ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE AT
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AS PERCEIVED
BY SELECTED JUNIOR CLASS STUDENTS

by David S. Taylor

The environment of a campus is an elusive but yet pervasive aspect of an institution. In an effort to assess campus environment this study had as its purpose the determination of the institutional "environment" of a school which is in a transitional phase of moving from a single-purpose to a multi-purpose university, and how that institutional "environment" is perceived by various student subgroups.

Those persons involved in the study were 168 junior class students, thirty-seven student personnel services faculty members, and twenty-four teaching faculty members. All persons were requested to complete the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) in order to gather data to aid in determining the type of campus environment as perceived by the respective subgroups. Student subgroups were formed on the basis of achievement level, sex, major area of study, participation and involvement in campus life, place of residency at school, and rural or urban home background. The subgroups within the given categories were compared with one another as were faculty responses with student responses. The hypotheses were presented in null form stating that there would be no significant differences in perceptions between compared subgroups. The mean scores of the groups were analyzed through the use of the t-test to test for differences between means.

The findings indicated that although there were some significant differences related to environmental perceptions of the campus, the

University was viewed somewhat similarly by students and faculty alike. That is, the school had basically one "environment" rather than several "environments." Students and faculty perceived the campus as being characterized by an emphasis on procedures and order. Secondly, they perceived the campus as being friendly, cohesive, and congenial, and as having an air of politeness and considerateness. There was an indication of little emphasis on competitive academic achievement and scholarship, and an even lesser emphasis on personal, poetic, and political aspects.

Of the 180 comparisons which were made, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between compared groups was rejected in eighteen instances. All scales of the CUES, with the exception of the Awareness Scale, were perceived somewhat differently by some of the subgroups. The majority of the differences were influenced by the sex of the student. Secondly, the major area of study of the student had a bearing on the student's perceptions of the campus environment. Finally, the student's place of residence was a factor in affecting perceptions of the prevailing institutional climate.

A school which is in a transitional phase of moving from a single-purpose structure to a multiple-purpose structure appears to be perceived similarly by student and faculty subgroups. Size and complexity of an institution most definitely play a role in determining at what point a school is seen differently by various subgroups within the campus community. When there are perceived differences in campus environment, these differences seem to be affected primarily by the sex of the student, his major area of study, and his place of residency while at school.

A STUDY OF INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE AT WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED JUNIOR CLASS STUDENTS

By

David S. Taylor

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education
Department of Higher Education

1969

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this magnitude cannot be undertaken and completed without the advice, counsel, and assistance of many individuals. Sincere appreciation is extended to the students and faculty who were willing to participate in the study. A deep sense of gratitude is felt toward Dr. Edward Blackman whose high goals and expectations for excellence guided the writer through the labyrinth of scholarly research and writing. His patience and understanding were indeed helpful throughout the entire project.

A special expression of thanks is extended to Dr. John Eibl and Mrs. Darlene Weber. Their continued assistance with editing, correcting, and typing were of tremendous benefit in moving the research study to its conclusion.

Above all, my wife Beverly has my eternal affection and appreciation for her thoughtfulness, encouragement, and faith in me, without which the research endeavor would have faltered. To my children, Gregory and Yvonne, appreciation is extended for their quietness and understanding during long periods of writing.

D.S.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of Study	4
	Formulation of Study Design	5
	Significance of the Study	7
	Overview	9
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
	Genesis of Environmental Studies	12
	Results of Prior Environmental Studies	14
	Expectations vs. Perceptions of Institutional Climate	14
	Environmental Climate as Related to Achievement Level	17
	Environment as Related to Student Housing	18
	Major Field of Study and Relationship to Campus Environment	20
	Faculty-Student Perceptions of Environmental Press	22
	Campus Leaders and Environmental Perceptions	24
	Institutional Comparisons and Characteristics	27
	Summary	30
III.	DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION AND ITS STUDENTS	38
	The Institution	38
	The Students	47
IV.	DESIGN	54
	Original Sample Group	54
	Actual Sample	56
	Data Collection	57

Chapter Page

Instrumentation 57

Validity 58

Reliability 62

Hypotheses Tested 62

Statistical Treatment of the Data 63

V. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS 65

Presentation of Results 66

Comparisons by Achievement Level and Sex 66

Comparisons by Major Area of Study 73

Comparisons by Degree of Participation and Involvement in Campus Activities 77

Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School 79

Comparisons of Students with Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty 85

Comparisons of Students by Urban or Rural Home Environment 91

Discussion 92

Summary 97

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 100

Summary of Purpose and Procedures 100

Summary of Results 102

Comparisons of Students by Achievement Levels and Sex 102

Comparisons by Major Area of Study 103

Comparisons by Degree of Participation and Involvement in Campus Activities 104

Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School 104

Comparisons of Students with Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty 104

Chapter Page

Comparisons of Urban Students with Rural Students . . . 105

Conclusions 105

Discussion 109

Recommendations 113

BIBLIOGRAPHY 117

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
IV-1	Correlations between CUES Scores and Other Institutional Features	60
V-1	Comparisons of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, and Low Achieving Females on the Practicality Scale . . .	66
V-2	Comparisons of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, and Low Achieving Females on the Community Scale	68
V-3	Comparisons of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, and Low Achieving Females on the Awareness Scale	69
V-4	Comparisons of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, and Low Achieving Females on the Propriety Scale	70
V-5	Comparisons of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, and Low Achieving Females on the Scholarship Scale	71
V-6	Comparisons of High Achieving Students with Low Achieving Students	72
V-7	Comparisons Between Males and Females	72
V-8	Comparisons of Students by Major Area of Study on the Practicality Scale	73
V-9	Comparisons of Students by Major Area of Study on the Community Scale	74
V-10	Comparisons of Students by Major Area of Study on the Awareness Scale	75
V-11	Comparisons of Students by Major Area of Study on the Propriety Scale	76
V-12	Comparisons of Students by Major Area of Study on the Scholarship Scale	77
V-13	Comparisons of Active Students with Inactive Students on the CUES	78
V-14	Comparisons of Leaders with Non-Leaders on the CUES	79

Table		Page
V-15	Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School on the Practicality Scale	80
V-16	Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School on the Community Scale	81
V-17	Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School on the Awareness Scale	82
V-18	Comparisons of Students by Place of Residency at School on the Propriety Scale	83
V-19	Comparisons of Students by Place of Residency at School on the Scholarship Scale	84
V-20	Comparisons of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty on the Practicality Scale	85
V-21	Comparisons of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, and Student Personnel Services Faculty on the Community Scale	86
V-22	Comparisons of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty on the Awareness Scale	87
V-23	Comparisons of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, and Student Personnel Services Faculty on the Propriety Scale	88
V-24	Comparisons of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, and Student Personnel Services Faculty on the Scholarship Scale	89
V-25	Comparisons of Total Students Sampled with Teaching Faculty on the CUES	90
V-26	Comparisons of Total Students Sampled with the Student Personnel Services Faculty	90
V-27	Comparisons of Urban Students with Rural Students . . .	91

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.	Description of the CUES Scales	125
B.	Initial Letter to Students	129
C.	Follow-up Letter to Students	131
D.	Memo to Teaching Faculty	133
E.	Memo to Student Personnel Services Faculty	135
F.	Personal Data Form	137
G.	T-test Formula	139

Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Nevitt Sanford, writing in The American College published in 1962, expressed his misgivings over the unwillingness of social scientists to conduct research studies on colleges and universities. In calling for more activity in this area, Sanford elaborated by stating that "...social scientists for their part have not been particularly interested in higher education as a field of research."[1] Since the compilation of material for Sanford's book, however, there has been an expanding program of activity in the realm of institutional research.

"Institutional research," as explained by Dyer, "is largely a post World War II phenomenon that got its big boost from the sudden rise in the student population and the sudden availability of foundation money for institutional self-testing."[2] The recent concern with institutional research was motivated primarily by two groups, researchers and administrators. Educators and social scientists began to engage in institutional research because of their interest in studying students, student behavior, and the college as a unique community. This type of research was also encouraged by administrators who were interested in "data" as a basis for making many of their institutional decisions.

One of the early post-war areas of interest for studies in higher education was the assessment of the "impact of college," or "outcomes of the college experience." The Edward W. Hazen Foundation was one of the strong supporters of research and publications of both the total impact of a college education on students and of the specific effect of the college experience on the value structure of students. The first book published under the auspices of the Hazen Foundation Studies was Phillip E. Jacob's oft-quoted and controversial Changing Values in College.

In Changing Values in College, Jacob attempted to determine what changes occur in students' value patterns in college, and to what extent changes stem from experiences within the college. From his analysis, Jacob concluded that:

> This study has discovered no specific curricular pattern of general education, no model syllabus for a basic social science course, no pedigree of instructor and no wizardry of instructional method which should be patented for its impact on the values of students. Student values do change to some extent in college. With some students the change is substantial. But the impetus to change does not come primarily from the formal educational process. Potency to affect student values is found in the distinctive climate of a few institutions, the individual and personal magnetism of a sensitive teacher with strong value commitments of his own, or value laden personal experiences of students imaginatively integrated with their intellectual development.[3]

The conclusions of the Jacob report influenced further institutional research with the single objective of determining the impact that a college or university had on its students.

One outgrowth of the activity of searching for the effects of collegiate experience on an individual was the birth of the concept of "campus climate," and, in turn, the desire to devise techniques to assess this "campus climate." Jacob himself made reference to "the distinctive climate of a few institutions."

Eddy, in a later publication, The College Influence on Student Character, interjects the concept of campus climate. He emphasized six major areas in which he feels the college should have definite impact on students. The areas of emphasis which Eddy cites are: setting an expectation of excellence for students; having committed and dedicated faculty; relating the curriculum to purposeful goals for the student and building an expectation of sound scholarship through the

curriculum; giving students opportunities for independent study, opportunities for governing their own affairs, and opportunities for sitting in with institutional policy making bodies; leading students to an understanding of religion and the part religion plays in the life of man; and finally fusing the elements together to create an environment or climate which will be a powerful force on the development of those who live within it.[4] Although Eddy does not specifically separate or emphasize his sixth point, it is significant that he makes note of the concept of a unique environment or climate of a campus.

Further emphasis on this intangible concept of climate is discussed by Huston Smith. In The Purposes of Higher Education, Smith writes:

> Any college worthy of the name will have a spiritual life of its own which makes of it more than an assembly of teachers, students, and buildings. At best it will have an atmosphere which is felt to be different from other environments the moment one steps into it and which acts as a powerful developing force upon all who live within it. Such an atmosphere will be like mist in the sense that one cannot put one's finger on it, but no one should be able to stay in it long without becoming thoroughly soaked.[5]

With consideration of the contributions of Jacob, Eddy, and Smith in mind, several questions relating to the study of campus environment as a part of a broad institutional research seem apparent. Such questions are: (1) How does one determine the specific characteristics of the campus environment? (2) How does one determine whether the climate is different from campus to campus without visiting each one to experience the "mist" and become "thoroughly soaked"? (3) How does one determine which campus environment is most satisfactory to an individual's needs? These questions all relate to the purpose of the study being reported.

Purpose of Study

There have been several reasons advanced for the need of assessing the climate of colleges and universities. In a symposium at the University of Texas, Pace commented that, "There is a long and distinguished history of research on the characteristics of college students...but there is no comparable history of research aimed at describing the characteristics of college."[6] In a similar vein, Astin and Holland, in their studies of National Merit Scholarship winners and the type of campus climate which the students entered, concluded that colleges are highly selective of students, but students are not nearly so selective of their college.[7] This, they feel, is largely due to the fact that information about the campus climate of an institution is not readily available.

Astin, in attempting to make more information available to prospective college students, developed the Environmental Assessment Technique. Astin felt that students should have as much information as possible in order to make an intelligent decision as to which college or university to attend.[8]

Dyer, in expressing his views, has indicated that "...the typical approach to institutional evaluation is to focus on faculty and facilities, not to attempt to see what happens to students as a consequence of having been exposed to them."[9] These data of the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, number of volumes in the library, and laboratory and classroom facilities are helpful in meeting accreditation standards but do not assist the institution in determining how the interaction of personnel and facilities combine to provide the desired campus environment. Additional data such as number of students, profile of class rank, standardized test score rankings, educational level of parents, socio-economic status of students' parents, and urban/rural home setting are all helpful in describing the student

population of an institution. Assessing the blending of such factors as faculty, facilities, and student population into a unique campus climate, however, may also be of value in institutional evaluative research.

Approaching the concept of campus climate from a different perspective, Pace suggests that a complex college/university has not one environment but several.[10] Trow, in his studies of college students, identifies four distinct student subcultures.[11] Pace feels there may be at least as many environments as student subcultures on any given campus.

In summary the reasons for assessing institutional climate are: (1) to provide environmental information, as well as other descriptive data, for the benefit of prospective students; (2) to utilize measures other than quantitative data when involved in an institutional evaluation program; and (3) to determine whether several "environments" exist on a campus or whether there is one overall prevailing campus atmosphere.

In the research study being reported, the purpose was to determine the type of "environment" and how that "environment" was perceived by several groups in a university which is in a transitional phase moving from a single purpose toward a multi-purpose structure. Does one's particular status, achievement level, field of study, place of residency, involvement in campus life, home background, etc., play a part in shaping the perceptions of the campus environment? Are there several "environments" within a university developing into one which is multi-purpose in nature? Is such an educational setting homogeneous or does it have various subgroups which perceive the environment from a frame of reference of the particular subgroup? These questions serve to expand and more fully develop the specific purpose of the study.

Formulation of Study Design

As stated above, the objective of the study was to determine the

prevailing environmental perceptions of an emerging multi-purpose university. (Additional information on the school, Western Illinois University, is presented in Chapter III, "Description of the Institution"). The task of determining whether several "environments" existed, or in other words, whether various subgroups perceived the campus differently, was accomplished by comparing students' perceptions on the basis of achievement level, sex, place of residency at school, major field of study, and involvement and participation in campus life. In order to measure whether home background had an effect on perceptions of college environment, rural students were compared with urban students. In addition, students were compared with teaching faculty members and student personnel services faculty members in regard to their respective perceptions of the campus environment. The comparisons were made by usage of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) developed by C. Robert Pace.[12] (See Appendix A for a description of the five scales of the CUES)

There is no question that a college population is comprised of a diversity of individuals, each of whom has different experiences and different impressions of the campus environment. It should follow that there are groups of students whose experiences are affected by their success in school, place of residency, major field of study, and involvement and participation in campus life. Faculty members may also have varying ideas of how students perceive the environment depending on their frequency of contact with the students and their understanding of the student culture. In order to determine whether there are differential perceptions of campus climate, it is necessary to design a method of comparison.

Several comparisons were necessary in order to determine whether differences in perception of campus climate actually did exist. In

Chapter IV, "Design" these comparisons will be stated as hypotheses, in null form, for statistical treatment of the data. The following comparisons, later developed in hypotheses, were made:

1. Comparisons of students on the basis of achievement level
2. Comparisons of students on the basis of sex
3. Comparisons of students on the basis of achievement level and sex
4. Comparisons of students by major area of study
5. Comparisons of students on the basis of participation and involvement in campus life
6. Comparisons of students by place of residency at school
7. Comparisons of students with faculty members
8. Comparisons of students on the basis of rural/urban home environment

The writer assumed that differences would occur when comparing students on the basis of place of residency, major field of study, and involvement in campus activities. All three areas play a significant role in the life of a student and, it would appear, seem to affect perceptions of the total campus environment. These assumptions will be discussed by the writer at a later time in the light of the total study.

Significance of the Study

At this juncture, the question might be raised regarding the value and benefit of such a study. As previously discussed, the purpose of the study was to determine the type of "environment" and how the "environment" is perceived by several groups in one school which is in a transitional period moving from a single purpose institution to a multi-purpose university. In other words, the environment as a whole, rather than isolated

facets of it, was studied in order to understand the unique nature of a transitional university.

Other institutional research studies have dealt with such relationships as faculty-student ratio, lecture vs. discussion type teaching, graded vs. ungraded evaluation of class work, permissive vs. directive advising, etc. Most definitely, this type of research is necessary in order to improve the learning climate. These studies of one minor relationship do not, however, give a picture of the total institutional environments. Faculty-student ratio may vary from class-to-class and department-to-department, lectures and discussions may occur on the same day for any one student, likewise grading procedures may vary, and one student may encounter a permissive adviser while another may have an adviser who is more directive. The ways in which these several relationships intertwine and interact with students and faculty alike determines the total environment. The desire to determine the university's campus climate was, therefore, a significant factor in the decision to undertake an environmental study.

Secondly, the determination of whether an institution is perceived differently by student subgroups and how the climate is viewed by such subgroups is of importance. Is a university comprised of several environments as Pace suggests? If so, what is the significance of this for the teaching faculty member and the student personnel worker. The concern for the teacher is one of knowing how the student perceives the scholastic or intellectual climate within his major field and the university in general, and whether this differs from perceptions of students in other areas of study. The student personnel worker needs to concern himself with students in various living areas and how they respectively view the university environment. If perceptions are significantly different, this may be an

indicator of the types of programs, services, and counseling that should be made available to certain living areas. In any event, the total university staff should know whether they are working with a student body which perceives the environment somewhat similarly or in many different ways. This information must be known and understood in order to work effectively in providing students with the most desirable educational experiences.

A third factor of significance for such a study was the gathering of information for purposes of institutional self-evaluation. Do student perceptions of the campus environment coincide with the stated aims and objectives of the university? When new programs and facilities are introduced on the campus, is there a method for gathering information to help determine whether environmental perceptions of the campus more nearly approach the established institutional goals? Do certain student subgroups need more attention than others in helping them gain the greatest benefit from the college experience? Should staff members know how the students perceive the campus climate in order to better understand the university, and to motivate a desire for alteration of the environment if necessary? The underlying theory here is that institutional climate can be altered and changed. However, there must be continuing evaluation of the campus environment in order to determine student perceptions at any given time.

Overview

The subject of institutional research was introduced in this first chapter. More specifically, attention was focused upon institutional research with regard to the study of campus climate. The chapter content included specific sections on the purpose of the study, formulation of study design, and the significance of the study.

In an effort to fully understand the historical development of interest in campus environmental studies, the creation of instruments or procedures to measure and assess campus climate, and the significant studies of institutional environment, it was necessary to review the research on this topic. In Chapter II, a review of the literature will be presented. The emphasis will be upon bringing together all relevant research and then relating it to the study being reported.

One of the features of the study is the assessment of campus climate at a school moving from a single purpose to a multi-purpose function. A description of the university is therefore in order. In Chapter III, the origin, the original purpose, the various stages of development, and the present status of the university will be discussed. In addition, a profile of the student body will be presented.

The design of the study will be extensively discussed in Chapter IV. The sample, collection of data, instrument used, validity and reliability of the instrument, hypotheses to be tested, and statistical treatment of the data will be covered. In Chapter V, the analysis of the results will be presented along with a discussion of results.

The summary and conclusions will be presented in the final chapter, Chapter VI. Here, the various aspects of the study will be summarized and the findings discussed. The relevance of the findings and implications for future research will be included in Chapter VI.

Chapter I - References

1. Nevitt Sanford. The American College. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York. 1962.

2. Henry S. Dyer. "Can Institutional Research Lead to a Science of Institutions." The Educational Record. Fall, 1966. p. 452.

3. Philip E. Jacob. Changing Values in College. Harper & Brothers: New York. 1957. p. 11.

4. Edward Eddy. The College Influence on Student Character. American Council on Education: Washington, D.C. 1959.

5. Huston Smith. The Purposes of Higher Education. p. 187.

6. C. Robert Pace, "Implications of Differences in Campus Atmosphere for Evaluation and Planning of College Programs." Personality Factors on the Campus. The Hogg Foundation: Austin, Texas. 1962. p. 45.

7. Alexander W. Astin and John L. Holland. "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 52. No. 6. Dec., 1961. pp. 308-316.

8. Alexander W. Astin. Who Goes Where To College. Science Research Associates, Inc.: Chicago. 1965.

9. Henry S. Dyer. op. cit. p. 463.

10. C. Robert Pace. The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College University Environments. Cooperative Research Project D. 1083. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. University of California, Los Angeles: Los Angeles, California. 1964.

11. Martin Trow. "Student Cultures and Administrative Action." Personality Factors on the Campus. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health: University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1962.

12. C. Robert Pace. College and University Environment Scales. Preliminary Technical Manual. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1963.

Chapter II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Genesis of Environmental Studies

Explorations in the field of campus environment were pioneered by George Stern and C. Robert Pace in the latter part of the 1950's. The work of Pace and Stern resulted in the formation of the College Characteristics Index (hereafter referred to as CCI) which was based on H. A. Murray's needs-press taxonomy developed in 1938.[1,2] Basically, Murray introduced a system of classifying both the environmental pressures and the ways in which the individual strives to structure the environment for himself in light of his needs. "Both needs and press are inferred from characteristic activities and events, the former from the things that the individual typically does, and the latter from things that are typically done to him in some particular setting."[3]

The CCI, utilizing Murray's needs-press concept, is a measure of thirty kinds of press describing the activities, policies, procedures, attitudes, and impressions that may characterize various types of undergraduate settings.[4] The strategy of analysis for the CCI is individually oriented. That is, the emphasis is upon understanding the press upon the individual in relation to his needs. The thirty environmental press scales of the CCI are related specifically to the thirty personality need scales of the Stern Activities Index.[5] The CCI is thus closely related to the personality of the individual.

A second strategy of analysis of the need-press concept led Pace to develop the College and University Environment Scales (hereafter referred to as CUES).[6] Pace describes this second strategy as an "educational sociological" approach in which the characteristics of institutions rather than individuals are the primary concern. "The

focus is on looking for patterns which best characterize environments, and, for this purpose, the unit of analysis is the college, not the individual."[7]

Astin, in his work with the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, developed what he calls the Environmental Assessment Technique (hereafter referred to as EAT).[8,9,10] The EAT utilizes "input" and "output" factors to determine institutional climate. The assumption is that the environment of an institution can be determined by assessing the input factors (characteristics of the entering students) and the output factors (number and type of degree holders produced by the institution). Astin's scales of the EAT are eight in number and reflect numerical data about the institution. The scales are: (1) Estimated Selectivity, (2) Size of the institution, (3) Personal Orientation, (4) Scientific Orientation, (5) Social Orientation, (6) Conventional Orientation, (7) Enterprising Orientation, and (8) Artistic Orientation. These last six scales are based on types of degrees offered in specified areas of study.[11]

By factor analysis, Astin determined six factors differentiating students: (1) Intellectualism, (2) Estheticism, (3) Status, (4) Leadership, (5) Pragmatism, and (6) Masculinity.[12] By relating the six differential factors with the eight "input" variables, an institutional profile is established. An inherent weakness of the Environmental Assessment Technique is that it does not take into account environmental variables within the institution. The EAT may be helpful in assisting the prospective student in determining which orientation of the school is dominant; but it has little value in institutional evaluation and self-study in determining the differences in campus climate as institutions change.

Of more recent origin in the field of environment assessment is the

development of the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (hereafter referred to as TAPE) by Pervin.[13] The theoretical rationale for the development of the TAPE questionnaire is that "human behavior can be best understood in terms of interactions or transactions between the individual and his environment."[14] The kinds of analysis for which TAPE was intended include: (a) comparisons of different college environments, (b) analysis of sources of conflict or strain within a college environment, and (c) the analysis of individual performance and satisfaction as a function of "Student x College" interaction.[15] The purpose of TAPE appears comprehensive in scope and may be attempting to do too many things with one instrument. To date no research has been found which utilizes the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment approach.

Of the above mentioned environmental assessment instruments, the CCI and the CUES have been most frequently utilized in assessing institutional climate. Recent research has relied more heavily on the usage of the CUES.

Results of Prior Environmental Studies

Since the development of the CCI and CUES, there have been several studies utilizing these instruments. None of these studies have included the several relationships explored in the present research being reported, but some have covered at least one or more relationships. Some studies have explored facets of campus environment that are not related to the relationships of the present study and are mentioned at the conclusion of this section.

Expectations vs. Perceptions of Institutional Climate. An area of exploration for several researchers has been one of determining whether expectations of students prior to entering college are consistent with

those of students presently enrolled or with their own perceptions after they have been on the campus for a period of time. Pace, in one study, selected seniors from three Los Angeles high schools and asked them to answer the CUES according to what they expected would be true of college. A similar group was asked to answer in view of what they hoped would be true. Both sets of answers - the expected and the ideal - were nearly identical. Furthermore, both groups differed substantially from the actual profiles of the colleges they hoped to enter.[16]

In another study by Pace, incoming freshmen at a junior college, two small liberal arts colleges, and two large universities were given the CUES during orientation week. Their responses were compared with those of upperclassmen from each institution. The differences between the freshmen and upperclassmen were substantial--especially on the scholarship, awareness, and community scales.[17] (See Appendix I for a description of the scales).

At the University of Minnesota, Berdie tested entering freshmen and found that scores on all five scales of the CUES decreased from the time of expectations testing prior to entering college and the time of perceptions testing after the sophomore year.[18] In making analyses six months following entrance into the university, Berdie concluded that changes in CUES scores were not related to students' place of residence or method of transportation to the campus. Changes in scores were related, however, to participation in some college activities. Participants in college activities showed less decline in scores than did non-participants. Correlations of test-retest prior to college and in the spring were significant for all five scales of the CUES.[19]

At Brigham Young University, in an earlier study using the CCI,

Standing and Parker found that: (1) differences existed between entering students and sophomores in their perceptions of the campus environment, (2) perceptions of the expected university environment were no different for non-area residents than for those who resided in the immediate university locale, and (3) students who drop out and students who persist perceive the environment similarly prior to entrance.[20] Also utilizing the CCI, Johnson and Krupius, at the University of North Dakota, reported that students' perceptions of the intellectual climate decline over the two year period of the freshman year to junior year. In an unpublished study at the University of North Dakota, reported by the same authors, Myers and Kranzler found that freshmen perceived a significantly greater intellectual press than upperclassmen.[21]

Kaelke, in a study at Michigan State University using the CUES, discovered that community college transfer students entered the four year institution with expectations of a greater emphasis upon Awareness and Scholarhsip when compared to "native" junior students' perceptions of these characteristics of the "real" environment.[22] The junior college transfer, it appears, has somewhat the same level of expectation as the incoming freshman when entering a four year institution.

From the studies reported, it is evident that incoming students have perceptions of the environment that differ from those of students who are presently at the institution, and that their perceptions will change after they have been in the institution for a period of time. Worthy of mention is the fact that most of the studies in this section noted that intellectual climate was perceived as being much greater prior to entering college. This could be attributed to the fact that the anxiety in regard to academic work is quite high and the image of the college or university as an intellectual environment is magnified by both institutional and non-institutional sources.

Environmental Climate as Related to Achievement Level. Is the academic or intellectual climate, or the total environment perceived differently by students of different achievement or ability levels? A few research studies have been directed toward answering this question.

Baker,[23] in a study at Wisconsin State University, River Falls, compared honors freshmen (those who elected an honors program) with non-honors freshmen (those who did not elect or were not chosen for an honors program) using the CCI. He found in his comparisons differences on six of the thirteen factors of the CCI which led Baker to conclude that the learning environments within the same institution differ for honors as compared to non-honors students. If an honors program includes enriched courses, special seminars, more personal faculty advising and involvement, coupled with a highly motivated group of students, the environment will no doubt be perceived differently by honors students because it is, in fact, a different environment.

At Indiana University, Bodelson[24] studied the environmental perceptions of high ability overachieving, high ability underachieving, low ability overachieving, and low ability underachieving freshmen using the CUES. Essentially, the study determined that high ability students perceive the environment differently from low ability students. High ability students perceived the environment as being less practical, less friendly and cohesive, and less academically oriented. Low ability overachieving students perceived the environment as providing more social, political, and cultural stimulation than did their peers in other groups. Although freshmen were used, they were tested in the latter part of the academic year which would tend to eliminate the problem of changing perceptions prior to and after living within the collegiate environment.

Bodelson reported that high ability students perceived their environment as being less academic than did low ability students. Davis,[25] in a study of intellectual climate at 135 colleges and universities, concluded that perceptual contrast was evident when students with high grades gave lower estimates of the intellectuality of their campus than did students with poorer grades. In the same vein, Centra,[26] in a study of Honors College and other high ability students at Michigan State University, found that student groups with the highest grade point averages rated the University lowest in perceived intellectuality.

One conclusion to be drawn from the results of the above studies is that high ability or high achieving students are more critical of the academic or intellectual environment than are low ability or low achieving students. The one exception was in Baker's study of honors and non-honors freshmen where it appeared that the honors students were involved in a special program. How can the environment be enriched in such a way as to bring about a heightened intellectual climate? Can special programs be instituted which will increase the academic stimulation not only for high ability or high achieving students, but for other groups as well? Certainly the research in this area should lead to questions regarding the particular type of climate provided for college students.

Environment as Related to Student Housing. Do students perceive their environment in relation to where they live while at school? Is the place of residency one of the several environments to which Pace refers? In order to answer such questions, one must evaluate the differences in perceptions of students living in the various types of housing.

In a comprehensive study in the State of California, Lindahl compared the seven state colleges in California using the CUES.[27] The

primary factor in his comparisons was the percentage of residential students on each campus. The percentage of residential students as compared to non-residential students had a great effect on the perceived institutional climate. The greater the proportion of residents, the more likely it was that students perceived the environment as being characterized by Practicality and Community with a lack of emphasis on Awareness and Scholarship. The most distinct relationship was the negative correlation between high residential population and an emphasis on academic achievement and intellectual discipline.

When comparing commuter students, by use of the CUES, with residential students at two commuter colleges in California, Lindahl[28] again found significant differences. The residents reported over twice as much emphasis as the commuters on loyalty, friendliness, and a feeling of togetherness with just the opposite being true for the qualities of politeness and consideration. The commuters considered aesthetics and personal enrichment much more characteristic of their environment than did the residents. The residents, indicating an emphasis on practical benefits and organizational elements, and a moderate emphasis on a quest for knowledge and intellectual discipline, viewed the campus differently from commuters who saw more of an emphasis on intellectual discipline and less of an emphasis upon practicality.

Using the College Characteristics Index, Baker[29] compared residence hall students, boarding house students, and students residing at home. The greatest differences in perceptions occurred when comparing boarding house students and students residing at home. The fewest differences occurred in comparing residence hall students with boarding house students. Gelso and Sims,[30] in a study using the CUES, cite the Baker study as supportive of their own findings that a person's location and position

in an institution significantly affects some of his perceptions of the characteristics of that institution. This conclusion by Gelso and Sims seems somewhat hasty, however, since they actually found more differences between faculty and students than between commuter students and residential students.

In Berdie's study at the University of Minnesota, where he tested students prior to entrance and again after six months, he found that changes in CUES scores were not related to students' place of residence.[31] In a report of studies using the CUES, Pace reports that when comparing residents and commuters the perceptions are basically similar.[32]

The findings of studies comparing students by place of residence at school appear to be mixed. Percentage of students in residence appears to affect the total environmental perception profile. In schools that are considered commuter colleges, there are definite differences reported by the commuters and the students in residence. At the University of Minnesota, however, a "multiversity" with a large commuter enrollment, changes in perception did not appear to be related to place of residence. Judgment must be reserved before generalizing as to whether one's occupancy in the several areas of student housing has an effect upon the total perceptions of the campus environment.

Major Field of Study and Relationship to Campus Environment. In a U. S. Office of Education study,[33] Pace proposed three hypotheses. Two of the three hypotheses speak directly to the relationships of the major area of study for the student and his perception of the campus environment. As stated by Pace, these hypotheses are:

> 1. The press from the academic and student subculture with which the student identifies will be more influential on the student's attainment, satisfaction with college, and sense of progress toward relevant objectives,

than the press from the college or university as a whole.

3. The educational impact of the college or university will be related to the proportion of its students who identify with academic and student subcultures which support the major objectives of the school.[34]

By comparing perceptions of press of major field with perceptions of total environmental press at several colleges and universities along the continuum of small to large, Pace was able to put his hypotheses to the test. Bennington, Swarthmore, and Antioch students perceived the environment similarly regardless of the academic field or other subculture identities. At St. Olaf College, a number of significant differences occurred between academic field and composite environment. In a middle sized institution, Eastern Washington State University, the number of divergent subcultures determined was greater than the number found in the smaller liberal arts colleges.

In a study done at a major, complex university, Centra[35] compared students' major field perceptions and total perceptions by using the CUES. One of his major findings was that students enrolled in different academic fields within a complex university had diverse perceptions of academic dimensions of the total environment. The results also indicated that students' perceptions of the total setting are generally related to students' perceptions of their academic discipline. The differences found, particularly on the Scholarship scale of the CUES, indicate that no one college within the university should be chosen to represent student perceptions of the total environment. In addition, the differences indicate that variations of perception within a large university may be as great as variations between separate institutions, and that the variations within could provide important information about the internal major field or college influences of the university.

The results in this area of investigation seem to show that smaller, single-purpose institutions have an environment that is dominant and is not greatly affected by the press of a particular major field of study. The larger the institution, however, the more probable it is that the major area of study constitutes an environment unto itself that may well have an effect on the perceptions of the total institution.

Faculty-Student Perceptions of Environmental Press. Some investigations have sought to determine if differences exist between faculty and students in their perceptions of the institutional climate.

Ivey, et.al.[36], used the College Characteristics Index (CCI) in their study of campus climate at Colorado State University. They found that significant differences existed between students, student personnel staff, and head resident advisers regarding their perceptions of the campus environment. Generally, students perceived the environment as possessing a greater degree of the environmental characteristics valued by the academic community (i.e., aspirational level, intellectual climate, and academic achievement) than did the other groups. The writers hypothesized that this may reflect the lack of involvement of head residents and student personnel staff with students in activities directly related to academic life. Furthermore, the authors suggest, these and other differences in perception may indicate that head residents and student personnel staff are primarily involved with atypical groups of students and with selected aspects of the collegiate milieu. This study may have significant ramifications for the student personnel worker, especially if the same conclusions are reached on other campuses.

Using the College and University Environment Scales at a school somewhat smaller than Colorado State University, McPeek[37] compared student, faculty, and administrators' perceptions of the campus climate at Milliken

University. In analyzing her data, McPeek determined that returning students, faculty members, and administrators had strikingly similar perceptions of the environment of the university and of their ideal university. New students and faculty members also generally agreed on the real and ideal environments. Where differences did occur, the majority were in regard to responses indicating an "ideal" campus climate.

In a previously cited study, Gelso and Sims[38] compared commuters, residents, and faculty perceptions of a junior college on the five scales of the CUES. They reported that small differences existed between the faculty and student groups on the Practicality scale, and between the faculty and the residents on the Awareness scale. Larger differences were found between the faculty group and the student groups on the Community scale. The faculty perceived the environment as containing more of the community dimensions than either of the student groups. Finally, the commuters and the faculty perceived the environment as containing significantly more propriety than did the residents. Obviously, whether the individual belonged to the faculty, was a resident student, or was a commuter student affected his perception of the campus environment.

Boyer and Michael,[39] in a recent article on faculty-student perceptions, indicated they were unable to find any noteworthy empirical studies in which differences in the perceptions of faculty and student groups regarding college environments had been reported. They therefore embarked on a study of their own. The authors' purpose for undertaking the investigation is cited as follows:

> (1) To present comparative data derived from the CUES instrument for groups of faculty members and corresponding groups of senior students at seven small religiously-oriented liberal arts

> colleges affiliated with the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC),
>
> (2) to formulate certain highly tentative generalizations concerning the perceived environmental features of these small colleges, and
>
> (3) to compare the environmental dimensions of the CUES as perceived by college seniors in these religiously-oriented colleges with the perceptions of students attending four other well known institutions.[40]

The findings reported were that: (1) faculty and seniors at all seven religiously-oriented colleges perceived the campus climate with no differences on all five scales, and (2) small religiously-oriented schools score high on community and propriety. This last finding, alongwith the third purpose of the study, represents information relative to institutional comparisons which will be covered in a later section. Basically, the similarity of the faculty-student responses at the seven small, religiously oriented, liberal arts colleges and the findings of the Milliken University study would seem to indicate some homogeneity existing in the smaller college in regard to faculty-student perceptions of the environment.

Campus Leaders and Environmental Perceptions. In relating perceptions of campus environment to involvement in a leadership capacity on the college campus, only one study of significance was found. The study referred to was a comprehensive one done at Indiana University by Winborn.[41]

The Winborn study was undertaken in order to determine whether leaders of social-political action groups had different perceptions of the campus from those of leaders of other types of groups. Because of unrest nationally and at Indiana University, the study was an attempt to gather pertinent information that might contribute to a better understanding of all aspects of the unrest situation. Also included with leaders of social-political action groups were leaders of religious organizations,

university residence halls, socio-activity groups, and fraternal groups. All leader groups were administered the CUES and mean scores were computed and compared.

The results of the Winborn study in regard to environmental perceptions are reported as follows:

> Mean scores of social-political action groups differed significantly from those of referent groups on four of the five scales of the CUES. Their mean scores differed significantly on the Community and Awareness scales from leaders of all comparative groups. On the Scholarship scale, their mean scores differed significantly from those of leaders of three of the four referent groups. A significant statistical difference was observed on the Practicality scale only between the mean score of social-political action leaders and leaders of fraternal organizations.
>
> The significant differences observed between leaders of social-political action groups and leaders of all other referent groups on the Community and Awareness scales indicates that social-political action leaders tend to perceive the environment of the Indiana University campus as being less friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented, than do leaders of referent groups. They do not view the environment as promoting a university-wide feeling of group welfare and loyalty to the same degree as other group leaders.
>
> Leaders of social-political action groups seem to have a different perception of environmental emphasis on personal, poetic, and political understanding. When compared with leaders of other group categories, they perceive less emphasis at Indiana University on self-understanding, poetic appreciation, and understanding of the condition of man in world situations.
>
> Leaders of social-political action groups and socio-activity groups tend to perceive the scholastic environment at Indiana University in similar ways. However, social-political action leaders scored significantly lower on the Scholarship scale than did leaders of religious organizations, residence halls, and fraternal groups. Leaders of social-political

> action groups tend to view the university environment as placing less emphasis on high academic achievement and in promoting a serious interest in scholarship than do leaders of referent groups.
>
> Social-political action leaders differed significantly only from fraternal leaders on the Practicality scale. According to these results, fraternal leaders perceive the campus environment as having a practical, instrumental emphasis. Leaders of social-political action groups do not place as much importance upon procedures, personal status, and practical benefits in the university environment.[42] (See Appendix A for a description of the five scales of the CUES)

As can be seen from these results, the leaders of various university groups differed significantly in their perceptions of campus environment. The diversity is great and definitely points to a heterogeneity of values among group leaders at Indiana. There were no comparisons made with non-leaders or non-involved students, but it would seem likely that here again a diversity in opinion regarding campus climate would be present.

The previous sections have reported the past research on environmental studies which are related to the present study, with the exception of the section on Expectations vs. Perceptions of Institutional Climate. The non-related area was included as a point of departure to give some frame of reference for knowing how a campus climate is usually perceived prior to entrance and again after a period of time at the institution. There have been other studies of campus climate, but because they are not uniquely related to the present investigation they will not be included here. Studies which investigated the relationship of environment to personality, environment to productivity, periods of controversy on the campus and related changes in perception, and perceptions of experimental colleges with those of "main" college students are examples of additional areas of research.

Since the assessment of climate in its entirety is one concern, the following section is devoted to comparisons of campus climate and characteristics of the climate of certain types of institutions. The questions to be raised before reporting the following information are: What factors contribute to creating the particular climate; is the climate as perceived consistent with the stated objectives of the institution; and, can the climate be altered or changed if such an alteration or change is desired?

Institutional Comparisons and Characteristics

One of the earliest studies of total institutional climate reports information which was used in establishing data for the College Characteristics Index. Pace and Stern selected thirty-two institutions as a normative sample for the CCI. This sample included liberal arts colleges (highly selective and relatively unselective, nonsectarian and denominational), universities (public and private), and various professional schools (education, engineering, and business) some separate and some a part of larger universities. In comparing like institutions, the correlations among seven private, nonsectarian liberal arts colleges ranged from +.93 to +.01; among seven small, denominational liberal arts colleges from +.78 to -.35; among seven large universities, both public and private, from +.87 to -.13; among four engineering schools from +.64 to +.10; among three teacher training schools from +.71 to -.35; among six institutions located in the southeast from +.82 to -.75; and among four New England Colleges from +.72 to -.80. As can be observed, comparing institutions of a similar nature yields different results of the perceived environment. Pace states that the two major factors which account for most differences

among college environments are the intellectual sphere and the social sphere.[43]

In a similar study of five environments,[44] Pace again indicated that the two major factors which accounted for most of the differences among college environments are the intellectual and the social. The intellectual dimension runs along a continuum from a high stress on abstract, theoretical, scholarly understanding to a high stress on practical status-oriented concerns. The social dimension ranges from a high stress on group welfare to a rebellion against group like. These characteristics, intellectual and social, in two studies reported by Pace, affected the total environment in one direction or another.

Pursuing the intellectual factor even further, Stern,[45] in a study dealing with responses of more than 1000 students in twenty-three colleges, found that the intellectual climate of an institution is closely related to the quality of its student body and to their later academic achievements. Correlations between the Intellectual Climate Score on the CCI and other measures are as follows; percentage of graduates receiving Ph.D. (.76); College Board Scores SAT-V means (.83); and the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test means (.71).[46] Describing the Scholarly atmosphere, Stern states:

> Schools with a high intellectual climate score tend to emphasize scholarly interests as an end in themselves, and also provide richer cultural opportunities. Relationships between students and faculty are more intimate and less likely to be confined to bureaucratic details. The low scoring schools on the other hand are technically oriented, non-cultural institutions. The academic process is more narrowly and tightly organized, and there is evidence of a greater separation between the student peer culture and the academic community. The low schools would appear to be more compartmentalized, less integrated organizations.[47]

In a review of research on college environments, Michael and Boyer[48] categorize colleges and cite their distinguishing characteristics. They report that three distinct types of colleges have merged from comparing profiles of environmental press. These types are: (1) the denominational colleges with marked emphasis on conformity, constraint, and dependence; (2) the small private liberal arts colleges shown to have highest standing on the intellectual press as well as a high emphasis on personal autonomy; and (3) the colleges described by their students as sources of social pleasure and togetherness.[49]

Most of the colleges high in intellectual climate--the so-called institutions of academic excellence--were found to be relatively small, residential, and expensive private liberal arts colleges in which (1) a strong general education program was in existence; (2) stress was placed on scholarly activities and hard work; (3) personal autonomy, nonconformity, and intellectual freedom for both students and faculty were highly valued and respected; (4) professors were available to talk with students informally and to encourage them; and (5) cultural activities and intellectually oriented events were numerous and well attended. Colleges that stood low in intellectual climate were largely public institutions in which (1) the orientation was toward practical and vocational curricula rather than toward intellectual or cultural activities as ends in themselves, although the prevailing attitude was not necessarily anti-intellectual; (2) propriety in social relationships and in patterns of conduct was closely observed; (3) opportunities for extracurricular activities were numerous; (4) considerable organizational, bureaucratic emphasis on such matters as class attendance and departmentalization of the curricula existed; and (5) the separation between the peer culture and the academic community was relatively well defined.[50]

Hassenger and Weiss,[51] in a study of campus climate at Catholic colleges using both the CCI and the CUES, found that such schools seem to place a greater emphasis on social awareness and politeness than on academic excellence and scholarship. On the specific scales of the CUES, Catholic colleges were typically high in Community and Propriety and low in Awareness and Scholarship. The writers expressed regret that there is a "blindness" in such instruments as the CCI and the CUES in that they do not assess the moral and spiritual impact of the college on the student. This, they feel, leaves an important area of human life--and one of special concern for the value oriented school--unexamined.

Two studies that have been reported previously also discuss aspects of total institutional environment and institutional comparisons. In the Boyer and Michael study[52] at seven small religiously-oriented liberal arts colleges, it was discovered that such schools score high on the Community and Propriety scales of the CUES and low on Awareness and Scholarship. The profile of these religiously-oriented schools is nearly identical to that of the Catholic colleges previously reported in the Hassenger-Weiss study. The Lindahl study compared the seven state colleges of California and reported that the percentage of resident students affected the perception of the environmental press.[53] The most distinct relationship was a high residential population correlating negatively with emphasis on academic achievement and intellectual discipline. This is contrary to the Michael and Boyer conclusion that the small expensive and residential, private, liberal arts schools were high in intellectual climate.

Summary

The information in Chapter II has been pertinent and germane to the field of environmental studies and to the present research being reported.

Three sections titled (1) Genesis of Environmental Studies; (2) Results of Prior Environmental Studies; and (3) Institutional Comparisons and Characteristics comprised the major areas which were reviewed.

The first campus environment studies were designed by George Stern and C. Robert Pace using an instrument which they devised and labeled the College Characteristics Index (CCI). Later, Pace developed the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) to be used in assessing campus environment. A different instrument used in the study of institutional climate, The Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) was developed by Astin through his work with the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. A fourth type of environment assessment instrument, the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) was designed by Pervin. Of the various assessment tools, the most useful and prevalent are the CCI and the CUES.

Several studies dealing with campus climate which relate to the current investigation were reviewed in addition to studies which compared perceptions of climate prior to entering school and perceptions of the climate after "living" for a period of time in the college setting. Such information was reported in order to give a base or frame of reference to the broader area of studies of institutional climate.

Generally, the research on campus environment has shown that: "before-after" type studies find that perceptions of campus climate are significantly different prior to entrance in college and after a period of time at school; high ability or high achieving students were more critical of the academic climate of their institution than were low ability or low achieving students; one's place of residence seems to have some bearing on the perceptions of the environment in that residential students have somewhat different perceptions from commuter students;

percentage of residential students at a college or university affects the profile of environmental perceptions, i.e., the more residential students, the lower the perceived intellectual press; major field of study affects the perception of climate on a larger campus but appears to have little significance at the small single-purpose institution; faculty-student perceptions are linked to size of institution with the differences occurring in the larger schools; and student leaders, at a large institution, appear to differ in their perceptions of campus environment.

Based on the results reported, it can be concluded that perceptions of the campus climate do vary. The single most predominant factor affecting diversity of perceptions is size. A small school, having basically a single purpose or curricular pattern, is more likely to have student subgroups perceive the environment in similar fashion. The larger institution which is multi-purpose in nature is likely to have student subgroups who perceive the environment differently. In general, the larger schools do have several environments whereas the smaller schools have one generally dominant environment.

Institutions also differ from one another in regard to overall climate. The two factors which account for most differences in institutional environments are the intellectual factor and the social factor. The most obvious findings indicate that small, religiously-oriented (both Catholic and Protestant) schools are characterized by a high degree of friendliness, cohesiveness and properness and a low degree of intellectual activity and esthetic interest whereas the small, non-denominational, highly selective college is characterized by a strong emphasis on intellectual pursuits and cultural activity with personal autonomy and nonconformity prevalent. Generalizations about

other types of institutions are not as easily made. Any school, by being religious or non-denominational, public or private, single-purpose or multi-purpose, residential, or non-residential, will have certain features which may have an effect on the total environment.

In Chapter II, the literature reported has been relevant to environmental studies and to the present investigation. Before reporting the design of the study and the analysis of the data it is in order to describe the school at which the current investigation was conducted. In this way, the reader will have an overview of environmental studies in the context of institutional research and information regarding the university used in the research project.

Chapter II - References

1. George C. Stern. "Characteristics of the Intellectual Climate in College Environment." Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 33. No. 1. Winter, 1963. pp. 5-41.

2. George C. Stern. "Environment for Learning." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 690-730.

3. Stern. Harvard Educational Review. p. 6.

4. Stern. The American College. pp. 706-708.

5. C. Robert Pace. College and University Environment Scales. Preliminary Technical Manual. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1963.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p. 8.

8. Alexander W. Astin. Who Goes Where to College. Science Research Associates, Inc.: Chicago. 1965.

9. Alexander W. Astin. "Further Validation of the Environmental Assessment Technique." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 54. No. 4. August, 1963. pp. 217-226.

10. Alexander W. Astin and John L. Holland. "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 52. No. 6. December, 1961. pp. 308-316.

11. Astin. Who Goes Where to College. pp. 55-56.

12. Ibid., p. 20.

13. Lawrence Pervin. "A Twenty-College Study of Student X College Interaction using TAPE (Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment): Rationale, Reliability, and Validity." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 58. No. 5. October, 1967. pp. 296-302.

14. Ibid., p. 290.

15. Ibid., p. 291.

16. C. Robert Pace. "When Students Judge Their College." College Board Review. No. 58. Winter, 1965-66. pp. 26-28.

17. Ibid.

18. Ralph F. Berdie. "Changes in University Perceptions During the First Two College Years." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 2. March, 1968. pp. 85-89.

19. Ralph F. Berdie. "College Expectations, Experiences, and Perceptions." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 7. No. 6. Nov. 1966. pp. 336-344.

20. G. Robert Standing and Clyde A. Parker. "The College Characteristics Index as a Mesure of Entering Students Preconceptions of College Life." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 6. No. 1. October, 1964.

21. Richard W. Johnson and Dr. Wayne J. Krupius. "A Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Study of Student's Perceptions of their College Environment." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 8. No. 3. May, 1967.

22. Michael E. Kaelke. A study of the Influence of Selected Orientation Programs on the Environmental Perceptions of Community College Transfer Students Attending Michigan State University. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University: East Lansing. 1967.

23. Sheldon R. Baker. "A Comparative Study of Perceptions of a University Between Honor and Nonhonor Freshman Groups." Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 26. No. 4. Winter, 1966. pp. 973-976.

24. Gerald R. Bodelson. Environmental Perceptions of Freshman College Students as Related to Selected Ability and Achievement Levels. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University: Bloomington, 1967.

25. James A. Davis. "Intellectual Climates in 135 American Colleges and Universities: A Study in Social Psychophysics." Sociology of Education. Vol. 37. Winter, 1963. pp. 110-128.

26. John A. Centra. A Study of Honors College and Other High Ability Students at Michigan State University. Unpublished Office Report, Office of Institutional Research: Michigan State University. 1964.

27. Charles Lindahl. "Impact of Living Arrangements on Student Environmental Perceptions." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 8. No. 1. January, 1967. pp. 10-15.

28. Ibid.

29. S. R. Baker. "The Relationship Between Student Residence and Perception of Environmental Press." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 7. No. 4. July, 1966. pp. 222-224.

30. Charles J. Gelso and David M. Sims. "Perceptions of a Junior College Environment." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 1. January, 1968. pp. 40-43.

31. Berdie. Journal of College Student Personnel. November, 1966. op. cit. p. 339.

32. C. Robert Pace. Comparisons of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1966.

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

34. Ibid., p. 20.

35. John A. Centra. Student Perceptions of Total University and Major Field Environments. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Michigan State University: East Lansing. 1965.

36. Allen E. Ivey, C. Dean Miller, and Arnold D. Goldstein. "Differential Perceptions of College Environment; Student Personnel Staff and Students." The Personnel and Guidance Journal. Vol. 46. No. 1. September, 1967. pp. 17-21.

37. Beth L. McPeek. "The University as Perceived by Its Subculture: An Experimental Study." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Vol. 30. No. 3. Spring, 1967. pp. 129-132.

38. Gelso and Sims. op. cit.

39. Ernest L. Boyer and William B. Michael. "Faculty and Student Assessments of the Environments of Several Small Religiously Oriented Colleges." California Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 19. No. 2. March, 1968. pp. 59-66.

40. Ibid., p. 60.

41. Bob B. Winborn. Some Personal Characteristics of Campus Leaders: A Comparison of Social Political Action Leaders with Four Other Categories of Student Leaders. Unpublished mimeographed manuscript. Indiana University: Bloomington. December 23, 1966.

42. Ibid., p. 126.

43. C. Robert Pace. "Diversity of College Environments." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Vol. 25. No. 1. October, 1961. pp. 21-26.

44. C. Robert Pace. "Five College Environments." College Board Review. No. 41. Spring, 1960. pp. 24-28.

45. George C. Stern. "Characteristics of the Intellectual Climate in College Environments." Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 33. No. 1. Winter, 1963. pp. 5-41.

46. Ibid., p. 15.

47. Ibid., p. 21.

48. William B. Michael and Ernest L. Boyer. "Campus Environment." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 35. No. 4. October, 1965. pp. 264-276.

49. Ibid., p. 266.

50. Ibid., p. 267-268.

51. Robert Hassenger and Robert Weiss. "The Catholic College Climate." The School Review. Vol. 14. No. 4. Winter, 1966. pp. 419-445.

52. Boyer and Michael. California Journal of Educational Research. op. cit.

53. Lindahl. Journal of College Student Personnel. op. cit.

Chapter III
DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION AND ITS STUDENTS

The Institution

In the latter part of the 1890's a movement to establish training schools for the purpose of properly educating those who would become teachers was developing in the State of Illinois. Illinois, by action of the legislature, had established normal schools in the Northern and Eastern sectors of the state in 1895 and "... it soon became apparent that the Western section of the state was not provided with equal advantages for the training of teachers."[1] L. Y. Sherman, a judge and a member of the Illinois General Assembly from the 32nd District, influenced the introduction of a bill to establish a normal school in what was then known as the Western Illinois Military Tract. On April 24, 1899, Governor John R. Tanner signed into law the establishment of Western Illinois State Normal School.[2]

Several years elapsed before the appropriate location, appropriation of sufficient funds, erection of a building, and selection of a President and staff were accomplished. The site of Macomb, Illinois, in the County of McDonough, was selected for the school's location, and John W. Henninger was named as first President. September 23, 1902, was fixed as the opening date for the Western Illinois State Normal School even though only the first floor of the building was completed at the time.[3]

At the time of its opening, Western Illinois State Normal School provided several curricular options for the student. However, no degree programs were available in the initial years of the school. The curricula which were available included:

1) a two year curriculum open to those who had completed a four year high school course or the equivalent.

2) a three year curriculum open to those who had done three

years of high school or the equivalent, or who held first grade certificates from county superintendents.

3) a four year curriculum for those who had done some high school work, or who held second grade certificates from county superintendents.

The two year curriculum provided for seven term credits in Education, including three of teaching in the Training School, seven in science, two in Mathematics, three in English, three in history, three electives, and one each in Music and Drawing.

The other curriculums were expanded downwards to cover high school subjects, and the courses given in these were almost wholly academic in subject matter; whatever of methods was given was embodied in the course as presented.[4]

To provide for practical experience and implementation of educational methods a training school was established. An on-campus laboratory school which includes grades kindergarten through 12, is in existence to the present day.

The Normal School retained its basic nature of teacher training for the first fifteen years. The enactment of the Lindley Law, which required eight years of elementary school and four years high school, brought about some refinements in the pre-college programs. These structural changes in the educational framework created a more well-defined distinction between the Normal School curriculum and couse work which rightly belonged to the high school or academy. This curricular arrangement aided Western Illinois State Normal School in developing three distinct divisions: the Normal School, the Normal Elementary or Practice School, and the Academy or High School.[5]

During the first ten years of operation, Western Illinois State Normal School was administered by three different presidents plus one acting president. In 1912, the naming of Walter P. Morgan as the fifth president of the school marked the beginning of a thirty-year (1912-1942)

administrative reign in which much of the curriculum and physical plan was developed and expanded.

The need for advanced study became evident early in President Morgan's term of office. Efforts in this regard culminated in 1917 when the state legislature approved the establishment of a four year college at the Macomb site.[6] The Normal School was authorized to grant degrees in a most general way. The first degree recipient was awarded the Bachelor of Education degree in 1918.[7,8]

While the state legislature was approving the four year degree program for Western Illinois Normal School, they were simultaneously reorganizing the state-wide educational structure by creating a governing board which was to administer the policies of the five state teacher training institutions. The first board was the "Unit Board" which was later renamed the State Teachers College Board. The schools which were under the direction of the Teachers College Board were experiencing a great amount of growth and increased responsibility. As a result, the normal schools, through the Board, sought college status in the full sense of the word. Responding to this institutional development, the Illinois State Legislature, in 1921, approved of this direction and Western Illinois State Normal School was renamed Western Illinois State Teachers College. This legislation further legalized the four year college program and strengthened the degree granting powers of the institution.[9] From one degree recipient in 1918, the numbers grew to fourteen in 1922 and sixty-six by 1927.[10] Western Illinois State Teachers College was thus fulfilling the need for which it was founded and was making its contribution to the program of higher education in the State of Illinois.

The attainment of teacher college status prompted greater effort in providing a variety of curricular options. Major and minor fields

of study were developed with college departments being divided into the five following groups:

Group 1. English and Foreign Language

Group 2. History and Economics

Group 3. Mathematics, Chemistry and Physics

Group 4. Biology, Agriculture and Geography

Group 5. Music, Physical Education, Commercial Subjects, Drawing and Design, Home Economics, Manual Training and Library Economy.[11]

During the twenty year period, 1921-41, the Teachers College developed and strengthened its entire educational program. During this period there were few changes in actual curricular content but there was heavy emphasis on strengthening existing course offerings and solidifying the organizational structure of the school. Several new positions and offices were created in order to provide more efficient handling of administrative matters. These included an Office of the Registrar, a position of Business Manager, an Office of Research, a position of Director of Public Relations, and a medical and health service. Near the end of this period, President Morgan appointed a committee to study an administrative reorganization of the college with the implied intent of incorporating the faculty into the policy and decision making aspects of the institution. Under the leadership of Walter Morgan, a strong, progressive school was established which provided a firm foundation for future growth.[12]

The retirement of President Morgan in 1941-42 brought Dr. Frank Beu to the helm of Western Illinois State Teachers College. Although a war was in progress and national collegiate enrollments were declining at the time of President Beu's appointment, the Teachers College, with impetus from Morgan's leadership, expanded the curricular offerings to

continue to serve the educational needs of the State of Illinois, and particularly the Western Illinois region. A growing concern of the faculty and administration centered upon the belief that young people whose primary interests were in fields other than teaching were not receiving the maximum educational benefit from the college. To satisfy this need of providing tax-supported facilities to a wider segment of the population, the General College Division was authorized in 1943.[13]

The purpose of the General College Division was to provide "(1) a well-balanced program of general education, (2) a number of pre-professional courses basic to such professions as law, medicine, engineering, dentistry, nursery, etc., and (3) attain short professional courses."[14] Students who enrolled in the General College Division tended to fall into the following groupings:

(1) those students who, at the time they enter college, do not have well defined plans for the future and want personal, educational, and vocational guidance; they may decide to teach or prepare for some other vocation;

(2) those students who want four years of general or liberal arts education; they must transfer to other colleges to complete the degree without teacher education requirements;

(3) those who desire two years of general education as a cultural background in order to live more fruitful and satisfying lives;

(4) those who desire pre-professional courses in preparation for such professions as engineering, medicine, law, denistry, etc.;

(5) those who want short professional courses, such as courses for office workers.[15]

Since every student was required to complete the teacher education requirements for a degree, those students who were enrolled in the general education or liberal arts curriculum tended to transfer to other colleges or universities to complete their degree work. The teacher education curriculum was of

prime importance, but the General Education Division did enable Western Illinois State Teachers College to establish a broader educational purpose.

In that same year, the Teachers College Board also granted to Western the authority to commence graduate studies thus increasing the school's responsibility and opportunity to be of service to the West-Central area of Illinois. Such a program aided administrative officers and teachers in the surrounding school districts who needed to meet the advanced degree requirements of their school boards. The first course work for the Master of Science in Education degree was offered in the summer of 1944 with the first graduate degree being conferred in 1946. Curricular offerings at the graduate level were organized into groupings of: Superintendents and Principals, Secondary School Teachers, Elementary School Teachers, and at a later date a Counseling and Guidance curriculum.[16]

The school continued to diversify, and in 1947 the State Legislature authorized a name change from Western Illinois State Teachers College to that of Western Illinois State College.[17] The institution, by this change, was able to broaden its purposes beyond that of teacher training but yet was hampered by the lack of authorization to grant a Bachelor's degree exclusive of fulfilling the teacher education requirements. Western's greatest need at that time was the permission to confer upon her general education or liberal arts students the Bachelor of Arts degree.

The years which followed were slow ones for Western Illinois State College. The ten year period of 1947-57 was noteworthy for its lack of progress and development. The school lost sight of her proud tradition of development, innovation, and change. In retrospect, the decade of 1947-57 was unfortunate for Western in that it retarded her later development as a fully emerging University.

The State Legislature, in 1957, in evaluating the role and function of higher education institutions in the State of Illinois, approved legislation authorizing for the four teacher training schools in the state the status of "state university." Western Illinois State College, lacking the program to fully implement her function as a state college, was now granted University status. The job ahead was a huge one which had to be met if Western Illinois University was to truly earn the name "University."

To assist Western Illinois University in beginning to fulfill the new challenges, the Teachers College Board, in July, 1957, extended authorization to grant the degree of Bachelor of Science in liberal arts and sciences.[18] A long tradition of the single-purpose function of teacher training had been performed well by Western. It was, however, in an increasingly complex and education conscious society, necessary for Western Illinois University to begin providing broader educational experiences for those students who were interested in careers other than teaching.

The establishment of the Bachelor of Science degree in liberal arts and sciences broadened the liberal arts and pre-professional course offerings. The objectives of the liberal arts and sciences curriculum as established in 1957 were:

1. To give a broad general education as a cultural background for good citizenship and useful living as a member of society.

2. To provide opportunities for specialization and depth of knowledge.

3. To make it possible for students interested in pre-professional education to meet such requirements through the proper choice of a major in liberal arts and sciences.

4. To encourage students to enter the teaching profession by making it easier to transfer from liberal arts and sciences to education, although the student did not originally intend to meet the professional requirements to teach.[19]

The 1957-58 academic year was one of several significant changes for the Western Illinois school. University status was granted, a new degree program was approved, and in mid-year President F. A. Beu resigned from his position. The governing board of Western Illinois University sought new leadership to build the school, the physical plant, and the curricular programs to be deserving of the status of "University" in fact as well as in name.

Two acting presidents carried on the work of the University throughout 1957-58. In the spring of that academic year, A. L. Knoblauch, then President of Morehead State College, Morehead, Minnesota, was named to the Presidency of Western Illinois University effective July 1, 1958.

Progress was slow at the outset of President Knoblauch's term of office since the long-range planning and development of Western Illinois University had been dormant for the preceding ten years. One of the significant events of the first year of tenure for the new president was a "Conference on Academic Goals and Policies."[20] Through this conference the entire faculty was able to share, plan, and begin to implement the academic plans for the future growth of Western Illinois University.

After the inaugural year passed into history, plans for new physical facilities appeared. The decade of the sixties was beginning and a new breath of life was surging into Western Illinois University. A new library, four new classroom buildings, a health center, eight residence halls, married student apartments, a new campus laboratory school, a field house and physical education building, and a student union were

all completed or under construction within the 1960-67 period. Plans for future facilities were drawn and implemented for a Business Building, Education Building, Fine Arts Building, Physical Science Building and additional residence halls and married student apartments. This tremendous upsurge of physical expansion provided for an increased growth of University programs to meet the needs of the greater number of students who came seeking an education at Western Illinois University.

Strides were being made in developing a comprehensive university organizational structure in order to maintain pace with the physical expansion. The construction of facilities indicative of a University was of the highest priority in the first half of the 1960-70 decade. By the mid-point of the decade, however, the priorities included an expanded curricular program. Liberal arts programs or teacher training comprised the sum and substance of Western's curricular offerings until January of 1966 when the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities approved a School of Business with commensurate authority to confer a Bachelor of Business degree. During the 1966-67 academic year, approval was granted to form a School of Applied Science and a School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. In the 1967-68 academic year a School of Fine Arts was recommended and approved. By the end of its ten year history as a University, Western Illinois University had progressed from the point of being primarily a teacher training institute to a multi-purpose university with six undergraduate schools and a graduate school. The decade of 1957-67 was certainly more productive than was the decade of 1947-57. Under the guiding hand of President Knoblauch, Western Illinois University had recaptured some of the same incentive for growth and change which was so prevalent under the leadership of President Morgan.

With the accomplishments of his projected ten year plan in sight, President Knoblauch announced his retirement in the spring of 1967 to become effective August 31, 1968. With the foresight, drive, and determination of President Knoblauch, Western Illinois University grew by great leaps in a short period of time. New eras in the history of Western are yet to come. The dawning of one new period began on September 1, 1968 when John T. Bernhard, formerly Dean of the College of Social Science at Brigham Young University, assumed the presidency of Western Illinois University. Under President Knoblauch Western became a University. Under President Bernhard the challenge is to become a University of excellence.

The Students

The student body of Western Illinois University is comprised primarily of Illinois residents. During the early growing years of the school, the students came from the western Illinois region of the state. As the college grew, young people from a broader geographical area within the state were attracted to Western's Campus. And, as the school attained University status, which included university-level programs, more students from the metropolitan area of Chicago, Peoria, and Springfield came to take advantage of the educational opportunities which were provided. With the commencement of the 1967-68 academic year, enrollment figures revealed that approximately 40% of the freshman class enrollees were from the greater Chicago area. This increase in persons from the greater Chicago metropolitan area raised the total percentage of students from that locale to 35%.

The University, for most of her existence, had predominantly a rural population. A greater influx of metropolitan area students, an International Understanding Program, and increased curricular offerings

all contributed to a changing complexion of the student body. Even with such changes, however, 99% of the students are still from the State of Illinois. The student body, therefore, could not be classified as a diversified one, except in the rural-urban context.

Figures on the ability level of the student indicated a steady increase over the ten year period of 1957-58 to 1967-68. This rise in measured ability level of students appears to be related to the admissions policies of the University. Prior to 1960, Western Illinois University had an "open-door" admissions policy, i.e., any student with a diploma from an accredited high school could be admitted to school upon submission of an application. As it became apparent that more students were seeking admission, and in order to reduce attrition, a "selective" admissions policy was adopted by the University for the 1960-61 academic year. By incorporating such a policy, the overall academic quality of the student body increased.

A review of the freshman class profiles[21] for the period of 1962 to 1967 reveals the following information:

1962 - 46.6% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

41.6% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

11.8% of entering group ranked in the lower third of their high school class

1963 - 45.7% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

41.2% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

13.2% of entering group ranked in the lower third of their high school class

66.9% of entering group ranked in the upper half of their high school class

ACT mean standard score of entering group was 20

1964 - 51.9% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

48.1% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

78.6% of entering group ranked in the upper half of their high school class

ACT mean standard score of entering group was 22

1965 - 53.6% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

46.4% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

83.5% of entering group ranked in the upper half of their high school class

ACT mean standard score of entering group was 23

1966 - 54.9% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

45.1% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

84.9% of entering group ranked in the upper half of their high school class

ACT mean standard score of entering group was 23

1967 - 58.8% of entering group ranked in the upper third of their high school class

40.0% of entering group ranked in the middle third of their high school class

1.2% of entering group ranked in the lower third of their high school class

91.7% of entering group ranked in the upper half of their high school class

ACT mean standard score of entering group was 23

As a result of this selective admissions process, students of increasingly higher ability were being admitted to Western Illinois University. The changing complexion of the student body drawing from a wider geographical area and from higher ability levels, coupled with increasingly complex organizational structure, is likely to alter the environment of the campus and thus the perceptions of the campus climate per se.

Summary

Western Illinois University was founded as Western Illinois State Normal School in 1899 by action of the legislature of the State of Illinois. After setting the location of the school in McDonough County, City of Macomb, the state opened the doors of the normal school in September of 1902.

Western Illinois State Normal School was basically a two-year teacher training institute for the first fifteen years. Elementary and high school curricular programs were provided through the training school program.

The first ten years of operation were supervised by three different presidents and one acting president. In 1912, Walter P. Morgan was appointed to the presidency and served in that position for thirty years. He helped to guide the normal school's development into a full-fledged teachers college with a variety of curricular offerings.

In 1917, Western Illinois State Normal School was granted authorization, by a legislative act, to confer degrees thus establishing a legitimate four year college program. Four years later, in 1921, the school was renamed Western Illinois State Teachers College.

The twenty year period of 1921-41 was one marked primarily by internal changes. By 1943, the college was prepared to enter into two new programs:

(1) the General College Division, which provided the Teachers College with an opportunity to offer a two year liberal arts program for those not planning on entering teaching; and, (2) a graduate program. The first graduate degrees were conferred in 1946.

In 1947, Western Illinois State Teachers College was granted state college status. After this action the college broadened its scope but was seriously hampered by its lack of authority to grant any degree other than the one in education.

The ten year period of 1947-57 was a slow period for Western Illinois State College.

In 1957, Western Illinois State College again had a name change when the Illinois State Legislature renamed the school Western Illinois University. Along with the newly assigned status as a University, Western Illinois University was granted the authority to confer the degree of Bachelor of Sciences in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The ten year period 1958-68, under the leadership of newly appointed President A. L. Knoblauch, was marked by many changes. The curricular areas were expanded from the former Department of Education into the six schools of: Applied Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Fine Arts, and Health, Physical Education and Recreation. The Graduate School began adding degree programs in the new schools as they were established. Physical facilities doubled in this time period with student residential facilities increasing four-fold.

In 1968 President A. L. Knoblauch retired. John T. Bernhard was appointed President at the time the University was entering a new phase of becoming primarily a senior college with emphasis on the junior, senior, and graduate levels.

The composition of the student body at the Western Illinois school

has always been predominantly comprised of Illinois residents. In the early years, and throughout much of the period prior to 1957, students came mostly from the western Illinois region. When the school achieved University status more students came from the metropolitan area of Chicago but the student enrollment was still comprised of 99% Illinois residents. The rural-urban composition gradually shifted from what was once predominantly a rural school to an approximately 50-50 split of rural-urban with the greater Chicago metropolitan area contributing nearly 40 percent to the student enrollment.

The ability level of the student body has shifted markedly since Western Illinois University instituted a "selective admissions" policy. From a period of time when any student with a high school diploma was eligible to enter Western Illinois University to the 1967-68 academic year when 91.7% of the entering freshmen ranked in the upper half of their high school class, the admissions requirements became increasingly stringent.

The purpose of the institution, the physical size of the institution, and the student body itself have changed down through the years and in all probability will continue to change.

Chapter III - References

1. Samuel B. Hursh: "History of the Western Illinois State Teachers College: First Twenty-five Years." Western Illinois State Teachers College Quarterly. Western Illinois State Teachers College: Macomb, March, 1927. p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

3. Ibid., p. 5-9.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

5. Ibid., p. 14.

6. Western Illinois State College "Golden Anniversary" Western Illinois State College Bulletin. Vol. 29. No. 2. October, 1949.

7. Ibid., p. 17.

8. Hursh. op. cit., p. 21.

9. Western Illinois State College. op. cit. p. 17.

10. Hursh. op. cit., p. 21.

11. Ibid., p. 42.

12. Western Illinois State College. op. cit., pp. 17-25.

13. Ibid., p. 26.

14. Ibid., p. 26.

15. Ibid., p. 26.

16. Ibid., p. 27.

17. Ibid., p. 26.

18. Western Illinois University Bulletin. Undergraduate Catalog 1958-60. Vol. 37. No. 3. January, 1958.

19. Ibid., p. 160.

20. Western Illinois University. Proceedings of the Conference on Academic Goals and Policies. Western Illinois University: Macomb, Illinois. June, 1959.

21. Information obtained from freshman class profiles prepared by the Admissions and Registrar's Office of Western Illinois University.

Chapter IV
DESIGN

The basic methodology used in the research study will be discussed in this chapter. More specifically, this chapter will include sections on the original sample selected; the actual sample derived; procedures involved in data collection; instrumentation; hypotheses to be tested; and statistical treatment of the data.

Original Sample Group

The sample groups selected for this study were students who had attained junior class standing at the end of the 1966-67 academic year. High achieving and low achieving subgroups were selected from this group of junior class students. High achievers were defined as those whose grade point average (hereafter referred to as gpa) was high enough to qualify a student for the Academic Dean's list. The gpa required for this designation is 3.3 on a 4.00 system of grading where A=4.00. Low achievers were defined as those whose gpa was no higher than required to remain in good standing with the university. A minimum grade point average of 2.00 on a 4.00 scale (A=4.00, C=2.00, F=0.00) is required to remain in good standing. Therefore, all junior students who had a grade point average of 2.00 to 2.09 were selected.

The rationale for selecting students who had achieved a junior class standing was: First, junior class students have been on the campus from one term to two years and thus have been a part of the environment long enough to form judgments regarding the environmental impact. Secondly, junior class students, for the most part, have selected a major field of study, and, therefore, by self-choice, have placed themselves in a particular subgroup of the university population. Thirdly, the Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of Illinois[1] has indicated that by the year 1970,

all freshman and sophomore enrollments will become fixed, i.e., the freshman-sophomore enrollment figure in the year 1970, will remain as the basic number for subsequent years. All increased growth following 1970 is to be at the junior, senior and graduate level. Western Illinois University is to move in the direction of becoming primarily a "senior" institution. By using junior class students for the study, data can be compiled on the upperclass student.

In order to determine which students qualified as high or low achieving junior class students, it was necessary to first obtain a listing, by grade point average, of all students who had attained junior class standing at the end of the 1966-67 academic year. There were 107 students who had achieved a gpa of of 3.3 or better. Fifty-eight were females and forty-nine were males. Those who achieved between a 2.00 and 2.09 gpa numbered 106. Thirty-nine of the 106 were females and sixty-seven were males. A total of 213 students were selected for inclusion in the testing program.

Two faculty groups were also chosen to be included in the study of environmental perceptions of the campus. A teaching faculty group was used as well as the student personnel services faculty. The student personnel services faculty was separated from the faculty at large in order to compile data from a faculty group that had student contact on a more informal and one-to-one basis than is true in most classroom teaching situations.

All faculty members, excluding student personnel services faculty, were assigned a number. The Western Illinois University Computer Center took the total amount of numbers and produced a random table of numbers by which faculty were selected for participation. The figure of fifty faculty members out of approximately 400 were selected as an adequate size. All student personnel services faculty were asked to participate in the study. This group included thirty-seven subjects.

Actual Sample

Of the selected sample group, ten high achievers, and twenty-one low achievers were not in school for the 1967-68 academic year. This attrition reduced the sample to ninety-seven high achievers and eighty-five low achievers for a total of 182 students. Over the course of the 1967-68 academic year five high achievers and nine low achievers left school which reduced the final actual sample to ninety-two high achievers and seventy-six low achievers totaling 168 in number. This left a seventy-nine percent figure of the total original sample group.

During the Winter Term of the 1967-68 academic year, a letter* was sent to the 182 students who were known to be in school at that time. Several dates and times were suggested and students were invited to participate in an "environmental study" of the University. Eighty-one students responded to the first invitation which represented approximately forty-five percent of the total sample group.

Those who did not respond to the first invitation were sent a second letter** requesting that they participate in the "environmental study" which was being conducted. Again several dates and times were suggested in order that a student could find a time when there were no conflicts. Thirty-three students responded to the second invitation.

Students who did not respond to either invitation were called by telephone and invited to come into the Office of the Dean of Student Personnel Services to complete the environmental inventory. Twenty-one students responded and completed the instrument.

At a point following the sending of the second letter, it was determined that fourteen students had left school since the start of the

*See Appendix B
**See Appendix C

Fall Term. The total sample available was thus reduced to 168 in number. Of the 168 subjects, 135 responded to either the letters or the phone call representing an eighty percent response of the actual sample available.

A memo,* a College and University Environment Scales booklet, and an IBM 1230 answer sheet were sent to the teaching faculty and student personnel services faculty selected for the study. Of the teaching faculty, twenty-four completed and returned the inventory for a forty-eight percent response. Of the student personnel services faculty, all thirty-seven returned the instrument representing a one hundred percent response.

Data Collection

The data collected was personal data information** from the student subjects, and the responses on the instrument used in the study for all the subjects. An IBM 1230 anser sheet was used to record the personal information data and the responses to the statements in the inventory. All subjects were asked to respond to the statements in the way in which they felt students generally perceived the campus environment.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was the College and University Environment Scales (CUES)*** developed by Pace. As described by Pace[2], the CUES consists of 150 statements about college life--features and facilities of the campus, rules and regulations, student life, extracurricular organizations, and other aspects of the institutional environment which help to define the atmosphere or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the college as students perceive it. Students are asked to say whether each statement is generally TRUE or FALSE

*See Appendix D and E
**See Appendix F
***See Appendix A for a description of the five scales of the CUES

with reference to their college: TRUE when they think the statement is generally characteristic of the college, is a condition which exists, an event which occurs or might occur, is the way most people feel or act; and FALSE when they think the statement is generally not characteristic of the college. The test is, therefore, a device for obtaining the students' description of the college. These students presumably know what the environment is like because they live in it and are a part of it. General agreement among students regarding various facets of a college/university serves to define the prevailing campus atmosphere.

The development of CUES grew out of the work of Stern and Pace when they developed the College Characteristics Index (CCI). The CCI was a result of incorporating Stern's interest in personality assessment with Pace's interest and previous work in evaluation and measurement in higher education. Pace and Stern subsequently went in different directions in their work with the CCI. Stern's strategy of analysis was a psychological approach in which responses of individuals are the primary concern. Pace was interested in an educational-sociological approach in which the characteristics of institutions are the primary concern.[3]

The development of the CUES resulted through Factor Analysis of the College Characteristics Index. Through this process, the 300 items in the CCI, which were originally in thirty scales of ten items each, were reduced to 150 items and organized into five scales of thirty items each. Pace's focus was to identify a set of dimensions along which college environments differed from one another and then to measure the dimensions by a set of items which most clearly and sharply reflected the differences between environments.[4]

Validity. Validity studies are presented by Pace in the CUES manual.[5] Correlational data reported utilizes Pearson product moment correlations

or contingency coefficients. Data are presented in relation to the five scales of the CUES. In Table IV-I the various correlations are presented.

Scores on the Practicality Scale are negatively correlated with scores on the SAT-V (-.65), with tuition and fees (-.51), library volumes/enrollment (-.44), percentage of Ph.D.s on the faculty (-.38), percentage of seniors in liberal arts (-.67), Productivity Index - natural sciences (-.48), Productivity Index - Arts, humanities, and social sciences (-.52), percentage of men who go to graduate school (-.51), and percentage of women who go to graduate school (-.72). There is a positive correlation between the practicality dimension and number of fraternities and sororities (.57) and number of ROTC units (.42). As can be seen, the practicality aspect has a good share of negative correlations with variables considered academic or scholarly in nature.

On the Community Scale, the following negative correlations resulted: number of students (-.58), size of community (-.56), percentage of graduate students (-.53), percentage of students earning ½ or more of expenses (-.69), and number of ROTC units (-.41). There is a positive correlation with faculty/student ratio (.42) and percentage of board members from the same religious denomination when the school is church related (.51). From the above figures it appears that the Community Scale is definitely related to size of campus and size of the community in which the campus is located.

Awareness is positively correlated with scores on the SAT-V (.56), faculty-student ratio (.49), library volumes/enrollment (.54), percentage of Ph.D.s on faculty (.51), percentage of seniors in liberal arts (.59), Productivity Index - natural sciences (.53), Productivity Index - arts, humanities, social sciences (.48), percentage of men who go to graduate school (.72), and percentage of women who go to graduate school (.81).

Table IV-I. Correlations between CUES Scores and Other Institutional Features[6]

	CUES Scores					
	Practicality	Community	Awareness	Propriety	Scholarship	N
Input Variables						
Number of students	.29	-.58	-.17	-.33	-.29	47
Percentage of female students	-.32	.36	.32	.64	.19	47
SAT-V	-.65	-.18	.56	-.02	.69	19
SAT-M	-.18	-.26	.18	-.44	.33	19
Environmental Variables						
Size of community	-.11	-.56	-.24	.06	-.10	47
Tuition and fees	-.51	.12	.28	.08	.35	47
Faculty/student ratio	-.14	.42	.49	-.18	.37	47
Percentage of graduate students	-.06	-.53	-.01	-.34	.00	47
Percentage of students earning ½ or more of expenses	.09	-.69	-.39	-.10	-.23	47
Library volumes/enrollment	-.44	.06	.54	-.05	.52	47
Dollars spent on library/enrollment	-.29	.00	.32	-.24	.45	47
Percentage of Ph.D.s on faculty	-.38	-.12	.51	-.17	.26	
Percentage of seniors in liberal arts	c-.67	n.s.	c .59	c .53	c .53	19
Number of fraternities and sororities	c .57	n.s.	c-.53	c-.72	c-.72	19
Number of ROTC units	.42	-.41	-.14	-.58	-.12	47
Required chapel	c .50	n.s.	c-.63	n.s.	n.s.	19
Percentage of board members from denomination	.07	.51	-.05	.41	.11	47
Output Variables						
Productivity Index--NS	-.48	-.09	.53	-.07	.43	19
Productivity Index--AHSS	-.52	.16	.48	.12	.17	19
Percentage of men who go to graduate school	-.51	n.s.	c .72	n.s.	c .41	12
Percentage of women who go to graduate school	c-.72	n.s.	c .81	c-.53	c .58	12

Negative correlations occurred between awareness and percentage of students earning ½ or more of expenses (-.39) and required chapel (-.63). The Awareness Scale correlates heavily with those features considered to be academic or scholarly.

Propriety is positively correlated with the percentage of female students in the student body (.64) and is negatively correlated with the percentage of women who go to graduate school (-.53). Negative correlations also occurred for the variables of number of fraternities and sororities (-.72) and number of ROTC units (-.58).

For the scholarship dimension, there are positive correlations with the input variable scores on the SAT-V (.69), and the output variables of Productivity Index - natural sciences (.43) and percentage of women who go to graduate school (.58). For the campus environmental variables, high Scholarship Scale scores are positively correlated with: faculty/student ratio (.37), library volumes/enrollment (.52), and dollars spent on library/enrollment (.45). There is a negative correlation between scholarship scores and number of fraternities and sororities (-.72).

In a study by Astin[7] five factors, obtained by factor analysis of thirty-three characteristics of institutions, were compared with the five dimensions of CUES. Astin's five factors are described as affluence, size, masculinity, homogeneity, and technical emphasis. The resulting correlations indicated that masculinity and technical emphasis were positively related to practicality; size was negatively related to community; affluence correlated positively with awareness; masculinity was negatively correlated with propriety but homogeneity was positively correlated with propriety; and both affluence and homogeneity were positively correlated with scholarship.

Reliability. In establishing reliability data for the CUES, Pace reports reliability estimates for the normative sample of forty-eight institutions by the Kuder Richardson formula 21 and from split-halves corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients range from .81 for Propriety and to .92 for Scholarship. Split-halves reliabilities ranged from .77 for Practicality to .95 for Scholarship.

Hypotheses Tested

The hypotheses tested in this study are stated in null form. The direction of the testing was to reject the null hypothesis at the established level of significance, which is 0.05.

Hypothesis I. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when students are compared by achievement level and sex.

Sub-Hypothesis I. 1 There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students by achievement level.

Sub-Hypothesis I. 2 There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students on the basis of sex.

Hypothesis II. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students by major area of study.

Hypothesis III. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing active students with inactive students.

Hypothesis IV. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing leaders with non-leaders.

Hypothesis V. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students on the basis of their place of residency while at school.

Hypothesis VI. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students with faculty.

Hypothesis VII. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing metropolitan area (urban) students with non-metropolitan area (rural) students.[8]

Statistical Treatment of the Data

To test the difference between means of the groups which were compared, the t-test statistical procedure was utilized. In using the t-test, the null hypothesis is that the two populations from which the samples were drawn have the same means (H_0: $M_1 = M_2$). The alternative hypothesis is that $M_1 \neq M_2$.[9]

T-ratios were considered significant at the 0.05 level of confidence. When differences were significant at the 0.01 these are noted.

Statistical treatment of the data obtained were processed by computer at the Research Computer Laboratory of the Western Illinois University Computer Center.

Chapter IV - References

1. Illinois Board of Higher Education. A Master Plan-Phase II. Board of Higher Education: Springfield, Illinois. 1966.

2. C. Robert Pace. College and University Environment Scales: Preliminary Technical Manual. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1963. p. 2.

3. Ibid., pp. 5-8.

4. Ibid., pp. 8-17.

5. Ibid., pp. 63-68.

6. Ibid., p. 64.

7. Alexander W. Astin. "An Empirical Characterization of Higher Educational Institutions." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 53. 1962. pp. 224-235.

8. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) and Urbanized area classifications were used to determine an urban or rural student. The U. S. Census definitions classify "urban" as an incorporated or unincorporated place of 2,500 inhabitants. This would not provide a precise delineation for purposes of the study so, therefore, the SMSA, or Urbanized area definition was used. An Urbanized area or SMSA is one which contains one city with a population of 50,000 or more; or two cities having contiguous boundaries and constituting for general economic and social purpose, a single community with a combined population of at least 50,000, the smaller of which must have a population of at least 15,000. United States Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census. 1960 Census of Population. Vol. 1. "Characteristics of the Population." Part 75, "Illinois." U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D. C. 1963. pp. XVII - XVIII.

9. Robert L. Linn, Junius A. Davis, K. Patricia Cross. A Guide to Research Design: Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1965. pp. A-5 to A-7.

Chapter V
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The primary objective of this study was to gather information about the campus climate which exists at Western Illinois University, and to compare various subgroups which are parts of the campus population of the University. As indicated in Chapter IV, 135 junior class students, twenty-four teaching faculty members, and thirty-seven student personnel services faculty members comprised the total sample. The various subgroups of the total student population, the teaching faculty members, and the student personnel services faculty members were compared on the various scales of the College and University Environment Scales (hereafter referred to as the CUES) by using the t-test to test for the differences between means.

In comparing the groups on the basis of their perceptions of the environmental characteristics of the institution, the data will be presented in the order of the stated hypotheses:

1. Comparisons of students on the basis of achievement levels and sex.

2. Comparisons of students by major area of study.

3. Comparisons of students by extent of participation and involvement in student activities.

4. Comparisons of students by place of residence while at school.

5. Comparisons of students with teaching faculty and student personnel services faculty, and teaching faculty with student personnel services faculty.

6. Comparisons of students by urban or rural home area.

The results will be shown in table form indicating the mean score for each scale on the CUES. Applying the t-test of significance to the

various means resulted in a t-score being available. The t-score is asterisked when the comparison is significant at the 0.05 level of confidence. A double asterisk denotes significance at the 0.01 level.

Presentation of Results

Comparisons by Achievement Level and Sex.

Null Hypotheses I. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when students are compared by achievement level and sex.

Sub Hypotheses I. 1. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students by achievement levels.

Sub Null Hypotheses I. 2. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students on the basis of sex.

Table V-1 shows the comparisons of students for the Practicality Scale of the CUES*by achievement level and sex.

Table V-1. Comparisons Of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, And Low Achieving Females On The Practicality Scale

Legend: HAM: High achieving males; HAF: High achieving females; LAM: Low achieving males; LAF: Low achieving females.

Compared Groups		HAM	HAF	LAM	LAF
	Means	18.08	17.47	17.94	19.24
HAM	18.08	-	-.86	-.20	
HAF	17.47		-		2.36*
LAM	17.94			-	1.82
LAF	19.24				-

* Significant at the 0.05 level.

* See Appendix A for a full description of the College and University Scales

The results shown in Table V-1 indicate that low achieving females perceive the campus environment as being more practical than do high achieving females, i.e., they see the campus as one where procedures, personal status, and practical benefits are important. Status is gained by knowing the right people, being in the right groups, and doing what is expected. Order and supervision are characteristic of the administration and of the classwork. Good fun, school spirit, and student leadership in campus social activities are evident.

By analyzing the comparisons presented in Table V-1, the hypothesis of no difference between high achieving females and low achieving females is rejected at the 0.05 level of significance for the Practicality Scale. Other comparisons indicate no difference in perceptions regarding the Practicality Scale.

Table V-2 presents the comparisons of high achieving males, high achieving females, low achieving males, and low achieving females for the Community Scale. This scale depicts the friendly cohesive campus; a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty encompasses the campus as a whole.

Table V-2. Comparisons Of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, And Low Achieving Females On The Community Scale

Legend: HAM: High achieving male; HAF: High achieving female; LAM: Low achieving male; LAF: Low achieving female.

Compared Groups		HAM	HAF	LAM	LAF
	Means	15.55	16.90	15.52	17.08
HAM	15.55	-	1.48	-.02	
HAF	16.90		-		.16
LAM	15.52			-	1.43
LAF	17.08				-

The results in Table V-2 indicate that whether high achieving or low achieving, male or female, the Community aspect of the campus is perceived with no significant differences. The null hypothesis of no differences between high achieving males, high achieving females, low achieving males, and low achieving females is, therefore, not rejected.

Table V-3 gives the comparisons of high achieving males, high achieving females, low achieving males, and low achieving females on the Awareness Scale. The items in this scale reflect a concern and emphasis upon three types of meaning: personal, poetic, and political. What seems characteristic from this scale is a stress on awareness--an awareness of self, of society, and of esthetic stimuli.

Table V-3. Comparisons Of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, And Low Achieving Females On The Awareness Scale

Legend: HAM: High achieving males; HAF: High achieving females; LAM: Low achieving males; LAF: Low achieving females.

Compared Groups		HAM	HAF	LAM	LAF
	Means	10.50	11.17	11.70	11.76
HAM	10.50	-	.53	.95	
HAF	11.17		-		.43
LAM	11.70			-	.04
LAF	11.76				-

On the Awareness Scale there were no significant differences found when comparing the groups. All groups, by comparing actual means, perceived the environment in much the same way insofar as the items of the Awareness Scale were able to tap this dimension of the campus environment.

Table V-4 shows the comparisons of high achieving males, high achieving females, low achieving males, and low achieving females on the Propriety Scale. The items in this scale suggest an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important.

Table V-4. Comparisons Of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, And Low Achieving Females On The Propriety Scale

Legend: HAM: High achieving males; HAF: High achieving females; LAM: Low achieving males; LAF: Low achieving females.

Compared Groups		HAM	HAF	LAM	LAF
	Means	14.77	16.80	15.85	16.92
HAM	14.77	-	2.11*	1.18	
HAF	16.80		-		.11
LAM	15.85			-	1.15
LAF	16.92				-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

High achieving females perceived the campus environment as being more proper, mannerly, and considerate than did high achieving males. Interestingly enough, the low achieving females and the low achieving males did not view the environment as significantly different in regard to propriety. Nor did the high achieving males and low achieving males differ significantly. From the above results, the null hypothesis of high achieving males not differing significantly from high achieving females can be rejected at the 0.05 level of confidence for the Propriety Scale.

Table V-5 presents comparisons of high achieving males, high achieving females, low achieving males, and low achieving females on the Scholarship Scale. The items in this scale tap the extend to which the environment is perceived as being academic and scholarly. Intellectual speculation, an interest in ideas as ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline -- all these are seen as characteristic of the environment.

Table V-5. Comparisons Of High Achieving Males, High Achieving Females, Low Achieving Males, And Low Achieving Females On The Scholarship Scale

Legend: HAM: High achieving males; HAF: High achieving females; LAM: Low achieving males; LAF: Low achieving females.

Compared Groups		HAM	HAF	LAM	LAF
	Means	11.52	12.47	13.38	10.76
HAM	11.52	-	.81	1.56	
HAF	12.47		-		-1.33
LAM	13.38			-	-2.03*
LAF	10.76				-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

Low achieving males perceived the environment as being significantly more scholarly than did low achieving females. Of all the groups, the low achieving males saw the campus more involved in intellectual speculation, although there were no significant differences between the groups except in the case of low achieving males and low achieving females. The null hypothesis of no significant differences between low achieving males and low achieving females is rejected at the 0.05 level of confidence for the Scholarship Scale.

Table V-6 shows comparisons between high achieving students and low achieving students on all five scales of the CUES.

Table V-6. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students With Low Achieving Students On The CUES

SCALES	HIGH ACHIEVERS MEAN SCORES	LOW ACHIEVERS MEAN SCORES	t-ratio
Practicality	17.76	18.49	1.43
Community	16.26	16.18	-.10
Awareness	10.85	11.72	.96
Propriety	15.84	16.30	.67
Scholarship	12.02	12.27	.28

The results reported on Table V-6 indicate that no significant differences exist on any of the five scales of the CUES when comparing high achieving students with low achieving students.

Table V-7 reports the results of comparisons of male and females for the five scales of the CUES.

Table V-7. Comparisons Between Males And Females On The CUES

SCALES	MALES MEAN SCORES	FEMALES MEAN SCORES	t-ratio
Practicality	18.01	18.15	.27
Community	15.54	16.96	2.08*
Awareness	11.08	11.40	.34
Propriety	15.30	16.84	2.31*
Scholarship	12.42	11.81	-.70

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As shown in Table V-7, female students perceived the campus as being friendly, cohesive and group oriented to a significantly greater degree than male students. Also, female students viewed the campus as being more proper, polite and considerate than did the male students. On the

three scales of Practicality, Awareness, and Propriety, males and females did not differ significantly on their perceptions of the campus environment. The Sub-Null Hypothesis I.2 is rejected at the 0.05 level for the Community Scale and the Propriety Scale. There is no evidence to support rejection on the remaining scales when comparing male students with female students.

Comparisons by Major Area of Study

In this section, the total group of students will be compared by major area of study to determine whether differences in environmental perceptions exist on the basis of field study in which the student has major emphasis.

Null Hypothesis II. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students by major area of study.

Table V-8 shows the results of comparing students in five major areas of study on the Practicality Scale. The five major areas of study compared are: Arts, Business, Education, Humanities, and Math-Sciences.

Table V-8. Comparisons Of Students By Major Area Of Study On The Practicality Scale

Legend: ARTS: Arts; BUSN: Business; EDUC: Education; HUM: Humanities; M-S: Math-Sciences.

Compared Groups		ARTS	BUSN	EDUC	HUM	M-S
	Means	18.33	17.95	18.42	17.47	17.91
ARTS	18.33	-	-.37	.09	-.94	-.42
BUSN	17.95		-	.57	-.56	-.04
EDUC	18.42			-	-1.11	-.73
HUM	17.47				-	.54
M-S	17.91					-

When comparing students by major area of study on the Practicality Scale, no curricular grouping viewed the campus as more procedural and practical than any other. The null hypothesis was not rejected for any comparison on the Practicality Scale.

Table V-9 presents the results of comparisons between the students by major area of study on the Community Scale.

Table V-9. Comparisons Of Students By Major Area Of Study On The Community Scale

Legend: ARTS: Arts; BUSN: Business; EDUC: Education; HUM: Humanities; M-S: Math-Sciences.

Compared Groups		ARTS	BUSN	EDUC	HUM	M-S
	Means	16.41	15.36	17.31	14.11	16.27
ARTS	16.41	-	-.78	.66	-1.75	-.10
BUSN	15.36		-	1.92	-1.23	.84
EDUC	17.31			-	-2.94**	-1.13
HUM	14.11				-	1.88
M-S	16.27					-

**Significant at the 0.01 level.

The students in the humanities area of study perceived the environmental atmosphere as being significantly less friendly and cohesive than did the students having their major emphasis of study in education. Humanities students, by gross comparisons, saw the campus as being less group oriented than did the other groups, but not to the significant extent as the comparison between humanities students and education students. The null hypothesis of no difference between major area of study groups is rejected for the Community Scale when comparing education students with humanities students. The evidence does not support a rejection of the null hypothesis for the remaining comparisons of groups.

For the Awareness Scale, Table V-10 presents results on the comparisons of the major area of study groups.

Table V-10. Comparisons Of Students By Major Area Of Study On The Awareness Scale

Legend: ARTS: Arts; BUSN: Business; EDUC: Education; HUM: Humanities; M-S: Math-Sciences.

Compared Groups		ARTS	BUSN	EDUC	HUM	M-S
	Means	12.16	9.54	11.80	9.70	11.91
ARTS	12.16	-	-1.56	-.20	-1.70	-.14
BUSN	9.54		-	1.60	.10	1.62
EDUC	11.80			-	-1.41	.08
HUM	9.70				-	1.46
M-S	11.91					-

As indicated by the results on Table V-10, no significant differences between groups on the Awareness Scale is evident. Some of the t-ratios approach a level of significance at the 0.05 level, but the evidence is not conclusive enough to reject the null hypothesis for this scale.

In Table V-11, the results of the comparison of students by major area of study on the Propriety Scale are reported.

Table V-11. Comparisons Of Students By Major Area Of Study On The Propriety Scale

Legend: ARTS: Arts; BUSN: Business; EDUC: Education; HUM: Humanities; M-S: Math-Sciences.

Compared Groups		ARTS	BUSN	EDUC	HUM	M-S
	Means	14.75	14.95	17.29	16.47	15.32
ARTS	14.75	-	.14	2.23*	1.20	.39
BUSN	14.95		-	2.58*	1.27	.32
EDUC	17.29			-	-.84	-2.28*
HUM	16.47				-	-.91
M-S	15.32					-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen in the information presented in Table V-11, education students perceive the campus environment as being significantly more proper, mannerly, and considerate than do arts students, business students, and math-science students. It would appear from these results that education students, in planning to enter a vocational environment of orderliness and propriety, are viewing their collegiate environment in this same way. The exposure to elementary and secondary classroom situations, as well as the manner of conducting professional education and methods courses may contribute to this particular perception by education students. The null hypothesis of no significant differences between students on the Propriety Scale is rejected when comparing education students with arts students, education students with business students, and education students with math-science students. There is no evidence to support rejection of the remaining seven comparisons for the Propriety Scale.

Table V-12 indicates the results of comparing the five major area of study groups on the Scholarship Scale.

Table V-12. Comparisons Of Students By Major Area Of Study On The Scholarship Scale

Legend: ARTS: Arts; BUSN: Business; EDUC: Education; HUM: Humanities; M-S: Math-Sciences.

Compared Groups		ARTS	BUSN	EDUC	HUM	M-S
	Means	11.91	10.31	12.55	10.64	13.43
ARTS	11.91	-	-.92	.37	-.76	.85
BUSN	10.31		-	1.74	.24	2.29*
EDUC	12.55			-	-1.40	.76
HUM	10.64				-	1.96
M-S	13.43					-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As shown in Table V-12, math-science students perceived the environment as being significantly more scholarly and academic than did business students. Students in other major areas of study did not differ significantly from one another in their perceptions of the academic environment.

Comparisons by Degree of Participation and Involvement in Campus Activities

As was indicated in Chapter IV, comparisons were made between students who participated in at least one campus activity and those who did not participate in any activity, as well as those who were involved in the activity in such a way as to hold a major office compared to those who held no office. The information presented in this section will report the results of such comparisons.

> Null Hypothesis III. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing active students with inactive students.
>
> Null Hypothesis IV. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing leaders with non-leaders.

Table V-13 shows the comparisons between students who participated in at least one campus activity (labeled active) with students who were not participants in any campus activity (labeled inactive).

Table V-13. Comparison Of Active Students With Inactive Students On The CUES

SCALES	ACTIVE STUDENTS MEAN SCORES	INACTIVE STUDENTS MEAN SCORES	t-ratio
Practicality	18.05	18.19	.21
Community	16.34	15.73	-.70
Awareness	11.42	10.46	-.84
Propriety	16.26	15.11	-1.34
Scholarship	12.44	10.84	-1.46

The results shown on Table V-13 indicate no significant differences between active and inactive students in regard to their perceptions of the campus climate. The null hypothesis of no significant differences between active and inactive students cannot be rejected on the basis of the results obtained.

Students were also compared on the basis of how involved they were in the campus activities in which they were a member. Table V-14 presents the comparisons between major office holders (leaders) and those who did hold a major office (non-leaders) on the CUES.

Table V-14. Comparisons Of Leaders With Non-Leaders On The CUES

SCALES	LEADERS MEAN SCORES	NON-LEADER MEAN SCORES	t-ratios
Practicality	18.08	18.07	-.03
Community	16.35	16.10	-.36
Awareness	11.64	10.83	-.89
Propriety	16.61	15.48	-1.67
Scholarship	12.47	11.79	-.79

As was the case in comparing active students with inactive students, there are no significant differences between the perceptions of leader and non-leader students. Hypothesis III and IV cannot be rejected on the basis of the results obtained.

Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School.

Students were compared in regard to their environmental perceptions of the campus in relation to their place of residence while attending school. This section will report the results of the various comparisons of perception of the campus climate as related to place of residency at school.

> Null Hypothesis V. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students on the basis of their place of residency while at school.

Table V-15 shows the comparisons of the living area groups on the Practicality Scale.

Table V-15. Comparisons Of Students By Place Of Residence At School On The Practicality Scale

Legend: RH: Residence Hall; OC: Off-campus; F-S: Fraternity or Sorority Housing; COM: Commuter; MARR: Married Housing

Compared Groups		RH	OC	F-S	COM	MARR
	Means	17.87	18.22	17.50	18.71	18.93
RH	17.87	-	.51	-.32	.71	1.31
OC	18.22		-	-.56	.38	.80
F-S	17.50			-	.71	1.24
COM	18.71				-	.20
MARR	18.93					-

No significant differences appeared when comparing students by living area on the Practicality Scale. All students, regardless of place of residency, viewed the campus similarly in regard to their perceptions of the practical aspects of the environment. The null hypothesis of no significant differences between students in various living areas cannot be rejected for the Practicality Scale.

Table V-16 presents comparisons of students by living area for the Community Scale.

Table V-16. Comparisons Of Students By Place Of Residence At School On The Community Scale

Legend: RH: Residence Hall; OC: Off-campus; F-S: Fraternity or Sorority House; COM: Commuter; MARR: Married Housing

Compared Groups		RH	OC	F-S	COM	MARR
	Means	16.33	16.44	14.75	16.57	15.93
RH	16.33	-	.11	-1.04	.14	-.35
OC	16.44		-	-.99	.06	-.39
F-S	14.75			-	.95	.80
COM	16.57				-	-.40
MARR	15.93					-

Interestingly enough, there were no significant differences found on the Community Scale between students in the several living areas. No group of students, regardless of their place of residence, perceived the campus significantly more or less so in regard to the friendliness and cohesiveness which prevails. The null hypothesis of no differences between students' place of residence and perceptions on the Community Scale is unable to be rejected with the evidence available.

Table V-17 reports the results of the comparisons of students by living area for the Awareness Scale.

Table V-17. Comparisons Of Students By Place Of Residence At School On The Awareness Scale

Legend: RH: Residence Hall; OC: Off-campus; F-S: Fraternity or Sorority House; COM: Commuter; MARR: Married Housing

Compared Groups		RH	OC	F-S	COM	MARR
	Means	11.47	11.88	9.25	8.57	11.13
RH	11.47	-	.34	-1.13	-1.44	-.23
OC	11.88		-	-1.13	-1.46	-.43
F-S	9.25			-	-.30	.86
COM	8.57				-	1.37
MARR						-

As on the previous two scales, no significant differences occurred when comparing students by place of residence on the Awareness Scale. The evidence does not support a rejection of the null hypothesis that no difference exists between students and their respective place of residence when compared on the Awareness Scale of the CUES.

Table V-18 shows the results of the comparisons of students by living area for the Propriety Scale.

Table V-18. Comparisons Of Students By Place Of Residency At School On The Propriety Scale

Legend: RH: Residence Hall; OC: Off-campus; F-S: Fraternity or Sorority House; COM: Commuter; MARR: Married Housing

Compared Groups		RH	OC	F-S	COM	MARR
	Means	16.34	15.96	13.62	16.28	15.80
RH	16.34	-	-.43	-1.78	-.03	-.47
OC	15.96		-	-1.58	.22	-.13
F-S	13.62			-	1.25	1.16
COM	16.28				-	-.26
MARR						-

The results reported in Table V-18 show no significance on the Propriety Scale when comparing students on the basis of place of residency. The null hypothesis of no significance between students by their place of residence as compared on the Propriety Scale, therefore, cannot be rejected.

Table V-19 presents the results of the comparisons of students by living area for the Scholarship Scale.

Table V-19. Comparisons Of Students By Place Of Residence At School On The Scholarship Scale

Legend: RH: Residence Hall; OC: Off-campus; F-S: Fraternity of Sorority House; COM: Commuter; MARR: Married Housing

Compared Groups		RH	OC	F-S	COM	MARR
	Means	12.12	12.77	8.62	11.00	13.40
RH	12.12	-	.56	-2.00*	-.60	.92
OC	12.77		-	-1.87	-.74	.33
F-S	8.62			-	1.65	2.43*
COM	11.00				-	1.13
MARR	13.40					-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen by the results reported on Table V-19, fraternity-sorority house students perceive the campus as being less scholarly and academic than do residence hall students or married students. The null hypothesis of no significant difference of students by living area when compared on the Scholarship Scale was rejected when comparing fraternity-sorority house students with residence hall students, and when comparing fraternity-sorority house students with married housing students. For other comparisons reported on Table V-19, the evidence does not support a rejection of the null hypothesis.

In comparing students by their place of residency at school on all five scales of the CUES, the only significant differences found were those previously reported for the Scholarship Scale. Except in those instances noted, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between students by living area and their perceptions of the campus environment cannot be rejected.

Comparisons of Students with Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty.

In order to strike a balance of reported perceptions of the climate which exists at Western Illinois University, teaching faculty and student personnel services faculty were asked to report their perceptions of how students perceived the institutional environment. In other words, the faculty groups were asked how they saw the students viewing the atmosphere or climate of the university. In this section, the results of the faculty survey are compared with those of high achieving students, low achieving students, and total students sampled.

> Null Hypothesis VI. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus when comparing students with faculty.

Table V-20 shows the results of comparing high achieving students, low achieving students, teaching faculty, and student personnel services faculty on the Practicality Scale of the CUES.

Table V-20. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, And Student Personnel Services Faculty On The Practicality Scale

Legend: HA: High Achievers; LA: Low Achievers; TF: Teaching Faculty; SPSF: Student Personnel Services Faculty

Compared Groups		HA	LA	TF	SPSF
	Means	17.76	18.49	17.76	19.02
HA	17.76	-	1.43	0.00	2.05*
LA	18.49		-	-1.09	.88
TF	17.76			-	1.62
SPSF	19.02				-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen from the results reported in Table V-20, student personnel services faculty viewed the students as seeing the environment as being more procedural and practical than did high achieving students. There were no significant differences, however, in comparisons of the other groups. The null hypothesis of no significant differences in perception of the campus environment is rejected when comparing high achievers with student personnel services faculty on the Practicality Scale. The evidence does not support a rejection of the null hypothesis when comparing teaching faculty with high or low achievers, or student personnel services faculty with low achievers and teaching faculty on the Practicality Scale.

In Table V-21, the results of comparing high achieving students, low achieving students, teaching faculty and student personnel services faculty are reported for the Community Scale.

Table V-21. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, And Student Personnel Services Faculty On The Community Scale

Legend: HA: High Achievers; LA: Low Achievers; TF: Teaching Faculty; SPSF: Student Personnel Services Faculty

Compared Groups		HA	LA	TF	SPSF
	Means	16.26	16.18	18.36	16.24
HA	16.26	-	-.10	2.31*	-.02
LA	16.18		-	2.26*	.06
TF	18.36			-	-2.14*
SPSF	16.24				-

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table V-21 shows that the teaching faculty saw students as viewing the campus as being more friendly, cohesive, and group oriented and one having a congenial atmosphere than did the high achieving students, low

achieving students, and student personnel services faculty. The comparisons of the other groups resulted in no significant differences on the Community Scale.

Table V-22 presents the comparisons of high achieving students, low achieving students, teaching faculty, and student personnel services faculty on the Awareness Scale.

Table V-22. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, And Student Personnel Services Faculty On The Awareness Scale

Legend: HA: High Achievers; LA: Low Achievers; TF: Teaching Faculty; SPSF: Student Personnel Services Faculty

Compared Groups		HA	LA	TF	SPSF
	Means	10.85	11.72	12.28	10.64
HA	10.85	-	.96	1.07	-.17
LA	11.72		-	.43	-.94
TF	12.28			-	-.98
SPSF	10.64				-

The results reported in Table V-22 indicate that no significant differences exist between the groups when compared on the Awareness Scale.

Table V-23 compares high achieving students, low achieving students, teaching faculty, and student personnel services faculty on the Propriety Scale.

Table V-23. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, and Student Personnel Services Faculty On The Propriety Scale

Legend: HA: High Achievers; LA: Low Achievers; TF: Teaching Faculty; SPSF: Student Personnel Services Faculty

Compared Groups		HA	LA	TF	SPSF
	Means	15.84	16.30	17.24	15.37
HA	15.84	-	.67	1.40	-.55
LA	16.30		-	1.01	-1.18
TF	17.24			-	-1.69
SPSF	15.37				-

As revealed in Table V-23, the compared groups did not see the environment differently in regard to properness, mannerliness, and consideration for others.

In Table V-24, comparisons are made between high achieving students, low achieving students, teaching faculty, and student personnel services faculty for the Scholarship Scale

Table V-24. Comparisons Of High Achieving Students, Low Achieving Students, Teaching Faculty, And Student Personnel Services Faculty On The Scholarship Scale

Legend: HA: High Achievers; LA: Low Achievers; TF: Teaching Faculty; SPSF: Student Personnel Services Faculty

Compared Groups		HA	LA	TF	SPSF
	Means	12.02	12.27	13.40	11.18
HA	12.02	-	.28	1.15	-.80
LA	12.27		-	.90	-.99
TF	13.40			-	-1.55
SPSF	11.18				-

The results reported in Table V-24 show that no significant differences exist between the compared groups in relation to their perception of the academic or intellectual environment.

The following two tables will report the comparisons of the total students to both the teaching faculty and the student personnel services faculty. Since the comparisons of teaching faculty and student personnel services faculty were reported in Tables V-20 through V-24, they will not be repeated in the next two tables. Table V-25 will present the results of comparisons of total students to teaching faculty for the five scales of the CUES. Table V-26 will report the comparisons between the total students sampled and the student personnel services faculty for all scales of the CUES.

Table V-25. Comparisons Of Total Students Sampled With Teaching Faculty On The CUES

SCALES	TOTAL STUDENTS MEAN SCORES	TEACHING FACULTY MEAN SCORES	t-ratios
Practicality	18.08	17.76	-.50
Community	16.22	18.36	2.45*
Awareness	11.23	12.28	.88
Propriety	16.04	17.24	1.35
Scholarship	12.13	13.40	1.13

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As in the previous comparisons to high achieving and low achieving students, the teaching faculty viewed students as perceiving the campus to be friendly and cohesive to a significantly greater degree than did the students. The faculty felt there was more of a community atmosphere of group welfare and group loyalty than did the students themselves.

Table V-26. Comparisons Of Total Students Sampled With The Student Personnel Services Faculty On The CUES

SCALES	TOTAL STUDENTS MEAN SCORES	STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES FACULTY MEAN SCORES	t-ratios
Practicality	18.08	19.02	1.71
Community	16.22	16.24	.01
Awareness	11.23	10.64	-.57
Propriety	16.04	15.37	-.90
Scholarship	12.13	11.18	-.99

No significant differences resulted when comparing students with the student personnel services faculty on the five scales of the CUES. The null hypothesis of no significant differences between students and teaching

faculty, and students and student personnel services faculty when comparing views on environmental perceptions of the campus is rejected only when comparing students with teaching faculty on the Community Scale. The evidence does not support a rejection of the null hypothesis for the other comparisons.

Comparisons of Students by Urban or Rural Home Environment.

In this section, comparisons will be made to determine whether urban or rural home environment has an affect on the perceptions of campus climate.

> Null Hypothesis VII. There will be no significant difference in environmental perceptions of the campus comparing metropolitan area (urban) students with non-metropolitan area (rural) students.

In Table V-27, comparisons are made between urban and rural students to determine whether home environment has any bearing on how the campus climate is perceived.

Table V-27. Comparisons Of Urban Students With Rural Students On The CUES

SCALES	URBAN STUDENTS	RURAL STUDENTS	t-ratio
Practicality	18.00	18.12	.23
Community	15.93	16.46	.76
Awareness	11.13	11.32	.20
Propriety	15.80	16.25	.66
Scholarship	11.16	12.90	2.02*

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

When comparing urban students with rural students, a significant difference resulted on the Scholarship Scale. Rural students perceived the campus as being more intellectual and scholarly than did urban students.

This could be a result of the type of school in the home community of the urban or rural students. The urban student has most likely attended a school that is larger, more competitive, and has higher percentage of graduates going on to college, whereas the rural student's school would be less so. This brings about, therefore, a difference in the perceived intellectual atmosphere of the school since the gap between the intellectual atmosphere of the high school and the University is greater for the rural student than for the urban student. It should be noted, however, that high achieving students and low achieving students are farily equally distributed throughout the urban and rural classifications. No differences were statistically significant on the other scales of the CUES when comparing urban students with rural students. Null hypothesis VII is rejected at the 0.05 level of confidence when comparing urban students on the Scholarship scale of the CUES.

Discussion

Variables such as the sex of the student, majoring in the field of education, or living in a fraternity or sorority house are involved in the greatest number of differences in the student's perceptions of the campus climate at Western Illinois University.

Females perceive the environment differently from males on two of the five scales of the CUES. Women students viewed the campus as being more friendly and cohesive, and as being more polite and proper than did the men. It is conceivable that men and women would differ on the Propriety Scale on most campuses, but it is not as obvious that they would differ on the Community Scale. Women, by the nature of their upbringing, the environment in their various places of residence on the campus, and a prevailing attitude of femininity seem to create an environment of properness and politeness and thus they probably perceive

the institutional environment as having significantly more emphasis on this aspect than do the men.

Why women see the atmosphere as being more friendly and cohesive than men is difficult to assess. A stronger tendency to socialize in the residence hall or off-campus house, coupled with more openness and directness with her peers may bring about the feeling of a friendlier atmosphere for the female student. There is also a stronger emphasis on helping one another and establishing a group identity in the women's residences which again could create a bond or feeling of cohesiveness for women students.

When the variable of achievement is included with that of sex, some differences do occur. Low achieving females see the environment as being more practical and status oriented than do high achieving females. Low achieving females also see the environment as being less scholarly and intellectual than do low achieving males. High achieving females view the campus climate as being more proper than do high achieving males. It is interesting to note that while the total female group perceived the institution more strongly than males on the Propriety Scale, high achieving females did not differ from low achieving males, nor did low achieving females differ from low achieving males for this aspect of campus environment.

Comparing students on the basis of major field of study yielded five significant differences on the CUES. Four of the five findings of significance involved students majoring in the field of Education. Education students viewed the campus as being more friendly and cohesive than did students in Humanities. Education students also saw the University as being more proper than did Arts students, Business students, and Math-Science students, but not Humanities students. It is conjectured that Education students score higher on the Propriety Scale than do most other major field of study groups because their academic preparation for teaching stresses a

certain decorum and mannerliness for their future professional role. Strong emphasis is placed on the teacher being an example for young people to follow and a good representative for the school. Thus, the attitude of properness and politeness is transmitted through the training process for Education majors.

It is interesting to comtemplate why Education students view the campus as being more friendly than Humanities students, but yet on the Propriety Scale, Humanities students are the only ones with whom Education students do not differ. In fact, the difference between Education students and Humanities students on the Community scale is the only t-ratio which was significant at the 0.01 level of confidence. By gross comparisons, the Humanities students perceived the campus as being less friendly and group-oriented than did any other group. The real difference is not so much that Education students see the campus as being more communal in nature, but that Humanities students view the environment as having less of a group spirit and orientation. Very much a possibility is the fact that the Humanities group may be closely akin to the leaders of social-political action groups of the Winborn study who also saw the campus as being less friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented.

The fifth significant finding when comparing major field of study groups occurred on the Scholarship Scale. Math-Science students perceived the university climate as being more academic and scholarly than did Business students. More than likely, the scientific, precise curriculum generates views of a scholarly aura when compared to a more technical, utilitarian curriculum which prepares students for careers in business.

Comparisons of students by place of residence at college yielded fewer significant differences than was expected. The two findings of

significance that did occur were on the Scholarship Scale. Students in married housing and residence hall students both perceived the environment as being more scholarship oriented than did students in fraternity or sorority housing. This finding is keeping with the academic achievement level of fraternity-sorority students at Western Illinois University. The greek-letter social organizations consistently have group grade point averages below that of the all university men's average or all university women's average. It appears that not only is there little emphasis on academic work in fraternities and sororities, but also these groups perceive the university environment as being less academic and scholarly than do residence hall students and married housing students.

Do students and faculty view a campus environment differently? Do faculty have a clear conception of how students perceive a college environment? In asking teaching faculty members and student personnel services faculty to respond to CUES items in the way they felt students would, several significant differences resulted. When compared with referent groups of high achievers, low achievers, total students and student personnel services faculty, the teaching faculty saw students perceiving the Community aspect of the environment as being greater. Teaching faculty members thought of the campus as being friendly, cohesive, supportive, congenial, and group-oriented. Whether they thought of this as a desired property of the environment is not known.

Student personnel services faculty viewed the Practicality dimension differently than did high achieving students. The student personnel faculty felt that students saw a highly practical, orderly, supervised campus. Because student personnel services people are heavily involved with student government groups and student problems and complaints it appears that they interpreted the environment as being even more organized and bureaucratic than did students themselves.

When comparing students not on the basis of university environmental variables but on the basis of home background, urban and rural students differed on the Scholarship Scale of the CUES. Rural students perceived the university environment as being more academic and intellectual in nature than did urban students. It is conjectured that this is a result of previous school experiences. The student in an urban area high school more than likely has gone to a larger school where the competition is somewhat keener and the established expectations to continue on to college are deeper engrained. This might not be true of an inner-city urban area high school but very few inner-city students are attending residential colleges and universities, and Western Illinois University is no exception. Because of this difference in high school environment between an urban area and rural area, the college scholastic environment is perceived as being less academic and scholarly by the urban students. This finding is probably not unlike the differences between expectations of college environment and actual perceptions of college environment reported in Chapter II.

From a total institutional perspective, 180 comparisons were made of which seventeen were significant at the 0.05 level of confidence and one at the 0.01 level of confidence. These findings appear to indicate that the several subgroups of the university community do not perceive the campus environment in a significantly different fashion. This relatively small difference in perceptions may be due to size of an institution. As the university grows, future studies may determine whether a greater number of differences in environmental perceptions will exist between subgroups or subcultures.

In toto, the University environment is perceived as being practical, friendly, and proper. The University is perceived as having little

emphasis on personal, poetic, and political aspects, as well as academic and scholarly pursuits.

Using the descriptive terminology of Pace for the environment scales, the atmosphere is characterized by procedures, personal status, and practical benefits. The climate depicts a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty, and has a congenial atmosphere which settles over the campus. Politeness, considerateness, and group standards of decorum are characteristic of the environment. To a lessor degree, the university environment stresses intellectual speculation, an interest in ideas as ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline. Least characteristic of the environment is a stress on awareness of self, or society, and of esthetic stimuli.

Summary

One hundred thirty-five junior class students, twenty-four teaching faculty members, and thirty-seven student personnel services faculty members were compared on the five scales of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) to determine whether any significant differences of environmental perceptions of the campus existed among the various sub-groups. Comparisons were made on the basis of achievement level, sex, major area of study, active or inactive and leader or non-leader in regard to student activities, place of residency while attending school, and whether students came from a rural or urban home locale. Teaching faculty members and student personnel services faculty members were compared with one another as well as with high achieving students, low achieving students, and the total sample group of students.

The t-test was the statistical application made to determine whether significant differences existed when means of the respective groups were compared. The 0.05 level of confidence was established to determine

whether the difference was significant when means were compared. Differences at the 0.05 level or beyond were asterisked and discussed.

Comparisons of Students by Achievement Levels and Sex. Low achieving females perceived the environment as being more pratical than did high achieving females. When comparing total males with total females, females saw the environment as being significantly more friendly and cohesive.

On the Propriety Scale, high achieving females viewed the environment as being significantly more proper and mannerly than did high achieving males. When comparing males with females, total females viewed the environment as being significantly more polite and considerate than did males. No other significant differences were noted for the Propriety Scale when comparing students by achievement level and sex.

Low achieving males viewed the environment as being more academic and scholarly than did low achieving females.

Comparisons by Major Area of Study. When students were compared by their major area of study of Arts, Business, Education, Humanities, or Math-Science, education students saw the environment as being more friendly and cohesive than did humanities students. Education students also viewed the environment as being significantly more proper and mannerly than did arts students, business students, and math-science students. On the Scholarship Scale, math-science students saw the campus environment as being significantly more scholarly than did business students. No other significant differences resulted.

Comparisons by Degree of Participation and Involvement in Campus Activities. No significant differences occurred on any of the five scales when comparing active students with inactive students, and leaders with non-leaders.

Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School. On the Scholarship Scale, fraternity-sorority house students viewed the environment as being significantly less scholarly than did residence hall students and married housing students.

Comparisons of Students with Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty. The student personnel services faculty viewed students as seeing the environment as more practical than did high achieving students. Teaching faculty members viewed students as perceiving the campus as significantly more friendly than high achieving student, low achieving students, and student personnel services faculty. When compared to the total student sample, the teaching faculty again viewed students as seeing the campus as being more cohesive and group oriented. All other comparisons resulted in no significant differences.

Comparisons of Urban Students with Rural Students. On the Practicality, Community, Awareness, and Propriety Scales, urban and rural students did not differ in their perceptions of the campus environment. On the Scholarship Scale, however, rural students viewed the campus as being more scholarly and academic in nature.

Looking at the total results, the campus environment is viewed as being practical. It is also seen as being friendly, cohesive, group oriented, and proper. There is lesser emphasis placed on the academic and scholarly features of the campus, and to an even lesser degree on the personal, poetic and political as perceived by students, teaching faculty, and student personnel services faculty.

Chapter VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the research problem, purpose of the study, procedures utilized, and obtained results. Conclusions are based on information obtained in the course of this study. Following the section on conclusions, a discussion of the "impact of the college," and "the impact of the faculty," is presented in order to link conclusions with recommendations. The recommendations are based on the results of this study and upon projected expectations for Western Illinois University.

Summary of Purpose and Procedures

Institutional climate was the main focus of this study. The reasons for assessing institutional climate are as follows: (1) to provide environmental information, as well as other descriptive data, for the benefit of prospective students; (2) to gather information other than quantitative data for institutional research purposes; and (3) to determine whether several "environments" exist on a campus or whether there is one overall prevailing campus atmosphere.

The central purpose of the study was to determine the institutional "environment" at Western Illinois University, and how that "environment" was perceived by student subgroups. Western Illinois University is a school which is in a transitional phase of moving from a single-purpose to a multi-purpose structure. The benefits of this type of research are: (1) the prevailing climate of a campus is able to be determined; (2) how student subgroups perceive the campus climate can be determined and recommendations can be made as to how this information can be used by faculty and staff; and (3) a determination can be made as to whether student perceptions of the institution coincide with stated institutional aims and objectives.

The students selected to participate in the study were those who had attained junior class standing at the beginning of the 1967-68 academic year. Junior students were chosen because they had been on the campus from one term to two years and had been a part of the environment long enough to evaluate the environmental impact upon them. Junior students, for the most part, had self-selected a major field of study, placing them in one of the subgroups of the university student population.

A group of high achievers (Dean's list) and low achievers (those achieving at a minimum "good standing" level) comprised two of the compared subgroups. The following other comparisons of student subgroups were made:

1. Comparisons of students by sex
2. Comparisons of students by major area of study
3. Comparisons of students on the basis of participation and involvement in campus life
4. Comparisons of students by place of residency at school
5. Comparisons of students by rural or urban home environment

Two faculty groups were also involved in the study: a teaching faculty subgroup, and a student personnel services faculty subgroup. Comparisons were made between student subgroups and the respective faculty subgroups and also between the two faculty subgroups.

All student participants were requested to complete a personal data form which was used to delineate subgroups for comparison purposes. All subgroups, student and faculty, were asked to respond to items in the College and University Environment Scales (CUES).* The subgroups' responses to the respective scales of Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety,

*See Appendix A for a description of the scales

and Scholarship, were compared using the t-test to determine the differences between subgroup means. T-scores which were significant at the 0.05 level of confidence were noted.

Summary of Results

Comparisons of Students by Achievement Levels and Sex. Low achieving females perceived the environment as being more practical than did high achieving females. In other comparisons on the Practicality Scale no significant differences were noted. When comparing mean scores of total high achievers with total low achievers, and total males with total females, no significant differences occurred on the Practicality Scale.

On the Community Scale, the one significant difference was noted when comparing mean scores of total males with total females. Females viewed the environment as being more friendly and cohesive than did males. This difference is interpreted to mean that the environment is more friendly towards women and that they themselves engender a feeling of closeness in their living quarters and around the campus. No differences were evident when comparing male and female achievement level subgroups' mean scores on the Community Scale. Likewise, no differences occurred when comparing high achievers to low achievers.

On the Awareness Scale, no significant mean score differences were noted when comparing students by achievement level and sex.

On the Propriety Scale, high achieving females viewed the environment as being significantly more proper and mannerly than did high achieving males. When comparing total males with total females, total females viewed the environment as being significantly more polite and considerate than did males. In their day-to-day existence, women seem

to place a greater emphasis on propriety and view the environment in that fashion. No other differences were significant on the Propriety Scale when comparing students by achievement level and sex.

Low achieving males, on the Scholarship Scale, viewed the environment as being more academic and scholarly than did low achieving females. Low achieving males may have more difficulty with academic work and therefore view the environment as being more scholarly and academic. When comparing high achieving males with high achieving females, high achieving females with low achieving females, high achievers with low achievers, or males with females, there were no significant differences.

Comparisons by Major Area of Study. Students were compared by the major area of study of Arts, Business, Education, Humanities, and Math-Sciences. For the Practicality and Awareness Scales no significant differences existed between compared groups.

On the Community Scale and the Propriety Scale, Education students perceived the environment differently from the other groups. Those in Education saw the University climate as being more friendly and cohesive than did the Humanities students. Education students viewed the environment also as being significantly more proper and mannerly than did Arts students, Business students, and Math-Science students. Education students, being involved in an area which emphasized rapport with others and proper decorum, seem to see the collegiate environment in this fashion. No other significant differences resulted on the Community and Propriety Scales.

On the Scholarship Scale, Math-Science students perceived the environment as being significantly more scholarly than did Business students. Math-Science students, being involved in the scientific disciplines which

appear to have greater academic emphasis, perceive the scholarly environment as being higher than the other compared groups. No other significant differences resulted.

Comparisons by Degree of Participation and Involvement in Campus Activities. No significant differences existed on any of the five scales when comparing active students with inactive students, and leaders with non-leaders.

Comparisons of Students by Place of Residence at School. For the Practicality, Community, Awareness, and Propriety Scales, no significant differences resulted when students were compared by place of residence. On the Scholarship Scale, however, fraternity-sorority house students viewed the environment as being significantly less scholarly than did residence hall and married housing students. This is interpreted as meaning that there is less emphasis on scholarly or academic pursuits in fraternity-sorority housing.

Comparisons of Students with Teaching Faculty and Student Personnel Services Faculty. Student Personnel Services faculty members felt students perceived the environment as being more practical than did those in the high achieving student group. Such a finding is probably a reflection of the kinds of "feedback" student personnel staff members receive regarding rules, regulations, and bureaucratic procedure. Teaching faculty members felt students viewed the campus as being more friendly than did high achieving students, low achieving students, and the student personnel services faculty. When compared to the total student sample, the teaching faculty perceived that students felt the campus was more cohesive and group oriented than did the students themselves. Whether faculty felt this from a positive or negative point of view is unknown. Other comparisons yielded no significant differences.

Comparisons of Urban Students with Rural Students. On the Practicality, Community, Awareness, and Propriety Scales, urban and rural students did not differ in their perceptions of the campus environment. On the Scholarship Scale, however, rural students viewed the campus as being more scholarly and academic in nature. The difference could be attributed to a contrast between a rural and urban secondary school environment. Perceived academic climate in an institution seems to be related to previous school experiences. A student involved in a strong intellectual high school environment might tend to perceive college as being less exacting and demanding than the student who had a less rigorous high school experience.

The total results indicated that the campus environment is viewed as being practical. This environment is also seen as being friendly, cohesive, group oriented, and proper. There is a lesser emphasis placed on the academic and scholarly features of the campus, and to an even lesser degree on the personal, poetic, and political aspects as perceived by students and faculty.

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest several conclusions regarding the prevailing campus climate at Western Illinois University and the different environmental perceptions of the various student and faculty subgroups who participated in the project. The conclusions are enumerated below:

1. Although there are some noted significant differences related to environmental perceptions of the campus, the University is viewed somewhat similarly by students and faculty. In other words, the university has basically one "environment" rather than being composed of several "environments." Pace has suggested that a complex university

has more than one environment. Based upon his findings, it must be concluded from the obtained results that Western Illinois University is not complex in nature.

2. Students and faculty alike perceived the campus as being characterized by an emphasis on procedures, order, and supervision. Secondly, students and faculty perceived the campus as being friendly, cohesive, group oriented, and congenial as well as having an air of politeness and considerateness, or in other words, absent of assertive, rebellious, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behaviors. Other perceived factors making up the campus climate are respectively the areas of Scholarship and Awareness. There is a low indication that rigorous and vigorous pursuit of intellectual knowledge exists on the campus. There is little emphasis on competitive academic achievement and scholarship. Of all the dimensions of the environmental spectrum, students and faculty perceived the least emphasis on the awareness scale. This reflects a concern upon three areas of meaning -- personal, poetic, and political. From the perceptions of the students, it is concluded that they feel the campus is orderly, friendly, and proper, but lacks an emphasis on intellectual speculation, self-understanding, and reflectiveness.

3. Examining differences in perceptions on the Practicality Scale, females in the low achieving group perceived the environment as emphasizing personal status, practical benefits, and orderliness more so than do females in the high achieving group. Student personnel services faculty view students as seeing the environment as being more status oriented, orderly, and structured than do high achieving students. While there are two significant differences on the Practicality Scale of the campus environment, it is concluded that nearly all students and faculty similarly perceived the campus on the Practicality Scale.

4. The feeling of community which prevails on the campus, is seen differently by female students and male students. Female students feel the campus is more friendly, cohesive, supportive, and sympathetic; that there is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses the university. Students in Education perceive the campus as having a congenial atmosphere to a significantly greater degree than their fellow students in Humanities. Teaching faculty members indicated that students view the campus as being more friendly and group-oriented than do the students themselves. Perceived differences also exist between faculty, high achieving students, low achieving students and student personnel services faculty. Teaching faculty view the Community dimension as being more prominent than do the students. Few differences are prevalent on the Community Scale, which leads to the conclusion that students view the congeniality of the campus quite similarly. Teaching faculty, however, view this friendly atmosphere as being stronger than students feel it actually is.

5. When dealing with the environmental dimension of Awareness -- an awareness of self, of society, and of esthetic stimuli -- no significant differences prevail among compared groups. Students and faculty alike are in total agreement when viewing this aspect of the campus climate.

6. Propriety suggests an environment that is polite and considerate, or conversely suggests the absence of demonstrative, assertive, rebellious, risk-taking, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behavior. High achieving females view the campus as having more emphasis on propriety than do their high achieving male counterparts. Similarly, total females differ from total males with females seeing greater stress on group standards of decorum and thoughtfulness. Education students differ from Arts students, Business students, and Math-Science students in that they feel

the environment is more characteristic of politeness and decorum than do the other groups. Several differences in perception are evident on the Propriety Scale. Female students, and students in Education view the campus as being more proper than do other male students and faculty members.

7. The Scholarship Scale is designed to detect the degree of emphasis toward an academic scholarly environment. In the investigation reported, low achieving males view the environment as being more academic and scholarly than do low achieving females. Math-Science students see the campus climate as having significantly more stress on ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline than do Business students. One's place of campus residence affects perceptions as evidenced by students residing in fraternity or sorority housing. They view the campus climate as significantly less academic and scholarly than do students in residence halls or in married housing. Rural students see the pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific and philosophical, as carried on more rigorously and vigorously than do urban students. It is concluded that the perceptions of the scholarship dimension are affected by affiliation with certain subgroups or by established expectations within subgroups.

8. All scales, with the exception of the Awareness Scale, are perceived somewhat differently by particular subgroups of the student population. The majority of differences are influenced by the sex of the student. Secondly, the major area of study of the student has a bearing on his perceptions of the campus environment. Finally, the student's place of residence is a factor. It is concluded that the sex of the student, the major area of study of the student, and the

student's place of residence are variables which are the prime determiners of how a student will perceive the prevailing climate of the university.

Discussion

Before stating specific recommendations inspired by this investigation, discussion of the "impact of the college," and the "impact of the faculty," is presented. In other words, what is it that determines the prevailing mood or atmosphere of a campus? What causes some groups to see the university differently than others? How can the staff of a college or university change (or manipulate, if you will,) the campus climate, or alter it in some desired manner? Does the college or university have any control over such an intangible and vague concept as "environment," or is it determined merely by the students and staff which happen to be a part of the institution at a particular place and time? Various authors have alluded to the concept of "atmosphere," "unique environment," and "campus climate," but yet there seems to be no outline or plan for the creation of the college/university that does have a profound impact on all those who come in contact with its environment.*

What is some of the contemporary thinking regarding the effect of environment, and what can be done to heighten environmental impact in a desired direction? Thistlethwaite,[1,2] in his studies of colleges high in productivity of scholars in various fields, indicates that the college environment is an important determinant of a student's motivation to seek advanced intellectual training. He also found that the college press which encourages the scientist differs from that which inspires the scholar. Faculty members and their characteristics play a large part in determining the college press and the eventual productivity level of

*See Chapter One for a discussion of these concepts

the college or university. In a study of student subcultures at Michigan State University, Adams[3] found no significant differences in scholastic ability when comparing students still in school with those who had withdrawn. He did find, however, significant differences in achievement of the two groups. It would appear from this study that factors other than ability determine whether a person achieves well and/or remains in school. These factors could be either environmental or personal, or both.

In helping to keep in focus the essential issue, Cummer[4] outlines five principles which must be subscribed to in order to foster a desirable campus climate. These principles, Cummer feels, must constantly confront everyone connected with the institution as viable concerns. The five principles are:

1. A deep and abiding conviction on the part of each employee of the university - be he counselor, faculty member, dean or president - of the totality, the unity of all that happens to the student as part of the educative process.

2. The institution must be permeated with a level of expectancy on the part of all.

3. The student must find himself constantly involved in as many firsthand experiences as possible.

4. There must be a high degree of personal relationship between the college community and each student.

5. Firm, openly expressed value commitments.

Three authors, Trow, Whiting, and Gusfield, voiced their concerns regarding the achievement of a desired campus climate. All three place the burden on the faculty to protect and preserve the proper atmosphere. Trow states:

> We must also be alert to <u>conditions</u> within institutions which encourage student subcultures that promote an interest in ideas and learning, and conversely, with the conditions which undercut and weaken those fruitful informed groupings and relationships.[5]

Whiting expresses his thoughts regarding the impact of the faculty in the collegiate environment in the following manner:

> ...the degree to which the student culture redirects and dilutes educational aims and efforts is directly related to the degree to which the faculty is indifferent, routinized in teaching practices and permissive in reviewing, checking, and evaluating student work. It is one belief that, where faculty expectations are uniformly high and are reflected in their requirements, and where the objectives of the educational program are pursued with vigor and confidence, the response of the student to the educational program will be strikingly positve.[6]

In a similar vein, Gusfield writes:

> As defenders and missionaries of a general intellectual quality, the faculty seek to overcome the mass culture of the student, the provincialism of his background, and the collegiana or vocationalism of his role as campus resident.[7]

As can be interpreted, these authors share a similar point of view that the faculty and the type of expectations they set will, in large measure, set or determine the prevalent campus atmosphere.

Expanding this point of view in discussing environment, and alteration of same, Keeton utilizes information gleaned from a study of Antioch students. Keeton records that graduating seniors reported that "the changes they regarded as most significant in their growth in college were attributed by them to influences other than courses and professors. These changes ranged from matters of values and philosophy of life to development of new intellectual interests or to changes in vocational choice and in personality."[8] From these findings, Keeton feels that, "To design a college with only courses in mind is to overlook the most influential forces available for teaching: peer influences, direct experiences of the world around, responsibility-taking experiences in

college affairs, and the influence of teachers upon their students in noncourse relations."[9] Keeton concludes his remarks by stating:

> Assuming that student culture is a significant factor in the educational potential of a college, how can it be altered to serve appropriate ends? Five examples will illustrate the many "handles" ready for faculty and administrative use: admissions, examinations and evaluation, models and leadership, dormitory atmosphere, and facilities.[10]

The remarks by Keeton reflect his feeling of the importance of the student in setting the environmental tone. The three previous citations stressed the role of the faculty in establishing the desired campus climate. An approach to building an institutional atmosphere consistent with aims and objectives must include all segments of the college/university community.

Initially, several questions were raised relative to what factors go into determining a particular environment and how a college or university can change or alter (if possible) such an ambiguous dimension as campus environment. Several points of view were presented describing what could be done to achieve a desired educational climate. Institutional climate can be altered and changed as previously noted. Relative to the present study, what are the implications of the conclusions to the specific recommendations? How does Western Illinois University raise the perceived level of Scholarship and Awareness, if that is felt to be desirable? How does the University retain the characteristics already prevalent while in turn enhancing others? Are the dimensions of Practicality and Scholarship antithetical as suggested by the "validity" information previously presented and as seemingly confirmed in the results of this study.* Can the emphasis on scholarliness and intellectuality be raised and yet retain a degree of orderliness and supervision, or are these opposing

*See Chapter Four

environmental variables? These types of questions can remain unanswered unless, in some way, the results of institutional studies are used to chart a direction for a college or university, or to make changes when and where necessary. With this discussion section as background, specific recommendations are presented.

Recommendations

The results of this investigation warrant the following recommendations.

1. It is recommended that these findings be made available to appropriate administrative officials for their review and study. These data, alongwith other assessments of strengths, weaknesses, assets, and liabilities of the institution, should have full and open discussion on the part of administrative officials, deans, and department chairmen. These individuals should approach their review with a sense of institutional pride and concern. In turn, they should direct their attention to suggesting ways in which the desired objectives of the University can be achieved. Their efforts should then be directed toward assisting in the implementation of any institution-wide program which might be formulated.

2. Based on the perceived low emphasis on scholarship, it is recommended that the University make a concerted effort to inspire greater scholastic effort on the part of students. Faculty members should increase their expectations of student achievement levels (but not necessarily giving lower grades and citing this as raising expectations). The University should establish honors courses and an Honors College to challenge those who are in the higher ability and higher achievement levels. All departments should incorporate seminar courses into their curricular program for majors in order to help bring together the meaning and usefulness of a particular body of knowledge.

3. In order to enhance the personal, poetic, and political properties of the environment, it is recommended that the University, through individual departments, increase programs of lectures, discussions, seminars, debates, and special gallery showings and performances. It is recommended that the residence halls continue and expand their programs of faculty visitations, floor discussions, art shows, seminars, lectures and the like.

4. Because of the perceived emphasis on practical aspects of the University, it is recommended that faculty and administrative staff engage in a thorough review of all policies, procedures, and regulations to determine whether some regulations are morbund and/or unnecessarily cumbersome. If the University can achieve an efficient, workable administrative operation, but remain flexible and unarbitrary in approach, the bureaucratic image could be reduced and create a less restricted feeling on the part of students, faculty, and administration.

5. The Community dimension of the CUES is perceived as being high at Western Illinois University. As the University grows, it might be desirable to retain the perceived feeling of cohesiveness and friendliness on the campus. It is recommended that the University encourage the continuation of this trait by taking pride in having a friendly, cooperative atmosphere. Faculty, staff and students should be aware of this point of view and be encouraged to be helpful to others whenever possible. The residence halls staff should strive to retain their spirit of assistance to students. Hall student governments should strive to continue to provide programs of assistance for students. The type of spirit engendered by this environment can have a carry-over value of instilling an altruistic and service-minded attitude in the alumni of Western Illinois University.

6. As changes take place, and as recommendations are implemented, further "campus environment" research would be in order. It is recommended

that periodic environmental studies be undertaken to assess the prevailing campus climate in given areas among specific University subgroups. Residence units should be especially involved in assessing the living environment of respective housing areas. Various political and activistic oriented student subgroups should be among these future compared groups in order to determine whether there are differences in perceptions of the campus environment on the part of these students.

Chapter VI - References

1. Donald L. Thistlethwaite. "College Press and Student Achievement." The Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 50, No. 5. October, 1959.

2. Donald L. Thistlethwaite. "College Press and Changes in Study Plans of Talented Students." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 51, No. 4. August, 1960. pp. 222-234.

3. Donald V. Adams. An Analysis of Student Subcultures at Michigan State University. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Michigan State University. 1965.

4. John P. Cummer. "Campus Climate and the Educational Process," The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 3, No. 1. October, 1961.

5. Martin Trow. "Student Cultures and Administrative Action," Personality Factors on the Campus. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health: University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1962. p. 212.

6. Albert N. Whiting. "The Student Culture and the Educational Enterprise," Liberal Education. Vol. 50, No. 4. December, 1964. p. 516.

7. Joseph R. Gusfield. "Community or Communities: The Faculty Impact on Student Life," Liberal Education. Vol. 53, No. 1. March, 1967. pp. 23-32.

8. Morris Keeton. "The Climate of Learning in College," College and University Bulletin. Vol. 15, No. 4. November 15, 1962. p. 1.

9. Ibid., p. 1.

10. Ibid., p. 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Charles. An Investigation of the College Environmental Perceptions of Prospective College Freshmen and their Relationships to the Choice of a College or University. Ed.D. thesis. Michigan State University. 1967.

Adams, Donald Van. An Analysis of Student Subcultures at Michigan State University. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Michigan State University. 1965.

Apostal, Robert A. "Student Subcultures and Personal Values." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 1. January, 1968. pp. 34-39.

Astin, Alexander W. "An Empirical Characterization of Higher Educational Institutions." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 53. 1962. pp. 224-235.

Astin, Alexander. "Effect of Different College Environments on the Vocational Choices of High Aptitude Students." Journal of Counseling Psychology. Vol. 12. No. 1. Spring, 1965. pp. 28-34.

Astin, Alexander W. "Further Validation of the Environmental Assessment Technique." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 54. No. 4. August, 1963. pp. 217-226.

Astin, Alexander W. "Personal and Environmental Factors Associated with College Dropouts Among High Aptitude Students." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 55. No. 4. August, 1964. pp. 219-227.

Astin, Alexander W. Who Goes Where to College. Science Research Associates, Inc.: Chicago. 1965.

Astin, Alexander W. and Holland, John L. "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 52. No. 6. Dec. 1961. pp. 308-316.

Baker, J. R. "The Relationship Between Student Residence and Perception of Environmental Press." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 7. No. 4. July, 1966. pp. 222-224.

Baker, Sheldon R. "A Comparative Study of Perceptions of a University Environment Between Honor and Nonhonor Freshmen Groups." Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 26. No. 4. Winter, 1966. pp. 973-976.

Barton, A. H. Organizational measurement and its bearing on the Study of College Environments. College Entrance Examination Board: New York. 1961.

Berdie, Ralph F. "A University is a Many Facated Thing." The Personnel and Guidance Journal. Vol. 45. No. 8. April, 1967. pp. 768-775.

Berdie, Ralph F. "Changes in University Perceptions During the First Two College Years." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 2. March, 1968. pp. 85-89.

Berdie, Ralph F. "College Expectations, Experiences, and Perceptions." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 7. No. 6. Nov. 1966. pp. 336-344.

Berdie, Ralph F. "Some Psychometric Characteristics of CUES." Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 27. No. 1. Spring, 1967. pp. 55-66.

Berry, Margaret. "Campus Culture: A Product of Its Own History." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 8. No. 1. January, 1967. pp. 3-9.

Bevan, William. "The University Climate and the Problem of Student Pressures." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 6. No. 6. Nov. 1965. pp. 343-347.

Blackburn, John L. "A Conversation with John Dewey." The NASPA Journal. Vol. 5. No. 1. July, 1967. pp. 35-42.

Bodelson, Gerald R. Environmental Perceptions of Freshman College Students as Related to Selected Ability and Achievement Levels. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University: Bloomington. 1967.

Boyer, Ernest L. and Michael, William B. "Faculty and Student Assessment of the Environments of Several Small Religiously Oriented Colleges." California Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 19. No. 2. March, 1968. pp. 59-66.

Brown, Donald R. "Personality, College Environment, and Academic Productivity." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc: New York, 1962. pp. 536-562.

Brown, Robert D. "Manipulation of the Environmental Press in a College Residence Hall." The Personnel and Guidance Journal. Vol. 46. No. 6. February, 1968. pp. 555-560.

Buros, Oscar. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. The Gyphon Press: Highland Park, New Jersey, 1965.

Bushnell, John H. "Student Culture at Vassar." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 489-514.

Centra, John A. A Study of Honors College and Other High Ability Students at Michigan State University. Unpublished Office Report, Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University. 1964.

Centra, John A. Student Perceptions of Total University and Major Field Environments. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Michigan State University. 1965.

Cummer, John P. "Campus Climate and the Educational Process." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 3. No. 1. October, 1961. pp. 29-32.

Davis, James A. "Intellectual Climates in 135 American Colleges and Universities: A Study in Social Psychophysics." Sociology of Education. Vol. 37. Winter 1963. pp. 110-128.

Dyer, Henry S. "Can Institutional Research Lead to a Science of Institutions?" The Educational Record. Fall, 1966. pp. 452-466.

Eddy, Edward D. The College Influence on Student Character. American Council on Education: Washington, D.C. 1959.

Gelso, Charles J. and Sims, David M. "Perceptions of a Junior College Environment." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 1. January, 1968. pp. 40-43.

Gusfield, Joseph R. "Community or Communities: The Faculty Impact on Student Life." Liberal Education. Vol. 53. No. 1. March, 1967. pp. 23-32.

Hassenger, Robert and Weiss, Robert. "The Catholic College Climate." The School Review. Vol. 74. No. 4. Winter, 1966. pp. 419-445.

Hendrix, Vernon L. "Academic Rank Revisited." Junior College Journal. Vol. 35. No. 5. Feb. 1965. pp. 24-28.

Hursh, Samuel B. "History of the Western Illinois State Teachers College: First Twenty-five Years." Western Illinois State Teachers College Quarterly. March, 1927.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. A Master Plan - Phase II. Board of Higher Education: Springfield, Illinois. 1966.

Ivey, Allen E., Miller, C. Dean, and Goldstein, Arnold D. "Differential Perceptions of College Environment: Student Personnel Staff and Students." The Personnel and Guidance Journal. Vol. 46. No. 1. September, 1967. pp. 17-21.

Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. Harper and Brothers Publishers: New York, 1957.

Johnson, Richard W. and Kurpius, DeWayne J. "A Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Study of Students' Perceptions of Their College Environment." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 8. No. 3. May, 1967. pp. 199-203.

Kaelke, Michael E. A Study of the Influence of Selected Orientation Programs on the Environmental Perceptions of Community College Transfer Students Attending Michigan State University. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation Michigan State University: East Lansing, 1967.

Keeton, Morris. "The Climate of Learning in College." College and University Bulletin. Vol. 45. No. 4. Nov. 15, 1962. pp. 1-2.

Lindahl, Charles. "Impact of Living Arrangements on Student Environmental Perceptions." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 8. No. 1. January, 1967. pp. 10-15.

Linn, Robert L., Davis, J. A., and Cross, K. Patricia. A Guide to Research Design: Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, N. J. 1965.

Marks, Edmond. "Student Perceptions of College Persistence, and Their Intellective, Personality and Performance Correlates." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 58. No. 4. August, 1967. pp. 210-221.

McConnel, T. R. and Heist, Paul. "The Diverse College Student Population." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 225-252.

McFee, Anne. "The Relations of Students Needs to their Perceptions of a College Environment." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 52. No. 1. Feb. 1961. pp. 25-29.

McPeek, Beth L. "The University as Perceived by Its Subcultures: An Experimental Study." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Vol. 30. No. 3. Spring, 1967. pp. 129-132.

Michael, William B. and Boyer, Ernest L. "Campus Environment." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 35. No. 4. October, 1965. pp. 264-276.

Nichols, Robert C. "Effects of Various College Characteristics on Student Aptitude Test Scores." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 55. No. 1. Feb. 1964. pp. 45-54.

Nunnally, J. C., Thistlethwaite, Donald L. and Wolfe, Sharon. "Factored Scales for Measuring Characteristics of College Environments." Educational and Psychological Measurenment. Vol. 23. No. 2. Summer, 1963. pp. 239-248.

Pace, C. Robert. College and University Environment Scales: Preliminary Technical Manual. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1963.

Pace, C. Robert. Comparisons of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, New Jersey. 1966.

Pace, C. Robert. "Diversity of College Environments." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Vol. 25. No. 1. October, 1961. pp. 21-26.

Pace, C. Robert. "Five College Environments." College Board Review. No. 41. Spring, 1960. pp. 24-28.

Pace, C. Robert. "Implications of Differences in Campus Atmosphere for Education and Planning of College Programs." Personality Factors on the College Campus. Sutherland, et. al. ed. The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health: The University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1962. pp. 43-61.

Pace, C. Robert. "Methods of Describing College Cultures." Teachers College Record. Vol. 63. No. 4. Jan. 1962. pp. 267-277.

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

Pace, C. Robert. "When Students Judge Their College." College Board Review. No. 58. Winter, 1965-66. pp. 26-28.

Pace, C. Robert and McFee, Anne. "The College Environment." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 30. No. 4. Oct. 1960. pp. 311-320.

Pace, C. Robert and Stern, George G. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 49. No. 5. October, 1958. pp. 269-277.

Pervin, Lawrence. "A Twenty College Study of Student x College Interaction Using TAPE (Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment): Rationale, Reliability, and Validity." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 58. No. 5. October, 1967. pp. 290-302.

Pervin, Lawrence A. "The College as a Social System." The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 38. No. 6. June, 1967. pp. 317-322.

Rowe, Frederick B. "Stability of a College Environment." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 5. No. 4. June, 1964. pp. 242-249.

Sanford, Nevitt. "Higher Education as a Field of Study." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 31-73.

Sanford, Nevitt. "Higher Education as a Social Problem." The American College. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 10-30.

Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962.

Schoen, Walter T., Jr. "The Campus Climate: Student Perception and Faculty Idealism." The Journal of Education Research. Vol. 60. No. 1. September, 1966. pp. 3-7.

Seymour, Warren R. "Student and Counselor Perceptions of College Environments." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 2. March, 1968. pp. 79-84.

Shaw, Kenneth A. "Accuracy of Expectation of a University's Environment as it Relates to Achievement, Attrition, and Change of Degree Objective." Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 9. No. 1. January, 1968. pp. 44-48.

Shemky, Robert William. "Catholic Higher Education: The Effect of the Academic Environment on the Stability of the Lay Faculty." The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 38. No. 2. February, 1967. pp. 70-77.

Standing, G. Robert and Parker, Clyde A. "The College Characteristics Index As a Measure of Entering Students Preconceptions of College Life." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. 6. No. 1. October, 1964. pp. 2-6.

Stern, George G. "Characteristics of the Intellectual Climate in College Environments." Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 33. No. 1. Winter, 1963. pp. 5-41.

Stern, George G. "Environments for Learning." The American College. Nevitt Sanford, ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1962. pp. 690-730.

Sutherland, Robert L. et. al. ed. Personality Factors on the College Campus. The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health: Austin, Texas. 1962.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "College Press and Changes in Study Plans of Talented Students." Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 51. No. 4. August, 1960. pp. 222-234.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "College Press and Student Achievement." The Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 50. No. 5. October, 1959. pp. 183-191.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "The College Environment as a Determinant of Research Potentiality." Scientific Creativity: Its Recognition and Development. edited by Calvin W. Taylor and Frank Barron. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1963. pp. 265-277.

Trow, Martin. "Student Cultures and Administrative Action." Personality Factors on the Campus. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health: University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1962.

Trustees of the Western Illinois State Normal School. "History and Views of Monroe Hall: The Women's Building." The Military Tract Normal School Quarterly. June, 1914.

United States Department of Commerce: Bureau of Census. 1960 Census of Population. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population. Part 15. Illinois. U. S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D. C. 1963.

Varg, Paul A. "Intellectual Climate and Student Unrest." Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 37. No. 2. February, 1966. pp. 76-79.

Webb, Sam C. and Crowder, Dolores G. "Analyzing the Psychological Climate of a Single College. Teachers College Record. Vol. 66. No. 5. February, 1965. pp. 425-433.

Western Illinois State College. "Golden Anniversary." Western Illinois State College Bulletin. Vol. 29. No. 2. October, 1949.

Western Illinois University Builds for the Future of Illinois: 1959-69. The Teachers College Board of the State of Illinois: Springfield, Illinois. January, 1959.

Western Illinois University. Proceedings of the Conference on Academic Goals and Policies. Western Illinois University: Macomb, Illinois. 1959.

Whiting, Albert N. "The Student Culture and the Educational Enterprise." Liberal Education. Vol. 50. No. 4. Dec. 1964. pp. 513-516.

Winborn, Bob. B. Some Personal Characteristics of Campus Leaders: A Comparison of Social-Political Action Leaders With Four other Categories of Student Leaders. unpublished mimeographed manuscripts Indiana University: Bloomington, Indiana. December 23, 1966.

Yonge, George D. "Personality Correlates of the College and University Environment Scales." Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 28. No. 1. Spring, 1968. pp. 115-123.

Appendix A

DESCRIPTION OF THE CUES SCALES

Description of the CUES Scales

Scale 1. Practicality. This combination of items suggests a practical, instrumental emphasis in the college environment. Procedures, personal status, and practical benefits are important. Status is gained by knowing the right people, being in the right groups, and doing what is expected. Order and supervision are characteristic of the administration and of the classwork. Good fun, school spirit, and student leadership in campus social activities are evident.

The atmosphere described by this scale appears to have an interesting mixture of entrepreneurial and bureaucratic features. Organization, system, procedures, and supervision are characteristic of many large enterprises, both public and private, industrial, military, and governmental, but they are not limited to large agencies. Such hierarchies as exist, however, may be interpersonal as well as organizational, so that it is not only useful to understand and operate within the system but also to attain status within it by means of personal associations, and political or entrepreneurial activities.

There are, of course, many practical lessons to be learned from living in an environment that has these characteristics and opportunities. Certainly such characteristics are encountered widely in the larger society.

Scale 2. Community. The combination of items in this scale describes a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. The environment is supportive and sympathetic. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses the college as a whole. The campus is a community. It has a congenial atmosphere.

The small college in a small town immediately comes to mind as a prototype--with friendly and helping relationships among the students

and between the students and the faculty. Some large universities, however, manage to have a strong sense of community; and some small colleges have an atmosphere that is better characterized by privacy, personal autonomy, and cool detachment than by a strong sense of togetherness. On the the whole, however, bigness tends to beget diffusiveness rather than cohesion; it also tends to beget impersonality but not necessarily unfriendliness.

If the organizational counterpart of "practicality" was the bureaucracy, perhaps the counterpart to "community" is the family.

Scale 3. Awareness. The items in this scale seem to reflect a concern and emphasis upon three sorts of meaning--personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggest the search for personal meaning. A wide range of opportunities for creative and appreciative relationships to painting, music, drama, poetry, sculpture, architecture, etc., suggest the search for poetic meaning. A concern about events around the world, the welfare of mankind, and the present and future condition of man suggest the search for political meaning and idealistic commitment. What seems to be evident in this sort of environment is a stress on awareness, an awareness of self, of society, and of esthetic stimuli.

Perhaps in another sense, these features of a college atmosphere can be seen as a push toward expansion and enrichment--of personality, of societal horizons, and of expressiveness.

Scale 4. Propriety. The items in this scale suggest an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. On the negative side, one can describe propriety as the absence of demonstrative, assertive, rebellious, risk-taking, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behavior.

Conventionality, in the sense of generally accepting and abiding by group standards, is in some respects a good term for the items in this scale, although so-called rebellious groups, beatniks for example, have strong conventions to distinguish them from what they think is conventional in others. Perhaps, then, propriety is a better term than conventionality.

In any event, the atmosphere on some campuses is more mannerly, considerate, and proper than it is on others.

Scale 5. Scholarship. The items in this scale describe an academic scholarly environment. 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 as ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline--all these are characteristic of the environment.

Appendix B

INITIAL LETTER TO STUDENTS

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY Macomb

Division of Student Personnel Services

January 29, 1968

Dear

Western Illinois University is constantly striving to improve itself as an institution of higher education. One way of assessing the University is to seek student perceptions regarding the campus environment which exists. For this reason, your name is one that has been selected to be asked to participate in an important study of student environmental perceptions at Western Illinois University.

The time involved in this project will require approximately forty-five minutes and will involve the completion of one inventory and a short personal data form. No preparation on your part is involved and the responses of each participant will be kept strictly confidential.

Realizing that you have a busy schedule, several alternative times for participation in the study have been established.

DATE	TIME	PLACE
Monday, February 5, 1968	4:00 P.M.	Sherman Hall Room 300
Tuesday, February 6, 1968	3:00 P.M.	Sherman Hall Room 300
	4:00 P.M.	Sherman Hall Room 300
Thursday, February 8, 1968	7:00 P.M.	Sherman Hall Room 300
	8:00 P.M.	Sherman Hall Room 300

We would appreciate your assistance and cooperation in this vital student project. If you could select a time that best fits your schedule and then contribute forty-five minutes to complete the "environmental perceptions" inventory, you would be helping greatly.

We look forward to seeing you at one of the scheduled times.

Sincerely yours,

David S. Taylor
Assistant to the Dean of Student
Personnel Services

DST:dw

Appendix C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO STUDENTS

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY Macomb

Division of Student Personnel Services

March 11, 1968

Dear

During the last term you were sent a letter requesting your assistance in assessing the campus environment which exists at Western Illinois University.

The initial testing dates may have been inconvenient in terms of your time, and, therefore, we are establishing additional times for participation in this important study. Since the success of this project depends upon the involvement of each student selected, we are again requesting your assistance. As before, the time involved will be forty-five minutes, or less.

Realizing that your schedule is a busy one, several alternative dates and times for participation have been established.

DATE	TIME	PLACE
Monday, March 18, 1968	4:15 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309
	6:30 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309
	7:15 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309
Thursday, March 21, 1968	4:15 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309
	6:30 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309
	7:15 p.m.	Sherman Hall, Room 309

We would greatly appreciate your assistance and cooperation in this vital project. If you could select a time that fits your schedule and the contribute forty-five minutes to complete the "environmental perceptions" inventory, you would be helping tremendously. As was indicated before, the responses of each individual will be kept strictly confidential and no names of participants will be revealed.

We will look forward to seeing you at one of the above scheduled times. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

David S. Taylor
Assistant to the Dean of Student
Personnel Services

DST/mvb

Appendix D

MEMO TO TEACHING FACULTY

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of Dean of Student Personnel Services

TO:

FROM: David S. Taylor, Assistant Professor of Education

SUBJECT: Environmental Perceptions Study

DATE: May 14, 1968

Western Illinois University is constantly striving to improve itself as an institution of higher education. One way of evaluating an institution is to assess the perceptions of the campus environment which exists. For this reason, you are being asked to participate in an important study of perceptions of the campus climate which exists at Western Illinois University.

A copy of the College and University Scales (CUES) is being made available as well as an IBM answer sheet. It would be appreciated if you would respond to each item of the CUES by marking (with a No. 2 pencil) either T (true) or F (false) depending on how you feel students perceive the campus environment which prevails at Western Illinois University. Completion of the scales will take approximately thirty minutes.

Your participation in this project will help greatly in studying the campus environment at Western Illinois University. Thank you for your cooperation.

David S. Taylor

DST:dw

Appendix E

MEMO TO STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES FACULTY

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of Dean of Student Personnel Services

May 7, 1968

Dear Student Personnel Staff Member:

Western Illinois University is constantly striving to improve itself as an institution of higher education. One way of evaluating an institution is to assess the perceptions of the campus environment which exists. For this reason, you are being asked to participate in an important study of perceptions of the campus climate which exists at Western Illinois University.

A copy of the College and University Scales (CUES) is being made available as well as an IBM answer sheet. It would be appreciated if you would respond to each item of the CUES by marking (with a No. 2 pencil) wither T (true) or F (false) depending on how you feel students perceive the campus environment which prevails at Western Illinois University. Completion of the scales will take approximately thirty minutes.

Your participation in this project will help greatly in studying the campus environment at Western Illinois University.

Sincerely yours,

David S. Taylor
Assistant to the Dean of Student
Personnel Services

DST:dw

Appendix F

PERSONAL DATA FORM

UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT STUDY

PERSONAL DATA INFORMATION

In the "identification number" spaces, please blacken the space on this sheet that corresponds with the number and response below.

1. Sex
   0. Male
   1. Female

2. Major Area of Study
   0. Arts (music, drama, art)
   1. Business
   2. Education
   3. Humanities
   4. Math or Sciences

3. Organizational Memberships
   0. Fraternity or Sorority
   1. Honorary or Professional Organization
   2. Departmental Club
   3. Residence Hall Council
   4. All University Student Government
   5. University Union Board
   6. Sequel or Courier Staff
   7. Other_____

4. Officer Position Presently Held
   0. President
   1. Vice-President
   2. Secretary
   3. Treasurer
   4. Other_____

5. Place of Residence
   0. University Residence Hall
   1. Off-Campus Private Housing
   2. Fraternity or Sorority House
   3. Parent's Home
   4. University Married Housing
   5. Off-Campus Married Housing
   6. Other_____

Appendix G

T-TEST FORMULA

T-test Formula

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{N_1 \sigma_1^2 + N_2 \sigma_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2}\right)}}$$

M_1 = Mean score of first sample group

M_2 = Mean score of second sample group

N_1 = Number of subjects in first sample group

N_2 = Number of subjects in second sample group

σ_1^2 = Standard deviation of first sample group

σ_2^2 = Standard deviation of second sample group