationship scale with reference group percentile.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	14	62
Madison Faculty	18	82
University College Students	11	29
University College Faculty	10	17
Social Science Students	11	29
Social Science Faculty	11	29

As a group Madison students and faculty report a considerably higher quality of teaching and faculty-student relationships than do the other two colleges.

The Madison student score of 14 is three points higher than student groups in the other two Colleges. The Madison faculty score of 18 is eight points higher than University College faculty and seven points higher than Social Science faculty.

This places Madison students' perceptions in the 62nd percentile and faculty perceptions in the 82nd percentile in the national reference group. All other groups fall into the 29th percentile except the University College faculty who are in the 17th percentile.

The College of Social Science faculty and students had identical scale scores of 11. University College students had a scale score of 11 and the faculty had a score of 10, thus differing by only one point. These two groups had more internal consensus than Madison, which had a faculty score of 18, higher by four points than the student score.

A significant goal of the residential colleges is to create an environment that facilitates student-faculty relationships. In comparing Madison with the other two Colleges, it appears as if that goal has been attained.

Hypothesis Number Seven

> Students with high grade point averages perceive the Madison College environment as more scholarly than students with high grade point averages in University College or in the College of Social Science.

The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline. The pursuit of knowledge and theories is carried on vigorously.

The CUES results of all student and faculty scores on the Scholarship scale are presented in Table 10. In Table 11, students' scores divided between those above and below a three point academic average (B) are presented.

TABLE 10.--Comparison of student and faculty scores on the Scholarship scale with reference group percentile.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students	19	31
Madison Faculty	19	31
University College Students	14	14
University College Faculty	6	1
Social Science Students	12	10
Social Science Faculty	12	10

As a group, Madison students and faculty perceive a higher degree of scholarship than the other two Colleges. The identical scale scores of 19 are considerably higher than the other groups. Consensus on this scale also exists in the College of Social Science where both students and faculty report a scale score of 12.

TABLE 11.--Comparison of students' scholarship scale scores of those above and below a three point academic average with reference group percentile.

	Scale Score	Reference Group Percentile
Madison Students above 3.0 point	16	18
Madison Students below 3.0 point	20	33
University College Students above 3.0 point	9	3
University College Students below 3.0 point	14	14
Social Science Students above 3.0 point	10	5
Social Science Students below 3.0 point	13	10

When students in the three colleges are divided between those above and below a three point overall academic average, the hypothesis is supported as Madison students above a three point average report a higher scale score of 16. This is seven points higher than University College students and six points above Social Science students.

In all three Colleges, students below a three point average report a significantly higher press on scholarship than students above a three point average. The difference is greatest in University College where students below a

three point average report a scale score of 14 where students above a three point report a scale score of 9.

Thus, students in Madison College, whether they are above or below a 3.0 point academic average, perceive a greater amount of press for scholarship than in the other two Colleges. Madison faculty support this perception as they also have a higher score than the other faculties.

Hypothesis Number Eight

> There will be a greater agreement on Environmental perception among students and faculty in Madison College than within the College of Social Science and University College.

This hypothesis is tested by comparing the differences of faculty and students on each of the scales and then totaling the differences on every scale for each college. The differences are presented in Table 12.

The hypothesis is not supported as Madison students and faculty report the total greatest difference in their scale scores of 26 points. University College reports the next greatest difference of 23 points. The College of Social Science has the highest degree of consensus with a difference of only 13 points.

The great difference between Madison students and faculty is due to the fact that on the Community, Awareness, Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships, and Campus Morale Scales, the Madison faculty reported considerably higher scale scores.

TABLE 12.--Total score differences between students and faculty in each college on the seven CUES scales.

	Madison	University College	Social Science
Practicality	3	1	1
Scholarship	0	8	0
Community	7	1	4
Awareness	4	1	1
Propriety	1	5	5
Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships	4	1	0
Campus Morale	7	6	2
Total	26	23	13

An opposite trend caused the great difference in scale scores of University College faculty and students. On the Scholarship, Propriety, and Campus Morale scales, the students reported higher scores than the faculty in University College.

In the College of Social Science the students reported a higher score than faculty on the Community scale and a lower score on the Propriety scale.

Hypothesis Number Nine

There is a greater agreement on environmental perception among faculty teaching in the three colleges than between students in these same colleges.

This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that faculty are not as affected as students by their environments. Thus faculty scale scores would be closer to each other numerically than would be the students' scores. To test this, the range of scores on each scale for faculty and students was determined. The results of this analysis are found in Table 13.

The results of this data indicate that the hypothesis is not supported. The total range of faculty scale scores is 69 while the range for students is only 29. There is a greater range on each faculty scale than on each of the students' scales.

Thus faculty teaching in different situations perceive those environments more uniquely than do students in different colleges.

Hypothesis Number Ten

> Students enrolled in a large department of social science, an experimental social science residential college and a living-learning basic college curriculum perceive their environments differently.

To test this hypothesis, all student scale scores must be examined to determine if there are significant differences. The scale scores for all three student groups are presented in Table 14.

On four of the seven scales, significant differences of three points or more exist between the different colleges. The scales that discriminate best between the colleges are Practicality, Scholarship, Quality of Teaching

TABLE 13.--A comparison of scale score ranges between combined faculty and combined students in the three colleges.

	Madison	University College	Social Science	Range
		Students		
Practicality	10	19	16	9
Scholarship	19	14	12	7
Community	19	19	17	2
Awareness	22	21	21	1
Propriety	9	10	8	2
Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships	14	11	11	3
Campus Morale	20	20	15	5
Total Range				29
		Faculty		
Practicality	7	18	17	11
Scholarship	19	6	12	13
Community	26	18	13	13
Awareness	26	22	20	6
Propriety	8	5	13	5
Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships	18	10	11	8
Campus Morale	27	14	17	13
Total Range				69

TABLE 14.--Comparison of student scale scores on all scales.

	Madison	University College	Social Science
Practicality	10	19	16
Scholarship	19	14	12
Community	19	19	17
Awareness	22	21	21
Propriety	9	10	8
Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships	14	11	11
Campus Morale	20	20	15

and Student-Faculty Relationships, and Campus Morale. On these four scales the students do perceive the environment differently.

On the Community, Awareness, and Propriety scales, the differences between colleges are two points or less.

Madison students are more like University College students than Social Science students on the Community and Campus Morale scales since the scale scores are identical. The College of Social Science students have a much lower score on the Campus Morale scale.

On the Scholarship and Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships, University College and Social Science students are similar as both have similar but lower scale scores than Madison College students.

There are sufficient differences in the scale scores to support the hypothesis that students in the three colleges perceive their environments differently.

The greatest difference between Madison students and students in the other two colleges is on the Practicality scale where their score is much lower, on the Scholarship scale where their score is much higher, and on the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships scale where Madison students also score much higher.

Comparison of Scale Scores with Reference Group of Colleges and Universities

As indicated in Chapter III, one method of analyzing CUES data is by comparing it with the normative data established by Pace (29, pp. 16-26). The reference group of 100 colleges and universities is divided up into eight different types of schools:

1. Highly Selective Liberal Arts Colleges
2. Highly Selective Universities
3. General Liberal Arts Colleges
4. General Universities
5. State Colleges
6. Teachers Colleges
7. Strongly Denominational Liberal Arts Colleges
8. Colleges and Universities Emphasizing Engineering and the Sciences.

Examples of each of these types is found in Chapter III. There is a mean score established on the five main scales of CUES for each of the eight types of scales. The resulting classification, based on the comparison of the actual scale scores of all six groups involved in this study with the mean scale scores established for the eight reference groups, is presented in Table 15. There are no reference groups established for the two sub-scales on the CUES because of their recent development.

By examining Table 15, it can be seen that in only four out of a possible thirty instances do the Michigan State University faculty and students used in this study fall into their actual reference group classification, that of a General University.

Madison students and faculty scale scores are most like Highly Selective Universities as well as Highly Selective Liberal Arts Colleges in five out of ten possibilities. Social Science students and faculty have scale scores close to the Highly Selective University classification in three out of ten instances, as do University College students and faculty.

On the Propriety scale, all six groups fall into the Highly Selective University classification which has the lowest mean score of all eight types. On the Scholarship scale, Madison is most similar to State Colleges with

TABLE 15.--Placement of student and faculty scale scores into comparable specific college types within the CUES reference group of colleges and universities by comparing scale scores with reference group mean scores.

	Practicality	Community	Awareness	Propriety	Scholarship
Madison Students	Highly Select. Univ. M=12.2 S=10	State Colleges M=19.3 S=19	General Univ. M=20.6 S=22	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=9	State Colleges M=18.4 S=19
Madison Faculty	Highly Select. Lib. Arts Col. M=6.1 S=7	Teachers Colleges M=25.2 S=26	Highly Select. Univ. M=30.7 S=26	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=8	State Colleges M=18.4 S=19
Social Science Students	Gen. Liberal Arts Colleges M=17.5 S=16	Highly Select. Univ. M=18 S=17	General Univ. M=20.6 S=21	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=8	Teachers Colleges M=14.7 S=12
Social Science Faculty	Gen. Liberal Arts Colleges M=17.5 S=17	Eng. & Sci. Colleges M=15.6 S=13	Strong Denom. Lib. Arts Col. M=20.1 S=20	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=13	Teachers Colleges M=14.7 S=12
Univ. College Students	Strong Denom. Lib. Arts Col. M=19.7 S=19	State Colleges M=19.3 S=19	General Univ. M=20.6 S=21	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=10	Teachers Colleges M=14.7 S=14
Univ. College Faculty	Gen. Liberal Arts Colleges M=17.5 S=18	Highly Select. Univ. M=18.1 S=18	General Univ. M=20.6 S=22	Highly Select. Univ. M=9.7 S=5	Teachers Colleges M=14.7 S=6

M = Mean scale score for specific reference group, type of college.
S = Actual scale score of Michigan State University group.

a mean of 19 while the other four groups are most similar to the lowest mean score of 14.7 in Teachers' Colleges.

On the Practicality scale all groups fall into a Liberal Arts College type of classification except Madison students who are most like students in Highly Selective Universities. The Madison faculty score is the lowest on this scale which places their perception into the Highly Selective Liberal Arts College classification.

On the Awareness scale, Madison faculty perceive the environment to be most similar to that in Highly Selective Universities. The Social Science faculty perceive their awareness level most like Strongly Denominational Liberal Arts Colleges. The other four groups perceive their environment to be most like General Universities on the Awareness scale.

The Community scale presents the greatest diversity of perception. The highest score, that of Madison faculty, makes their perception of Community most like that found in Teacher's Colleges. The lowest score by Social Science faculty creates a perception on Community similar to that found in colleges emphasizing Engineering and the Sciences.

Summary

The following hypotheses were fully supported as a result of the CUES analysis:

Hypothesis Number

4 Students and faculty in both the College of Social Science and University College perceive a higher degree of practicality than do students and faculty in Madison College.

6 Students and faculty in James Madison College perceive a higher Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships than do students in University College or the College of Social Science.

7 Students with high grade point averages perceive the Madison College environment as more scholarly than students with high grade point averages in University College or the College of Social Science.

The following hypotheses were partially supported:

Hypothesis Number

1 Students and faculty in Madison College perceive more of a Community than do students and faculty in University College or the College of Social Science.

This was found to be true of Madison faculty only.

2 Students and faculty perceive a higher degree of Campus Morale in Madison College than do the students and faculty in both the University College and the College of Social Science.

This was found to be true only for the Madison faculty. Madison students, however, have a higher score than all other groups outside Madison except University College students.

3 A higher degree of Awareness is perceived by both faculty and students in Madison College than in University College or the College of Social Science.

Hypothesis Number	
	This hypothesis is supported for Madison faculty only.
5	Students and faculty in University College perceive more propriety in their environment than do students and faculty in the College of Social Science or James Madison College. University College students have a higher level of propriety than other student groups, but the University College faculty has the lowest score on propriety. The Social Science faculty has the highest propriety score.
10	Students enrolled in a large department of Social Science, an experimental Social Science residential college and a living-learning basic college curriculum perceive their environments differently. This is true only for the Practicality, Scholarship, Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships and Campus Morale scales.

The following hypotheses were not supported:

Hypothesis Number	
8	There will be greater agreement on environmental perception among students and faculty in Madison College than within the College of Social Science and University College. It was found that Madison College had the lowest level of agreement. The College of Social Science had the greatest agreement.
9	There is a greater agreement on environmental perception among faculty teaching in the three colleges than between students in these same colleges. It was found that students are much closer on their environmental perceptions than faculty.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This research investigates three environments at Michigan State University. The focus of the study was to determine how one of these environments, James Madison College, compared to other related environments at Michigan State University.

James Madison College is one of the three experimental residential colleges at this University. It is a cluster college with a four-year experimental curriculum in the social sciences. The college is located in what was initially a living-learning residence hall so that faculty in the College have offices there and College classes are taught within the building.

In order to determine if the environment in Madison differed from other parts of the University, two comparative groups were selected. One of the comparative units selected was a living-learning residence hall in which University College faculty taught and had offices. The University College is the basic college for freshmen and

sophomores at Michigan State University. There are four basic classes of three terms each which all students take in University College and can take within their own residence hall. By the end of the sophomore year students in University College must declare a major in a college within the University but they have the option of declaring a major at any time during their first two years.

The University College living-learning residence hall was selected because it provided a comparison with another unit which had faculty offices and classrooms within the same building. The residential college concept is an extension of the living-learning idea so it was important to determine if there were discernable differences in environmental perceptions.

The second comparative unit selected for the study was the large department of social science at Michigan State University. This department has all the social science majors within it. This group was chosen because it would be the normal alternative department if a student had not elected to enter James Madison College since both units have the social sciences as a curricular base. Any student admitted to Michigan State University could select James Madison or the College of Social Science.

In order to determine the differences in environmental perceptions, sophomore students and faculty in each of the three groups were asked to complete the College and

University Environment Scale, Second Edition, which was developed by C. Robert Pace. This instrument was heavily based on another environmental test, The College Characteristics Index, developed earlier by Pace and George Stern.

The students, all randomly selected, were sophomores in Madison College, sophomores residing in the living-learning residence hall in which the University College is located, and sophomores with declared majors in the College of Social Science. The faculty selected were all those faculty teaching in Madison College, all University College faculty who taught and had classes in the living-learning residence hall and all faculty who were teaching social science courses below the 399 level during the winter term, 1970.

Copies of the CUES plus an explanatory letter were mailed to 100 students in each of the three colleges, to thirty-two faculty in Madison College, to sixteen faculty in University College, and to fifty-one faculty in the College of Social Science. The response rate varied from 68 per cent of the Social Science students to 75 per cent of the University College and Madison faculty. See Table III in Chapter III for a breakdown of return percentages.

The data was then analyzed by the Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State University. The final scale scores for the CUES were developed by the researcher using the scoring procedure developed by Pace, which is

described fully in Chapter III. The seven scales with a short explanation are:

1. Practicality--this scale describes an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities.

2. Community--the items in this scale describe a friendly, cohesive, group oriented campus.

3. Awareness--the itmes in this scale reflect a development of three types of concerns--personal, poetic, and political.

4. Propriety--these items describe an environment characterized by polite and considerate behavior. There is an absence of argumentative and risk-taking behaviors.

5. Scholarship--items in this scale describe an environment characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline.

6. Campus Morale--the items in this scale describe an environment characterized by acceptance of social norms, group cohesiveness, friendly assimilation into campus life, and, at the same time, a commitment to intellectual pursuits and freedom of expression.

7. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships--this scale defines an atmosphere in which professors are perceived to be scholarly, to set high standards, to be clear, adaptive, and flexible.

Discussion of Results

The Madison College environment does differ from the College of Social Science and a living-learning residence hall in several areas.

Students and faculty in Madison perceive a significantly lower press of Practicality in their environment than the other two colleges. The Practicality scale emphasizes collegiate and vocational aspects of student life.

Students in Madison are concerned more about social issues than some of the more traditional aspects of collegiate life such as football, fraternities, and term parties. They also must see their education having a more intellectual purpose than just preparation for a good job. This is supported by their higher scores on the Scholarship scale.

Madison students and faculty perceive a much higher level of scholarship than the other two Colleges. There is more intellectual stimulation and discipline felt as well as more academic competition found in the residential college than in the College of Social Science or the University College. The University College faculty and the Social Science students report the lowest stress in Scholarship.

Madison students above a three point academic average also perceive a higher level of scholarship than do students in the other two colleges. In each of the three colleges, students below a three point average perceive a higher level of scholarship than their colleagues above a three point. Madison students below a three point average, however, also perceive a higher level of scholarship than students in the other colleges. This implies that students who are achieving at a higher level are not as satisfied with the academic part of their life as are students who do achieve as high. They might not be as challenged as the lower achieving students.

On the Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relationships, Madison students and faculty report significantly higher scores than the other two colleges. This reflects a greater interest in students by faculty as well as more faculty help given to students. At the same time, faculty are perceived by students to be more scholarly and to set higher standards than in the other two colleges. One of the goals of the residential colleges has been to attain this goal. This concern for students is also supported in the Campus Morale scale.

Faculty in Madison College demonstrate the highest level of Campus Morale of all faculty groups. Thus they perceive the highest level of freedom of expression as well as an exemplification of intellectual goals. Madison faculty see the greatest degree of warm and personal social relationships. On the Campus Morale scale, Madison students perceive these same characteristics at an identical level to those students in living-learning residence halls but significantly higher than the College of Social Science.

Similar results are found on the Community scale. Madison faculty have a significantly higher score on this scale than all other faculty and student groups. Madison faculty perceive that they know the students and are interested in their problems. They feel a higher degree of group loyalty and welfare in Madison than other faculty members do. Madison students perceive a level of Community

which is identical to students in living-learning residence halls but lower than Madison faculty. The faculty and students in the College of Social Science perceive the lowest level of Community of all three colleges. Developing a sense of community is clearly one of the goals of cluster colleges. Madison faculty seem to have attained that level. Madison students feel that community at a higher level than Social Science students but not higher than those students in living-learning residence halls.

On the Awareness scale, Madison faculty again perceive the highest level of all other faculty and student groups. They sense an environment that is more concerned about developing an awareness of self, an awareness of society, and of aesthetic stimuli. They perceive a greater encouragement of questioning and dissent as well as a tolerance of nonconformity and personal expressiveness. All other faculty and student groups perceive the press on awareness to be at a lower and similar level. It is interesting to note that all groups fall into the upper percentile levels of awareness when compared with a national reference group of colleges and universities.

On the Propriety scale, all groups fall into the lower percentile levels when compared with the reference group of colleges and universities established by Pace. This implies that there is little press on group standards of decorum and that the campus is not seen as requiring as much conventional behavior as do other colleges. The

University College faculty perceive the lowest level of propriety while the Social Science faculty perceive the highest level. There is little difference between the remaining student groups and the Madison faculty.

The higher Madison faculty scores on the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships, Scholarship, Community, Awareness, and Campus Morale scales indicate that they have the most "idealized" view of the three environments. Madison students generally share this view but to lesser extent on all but the Scholarship scale.

Students seem to have a greater agreement among themselves on their environment, despite their college, than do faculty on an overall basis. The conclusion might be that faculty are more influenced by the environment in which they teach than are students influenced by the environment in which they learn. Students and faculty in Madison College have the least amount of consensus on the aspects of their environment. Even though the scores for the faculty and students in the College of Social Science are generally the lowest for the majority of the scales, their degree of consensus is the highest.

When the perceptions of the three environments are compared with the reference group of college and universities established by Pace, several trends are clear. Since Michigan State University is classified as a General University in that classification, it might be hypothesized

that the majority of scale scores would fall into that classification.

This is not true of Madison College where students and faculty perceive their environment as having more characteristics of Highly Selective Liberal Arts Colleges and Highly Selective Universities than the other two colleges. The other colleges indicate more characteristics like General Liberal Arts Colleges, General Universities, and Teachers Colleges. This might indicate that the Madison environment is seen as more like "prestigious" colleges than the other two colleges.

Implications for Future Research

The focus of this study was to provide comparative research about Madison College to determine how it differed from other environments at Michigan State University.

In order to further study the uniqueness of the residential colleges and their degree of impact upon students much more data should be gathered.

The characteristics of students and faculty in residential colleges should be studied to determine if they are different from other students and faculty who do not enter into experimental colleges. Such research would include personality studies, value orientations, and ability levels. Changes in these characteristics should be traced over a four-year period using a control group of

non-residential college students to study what kind of impact the residential college has on these areas.

It is clear from this study that the Madison faculty see their environment differently from other faculties at Michigan State University. Is this a function of the characteristics of Madison faculty or the Madison environment? Studies of experimental college faculty should be done to answer this question.

Studies should also be conducted on why students leave residential colleges. The characteristics of this group should be compared with students who graduate from residential colleges.

Another area of important research would involve a follow-up of students who graduate from residential colleges to see if there is a difference in occupational choices, rate of graduate school attendance, and general satisfaction with their experience in the residential college.

A study should be conducted on the development of the residential college concept across the nation to examine the general problems these colleges encounter at the institutions which contain them. This might involve a study of non-residential colleges. Or it might involve a study which examines the failures and disadvantages of various residential colleges as they exist for longer periods of time.

Since one of the main purposes of residential colleges is to create models and experiments that might be

applied to the larger institution, it is important to determine to what extent this has become a reality.

Limitations of Study

This study focuses on only one residential college, James Madison. Although it points out differences between James Madison College and two other academic areas at Michigan State University, these same differences may not exist at other colleges. Residential colleges across the country share many characteristics such as the close student-faculty relationships and classes taught within the same building where students live, but in other areas such as student characteristics and curriculum, they differ greatly. Hopefully this research will be of value to other colleges who are examining the environment in experimental colleges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Axelrod, Joseph. "New Organizational Patterns in American Colleges and Universities." In Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Edited by Lewis Mayhew. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1967.

2. Axelrod, Joseph, Mervin Freedman, Winslow Hatch, and Joseph Katz. Search for Relevance, The Campus in Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

3. Baskin, Samuel, ed. Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

4. Berdie, Ralph. "Changes in University Perceptions During the First Two Years." Journal of College Student Personnel, IX, No. 2 (March, 1968).

5. Centra, John A. "Student Perceptions of Residence Hall Environments: Living-Learning v. Conventional Units." Paper presented at the meetings of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas, Texas, 1967.

6. Dressel, Paul. "Educational Innovation at Michigan State University." In Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Education. Edited by W. Hugh Stickler. Tallahasee, Florida: Florida State University, 1964.

7. Feldman, Kenneth, and Theodore Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

8. Foote, Caleb, Henry Mayer, and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

9. Frost, Gary. "Building of An Academic Community: James Madison College." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

10. Gardner, John. "Agenda for the Colleges and Universities." In Campus--1980. Edited by Alvin Eurich. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

11. Garfinkel, Herbert. "Report on James Madison College to the Academic Senate." Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 24, 1967.

12. Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Miseducation and the Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

13. Gores, Harold. "The American Campus--1980." In Campus--1980. Edited by Alvin Eurich. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

14. Hall, Calvin, and Gardner Lindzey. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.

15. Heskett, Sharon, and W. Bruce Walsh. "Differential Perceptions of College Environment." Journal of College Student Personnel, X, No. 3 (May, 1969).

16. Horn, Francis, Jonathon King, and James Morisseau. "Facilities and Learning: An Overview of Developments." In Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. Edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

17. Lamb, Karl. "Seeking the Essence of Oxford." American Oxonian, April, 1964.

18. Lozoff, Marjorie. "Residential Groups and Individual Development." In No Time for Youth. Edited by Joseph Katz. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

19. Martin, William Bryan. Alternative to Irrelevance. New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

20. Martin, William Bryan. Conformity, Standards and Change in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

21. Martin, William Bryan. "The Problem of Size." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (March, 1967).

22. Mayhew, Lewis B. Colleges Today and Tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

23. Mayhew, Lewis B. "The Future Undergraduate Curriculum." In Campus--1980. Edited by Alvin Eurich. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

24. Mayhew, Lewis. "The New Colleges." In Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. Edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

25. McHenry, Dean E. "Environmental Implications of the Concern for Community." Liberal Education. Bulletin of the American Association of American Colleges, LIII, No. 1 (March, 1967).

26. Michigan State University Publication. Catalog of Courses and Academic Programs, LXIII, No. 7 (December, 1968).

27. Michigan State University Office of the Registrar Enrollment Report. Winter Term, 1970.

28. Newcomb, Theodore. "Research on Student Characteristics." In College and the Student. Edited by Lawrence Dennis and Joseph Kauffman. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

29. Pace, C. Robert. College and University Environment Scales, Second Edition, Technical Manual. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

30. Pace, C. Robert. Comparisons of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters. Report Number 1. College Entrance Examination Board, July, 1966.

31. Pace, C. Robert. "Student and His College." College and the Student. Edited by Lawrence Dennis and Joseph Kauffman. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

32. Pace, C. Robert. The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College and University Environments. U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 1083, University of California at Los Angeles, 1964.

33. Pace, C. Robert. The Use of the CUES in the College Admissions Process. Los Angeles: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

34. Pace, C. Robert, and Anne McFee. "The College Environment." Review of Educational Research, XXX, No. 4 (1960).

35. Pace, C. Robert, and George Stern. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIX, No. 5 (1958).

36. Reiner, John R., and Donald Robinson. "Perceptions of College Environment and Contiguity with College Environment." The Journal of Higher Education, XLI, No. 2 (February, 1970).

37. Riker, Harold. College Housing as Learning Centers. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1965.

38. Sandeen, Arthur. "The New Experimental Colleges: A Challenge to Student Personnel Work." Journal of College Student Personnel, IX, No. 6 (November, 1968).

39. Saturday Review. "The Small College on the Big Campus." January 21, 1967.

40. Schoen, Walter, Jr. "The Campus Climate: Student Perception and Faculty Idealism." The Journal of Educational Research, LX, No. 1 (September, 1966).

41. Stickler, W. Hugh, ed. Experimental Colleges: Their Role in Higher Education. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, 1964.

42. The Student in Higher Education. Report of the Committee on the Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Connecticut: Hazen Foundation, 1968.

43. Time Magazine. September 9, 1966.

44. Walsh, W. Bruce, and Richard McKinnon. "Impact of an Experimental Program on Student Environmental Perceptions." Journal of College Student Personnel, X, No. 5 (September, 1969).

45. Watson, Goodwin. "Utopia and Rebillion: The New College Experiment." In Innovation in Education. Edited by Matthew Miles. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

46. Wright, Stephen. "Institutional Expectations and Influences." In College and the Student. Edited by Lawrence Dennis and Joseph Kauffman. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.