

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES  
TOWARD PARTICIPATION IN  
DECISION MAKING AND GOVERNANCE  
IN A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
HARVEY D. LIVIX  
1971



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES  
TOWARD PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING  
AND GOVERNANCE IN A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

presented by

Harvey D. Livix

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Administration  
and Higher Education

  
Major professor

Date May 20, 1971

## ABSTRACT

### AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING AND GOVERNANCE IN A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

By

Harvey D. Livix

#### Purpose

The primary objective of the present study is to examine student attitudes concerning participation in collegiate activities, policy-making, and institutional planning and governance in a small liberal arts college. The study attempts to determine the existence of consistent correlation between "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects.

#### Procedures

In conducting this research, the following procedures were employed: (1) the researcher reviewed the related literature; (2) an 80-item self-reporting questionnaire was constructed and administered in group sittings to 450

students from Siena Heights College who served as the research population; and (3) multiple regression analysis and multivariate analysis of variance statistical procedures were utilized to define relationships, indicate relative contribution of important variables, and demonstrate differentiation among variables.

### Findings

The findings of the study support the hypothesis that there is a significant difference between "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes concerning participation in three specific phases of college activities, namely, (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects.

The results of the multiple regression analysis utilized in the study indicate that only the scores on the scale dealing with student involvement in decision-making consistently serve as a predictor variable.

Students seem willing to experiment, to make choices, and to concur with the actions of others who feel participation is important, but they indicate reluctance to expend energy to implement any meaningful participation in student activities and student government processes. Although the student research population gives substantial approbation to participation in college decision-making

processes and activities and they view these as highly beneficial and valuable, nevertheless, there is no assurance that they are willing to undertake those sacrifices necessary to operationalize their convictions.

Analysis of data indicates the following: There is a significant difference at the .01 level between freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students in this research population relative to

- (a) the degree of student satisfaction with the college environment;
- (b) the appropriateness of student participation in decision-making;
- (c) student concern for being involved in institutional planning and governance; and
- (d) attitudes toward student government/class meeting processes, class discussion, and community service projects.

### Recommendations

1. It would seem essential that college officials distinguish between the "expression" and "action" levels of student demand for participation in institutional decision-making and governance procedures.

2. The degree and dimension of participation in institutional governance ought to be clearly defined by administrators, faculty, and students before implementation

of any type be attempted.

3. Before students can be meaningfully involved in institutional decision-making and governance, the campus climate must support such involvement, recognizing it as beneficial to both the academic community and the student.

4. It is necessary that students, faculty, and administrators commence to reason, judge, and act in consort along evolutionary lines rather than revolutionary lines.

5. The evolutionary process for involving students in decision-making and governance procedures necessitates that students, faculty, and administrators construct processes and procedures that will provide students with a "reasonable partnership" status in the academic community.

6. Models for involving students in the decision-making process and institutional governance must be constructed and results of such involvement thoroughly analyzed, evaluated and reported.

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ATTITUDES  
TOWARD PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING  
AND GOVERNANCE IN A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

By

Harvey D. Livix

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education  
College of Education

1971

© Copyright by  
Harvey Daniel Livix  
1971

This study is dedicated to my mother, sister, brother-in-law, and wife whose faith, love, and support were limitless and indispensable.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to the the members of the Guidance Committee who directed this dissertation. Dr. Louis Stamatakos was instrumental in giving insight, valuable direction, and support for such a study. Dr. Floyd Parker assisted with advice and comment. Dr. Arthur Vener provided constructive criticism. My greatest gratitude is to Dr. Walter F. Johnson, the Committee Chairman, who has given constant support, scholarly criticism, beneficial direction, and firm and friendly guidance toward the completion of this research project.

Special thanks is extended to Dr. Frank B. May, Washington State University, whose scholarly efforts provided the theoretical framework for the modified taxonomy utilized in the present study to measure attitudes. Dr. May's encouragement was of great benefit to the researcher.

Gratitude is given to Sister Jean Fitzgerald, O.P., Academic Vice President of Siena Heights College, Adrian, Michigan, and Mr. Richard Reaume, acting President. Their interest and cooperation greatly assisted the completion of this research project. Further appreciation is expressed to those students who assisted in administering the instrument of the study and to the entire student body, faculty,

and administration at Siena Heights College for their participation and assistance.

Lastly, but most importantly, I wish to thank my beautiful wife, Mary Jo, for her expert assistance in editing and preparing this manuscript. Without her constant interest and enthusiastic support this dissertation could not have been realized.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES. . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Nature of the Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Rationale for the Study . . . . .	5
Basic Assumptions . . . . .	8
Hypothesis To Be Tested . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms . . . . .	9
Organization of the Study . . . . .	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	14
An Overview . . . . .	14
Surveys . . . . .	18
Dissertations . . . . .	24
Major Reports . . . . .	28
Institutional Reports . . . . .	34
International Studies . . . . .	38
McGrath Study . . . . .	41
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	44
Research Population . . . . .	44
Description of Siena Heights College. . . . .	45
Rationale for Instrument Selection . . . . .	46
Instrumentation . . . . .	51
Collection of Data . . . . .	56
Statistical Procedures . . . . .	57
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	60
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	63
Descriptive Data . . . . .	63
Demographic Differences . . . . .	64
Satisfaction with College Environment . . . . .	67

## Chapter

	Page
Student Concerns . . . . .	
Participation Issues . . . . .	72
Involvement in Institutional Governance and Planning . . . . .	77
Reliability . . . . .	80
Tests of Significance . . . . .	89
Hypothesis Relative to Participation Attitudes . . . . .	91
Other Tests of Significance . . . . .	93
Multiple Regression Analysis . . . . .	97
Additional Analysis . . . . .	105
Summary . . . . .	108
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN . . . . .	110
Part I: Summary of Results . . . . .	110
Attitudes toward Participation . . . . .	111
Other Significance Tests . . . . .	112
Multiple Regression Analysis . . . . .	113
Additional Analysis . . . . .	114
Summary . . . . .	116
Analysis of Student Attitudes and Concerns . . . . .	117
Part II: Theoretical and Methodological Issues and Recommendations . . . . .	121
Theoretical Issues . . . . .	121
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	122
Part III: A Comprehensive Plan . . . . .	124
Basic Assumptions . . . . .	125
Theory . . . . .	126
The Plan . . . . .	129
Summary . . . . .	136
LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .	137
APPENDIX . . . . .	146

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of respondents according to sex and class . . . . .	64
2. Population demographic characteristics . . .	65
3. Demographic characteristics . . . . .	66
4. Responses to satisfaction scale questions . .	68
5. Responses to satisfaction scale questions . .	69
6. Student concerns . . . . .	70
7. Student participation issue scale . . . . .	73
8. Student participation issue scale . . . . .	75
9. Student involvement in governance-planning scale . . . . .	78
10. Reliability scales . . . . .	81
11. Reliability scales . . . . .	81
12. Reliability scales . . . . .	81
13. Reliability scales . . . . .	82
14. Reliability scales . . . . .	82
15. Reliability scales . . . . .	82
16. Reliability scale: Total scale (expression- action) student government--class meeting processes . . . . .	83
17. Reliability scale: Total scale (expression- action) class discussion activities . . . . .	83

# Table

	Page
18. Reliability scale: Total scale (expression-action) community service projects . . . .	83
19. Matrix of the correlations between each dependent variable utilized in the study .	85
20. Mean, standard deviations, and standard errors for the six scales employed in the present study . . . . .	88
21. Significance between scale tests . . . . .	91
22. Significance tests for difference between classes . . . . .	94
23. Significance tests for difference between sexes . . . . .	95
24. Significance tests for interaction between sex and class . . . . .	96
25. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward student government participation-- <u>expression</u> (dependent), N=450 . .	98
26. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward class discussion participation-- <u>expression</u> (dependent), N=450 . .	99
27. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward community service participation-- <u>expression</u> (dependent), N=450 . .	100
28. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward student government participation-- <u>action</u> (dependent), N=450 . . .	101
29. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward class discussion participation-- <u>action</u> (dependent), N=450 . . . .	102
30. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward community service participation-- <u>action</u> (dependent), N=450 . . . .	102
31. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Total student government attitude scale (dependent), N=450 . . . . .	103

## Table

	Page
32. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Total class discussion attitude scale (dependent), N=450 . . . . .	104
33. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Total community service attitude scale (dependent), N=450 . . . . .	105
34. Matrix of the cell means for the six major scales and the six sub-scales . . . . .	106

## Figures

1. A comparison of Taxonomy II and May's Modified Taxonomy II . . . . .	49
2. Design for the multivariate analysis of vari- ance . . . . .	90

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The American college, confronted by new demands from a segment of its student population in the 1960's, is now entering a new and apprehensive decade. The autumn of 1964 marked the beginning of student disruptions at the University of California, Berkeley. Primary demands at Berkeley were for "free speech," while today's student demands run a gamut from increased black enrollment to one man-one vote participation in every facet of institutional governance.

Students for a Democratic Society, founded at Port Huron, Michigan, in June, 1962, formed the vanguard for student activism. Among the over 2,400 colleges and universities in the United States, an estimated 145 were hit with violent demonstrations during the 1968-69 school year. During the same period the American Council on Education [1] stated that over 524 institutions experienced disruptive protests. This number increased significantly during the 1969-70 term. A new and tragic phase of confrontation erupted with the violent deaths of students at Kent State University in Ohio and at Jackson State College

in Mississippi. Although the academic year 1970-71 has witnessed a remission of student activism, will the seeming calm continue? Is this merely a temporary abatement?

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education [2] reports that a majority of the nation's college students and faculty feel that there may be trouble between teachers and undergraduates in the future. Clark Kerr, head of the Commission, noted ample evidence of increased demand for student participation in decision-making on the campuses.

#### Nature of the Problem

Nearly every college or university campus presents some tension within a structure which seemingly places significant decision-making in the hands of the administration and faculty excluding, for the most part, student involvement.

Two opposing positions are generally assumed in interpreting the situation. First, student demand for participation in policy-making and institutional governance is viewed as primarily an attempt to take over the running of the institution. Such student action reflects a thirst for power and a perverted form of democracy. Students are thus pictured as interested in destroying the existing collegiate structures and substituting anarchy. Proponents of this view see one solution: to rid the campus of troublemakers and diminish the spirit of permissiveness

that now exists on some campuses.

The second position interprets the student as being forced to live with rapidly changing social and economic structures that have not addressed themselves to "people problems." In this environment the institution of higher learning too frequently presents a classroom experience that is irrelevant because it tends to alienate the student's curiosity and smother intellectual search and excitement. The argument supporting this position states that the student must be given the right to articulate his personal concerns and be given the opportunity to help construct the type of meaningful learning environment that will speak to his world and his life.

A question that must be answered ultimately is whether it is desirable to create processes and procedures whereby students might participate centrally and formally in the decision-making role. The degree and dimension of such student participation in institutional governance and decision-making has yet to be defined by most colleges and universities.

#### Statement of the Problem

The primary objective of the present study is to examine student attitudes at a small liberal arts college concerning participation in:

- (1) student government--class meeting processes;

- (2) class discussion activities; and,
- (3) community service projects.

The study attempts to determine if there is a consistent correlation between "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in these three defined areas.

In addition, other related student attitudes and concerns are investigated, namely:

- (a) student satisfaction with his present college environment;
- (b) the dimension and degree of student participation in policy-making as judged to be legitimate by the student; and
- (c) the student's perceived appropriateness of his participation in college planning and governance.

Another objective of the study is to correlate the attitude scores toward participation with the three variables listed immediately above which, from a theoretical viewpoint at least, should serve as correlates or predictors. Additional personal and demographic data have been procured which are not directly relevant to the primary objective of the study. However, modern computer analysis makes it possible to ascertain interrelationships between diverse data which may provide suggestive relationships for future investigation and research.

### Rationale for the Study

The 1966 Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities [3], jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, states:

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the governance of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. . . . It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal. Students expect, and have a right to expect, both the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view and idealism of the student body.

The 1968 Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students [4], approved by the American Association of University Professors, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the U.S. National Student Association, the Association of American Colleges, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, affirms the rights of students to free inquiry and expression in the classroom and in conference.

The 1970 Draft Statement on Student Participation in College and University Government [5] issued by the American Association of University Professors states: "Student involvement in institutional government may include membership--voting or non-voting--on department committees, on college or division councils and committees, or on the university senate or any other principal legislative body and its committees."

A simple review of demands on the part of students or appeals from educators for student involvement in institutional policy-making and governance produces no solution. There is apparent need to develop social-educational data which defines the realities of the individual campus in relation to student attitudes toward participation in college activities, student desire to participate in institutional planning and governance, and the degree of participation to which the student aspires.

Much of the argument utilized in either supporting student participation in policy-making and governance procedures or opposing such action is prescriptive in nature, infrequently accompanied by fact and evidence. As Charles Frankel [6] has aptly stated:

No reforms can be discussed intelligently unless we take phrases that are now dominating discussion--"student rights," "student power," "participation," "democracy," "a relevant education," and all the rest--and ask seriously what they mean, and what assumptions are behind them. For it is astonishing how little genuine public

discussion there has been on such matters, and how little of what has been said has gone beneath the surface of slogan and generality.

Without clear and definite data concerning student attitudes related to involvement in policy-making and governance of the academic institution, it is unlikely that construction of appropriate participatory models can be commenced or operationalized.

### Basic Assumptions

If the parameters of student participation in institutional policy-making and governance are to be established and defined, then, it seems apparent that certain assumptions ought to be first reviewed and analyzed.

1. In order to solve a particular governance problem on a particular campus, the parties to that problem would do well to set aside empty rhetoric, over-generalizations, and accusations, and work with the actual facts and conditions of their campus environment.

2. There is need to understand the nature and attitudes of the student body concerning participation in institutional policy-making and governance; the present campus environment and its impacts; student satisfaction with their present condition; and, a survey of possible models of institutional governance that might prove appropriate for the campus with its peculiar and distinct climate and press.

3. Campus constituencies need to work with the specifics of their situation in a way that respects the varying perceptions and judgments of all members of the collegiate community. This process may help legitimize perceptions and judgments as relevant communication and as determinative factors in the definition of problems, the choice of priorities, and the allocation of effort and resources.

4. Like society at large, the college is moving rapidly toward a complexity of task and make-up which may demand a change to modes of operation that are less authoritarian, restrictive, centralized, and more collaborative. Since the collegiate community is composed of a variety of persons who differ markedly in experience, learning, maturity, competency, and expertise, a vital interaction among these individuals will likely produce relevant and meaningful education as well as discovery of beneficial policy-making and governance procedures.

5. There is ample evidence that the institution of higher learning need concern itself with constructive change and reform in order to better serve the needs of the student. Education must be sufficiently broad in scope to meet the needs of the whole person--intellectual, social, moral, and emotional. As the student demands a greater share in the control and responsibility of carrying on his education, his interests and concerns for involvement in institutional policy-making and governance ought to be met in a positive and constructive manner.

### Hypothesis To Be Tested

Following directly from the previously stated purposes, rationale, and assumptions of the study, the subsequent hypothesis is formulated:

It is possible to differentiate between "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects.

For the purpose of statistical testing, the above hypothesis is stated in the null form, as follows:

There is no significant difference between the "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects.

If subsequent to the analysis of the data, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicated differences will be examined and discussed.

Multiple Regression Analysis and Multivariate Analysis of Variance statistical procedures, discussed in Chapter III, will be utilized to define relationships, indicate contribution of important variables, and demonstrate differentiation among variables.

### Definition of Terms

For clarity of understanding, the following terms are defined either because of their specialized meaning or

because of the operational definition which is used in this particular study.

Attitude.--The sense in which this general term will be used follows the definition of Thurstone [7]: The intensity of positive or negative affect for or against a psychological object. A psychological object is any symbol, person, phase, slogan, or idea toward which people can differ as regards positive or negative affect.

Attitude Component.--In the present study, May's [8] Modified Taxonomy II based on Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia [9] Handbook II: Affective Domain is utilized. Four suggestions for changing the taxonomy of affective objectives, as proposed by May, are discussed in Chapter III.

Attitude Content.--The attitude content component refers to the actual item statements within an attitude scale.

Attitude Scale.--As used in the present study, a scale is a set of items which fall into a particular relationship in respect to the ordering of respondents. According to Guttman [10], a set of items can be said to form a scale if each person's response to each item can be reproduced from the knowledge of his total score on the test within reasonable limits of error.

Demographic Variables.--Specifically, this refers in the present study to certain variables typically used

in sociological studies. These variables are (a) sex, (b) class enrollment, (c) family neighborhood, (d) urban-rural environment as a youth, (e) grade point average, and (f) current political preference. Data on these demographic variables were secured through responses to questionnaire items.

Governance Procedures.--This term is operationally defined by four questionnaire items designed to ascertain the following: first, student reaction to disruptive behavior on the college campus; second, student perception of "participatory democracy" as relevant to college governance affairs; third, student judgment as to whether or not college students are sufficiently mature to participate in college governance procedures; and, fourth, whether it is important for students to be involved in institutional planning and governance.

Institutional Satisfaction.--This term is used to describe the response to a set of questions regarding the perceived effectiveness of the campus environment and press.

Legitimate Participation Issues.--This term is used to describe the response to a set of ten governance participation issues which the student perceives as legitimate for student involvement.

Participation Attitude "Expression-Action" Scale.--This term is operationally defined by three sets of

fifteen questionnaire items designed to measure student attitude as it pertains to (1) willingness to experiment, (2) selection of choices, (3) concurrence with the actions of others, (4) willingness to proselytize for a value, and (5) willingness to take risks and to make meaningful sacrifices for a value.

Student Concerns.--This term describes the response to a set of fifty terms or concepts listed in ten separate categories in order to detect the major concerns of the student population. It is also utilized to determine if there are a set of common concerns among the population and if there exists a variance in concerns according to grade classification.

### Organization of the Study

This dissertation is structured according to the following plan:

Chapter I presents an introduction to the nature of the problem and the need for the present study.

Chapter II reviews the research related to this study and discusses attitude theory that is considered germane.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the present study. A description and selection of the sample, the rationale for instrumentation, the hypotheses, and the statistical procedures utilized in analyzing the data are likewise included in this chapter.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data and the statistical results in tabular and explanatory form.

Chapter V contains a summary of the results with conclusions and recommendations for additional research and a model of institutional involvement of students is presented.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### An Overview

What provoked student "sensitivity" to social and academic issues in the 1960's? During the 1940's and 1950's relatively few students were actively involved in either social issues or voicing demands for institutional change and reform. By the late 1950's the sound of distant drums was commencing to be heard on college campuses.

Lipset [11] theorizes that a change in international conditions was primarily responsible for the rise of "student activism." He contends that during the 1940's and early 1950's the Western world was concerned with expansionist tendencies of totalitarian systems, namely, fascism and communism. These threats caused intellectuals to assert and justify the virtues of the societies in which they lived. Serious domestic criticism was absent. By 1956, with the apparent disappearance of serious international dangers, domestic criticism commenced. Students who accepted the basic values of their American society began to press for implementation of ideals.

Sanford [12] argues that the institution of higher learning no longer addresses the needs of students. Others, including Erickson, Katz, and Riesman, articulate the thesis that personality development has been abandoned by the colleges and that a hostile environment brought forth the present evident alienation, apathy, and hostility.

Williamson and Cowan [13] argue for student involvement in the total educational process. Goodman [14] proposes the theme that specific and detailed attention be paid to the small social structures and institutions that immediately affect people and their lives--predominantly the school. The Marxist idiom, idealized in the figure of Che Guevara, presses for radicalization of the masses by demonstrating that no change except revolution itself will benefit students and society at large.

Camus and Sartre announced the absurdity of life as Altizer and Hamilton signed the death certificate of God. Greeley, Califano, and others, proclaim the "crisis of belief and values" while Kafka portrays man as dehumanized by bureaucratic organizations and structures.

Undoubtedly each of these verities helped to give rise to student demands for meaningful involvement in institutional governance procedures. No single thread dominates the tapestry of "involvement" but, rather, multi-dimensional human strands are interwoven into the fabric of the banner--"Student Participation, Now!"

Student participation, at least on a limited scale, has begun to produce change on a number of American campuses. A variety of publics, outside the academic arena, have joined leading educators, sociologists, psychologists, and others, in urging greater student involvement in higher education governance.

A review of the literature clearly indicates that the proponents of student participation in governance of institutions of higher learning are far more numerous than opponents. According to Schwartz [15], former president of the U.S. National Student Association: the question is no longer whether, but how; no longer how far, but how fast; and these depend, essentially, upon the ability of an old order to move, to change, and to grow.

Sharp differences arise, however, over the question of the limits of student influence. While many academicians are willing to agree to some redistribution of authority, most are not ready to embrace the concept of the academic institution as a democracy. Nevertheless, student pressures toward this end are likely to continue in the 1970's.

The personal and cultural value of student participation in administrative decision-making is acknowledged by many educators. Although Lunn [16] and Falvey [17] have written persuasively about the problem area, relatively little empirical research has been generated in educational institutions. The works of Friedson [18] and Carr [19] on

student government and participation are germane as is the research by Stern [20], who reports between-school variation on proportions of authoritarian-oriented students. Feldman-Newcomb [21] have summarized extensive studies on college students' political and social values.

Relevant research has also been reported in the literature of industrial social psychology. Vroom [22] has shown that employee participation in decision-making on the job is more satisfying to low than to high authoritarians. Other relevant studies are reported or summarized by Coch and French [23], Willerman [24], Tannenbaum and Allport [25], and Maier and Hayes [26]. Likert [27] summarizes additional findings from industrial research. In sum, these studies strongly suggest that employee participation in decision-making may have important implications for productivity, job satisfaction, labor turnover, mental health, absenteeism, and grievance behavior. However, it must be noted that Strauss [28] has raised some serious questions about theoretical issues and possible dysfunctional aspects of employee participation in industrial decision-making that also may be applicable in institutions of higher learning.

Relevant sociological organizational theory and research has indicated: (1) Blau and Scott [29] state that organizations depend upon goals and motives as well as clients served, (2) Abbot [30] and March and Simon [31]

demonstrate that bureaucratic tendencies have the potential to retard and frustrate school adaptiveness, (3) Griffiths [32] states that administrators who perceive themselves as controllers of the decision-making process rather than maker will be more effective, (4) Argyris [33] shows the prevailing need for self-actualization in man and the dysfunctional effects of organizational life, (5) Likert [34] states that effective groups are crucial to an effective organization, and (6) Thompson [35] indicates that enormous commitment from all parties is essential to renovate prevailing structures and traditions in education.

### Surveys

The period between World War II and 1964 saw a basic pattern of student participation in higher education remain unchanged. Certain significant developments did, nevertheless, occur. Williamson [36] noted that the influx of veterans following World War II brought a more mature undergraduate who demanded an arbitration-negotiation relationship to the college campus. Another factor that led to a demand for student participation was caused by the student personnel point of view which commenced to articulate the need for the college to deal with the student as a "whole person," and that his guidance was more important than regulations or discipline.

Brown [37] stated that student participation demands grew out of the concern that America, as a democratic society, was obligated to train citizens for greater participation in the democracy. Mayo [38] claimed that industry, apart from production of goods, has a social function to perform; that the primary group rather than the isolated individual ought to be the basic unit of observation in all industrial research; and, that adequate motivation is more important than the conditions of the physical environment. Inevitably this widespread concern for the democratic ideal influenced the college environment.

In 1950, I. D. Weeks [39], President of the University of South Dakota, asserted that student participation in curriculum, evaluation of teaching, convocations, commencement programs, and other college activities ought to be encouraged. In 1951, the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota officially stated that the Regents looked with favor upon all efforts designed to improve consultation, communications, and relationships between staff members and responsible student leaders.

The findings of Freidson [40], Hynes [41], McKown [42], Hand [43], and Morrison [44] clearly indicate that meaningful student participation in higher education decision-making had not developed to any great extent by the later part of the 1950's.

Carr [45] conducted a study focused upon student participation in college administration. One hundred nine state teachers colleges were studied as to four channels of student participation: student council; joint councils; student committees; and joint committees. Seventy-three and six-tenths percent of the institutions reported participation in administration, as defined by the four previously mentioned categories, by 30 percent or fewer of the seniors during their college careers. The study demonstrated the relatively insignificant student participation on the surveyed campuses. The concluding recommendations of the findings urge greater effort be given in obtaining and using students' suggestions and ideas pertaining to college administration. The study is important because of its systematic approach.

Boren [46] found at the University of Minnesota that the attitudes of faculty chairmen often determined the effectiveness of student participation; student participants believed the experience was valuable; students held that their committee service had improved university-student relationships and communication; and students and faculty became better acquainted. Davis [47], with questionnaire responses from 49 schools, concluded (1) that more than three-fourths of the schools had a policy that provided for student membership on some academic committees, (2) such membership was a recent development,

usually initiated by the administration, (3) qualifications for student membership varied, (4) contributions made by student membership was considered significant by most schools, and (5) no regional differences were found.

Muston [48], in surveying 1,769 institutions of higher learning, reported significant changes in governance during 1968. Data revealed that the most frequent means of involving both faculty and students was through increasing membership on standing and advisory committees. The results of a questionnaire administered to 3,000 persons on 19 campuses and in more than 900 interviews is reported by Hodgkinson [49]. Three types of responses were given: (1) student participation was favored in the belief that better decisions would result; (2) students had been included in governance to "take the heat off"; and (3) administrators believed that students should have no say, while the faculty sympathized with the administrators and students simultaneously. On occasion, more responsibility was offered than students were willing to accept; other times there was a lag between the granting of more power to students and a corresponding increase in respect for their ability and responsibility. Most resistance was expressed to student participation in faculty promotion and retention and in curriculum matters. Hodgkinson concluded that students are needed to improve the quality of campus decision-making because they seem more concerned

about the quality of teaching than either faculty or administrators.

An empirical study reported by Golden and Rosen [50], designed to determine in what areas of college administration students desire to participate and to investigate the relationship between attitudes toward such participation and authoritarianism as a personality trait, indicated that those students having the most liberal attitudes regarding student participation in decision-making also tend to be less satisfied in general with their college and less authoritarian generally.

Orcutt [51] reports the concerns of junior college students with regard to their rights and responsibilities. A dean and a student responded at each of 12 colleges surveyed. The most frequently endorsed response was that some student involvement ought to be formulated in areas of governance. This poll provides a strong endorsement of student involvement in institutional governance. A Gallup Study [52] of 1,030 students in 55 colleges reported that 81 percent of the total believed that students should have a greater say in running colleges; and, 75 percent stated that students should have a greater influence over the academic realm of college life.

Wilson and Gaff [53] data, supplied by 1,069 faculty members of six diverse colleges and universities, indicated that while faculty members were generally

favorable toward student participation in the formulation of social rules, they were reluctant to share academic power with students.

A survey conducted by College Management [54], reporting the views of 212 deans of students concerning several aspects of student participation, found that students have the least to say about faculty appointments, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. About one-half of the deans felt that the participation of students was too low. Sixty-five percent reported appeals for a larger role in governance at their institutions. Sixty-one percent believed that student members of governing bodies were as responsible as the regular members. The faculty was seen as most resistant to change. Although the results of this survey were based on less than one-half of the total sample, similar trends were found in later responses.

Hodgkinson [55] conducted a study to identify the characteristics that distinguish institutions reporting increased student protest from those which do not. Among the variables examined in a sample of 1,230 institutions was the effect of a strong student voice in institutional policy. The hypothesis that increased student control over institutional policy would result in a decrease in student protest was not supported by the data.

### Dissertations

A review of dissertation abstracts reveals ten studies that deal specifically with student participation in institutional governance.

A study conducted by Aceto [56] structured on interviews with 66 people from 11 universities that included deans, students, student leaders, SDS leaders, etc., concluded (1) only a small minority of students want to take over the university, (2) extensive disagreement exists between deans of students and the SDS, especially on the use of direct action, (3) increased student participation in policy-making can be effected only to the extent that it is welcomed by the faculty and administration in fact as well as theory, (4) non-obstructive direct action is acceptable, although it is not necessarily the preferred tactic used to initiate or change policy on the university campus.

Hekhuis [57] studied representatives from six groups at Michigan State University--student non-leaders, student leaders, faculty non-leaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators, and student personnel administrators--who were asked to rate the extent to which they thought students should be involved in various aspects of university policy-making. In most areas, policy formulation was not perceived as the sole prerogative of any

group. Student participation in policy formulation relating to general institutional government or academic administration was most often perceived as participation through recommendation or advising.

A study of Negro colleges and universities conducted by Bradley [58] indicated that students felt that they should have more responsibility in governance. The study also found that the status of students in participatory matters was more closely related to the philosophy of the administration than it was to the size, type of institution, or geographic location. Student government associations in many of the institutions were judged to be poorly organized and lacking in leadership.

In a case study of Southern Illinois University, Evans [59] concluded with an admonition for encouragement of greater student participation in the overall operation of the University.

Volkwein [60], in a study of 78 institutions of higher learning, reported that schools which are characterized by high quality and low bureaucratization tend to be "low protest and high student participation" institutions. The survey, which involved the highest ranking student affairs administrators, also found that schools which rate high on overall student participation are primarily characterized by high academic quality.

The Vaughan [61] study found that among high ability freshmen at the University of Minnesota alienation exists and varies widely in degree. The study also indicated that university administrators can alter the structure of the situation in which students interact with faculty and other students at the University which will preempt or reduce such feelings of alienation.

Pierce [62], in a survey of college and university administrators, found that the highest preferred levels for student participation concerned matters relating to student life affairs. Administrators least preferred student participation in matters that dealt with staff personnel. Administrators suggested that current formal channels for student participation may be inadequate for widespread meaningful and effective involvement. Changes and increases in levels of participation were generally considered to be welcomed. Faculty were considered the appropriate group to approve increased student participation while the initiative for such increases were thought to rest primarily with administrators.

Holt [63], in studying a large urban state university in New York, concluded (1) that general agreement about participation will not produce the results expected by students, (2) implementation of student involvement in decision-making will require careful preparation in order to ensure success, and (3) responsibility for providing

complete, clear, and regular reports on the status of administrative activities must be shared with students, and that students have the obligation to defend and implement those decisions that they participate in formulating.

Follett [64], in a study involving colleges and universities in Ohio, found that the prime area of student concern, and the area in which participation was requested and permitted, was student affairs. The study also found that there was no significant difference in level of participation between large public institutions and small private institutions. Private non-church affiliated schools did not have more participation than church-related institutions. However, Protestant schools did have more participation than Roman Catholic institutions surveyed.

Muston [65], in a study of data received from 1,670 institutions governed by 1,399 policy boards, found that policy boards used executive committees less frequently when students were participants. The incidence of recent problems relative to the distinction between policy making and administration and existing policies of academic freedom was significantly higher where students were involved in policy board participation. Three conclusions resulted from the study. (1) Boards with students involved reflect potential conflict of interest, internal struggle for influence and power, and dilution of the operation of

the policy board as a unit. (2) Boards with student participation operate in a more open and democratic manner than do other boards. (3) The concept of lay control is significantly threatened by student participation.

### Major Reports

The Committee on the Student in Higher Education [66], appointed by the Hazen Foundation early in 1966, was given the task to gain perspective on the various social and psychological influences which shape student attitudes, interests, and activities. The report points out that the tacit assumption made by the faculty and administration is that students are, by and large, simple-minded savages who will destroy the peace, order, and reputation of a school if they are not controlled and kept at bay. Consequently, collegiate organizational structure is much like the ordinary penal institution, with the single exception that the student is free to leave the college or university. The premise behind the exclusion of students from real governance of their lives is that they are not mature enough to be trusted with responsibility.

The Hazen report relates two themes: (1) the college is a major influence on the development of the student's personality; and (2) the college must recognize that the acquisition of knowledge takes place in a context of emergent adulthood. The Committee states its firm

convictions that American higher education must be simultaneously liberal and developmental.

The Committee's recommendations call for improvement in the quality of human relationships in the college through experimentation and application of developmental psychology. A major recommendation concerns increased student participation in educational policy-making. The Committee argued that students have insight into the meaning of their educational experiences which are important in making policy and administrative decisions. Student representation at the very highest governing levels of the college, even on the board of trustees, is necessary to prevent student victimization by the professional guilds and college administrators.

The Committee strongly recommends wide democratization of rulemaking and enforcing on the college campus. Democratization seems inevitable and therefore, according to the Committee, administrators ought to take the initiative rather than react to student pressure. The Committee concludes by insisting that improvement of the quality of human relationships and efficient education are inseparable.

After major disruptions occurred on American campuses during the spring of the 1969-70 academic year, President Nixon appointed former Governor of Pennsylvania William Scranton to conduct an inquiry into campus troubles.

The Scranton Report [67] found that the major complaint of student protesters lay in their lack of formal power in organizational and educational decision-making. The report states that major campus disturbances have been accompanied with demands for a "restructuring" of university governance in order to expand the role of students. The report asserts that until the mid 1960's few academic institutions devoted attention to the allocation of decision-making powers to students. Recent campus disorders reveal startling weaknesses in the systems of governance at most institutions of higher learning.

The Scranton Report established guidelines that ought to be considered in the process of reform of governance. (1) There ought to be increased participation of students, faculty, and staff in the formulation of university policies. (2) Universities are not institutions that can be run on a one-man, one-vote basis or with the participation of all members on all issues. (3) Competency should be a major criterion in determining involvement in the university decision-making process. (4) Another criterion for involvement in decision-making should be the degree to which decisions affect any group. (5) Procedures for electing representatives of university constituencies should be carefully designed to guarantee true representation, perhaps by having representatives elected by small departmental or residential units, or by establishing

quorum requirements to encourage participation and to enhance the legitimacy of the election results.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education [68], reporting data collected in 1969 from more than 60,000 faculty members, more than 30,000 graduate students, and more than 70,000 undergraduates at 300 institutions, found that more than two-thirds of the undergraduates claimed satisfaction with student-faculty relations, their relations with other students, the quality of classroom instruction, the intellectual environment of the campus, and the college administration.

On education reform, 90 percent of the undergraduates said course work should be more relevant to contemporary life and problems, and 82 percent felt that more attention should be paid to students' emotional growth. More than half the undergraduates favored making all courses elective, abolishing grades, and giving faculty members and students complete control of the universities.

On academic governance, few in any of the three groups felt that students should have control of major campus decisions, but there were sharp differences concerning the extent of the role students should have. A majority of the undergraduates felt that they should be involved in decisions on undergraduate admissions, course content, and bachelor's degree requirements--either with or without a vote--but most faculty members did not.

Both faculty and undergraduates agreed that undergraduates should control or have voting power on committees dealing with student discipline.

One-fifth of the undergraduates felt that students should have a vote on faculty appointments and promotions, and another 25 percent felt that they should be consulted. Only 5 percent of the faculty members favored giving students a vote; 15 percent favored consultation.

Although most faculty members and students oppose violent and disruptive demonstrations on campus, the Commission reported that there is disquiet among academic people about the state of American politics.

Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission, noted that the surveys have several implications for college administrators: (1) Faculty members and students are probably inclined to support policies that are designed to prevent campus violence and disruption and to support punishment for those who violate such policies; (2) The areas in which students who seek to extend their power are in the domain controlled by the faculty, and not the administration; therefore, it is likely that future conflicts on the campuses will be between students and faculty; and (3) The remarkable agreement among faculty members, graduate students, and undergraduates suggests that, however difficult campus problems may appear to be, they are potentially susceptible to resolution.

The Assembly on University Goals and Governance

[69], established by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to stimulate educational reform, states that the academic community must "rethink" its fundamental orientations if colleges and universities are to be revitalized and their weaknesses eliminated. Among the 85 theses presented, specific recommendations concerning institutional governance are (1) a system of college or university governance should be educative for all who take part, (2) good governance depends on a reasonable allocation of responsibilities that makes the structure of authority credible for all groups, (3) there ought to be a division of authority and responsibility, a sharing of information, and a readiness to subject authority to the requirements of a well-defined system of accountability, (4) the governance models borrowed from business and public administration are not appropriate for most functions of academic institutions, (5) the centralization of student politics, a result of student government, may reduce the involvement of students in the decentralized schools and departments of the institution, (6) many activities in addition to the extra-curricular ones now handled by students might desirably be delegated to students, and (7) the greatest opportunity for students to influence educational policy can occur on a decentralized basis of institutional activity and programs.

### Institutional Reports

Numerous institutional reports, some published and others strictly of an intra-institutional nature, have been issued concerning student participation in governance. The following specific reports, resulting from a review of literature, are utilized since they seem to be the most substantive.

A major report, following the Muscatine Report and the Herr Committee's Report issued at Berkeley, entitled The Culture of the University: Governance and Education [70] concerned itself with student participation in governance at the University of California, Berkeley. The majority report of the Committee agreed that the University was responsible for two critical failures: (1) an inability to develop a student body which respects the value of the intellect "per se" and thereby produces students with passionless minds and mindless passions (characterized by apathy and careerism); and (2) domination by "service." The latter failure resulted, in the Committee's judgment, because the function of providing useful knowledge and expert consultants to assist society has gotten out of hand.

The major recommendations of the report are (1) an extensive decentralization of all the functions of the university to the departmental level, together with a

great increase in the role of students in educational policy-making at every level, and (2) an elaborate system for exercising student discipline through various courts, panels, and appellate bodies, whose aim is to ensure the fullest due process.

In 1964, Robert Somers [71], a University of California, Berkeley, sociologist, conducted a poll on that campus and found that 56 percent of the students agreed that the campus administration could usually be counted on to give sufficient consideration to the rights and needs of students in setting university policy. By 1968, the proportion of students agreeing with this statement had dropped to 32 percent.

Morison [72], Chairman of Cornell's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making, asserts in his published report that the student's cry for more power in the decisions which affect his life is a plea for more control of the type of educational opportunity available to him and indicates his ardent desire to use the university as an active instrument for social reform.

This apparent feeling on the part of a sizable proportion of students reveals three fundamental notions:

- (1) the institution of higher learning is important;
- (2) the institution of higher learning may be more deeply involved in supporting bad features of the existing politico-socio-economic structure than it is willing to

admit; and (3) the college setting with which the student is most familiar ought to be an ally in remedying the ills of an ever increasingly complex and depersonalized world.

Morison outlines the primary concerns and recommendations regarding student involvement in academic policy making at Cornell in three major proposals. First, a broad representative group must consider major policy issues. Groups who should participate in the decision-making process should consist of students, faculty, trustees, administrators, and non-academic staff. The primary benefit resulting from such group participation in decision-making that involves such constituencies would be the ability to investigate instances when policy has been made under the guise of administrative procedure.

Second, policy making mechanisms must be made active and innovative, with clearly defined spheres of competence, sufficient power to move in those spheres of concern, responsive to crisis, and relevant to the areas in which policy must be made.

Third, separate student government structures which legislate on student affairs must give way to the inclusion of students in the college's policy-making structures. This implies a recognition of students as constituents in the university as a whole and rightfully participating in decisions that affect the college as a whole, not merely narrowly defined "student affairs."

Fourth, student participation in the decision-making process must reflect the inability of students to get their concerns on the institution's priority list through the devices of informal persuasion open to the faculty. The minority of active students interested in taking a role in university decision-making must be allowed to do so, while still permitting the majority of the student body to exert a check upon these students on specific issues when its interest is aroused.

The four major recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the University [73] are representative of the kinds of changes being considered and recommended by many institutions of higher learning. The Committee advocates (1) virtually complete withdrawal by the university from its "in loco parentis" activities, (2) broader student participation of various forms in practically all areas of university government, (3) greater student self-governing authority and simpler means of liaison between students and faculty, and (4) restructured, limited, and clarified university disciplinary procedures.

A survey of literature indicates that 35 colleges and universities have issued major reports concerned with proposed or recently implemented changes in governance at specific institutions.

International Studies

Duster [74], a Swedish scholar, takes a sociological approach to the topic of student participation in college and university governance. He suggests looking at the nature of rewards for the three groups--faculty, administrators, and students. If differences are found, there would be justification for representation of each group in a governing council. He describes the student role in governance at Swedish universities and suggests adopting the kinds of structural devices which would most suit the particular institutional governance needs of the campus.

The Duff-Berdahl Report [75] on University Government in Canada, deals with matters of internal institutional governance. Canadian universities (nearly 60 at the time of the study) traditionally operated under the guidance of powerful university presidents, flanked by lay boards dependent on presidential guidance, and by a disenfranchised academic senate. The report recommends the elevation of the senate to the supreme academic body of the university. Lay boards should be modified to include no fewer than three faculty representatives. The report recommends that students be elected to the senate.

The Duff-Berdahl study has reportedly produced significant changes in Canadian higher education. Students now have membership on at least some academic committees

at practically all Canadian universities and have direct senate representation at more than half of them.

McGrath [76], in seeking information about the impact of the Duff-Berdahl study and the present status of student involvement in Canadian universities, concludes (1) with few exceptions the members of the Association of Canadian Universities and Colleges have brought students into the top policy-making bodies, (2) students now generally elect or appoint their own members to sit on the senate and its committees, (3) Canadian administrative officers overwhelmingly believe that students are making valuable contributions to the deliberations of academic bodies, (4) there are still some problems to be solved, and (5) evidence suggests that the Canadian enterprise of higher education is committed to the doctrine that students can and should play an important role in determining the policies and practices which shape higher education.

M de Jouvenel [77] contends that the primary conflict for college students is with society rather than with the university. Jouvenel specifies three ideal conditions for democratic self-government, all of which are present in the university: (1) a relatively small number of citizens; (2) a relatively intelligent group of citizens; and (3) wise men standing on the sidelines (administrators and faculty).

Jouvenel comments on the student incidents at Natterre, the Sorbonne, and the Paris Faculty of Law and Economics during the spring and early summer of 1968. He contends that improper institutional response at the first two mentioned institutions escalated into a national crisis. At the Paris Faculty of Law and Economics, composed of 36,000 students, "student power" was given recognition and voice by academic authorities. A General Assembly, half of whose members were students, divided into commissions and presented its mandates.

Jouvenel reports that the conclusions reached by the commissions bore upon every aspect of the learning process and its organization at the Paris Faculty of Law and Economics. Jouvenel states that the earnestness and thoughtfulness of the students was highly impressive. In fact, the professors were driven to remark that the changes that students called for would demand very much more personal effort on the part of the students than did existing conditions.

Jouvenel contends that academic authorities should avoid coming into conflict with students' outward-addressed activities and should provide viable processes to deal with inward-addressed demands for change and reform. The policies inaugurated by the Faculty of Law and Economics at the University of Paris, Jouvenel states, gave rise to no incidents. On the contrary, it was an affair of good fellowship between students and professors.

McGrath Study

McGrath's [78] study of students and their role in college and university governance, the most significant and comprehensive to date, presents the following major findings: (1) student participation in academic government is unlikely to turn out to be a passing fad; (2) literature treating the theoretical issues related to student involvement has generally been unsystematic, fragmentary, and fugitive; (3) the primary consideration at this time is how students can be most effectively involved in deliberative and legislative academic bodies; (4) formal student participation at Antioch College, Roosevelt University, Bennington College, Sarah Lawrence, Marlboro, Goddard College, and steps being taken by the Canadian colleges and universities clearly indicate that such involvement on the part of students in academic governance can be vitally and effectively productive; (5) means must be found to formalize the students' participation in the making of academic policy, to regularize their contribution, and to involve them as initiators of, rather than as protesters against, policy; and (6) students are best equipped by knowledge, compassionate feeling, and vigorous spirit to accomplish long-overdue reforms and reliable fact and logical argument will help persuade them that they can bring about change and reform.

McGrath concludes his study by observing that, although specific structure and the political processes of the academic government of the future must yet be determined, nevertheless, where students have been fully involved in academic government, they have typically discharged their responsibilities with effectiveness and with dignity.

### Conclusions

It is clear from the summary of literature and research concerning student participation in institutional governance that the vast majority of material published to date is more journalistic and polemical than analytical.

There are still major gaps in the research available on student participation. Three areas seem to be almost totally neglected; namely, (1) individual campus self-evaluation of institutional framework, environment, and "press"; (2) study of the campus population with particular emphasis given to determining the needs, concerns, and goals of the student; and (3) delineation of those institutional factors and responses which can creatively and usefully stimulate student involvement in decision-making processes and governance.

Research and study concerning student involvement in institutional governance and reform is not an esoteric subject for irrelevant academics, but it is a matter of

utmost concern to college administrators, faculty, and perhaps in the long run to society itself. As higher education opportunities expand and attract larger and more heterogeneous student populations and become increasingly more important in American culture and political life, student involvement in institutional government will be even more relevant.

Policy-making and institutional response to legitimate student demand for change and reform ought to be based on enlightened analysis and not simply a reaction to internal or external pressures. The phenomenon of student involvement in decision-making and institutional governance may teach some important truths about broader trends and participation in the American political system.

The literature reviewed adds positive credence to the value and rationale for involving students in academic governance and decision-making. It is apparent that each institution of higher learning will have to construct its own model to meet the specific needs of the campus population.

The review of the literature reveals no studies such as the present one.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Since it is presumed that college students have attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion, and community service projects, it seems valuable to measure these attitudes as to their "expression" and "action" components. If students presently express a concern and a desire to participate in institutional policy-making and governance, is it likely that they will take action if opportunities for participation are extended to them?

#### Research Population

The population for this study consisted of all students enrolled at Siena Heights College, Adrian, Michigan, with the exception of 37 Religious women who were excluded from the study because they were enrolled in only one course. An attempt to test the entire population was made. Three class days and evenings were utilized in gaining responses to the questionnaire items. Each student who attended classes during the three day period was given an opportunity to complete the questionnaire.

Special efforts were made to insure that no student answered twice.

### Description of Siena Heights College

The present study demanded a population of students at a particular small liberal arts college. Siena Heights College was selected for the study because of the following reasons: (1) its proximity to Michigan State University; (2) the investigator's familiarity with the college while serving as institutional consultant; (3) the enthusiasm and cooperation manifested by the administration and faculty concerning the study; and (5) the college's present efforts to revise curriculum and to construct procedures and strategies to involve students in institutional governance and policy-making.

Siena Heights College was founded in 1919 by the Sisters of St. Dominic. The college offers a four-year course of study with programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Science in Home Economics. The college also confers secretarial diplomas for the completion of two years of work in secretarial science.

Since 1958, graduate courses have been offered in art, education, English, history, philosophy, science, and mathematics. The Graduate Division of Siena Heights College now offers work for degrees in art, Master of Art

and Master of Fine Arts; science, Master of Science, and education, Master of Education and Master of Arts in Teaching.

The student population consists of 674 students, of which 592 are enrolled in the undergraduate division and 82 are enrolled in the graduate division. Of the total student population, 444 are women, 136 are men, and 94 women are classified as Religious for the second semester of the academic year 1970-71.

#### Rationale for Instrument Selection

Attitudes are one's conviction about which objects are good or bad, which are acceptable or unacceptable, to be agreed with or disagreed with [Collins, 79]. An attitude can be considered as

- (1) a residue or measurement of previous experience with the attitude object, or
- (2) correlated with present and future behavior toward the attitude object.

Previous experience can be direct, personal, or socially mediated experience which results from verbal instruction or communication. Previous experience can also be considered as a residue, record or measurement.

The present study relies upon Thurstone's [80] explication of attitude. Attitude, states Thurstone, is the intensity of positive or negative affect for or

against a psychological object. A psychological object is any symbol, person, phrase, slogan, or idea toward which people can differ as regards positive or negative affect.

The measurement of attitude in this study is utilized for two purposes: (1) to evaluate three "college participation" situations experienced by the individual student; and (2) to predict, if possible, subsequent behavior.

### Instrument Selection

The assessment of attitudes is complex and illusive; likewise, the problem of predicting action from a survey of attitudes is formidable. With the appearance of Handbook II: Affective Domain by Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia [81], researchers interested in assessing attitudes seemed to have been provided a tool for developing simple but useful devices for that purpose.

May [82] examined Taxonomy II over a period of five years, discovered what he thought to be several weaknesses in it, and proposed a modified taxonomy which will be utilized in the present study. (Figure 1, page 49, presents a comparison of Taxonomy II and May's Taxonomy II Modified.) May proposes four modifications to the taxonomy of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia. The suggested modifications are the following:

1. A change of the successive categories in the affective hierarchy from intervening variables to response variables. The rationale for this change rests with the premise that intervening variables are inferred states of feeling or thinking whereas response variables are founded upon actual behavior. May argues that response variables can be measured more objectively and accurately than intervening variables.

2. The internalization hierarchy out to be based on emotional involvement rather than organizational complexity. The internalization hypothesis, articulated by May, coincides with an increasing willingness to expend energy or to take action for the sake of one's values. It would seem that a person, according to May, would have a certain degree of willingness to experiment, choose, to concur, to proselytize, and to make sacrifices. A person strongly willing to proselytize may have internalized a value more than a person only mildly willing to concur with the feelings of others. The two-dimensional approach, citing "expression" and "action" components, is also proposed by May in his modified taxonomy.

3. There is need to develop new objectives. May recommends that a taxonomy of affective-type objectives serve as a model for objectives rather than a container of them. If the language of affective objectives is imprecise, May contends, perhaps words such as "satisfaction,"

## TAXONOMY II

## MODIFIED TAXONOMY II

1.0 Receiving	1.0 Experiment State	Lo 2 3 4 Hi
1.1 Awareness	1.1 Expression of willingness to try something	
1.2 Willingness to receive	1.2 Indication that something has been tried	
1.3 Controlled or selected attention		
2.0 Responding	2.0 Choice Stage	Lo 2 3 4 Hi
2.1 Acquiescence in responding	2.1 Expression of choice between things	
2.2 Willingness to respond	2.2 Indication that choices have been actually made	
2.3 Satisfaction in response		
3.0 Valuing	3.0 Concurrence Stage	Lo 2 3 4 Hi
3.1 Acceptance of a value	3.1 Expression of agreement with others	
3.2 Preference for a value	3.2 Expression of willingness to share an activity with other enthusiasts	
3.3 Commitment	3.3 Indication that a certain type of behavior has been shared with other enthusiasts	

4.0 Organization	4.0 Proselyte State	Lo 2 3 4 Hi
4.1 Conceptualization of a value	4.1 Expression of willingness to encourage others to try something	
4.2 Organization of a value system	4.2 Indication that proselytizing has taken place	
<hr/>		
5.0 Characterization by a value complex	5.0 Sacrifice State	Lo 2 3 4 Hi
5.1 Generalized set	5.1 Expression of willingness to do something despite sacrifice	
5.2 Characterization	5.2 Indication that sacrifices have been made	
<hr/>		

Figure 1. Comparison of Taxonomy II and May's Modified Taxonomy II.

"realistic acceptance," and "continuing desire" should be deleted.

4. Test items ought to elicit more definitive responses. In the Modified Taxonomy II (Figure 1) proposed by May and utilized in the present study, each of the five stages has an "expression" and "action" component. The "expression" component utilizes a measurement component whereas the "action" component utilizes a measurement of frequency, latency, and magnitude. A measurement of extinction could have been made by means of test-retest procedures. This was not deemed necessary or advantageous for the present study. Only if one wanted to determine the development or change in student attitudes would the extinction factor need to be included.

#### Instrumentation

The 80-item questionnaire (see Appendix) constructed for this study was first submitted to five independent judges in order to remove ambiguous statements or terminology, to delete irrelevant statements, to insure easy reading of statements, and to change item structure and presentation format.

The variables selected for inclusion in the questionnaire were those which were postulated to have some particular relationship to the criterion variable. Other variables were included, however, which were

intended to provide information in respect to the characteristics of students at Siena Heights College. The major variables to be used in the study are briefly discussed in this section.

#### Attitude Toward Participation (Criterion Variable)

An Attitude Toward Participation--Expression/Action--Scale was developed by the investigator based upon the modifications suggested by May in the previous three pages of this chapter.

The scale was simple to administer and was utilized because there is rationale for hypothesizing a relationship between attitude expression and behavior prediction. The complete instrument consists of forty-five items, of which twenty-one are "expression" components and twenty-four are "action" components. For statistical purposes three latency items were deleted from the "action" components in order that each area might contain twenty-one items.

The scale attempts to survey the attitudes of students concerning participation in three areas of college life, namely, student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects. The selection of these three factors as the basis for the item construct is founded on the rationale that every college student will have had the opportunity of forming attitudes toward these activities

and will have been afforded numerous opportunities to have been actively involved in these three areas during the college experience. Involvement in such activities cannot be considered to be an isolated or rare opportunity possibility, but rather something constant and prevailing.

### Likert-type Scale

Responses to questionnaire items in this study are scored on a five point Likert-type scale. The scaling procedure is beneficial for statistical analysis.

### Governance Involvement

Four questionnaire items (See Appendix, questions 76, 77, 78, and 79), three of which were suggested by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Study [83], attempt to measure student response to matters of participation in policy-making and institutional planning. Each questionnaire item is recorded on a five point continuum.

### Institutional Satisfaction

This variable was measured by four questionnaire items (Appendix, questions 6, 7, 8, and 9). Chickering [84] lists the major impacts for change that a college ought to have upon a student. The self-report responses, incorporating Chickering's criteria of impact, measured student satisfaction with the general academic environment,

personal development, and satisfaction with present teaching practices.

### Participation Issues

The attitude objectives used in the scale items (Appendix, questions 36 through 45) were developed by the investigator from twenty-five items reported by Golden and Rosen [86]. The items were subjected to an internal consistency analysis which produced a highly reliable instrument, according to Golden and Rosen.

Some modification in the instrument was found necessary since all 24 participation issues were not relevant to the student population being investigated; furthermore, the review of literature indicates more pertinent issues of participation being raised on present-day campuses.

### Student Concerns

Fifty items, representing concepts or concerns, were arranged in 10 specific categories that attempted to measure the present student population's major concerns. The Student Concern Scale was intended to (1) register the concerns of the general student population, (2) determine if there is a set of common concerns among all students, and (3) determine if there are varying concerns according to class groupings.

The construct for the first 8 categories resulted from a study reported by Thornburg [86]. The present study introduces two additional categories, namely, (a) political interests, and (b) educational interests. In addition, several items were changed in order to accommodate three student judges who reviewed the 10 categories and found some items too ambiguous or lacking in meaning for the present college student population.

### Demographic Variables

Respondents were asked to indicate their placement on several variables found to be of significance in social-educational research. These variables are (a) sex, (b) class enrollment group, (c) family neighborhood characterization, (d) current political preferences, (e) grade point average, and (f) urban-rural background.

### Validity and Reliability

The four major scales of the study were submitted to two independent judges in order to confirm face validity. A five year effort of May [87] resulted in the Modified Taxonomy II measurement of attitudes used in this study. May recommends that reliability coefficients related to the population studied be computed since such reliability coefficients vary a great deal from one population to another. Chapter Four reports the Hoyt Reliability Coefficients for the present study.

### Collection of Data

The 80-item questionnaire was administered by the investigator and three assistants in group settings. Respondents were free to respond or not and were requested not to identify themselves on the questionnaire in any manner.

All students attending class sessions held on January 25, 26, and 27, 1971, at Siena Heights College were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Good cooperation was received with a return of 450 usable questionnaires from the student population of 637. However, complete and total participation was not received for a number of reasons, among them being the following:

(1) for various reasons some students do not attend every class session; (2) some few students were ill, absent for personal or family reasons, or were detained from class attendance during the three days on which the questionnaire response could have been made; and (3) some few students felt the questionnaire was either too long or too irrelevant to spend time in responding. Twenty-three questionnaires that were returned could not be used because of incompleteness or failure to follow directions.

The 80-item questionnaire took an average of 30 minutes to answer. An assistant was available to every group during the time responses were being made to the

questionnaire in order to clarify directions or answer any questions that might have arisen.

## Statistical Procedures

### Descriptive Statistics

The responses were first scored on a special scoring sheet and then transferred to punched cards which could be fed into the CDC 3600 or CDC 6500 computer, available at Michigan State University. The CDC CISSR Percount Program was first utilized in tabulating percentages for each questionnaire item. This proved useful in selecting variables for analysis and in gaining a clinical "feel" for the data.

### Weighting Procedures

The weighting program utilized in the present study was devised by Wilson and Yager [88]. The procedure employs an a priori set of item response weights assigned by the investigator to the three scales of "attitudes toward participation" in (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects.

The weighting hypothesis assumes that each stage of internalization (see Chapter Three for an extended explanation of the stages in the attitude taxonomy) has

its own continuum or degree of differentiation. Therefore, an individual has a certain degree of willingness to experiment, to choose, to concur with the actions of others, to proselytize, and to make sacrifices for attitudes or values that he believes are of importance.

The weighting procedure assumes that each successive stage ought to receive increased weighting since, for example, it is of greater significance to proselytize or to make sacrifices for one's values (stages 4 and 5) than simply to express or indicate attitude action in the experiment or choice stages (stages 1 and 2).

#### Mean Difference Analysis

A multiple analysis of variance design for unequal N's was used to analyze group-sex interaction. For the convenience of computer programming, both the T and F statistic were used for all testing of mean differences. However, in testing the hypothesis of the study the T statistic was used.

The "print-out" from the computer on the multiple analysis of variance design provided the frequencies, sums, means, sum of squares, and sums of squared deviations of the means for each category, as well as the F statistic and the approximate significance probability of the F statistics. This convenient "print-out" enabled the researcher to know at a glance whether or not the F was

significant without referring to statistical tables. For example, if the number printed out was .01, this implied that for a given  $F$  with the appropriate degrees of freedom, the level of confidence would be .01. However, if only .00 was printed out, the level of confidence was to be considered to be .005 or less.

### Predictive Statistics

With the help of the CDC 3600 computer program, the researcher procured the following measures of association for the purposes of predictive and relational analyses: (a) zero-order correlations; (b) multiple correlations; and (c) partial correlations. The programs provided data that included means and standard deviations for each variable, the matrix of simple correlations between all variables, the multiple correlations of selected variables on the criterion, the beta weights of all predictor variables used in the analyses, a test of significance for each beta weight, and partial correlations between each predictor and the criterion.

The multiple regression analysis that was performed for the data was consistent with the appropriate research hypothesis. The use of multiple regression analysis has been recommended by many researchers. Ward [89] observes that it "not only reduces the dangers inherent in piecemeal research but also facilitates the investigation of

broad problems never before considered researchable."

Partial correlation was computed from the outputs of the general multiple regression model used in the CDC 3600 program. One benefit of the use of partial correlation is that a number of variables which are assumed to have some relationship to a criterion, or dependent variable, can be examined simultaneously. Often, when a series of Pearsonian product-moment r's are computed between a criterion and a set of variables considered to be predictors of the criterion, spurious conclusions may be obtained because the predictor variables are themselves interrelated, rather than directly predictive of the criterion. In a partial correlation solution to the problem these relationships among the predictor variables are taken into account in computing the true correlation of each variable with the criterion. That is, the effects of all but one variable are held constant.

#### Limitations of the Study

1. Every comparative analysis study is limited because it cannot indicate a cause-effect relationship. The results of such a study can only imply conclusions. Generalization is not possible. However, since the intent of the present study concerned itself with a specific college student population, the implications for this college are greatly increased in significance.

2. An instrument used for the first time has a number of inherent weaknesses that must be eradicated in the future usage of such an instrument. The selection of item content may also contend to deflate the effectiveness of the instrument.

3. The questionnaire administration might have caused some students anxiety about responding which could have reduced the percentages of completed questionnaires. The method of sampling may have placed limitations on the generality of results since over 28 percent of the student population is not included in the study results.

4. Time and money limitations did not permit the giving of these instruments to a pre-test group before administering them to the student population of the study. However, this limitation has been somewhat diminished by the statistical procedures utilized.

5. The reliability and validity of the measurements may be open to some question. It is difficult if not impossible to determine the degree of uniformity in communication and the accuracy of the respondents' reporting. Yet even if these factors were negligible, high reliability and validity coefficients cannot be assured.

6. The reporting of one's own ideas, feelings, or beliefs is always subject to deficiencies because of possible inability to analyze true apprehensions and attitudes and report them accurately.

7. Questionnaire content is always subjected to a certain amount of investigator bias. Undoubtedly this has also taken place, at least to a degree, in this study.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter is organized into three main sections:

- (1) Descriptive characteristics of the population investigated.
- (2) The testing of the hypothesis.
- (3) Presentation of other statistical analyses which did not relate to the hypothesis, but which were relevant.

#### Descriptive Data

The descriptive characteristics of the research population are presented in this section. Analysis of the data is based on the CDC 3600 CISSR PERCOUNT PROGRAM which provided a number of statistics useful for simple demographic descriptions.

Table 1 presents the population size, showing the respondents according to sex, class, and number. It is apparent that the number of male respondents, particularly in the junior, senior, and graduate classes, is small. The reason for this is two-fold: (a) only recently has

Siena Heights College admitted males to the student population; and (b) a large percent of the male population is enrolled as part-time students.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to sex and class.

Sex	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate
Male	34	22	12	3	10
Female	95	89	53	95	37
Sub-Total	<u>129</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>47</u>
Not in Study:					
Male	25	9	4	3	11
Female	32	21	16	23	24
Total	<u>186</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>82</u>

### Demographic Differences

The data for the three demographic variables of class, family background, and current political preferences are presented in Table 2. It is interesting to note that the political preference percentages reported are very similar to the political preferences indicated by the 1970-71 freshmen reported by the American Council on Education [90]. In that study 33.5 percent of the

freshmen surveyed were classified as liberal and 45.4 percent indicated that they were middle of the road. In the present study 34.8 percent of the respondents classified themselves as liberal whereas 48.2 percent of the students indicated that they held a middle of the road political philosophy.

Table 2. Population demographic characteristics.

Class Enrollment	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
Freshman	129	28.67	129	28.67
Sophomore	111	24.67	240	53.33
Junior	65	14.44	305	67.78
Senior	98	21.78	403	89.56
Graduate	47	10.44	450	100.00
Total N = 450    Mean = 2.6067    Standard Deviation = 1.3705				
Family Class				
Upper	7	1.56	7	1.56
Upper-Middle	94	20.89	101	22.44
Middle	253	56.22	354	78.67
Working	91	20.22	445	98.89
Lower	5	1.11	450	100.00
Total N = 450    Mean = 2.9844    Standard Deviation = 0.7202				
Political Preference				
Far Left	7	1.56	7	1.56
Liberal	157	34.89	164	36.44
Middle of the Road	217	48.22	381	84.67
Conservative	68	15.11	449	99.78
Far Right	1	0.22	450	100.00
Total N = 450    Mean = 2.7756    Standard Deviation = 0.7224				

Over 56 percent of the students reported that their family background was middle class while only 1.5 percent classified themselves as coming from upper-class backgrounds and 1.1 percent indicated that they were from a lower class family.

Table 3. Demographic characteristics (continued).

GPA	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
0 - 1.0	1	0.22	1	0.22
1.0 - 2.0	28	6.22	29	6.44
2.0 - 3.0	242	53.78	271	60.22
3.0 - 3.5	139	30.89	410	91.11
over 3.5	40	8.89	450	100.00
Total N = 450    Mean = 3.4200    Standard Deviation = 0.7486				
Urban-Rural				
Farm	89	19.78	89	19.78
Small Town	137	30.44	226	50.22
Moderate Size City	109	24.22	335	74.44
Large City	63	14.00	398	88.44
Suburb	52	11.56	450	100.00
Total N = 450    Mean = 2.6711    Standard Deviation = 1.2622				

Table 2 also indicates the percentage of distribution of the respondents according to class enrollment. It would appear that a highly representative sampling is included in the study. Although the inclusion of the entire population would have benefited the present study,

the reasons cited in Chapter III prevented such an accomplishment.

Tables 2 and 3 indicate the general heterogeneity of the student population as measured according to the demographic parameters utilized in the study.

### Satisfaction with College Environment

Tables 4 and 5 indicate student apparent satisfaction with the present academic environment. A significant 75.3 percent stated that they were either mildly or very satisfied with the general college atmosphere. Only 9.8 percent stated that they were undecided about the college as a place to receive an education. It is interesting to note that 76.2 percent of the students mildly or strongly disagreed with the statement that they feel their development is beyond the level of the college and their fellow students.

The questions for four of the five items included in the Satisfaction Scale were derived from remarks concerning the impact of the college upon students as suggested by Chickering [91].

Responses to the five satisfaction items would seem to indicate a student body that is generally well satisfied with the learning experience provided by the college and with the quality of instruction and beneficial impact of the faculty.

Table 4. Responses to satisfaction scale questions.

---

In general, how satisfied are you with the college as a place to get an education, taking into account professors, courses, administrative practices, campus facilities, personal relationships, etc.?

---

Degree	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	105	23.33	105	23.33
Mildly "	234	52.00	339	75.33
Undecided	44	9.78	383	85.11
Mildly dissatis.	56	12.44	439	97.56
Strongly "	11	2.44	450	100.00

Total N = 450    Mean = 2.1867    Standard Deviation = 1.0081

---

According to my own personal estimation, I feel that my development is beyond the level of this college and my fellow students.

---

Strongly agree	21	4.67	21	4.67
Mildly agree	89	19.78	110	24.44
Undecided	103	22.89	213	47.33
Mildly disagree	130	28.89	343	76.22
Strongly "	107	23.78	450	100.00

Total N = 450    Mean = 3.4733    Standard Deviation = 1.1847

---

This college has helped me to clarify my own purposes and potentials and to accelerate my own development.

---

Strongly agree	99	22.00	99	22.00
Mildly agree	197	43.78	296	65.78
Undecided	67	14.89	363	80.67
Mildly disagree	57	12.67	420	93.33
Strongly "	30	6.67	450	100.00

Total N = 450    Mean = 2.3822    Standard Deviation = 1.1543

---

Table 5. Responses to satisfaction scale question (cont'd).

---

My experiences at this college have helped me to become a more independent person, able to express my impulses and to tolerate the complexity of life.

---

Degree	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	101	22.44	101	22.44
Mildly agree	225	50.00	326	72.44
Undecided	45	10.00	371	82.44
Mildly disagree	55	12.22	426	94.67
Strongly "	24	5.33	450	100.00

Total N = 450    Mean = 2.2800    Standard Deviation = 1.1035

---

The teachers at this college have had a significantly beneficial impact upon me.

---

Strongly agree	106	23.56	106	23.56
Mildly agree	192	42.67	298	66.22
Undecided	61	13.56	359	79.78
Mildly disagree	65	14.44	424	94.22
Strongly "	26	5.78	450	100.00

Total N = 450    Mean = 2.3622    Standard Deviation = 1.1579

---

### Student Concerns

Student concerns are measured according to 10 categories presented in Table 6. One interesting statistic prevailed: in nearly all cases students expressed more concern over situations involving themselves than they did over various domestic and international issues. This is observed in the fact that the items of freedom, learning, education, and drugs ranked highest among the students.

Table 6. Student concerns.

Category	N	Percent	Category	N	Percent
<u>FUTURE</u>	18	4.00	<u>PERSONAL</u>		
Competition	18	4.00	Emancipation	16	3.56
Occupation	74	16.44	Self-esteem	39	8.67
Education	293	65.11	Social Ident.	12	2.67
Econ. Stability	60	13.33	Self-respons.	115	25.56
Automation	5	1.11	Self-identity	268	59.56
N=450 Mean=2.9111 SD=0.7039			N=450 Mean=4.2889 SD=1.0991		
<u>APPROVAL</u>			<u>INTERNATIONAL</u>		
Popularity	31	6.89	Nuclear War	59	13.11
Teacher Appr.	45	10.00	Overpopulation	106	23.56
Societal "	68	15.11	U.S.-Russia	21	4.67
Peer Approval	152	33.78	Viet Nam	193	42.89
Parental "	154	34.22	Communism	71	15.78
N=450 Mean=3.7844 SD=1.2125			N=450 Mean=3.2467 SD=1.3278		
<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>MORAL</u>		
Civil Rights	59	13.11	Moral Code	51	11.33
18-yr. Old Vote	24	5.33	Formal Religion	31	6.89
Law and Order	122	27.11	Marriage	75	16.67
Poverty	130	28.89	Phil. of Life	119	26.44
Ecology	115	25.56	Values-Attitudes	174	38.67
N=450 Mean=3.4844 SD=1.2876			N=450 Mean=3.7422 SD=1.3366		
<u>SEXUALITY</u>			<u>SOCIAL ACTION</u>		
The 'Pill'	21	4.67	Cigarettes	51	11.33
Sex Education	196	43.56	Commune Living	55	12.22
Meaningful Pre-marital Sex	67	14.89	Drugs	286	63.56
Abortion	82	18.22	Gambling	5	1.11
Birth Control	84	18.67	Liquor	53	11.78
N=450 Mean=3.0267 SD=1.2465			N=450 Mean=2.8978 SD=1.245		

Table 6. (cont'd).

Category	N	Percent	Category	N	Percent
<u>POLITICAL</u>			<u>EDUCATIONAL</u>		
Reform	67	14.89	Learning	322	71.56
Bureaucracy	9	2.00	Participation	32	7.11
Revolution	29	6.44	Teaching	55	12.22
Repression	22	4.89	Cheating	4	0.89
Freedom	323	71.78	Grades	37	8.22
N=450 Mean=4.1667 SD=1.4762			N=450 Mean=1.6711 SD=1.2282		

However, it must be pointed out that these are college students responding and, therefore, these listed concerns are undoubtedly intensified.

The other most frequently listed concerns involved self-identity, parental and peer approval, and sex education. Other concerns that received significant student attention indicate a diversity of concerns rather than a narrow pre-occupation with one or two specific issues.

It is interesting to note that in relation to national concerns the matter of 18 yr. old voting received a 5.3 response as being a major concern for the students. In regard to moral concerns, formal religion was the primary concern of only 6.8 percent of the students (in attendance at a private Roman Catholic college) whereas values and attitudes were the primary concern of 38.6 percent of the student respondents.

These findings relate closely to Thornburg's (1969) survey of 797 students at four major universities. Thornburg reports the ten most frequent concerns as education, Viet Nam, sexuality, occupations, draft, peer approval, politics, civil rights, competition, and self-identity.

### Participation Issues

Student attitudes concerning participation in policy-making are reported in Tables 7 and 8. The total research population response is presented on an item by item basis. The most salient items seem to be those related to the very areas in which students generally have been agitating against college and university administrations--selecting visiting speakers, controlling dormitory policies, and planning the curriculum.

In contrast, the least significant items seem to be of two types: those that indicate areas in which students probably feel they already have voice, as for example, establishing library codes, establishing grade policy and procedures, and those that represent areas in which students perhaps feel that they are unqualified and should not generally participate, as for example, meeting with college trustees, establishing tuition costs, or regulating scholarship and loan policies.

Students seem to be most concerned with those areas which have or which may have an immediate and direct

Table 7. Student participation issue scale.

Students should participate in:					
Issue	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent	
1. Establishing library codes.					
always	130	28.89	130	28.89	
usually	135	30.00	265	58.89	
sometimes	133	29.56	398	88.44	
seldom	30	6.67	428	95.11	
never	22	4.89	450	100.00	
Total N = 450		Mean = 2.2867			
		Standard Deviation = 1.1007			
2. Selecting visiting speakers and lectures					
always	187	41.56	187	41.56	
usually	165	36.67	352	78.22	
sometimes	84	18.67	436	96.78	
seldom	4	0.89	440	97.78	
never	10	2.22	450	100.00	
Total N = 450		Mean = 1.8556			
		Standard Deviation = 0.9048			
3. Controlling dormitory policies					
always	203	45.11	203	45.11	
usually	115	25.56	318	70.67	

sometimes	104	23.11	422	93.78
seldom	18	4.00	440	97.78
never	10	2.22	450	100.00

Total N = 450      Mean = 1.9267      Standard Deviation = 1.0194

#### 4. Planning the curriculum

always	198	44.00	198	44.00
usually	112	24.89	310	68.89
sometimes	113	25.11	423	94.00
seldom	16	3.56	439	97.56
never	11	2.44	450	100.00

Total N = 450      Mean = 1.9556      Standard Deviation = 1.0265

#### 5. Establishing academic policy on class attendance, class cuts, etc.

always	159	35.33	159	35.33
usually	114	25.33	273	60.67
sometimes	116	25.78	389	86.44
seldom	36	8.00	425	94.44
never	25	5.56	450	100.00

Total N = 450      Mean = 2.2311      Standard Deviation = 1.1751

---

Table 8. Student participation issue scale (continued).

Students should participate in:				
Issue	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
6. Membership on all administrative- faculty committees				
always	147	32.67	147	32.67
usually	119	26.44	266	59.11
sometimes	127	28.22	393	87.33
seldom	37	8.22	430	95.56
never	20	4.44	450	100.00
Total N = 450		Mean = 2.2533	Standard Deviation = 1.1298	
7. Establishing grade policy and procedures				
always	136	30.22	136	30.22
usually	136	30.22	272	60.44
sometimes	120	26.67	392	87.11
seldom	34	7.56	426	94.67
never	24	5.33	450	100.00
Total N = 450		Mean = 2.2756	Standard Deviation = 1.1305	

8. Meeting with college trustees and/or regents					
always	120	26.67	120	26.67	
usually	112	24.89	232	51.56	
sometimes	151	33.56	383	85.11	
seldom	40	8.89	423	94.00	
never	27	6.00	450	100.00	
Total N = 450	Mean = 2.4267	Standard Deviation = 1.1483			
9. Establishing tuition costs					
always	139	30.89	139	30.89	
usually	93	20.67	232	51.56	
sometimes	104	23.11	336	74.67	
seldom	60	13.33	396	88.00	
never	54	12.00	450	100.00	
Total N = 450	Mean = 2.5489	Standard Deviation = 1.3624			
10. Regulation of scholarships and loan policies					
always	126	28.00	126	28.00	
usually	88	19.56	214	47.56	
sometimes	126	28.00	340	75.56	
seldom	30	11.11	390	86.67	
never	60	13.33	450	100.00	
Total N = 450	Mean = 2.6222	Standard Deviation = 1.3296			

influence on their everyday campus lives, and the students in this study concur.

#### Involvement in Institutional Governance and Planning

Although students seem to define the dimension and degree to which they desire to participate in deciding specific institutional policies, as indicated in Tables 7 and 8, nevertheless, Table 9 seems to clearly indicate that students want to be free to influence in some manner and through some defined process institutional planning and governance.

It may well be that students merely desire to know that the college "system" is open and not closed and that student advice, counsel and active representation is generally sought and provided.

It is interesting to note that 59.7 percent of the respondents mildly or strongly agree that students who disrupt the functions of a college should be expelled or suspended.

In response to whether or not the college would be much more successful if "participatory democracy" existed in all governance matters, 31.3 percent of the students stated that they were undecided. This is the highest undecided response made to any of the four specific questions related to student involvement in governance-institutional planning activities. It might well be that

Table 9. Student involvement in governance-planning scale.

Issue	N	Percent	Cumulative N	Cumulative Percent
1. Students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended.				
Strongly agree	156	34.67	156	34.67
Mildly agree	113	25.11	269	59.78
Undecided	100	22.22	369	82.00
Mildly disagree	56	12.44	425	94.44
Strongly disagree	25	5.56	450	100.00
Total N = 450		Mean = 2.2911	Standard Deviation = 1.2187	
2. This college would be much more successful if "participatory democracy" existed in all governance matters.				
Strongly agree	119	26.44	119	26.44
Mildly agree	155	34.44	274	60.89
Undecided	141	31.33	415	92.22
Mildly disagree	26	5.78	441	98.00
Strongly disagree	9	2.00	450	100.00
Total N = 450		Mean = 2.2244	Standard Deviation = 0.9698	

3. Students are sufficiently mature to actively participate in college governance procedures.

Strongly agree	136	30.22	136	30.22
Mildly agree	198	44.00	334	74.22
Undecided	71	15.78	405	90.00
Mildly disagree	38	8.44	443	98.44
Strongly disagree	7	1.56	450	100.00

Total N = 450      Mean = 2.0711

Standard Deviation = 0.9668

4. It is important and necessary that students be involved in institutional planning and governance.

Strongly agree	223	49.56	223	49.56
Mildly agree	157	34.89	380	84.44
Undecided	49	10.89	429	95.33
Mildly disagree	16	3.56	445	98.89
Strongly disagree	5	1.11	450	100.00

Total N = 450      Mean = 1.7178

Standard Deviation = 0.8768

either the terms "participatory democracy" are entirely too vague and ambiguous or that students do not at this time feel that "participatory democracy" is germane to the college or academic setting.

A very large and significant 84.4 percent of the students mildly or strongly agree that it is important and necessary that students be involved in institutional planning and governance. However, responses contained in Tables 7 and 8 ought to be kept clearly in mind when interpreting this item since students seem to prefer to define and delimit the degree and dimension of participation in decision-making and governance procedures.

### Reliability

A five year effort of May [92] resulted in the Modified Taxonomy II measurement of attitudes utilized in the present study. This is the first reported study that has employed this taxonomy as far as the investigator can discern. For this reason, it has been deemed essential that reliability coefficients be presented in table form. Such a procedure would not ordinarily be necessary.

It is generally recommended that reliability coefficients related to the population studies be computed since such reliability coefficients vary a great deal from one population to another.

Table 10. Reliability scales.

EX-SG (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	20877.078	449	46.496
Items	55028.128	4	13757.032
Subjects x Items	21395.572	1796	11.912
Total	97300.778	2249	43.264
r=.74                      Standard Error of Measurement=6.90			

Table 11. Reliability scales.

EX-CD (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	15298.025	449	34.071
Items	47946.933	4	11986.733
Subjects x Items	23916.467	1796	13.316
Total	87161.425	2249	38.755
r=.61                      Standard Error of Measurement=7.29			

Table 12. Reliability scales.

EX-CS (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	13162.447	449	29.315
Items	49871.913	4	12467.978
Subjects x Items	12840.987	1796	7.149
Total	75875.347	2249	33.737
r=.76                      Standard Error of Measurement=5.34			

Table 13. Reliability scales.

ACT-SG (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	26350.772	449	58.687
Items	18248.844	4	4562.210
Subjects x Items	15409.756	1796	8.580
Total	60009.372	2249	26.682
r=.85                      Standard Error of Measurement=1.85			

Table 14. Reliability scales.

ACT-CD (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	13375.758	449	29.790
Items	30422.255	4	7605.563
Subjects x Items	19517.145	1796	10.867
Total	63315.158	2249	28.152
r=.64                      Standard Error of Measurement=6.59			

Table 15. Reliability scales.

ACT-CS (sub-scale)	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	17651.805	449	39.313
Items	40332.469	4	10083.117
Subjects x Items	16524.331	1796	9.200
Total	74508.605	2249	33.129
r=.77                      Standard Error of Measurement=6.07			

Table 16. Reliability scales. Total scale (expression-action) student government--class meeting processes.

	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	39279.379	449	87.481
Items	84307.877	9	9316.871
Subjects x Items	44753.798	4041	11.804
Total	168341.054	4499	37.417
r=.87      Standard Error of Measurement=9.98			

Table 17. Reliability scales. Total scale (expression-action) class discussion activities.

	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	24456.880	449	54.469
Items	83815.840	9	9316.871
Subjects x Items	47700.685	4041	11.804
Total	155973.406	4499	34.668
r=.78      Standard Error of Measurement=3.26			

Table 18. Reliability scales. Total scale (expression-action) community service projects.

	Reduced Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Subjects	26127.021	449	58.189
Items	100390.976	9	11154.552
Subjects x Items	34052.549	4041	8.426
Total	160570.546	4499	35.690
r=.86      Standard Error of Measurement=8.71			

Hoyt's reliability coefficients were determined for each of the six major scales utilized in the study and for the six sub-scales of the "attitude toward participation" measurement. The Generalized Item Analysis Program (GITAP) designed by Baker and Martin and revised for use on the CDC 3600 Michigan State University computer by Wright [93] was used to obtain the reliability coefficients.

The Hoyt reliability coefficient equation used in this study is

$$\frac{\text{MS subj.} - \text{MS subj.} \times \text{item interaction}}{\text{MS subjects}}$$

Tables of reliability are presented only for the "Attitude Toward Participation" scales. However, the Hoyt reliability for the College Satisfaction scale was  $r=.68$  with the standard error of measurement being 1.88. An  $r=.84$  and a standard error of measurement 2.75 was computed for the "legitimate participation issues" scale. A low  $r=.25$  and a standard error of measurement of 1.68 characterized the "appropriateness of involvement in institutional planning and governance" scale.

Table 19 presents the matrix of the correlations between each of the dependent variables employed in the study. An examination of the table reveals that the "expression" and "action" subscales correlate to a high degree in all three areas of (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and

Table 19. Matrix of the correlations between each dependent variable utilized in the study.

<u>ATTITUDES</u>	
<u>EX-SG</u>	1.000
"Expression" Student Government	
<u>EX-CD</u>	0.247 1.000
"Expression" Class Discussion	
<u>EX-CS</u>	0.298 0.275 1.000
"Expression" Community Service	
<u>ACT-SG</u>	<u>0.667</u> 0.125 0.191 1.000
"Action" Student Government	
<u>ACT-CD</u>	0.234 <u>0.707</u> 0.271 0.257 1.000
"Action" Class Discussion	

<u>ACT-CS</u>	0.252	0.1278	<u>0.703</u>	0.243	<u>0.425</u>	1.000
"Action"						
Community Service						
<u>SATIS.</u>	0.092	-0.119	-0.122	0.061	-0.071	1.000
College Satisfaction						
<u>PART.</u>	0.214	-0.174	-0.154	<u>-0.239</u>	-0.141	-0.147
						1.000
Issues of Partici-						
pation for Students						
<u>GOVERN.</u>	0.163	-0.193	-0.141	-0.167	-0.153	-0.069
					<u>0.322</u>	1.000
Student Involvement in						
Governance and Planning						
	EX-SG	EX-CD	EX-CS	ACT-SG	ACT-CD	ACT-CS
					SATIS.	PART.
						GOVERN.

(3) community service projects. This correlation between the two components of each scale would seem to confirm validity of the total scales that have been utilized in the study to evaluate student attitudes concerning the three above listed activities.

Two other significant correlations ought to be noted:

- (1) Students who seem willing to "act" in relation to community service projects also seem to be interested in taking an active part in class discussion activities.
- (2) Students who indicate that participation in decision-making is legitimate for students generally also feel that it is appropriate for students to become involved in academic governance and planning procedures.

It is interesting to note that satisfaction with the college environment and experience does not correlate to any significant degree with any of the other scales. In other words, satisfaction with the college experience does not give assurance that a student will participate more fully either through "expression" or "action" in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion, or community service projects.

Table 20 presents the means, standard deviations, and standard error for the six scales utilized in the study.

Table 20. Mean, standard deviations, and standard errors for the 6 scales employed in the present study.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean
Total: Student Government*	90.58	29.57	1.39
Total: Class Discussion*	105.44	23.33	1.10
Total: Community Service*	101.34	24.12	1.14
College Satisfaction	11.73	3.72	0.17
Participation Issues	22.38	7.39	0.34
Govern. Involvement	8.30	2.26	0.10

Note: Standard Error of the Mean is the standard deviation of  $N=450$ , the sampling distribution of the mean arrived at by  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_x^2}{N}}$  where

$\sigma_{\bar{x}}$ =standard deviation of sample distribution  
 $\sigma_x$ =standard deviation of population  
 $N$ =sample size

\*These scales were weighted in the opposite direction of the other three scales so that the lowest score meant strongest attitudes toward participation in (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) participation in policy-making, and (3) student involvement in institutional planning and governance procedures.

It must be noted that the scores for three of the scales were weighted in the opposite direction from the other

scales presented. An explanation is contained with the table followed by a brief discussion of the procedure. Although these three scales were weighted in the opposite direction, such a weighting procedure has no effect upon the correlations other than in the sign (- or +) of the coefficient. This can be shown to be a linear transformation ( $Y=6-X$ ) of the opposite weighting scheme. Linear transformations do not affect the absolute value of correlation coefficients.

### Tests of Significance

The Multivariate Analysis of Variance [94] statistically produced tests of significance for (1) class main effect, (2) sex main effect, and (3) interaction between class and sex. Tables 21, 22, 23, and 24 illustrate the findings.

The design for the MANOVA is illustrated in Figure 2, page 90.

### Hypothesis Relative to Participation Attitudes

H-1: There will be a difference between the "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in each scale relative to (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects.

	M	F
C <sub>1</sub>	34	95
C <sub>2</sub>	22	89
C <sub>3</sub>	12	53
C <sub>4</sub>	3	95
C <sub>5</sub>	10	37

Legend:

C<sub>1</sub>: Freshmen C<sub>2</sub>: Sophomore C<sub>3</sub>: Junior C<sub>4</sub>: Senior  
C<sub>5</sub>: Graduate

M: Male F: Female

M<sub>1</sub>: Attitudes toward student government/class meeting processes.

M<sub>2</sub>: Attitudes toward class discussion activities.

M<sub>3</sub>: Attitudes toward community service projects.

M<sub>4</sub>: Satisfaction with college environment.

M<sub>5</sub>: Legitimate student participation issues.

M<sub>6</sub>: Appropriateness of student involvement in institutional planning and governance.

Figure 2. Design for MANOVA.

Table 21. Significance between scale tests.

	Mean	SD	SD Error of Mean	T of Mean	F of Mean	Sig. of Mean
EX-SG	53.118	15.247	0.718	73.902	5461.565	0.0005*
EX-CD	58.247	13.052	0.615	94.668	8962.150	0.0005*
EX-CS	58.194	12.106	0.570	101.966	10397.172	0.0005*
ACT-SG	37.462	17.130	0.807	46.391	2152.199	0.0005*
ACT-CD	47.195	12.204	0.575	82.032	6729.342	0.0005*
ACT-CS	43.148	14.020	0.660	65.285	4262.250	0.0005*
Total: SG	15.656	13.304	0.627	24.962	623.123	0.0005*
Total: CD	11.052	9.690	0.456	24.195	585.406	0.0005*
Total: CS	15.045	10.217	0.481	31.237	975.795	0.0005*

N=450 \*significant at .01 level

NOTE: The scores presented in this table indicate the differences between each subscale and total scale. Both the T and F statistic are given.

LEGEND:

EX-SG: "Expression" Student Government; EX-CD: "Expression" Class Discussion;  
EX-CS: "Expression" Community Service; ACT-SG: "Action" Student Government;  
ACT-CD: "Action" Class Discussion; ACT-CS: "Action" Community Service;  
Total SG: Combined "Expression" and "Action" components for Student Govern.;  
Total CD: Combined "Expression" and "Action" components for Class Disc.;  
Total CS: Combined "Expression" and "Action" components for Community Serv.

In testing this hypothesis, the null form was used and the attitude toward participation scales were divided into three specific areas in order to measure student attitudes. The three total scales were subdivided into "expression" and "action" component measurements.

Table 21 presents a statistical analysis of the scales and indicates that there is a significant difference between the scores for each sub-scale and total scale.

The hypothesis that there is a significant difference between "expression" and "action" components in the three participation scales is supported at the .01 level of significance using a two tailed t test.

Further analysis of data, supporting the hypothesis, indicates the following facts. Twenty percent of the student respondents were willing to make sacrifices in order to support student government procedures, while only 18.44 percent would proselytize for this activity. Student respondents indicated that 40.89 percent were willing to proselytize for class discussion involvement but only 27.11 stated that they would be willing to make sacrifices to improve class discussion. In the area of community service, 29.11 percent of the respondents indicated that they would proselytize for community service participation but only 25.78 percent indicated a willingness to make sacrifices or to expend energy to effect such participation.

Students seem willing to experiment, to make choices, and to concur with the actions of others who feel participation is important, but they are less likely to become involved themselves in such processes.

In sum, although the research population indicates a very high degree of interest in participating in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion, and community service projects, nevertheless, they seem unwilling to expend time and effort to implement their "expressed" concern or feeling for participation in these given activities.

#### Other Tests of Significance

The multivariate test, presented in Table 22, indicates that there is a significant difference between the responses of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students to the entire six scales (tests). In other words, each class differs from the other classes (at the .01 level) in its response to these dependent measures.

When the univariate analyses are examined, only a significant difference is found with regard to attitudes toward student government/class meeting processes. This indicates that the five class groups have significantly varying attitudes about the benefit or utility of student

government/class meeting processes. Further explanation of these differences appear on page 107 of this chapter.

Table 22. Significance tests for differences between classes.

Multivariate Test			
Degrees of Freedom=24 and 1518.743      P Less than 0.0011**			
Univariate Test			
<u>Scale Variable</u>	<u>Between Mean Square</u>	<u>Univariate F</u>	<u>P Less Than</u>
College Satisfaction	32.72	2.37	0.051
Participation Issues	100.57	1.87	0.113
Governance Involvement	5.00	0.97	0.419
Attitudes: Stud. Govern.	5389.11	6.47	0.000*
Attitudes: Class Disc.	1341.49	2.48	0.042
Attitudes: Community Serv.	382.79	0.65	0.621

Degrees of freedom are 4 and 444

\*significant at the .05 level; \*\*significant at the .01 level.

NOTE: For all multivariate tests, test  $\alpha$  is partitioned by the number of dependent univariate ANOVA's being performed. Therefore,

$$\text{test } \alpha = \frac{\text{overall } \alpha}{\text{No. of test}} = \frac{.05}{6} = .0083$$

The multivariate test, presented in Table 23, indicates that there is a significant difference between the responses of males and females to the "package" of the

entire six scales (tests). In other words, men significantly differ from women (at the .05 level) in their response to these dependent measures.

Table 23. Significance tests for differences between sexes.

Multivariate Test			
Degrees of Freedom=6 and 435.000		P Less than 0.0290*	
Univariate Test			
<u>Scale Variable</u>	<u>Between Mean Square</u>	<u>Univariate F</u>	<u>P Less Than</u>
College Satisfaction	0.11	0.00	0.928
Participation Issues	200.23	3.73	0.054
Governance Involvement	6.70	1.31	0.253
Attitudes: Stud. Govern.	5083.75	6.22	0.013
Attitudes: Class Disc.	422.77	0.78	0.376
Attitudes: Community Serv.	1824.23	3.13	0.077

Degrees of freedom are 1 and 440.

\*significant at the .05 level.

It is of interest, however, that when the univariate analyses are examined, no significant differences were found for any one of the six scales. It must be remembered that the test  $\alpha$  for the univariates is .0083 in order to assure that differences are significant despite the dependence between scales.

The multivariate test illustrated in Table 24 indicates that interaction of sex and class does not

significantly influence student satisfaction with the college environment, concern for student participation in the decision-making process, appropriateness of student involvement in institutional governance and planning, student attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, or community service involvement when measured by the combined six scales.

The univariate analyses presented in Table 24 also indicate that no significant differences were found for any one of the six scales.

Table 24. Significance tests for interaction between sex and class.

Multivariate Test			
Degrees of Freedom=24 and 1518.743      P Less than 0.1595			
Univariate Test			
<u>Scale Variable</u>	<u>Between Mean Square</u>	<u>Univariate F</u>	<u>P Less Than</u>
College Satisfaction	4.79	0.34	0.846
Participation Issues	99.65	1.86	0.116
Governance Involvement	4.91	0.96	0.429
Attitudes: Stud. Govern.	1805.31	2.21	0.067
Attitudes: Class Disc.	369.51	0.68	0.603
Attitudes: Community Serv.	440.01	0.75	0.555

Degrees of freedom are 4 and 440.

\*significant at the .05 level.

### Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis is frequently used to estimate relationships between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables. The CDC 3600 LS Routine, programmed by Ruble and Rafter [95] at Michigan State University, was utilized in the present study to calculate the regression problems.

The multiple regression analysis produces a measure of variation in the dependent variable above the variation which can be accounted for by its mean or by a group of other independent variables. The multiple correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) and the square of the multiple correlation coefficient ( $r^2$ ) is used in reporting data in the present study.

In Tables 25 through 33, negative partial correlations between college satisfaction, participation issues, and governance involvement and the attitude scales is due to the fact that these scales were weighted in such a manner that the lowest scores indicated (1) greatest satisfaction, (2) most participation, or (3) greatest agreement with appropriateness of student involvement in institutional planning and governance. The reader is asked to refer to Table 20, page 88 of this chapter, for a clear explanation of the procedure.

Table 25. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward student government participation --expression (dependent); N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	-0.177	0.000*
Sex	0.028	0.561
College Satisfaction	-0.128	0.006*
Participation Issues	-0.175	0.000*
Governance Involvement	-0.098	0.036
Multiple Correlation Coefficients		$R^2=0.100$ $R=0.316$

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 444.

\*significant at the .05 level.

Table 25 indicates the results of regression analysis on the dependent variable of EX-SG. The five independent variables (or predictors) include class, sex, college satisfaction, participation issues, and student involvement in institutional governance and planning. The multiple regression coefficient derived from this procedure was significant and was  $r=.32$ .

Of the five independent variables, class and participation scores contribute most in explaining variance with the dependent variable whereas satisfaction with college and involvement in institutional governance and planning, although important contributors, are less significant.

It must be noted that all five independent variables, nevertheless, account for only about 10 percent of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 26. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward class discussion participation --expression (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	-0.026	0.589
Sex	-0.068	0.146
College Satisfaction	-0.145	0.002*
Participation Issues	-0.144	0.002*
Governance Involvement	-0.145	0.002*
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.076$ $R=0.277$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 444.

\*significant at the .05 level.

The multiple regression coefficient derived in Table 26 is significant and equated at  $r=.28$ . Three of the five independent variables, namely, college satisfaction, participation issues, and governance involvement scores contribute significantly in explaining variance with the dependent variable EX-CD.

However, all independent variables account for only approximately 8 percent of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 27. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward community service participation --expression (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	0.031	0.516
Sex	0.582	0.217
College Satisfaction	-1.46	0.002*
Participation Issues	-0.131	0.005*
Governance Involvement	-0.090	0.054
Multiple Correlation Coefficients		$R^2=0.057$ $R=0.239$

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 440

\*significant at the .05 level

The multiple correlation coefficient of  $r=.24$  was derived statistically for the EX-CS dependent variable.

(Table 27.)

Two independent variables, college satisfaction and scores on participation issues, indicate significant variance at the .05 level. However, the five independent variables account for only about 6 percent of the variance of the "expression" toward community service project participation.

The independent variables of sex and the scores on the ten participation issues are highly significant when explaining variance with the dependent variable ACT-SG.

Table 28 demonstrates a significant multiple correlation coefficient of  $r=.32$ .

Table 28. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward student government participation--action (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	-0.117	0.013
Sex	0.175	0.000*
College Satisfaction	0.030	0.526
Participation Issues	-0.172	0.000*
Governance Involvement	-0.095	0.042
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.103$ $R=0.321$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 440.

\*significant at the .05 level.

A review of Table 29 indicates that only the scores on the ten participation issues scale explain significant variance with ACT-CD.

The multiple correlation coefficient is  $r=.22$ . Again, it is important to note than only about 5 percent of the variance of Attitude "action" toward class discussion participation is explained by the total five independent variables.

Table 29. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward class discussion participation--action (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	0.091	0.051
Sex	0.013	0.772
College Satisfaction	0.089	0.055
Participation Issues	0.121	0.010*
Governance Involvement	0.111	0.018
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.048$ $R=0.221$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 440.

\*significant at the .05 level.

Table 30. Multiple regression/predicting participation, Attitude toward community service participation--action (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Class	0.061	0.194
Sex	0.083	0.073
College Satisfaction	-0.062	0.183
Participation Issues	-0.140	0.003*
Governance Involvement	-0.017	0.713
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.038$ $R=0.196$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 440.

\*significant at the .05 level.

Table 30 indicates that only the participation issues scale has a significant variance with attitude "action" toward community service participation (dependent variable). However, in this instance the multiple correlation coefficient is a low  $r=.19$ , which indicates that only about 4 percent of the variance can be explained by the five independent variables.

Table 31. Multiple regression/predicting participation, total student government attitude scale (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Sex	-0.159	0.001*
Class	0.117	0.013
College Satisfaction	-0.049	0.298
Participation Issues	-0.190	0.000*
Governance Involvement	-0.106	0.024
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.106$ $R=0.326$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 444.

\*significant at the .05 level.

Tables 31, 32, and 33 indicate the results of regression analysis on the three separate total attitude scales (including both expression and action components). The multiple correlation coefficient for student

government/class meeting processes is  $r=.33$ ; class discussion activities  $r=.26$ ; and community service project participation  $r=.22$ .

Table 32. Multiple regression/predicting participation, total class discussion attitude scale (dependent),  $N=450$ .

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Sex	0.033	0.482
Class -0.045	-0.045	0.345
College Satisfaction	-0.128	0.007*
Participation Issues	-0.143	0.002*
Governance Involvement	-0.139	0.003*
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.067$		$R=0.259$

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 444.

\*significant at the .05 level.

In all three regression procedures, the ten participation issues scale consistently is significant at the .05 level in explaining variance with the dependent variables, namely (1) college satisfaction, (2) participation issues, and (3) governance involvement are significant in explaining variance with the dependent variable of class discussion activities.



Table 33. Multiple regression/predicting participation, total community service attitude scale (dependent), N=450.

Variable	Partial Corr. Coefs.	Sig.
Sex	0.020	0.675
Class	0.078	0.095
College Satisfaction	-0.109	0.019
Participation Issues	-0.147	0.002*
Governance Involvement	-0.055	0.242
Multiple Correlation Coefficients $R^2=0.049$ $R=0.221$		

Degrees of freedom are 5 and 444.

\*significant at the .05 level.

#### Additional Analysis

Table 34 presents the matrix of the cell means for the six major scales and the six sub-scales of the study. An examination of this cell matrix indicates the following:

- (1) "expression" score components are considerably greater on all three scales of participation than are the "action" component scores;
- (2) the "expression" component scores for class discussion are higher than either student government/class meeting processes or community service project scores;

Table 34. Matrix of the cell means for the six major scales and the six sub-scales.

Class	Sex	N	EX-SG	EX-CD	EX-CS	ACT-SG	ACT-CD	ACT-CS	C.Sat.	Part.	Govern.	T-SG	T-CD	T-CS
Fresh.	M	34	55.02	60.38	55.64	32.83	46.16	38.02	11.20	22.58	8.32	87.86	106.54	93.67
	F	95	55.92	58.78	59.50	39.24	46.40	43.26	11.54	21.47	8.21	95.17	105.18	102.77
Soph.	M	22	52.15	59.56	57.25	31.54	46.04	37.77	12.59	20.63	8.36	83.70	105.61	95.02
	F	89	55.35	58.30	58.43	42.61	46.82	44.28	12.38	21.62	8.25	97.97	105.13	102.71
Junior	M	12	45.75	59.83	57.20	26.12	51.12	42.66	11.33	28.33	9.33	71.87	110.95	99.87
	F	53	54.15	55.09	58.56	39.78	42.75	43.09	11.26	22.54	8.33	93.93	97.84	101.66
Senior	M	3	52.16	55.16	53.33	25.50	48.83	46.66	14.33	24.00	10.33	77.66	104.00	100.00
	F	95	52.80	59.47	59.31	39.34	51.61	45.20	12.02	22.54	7.97	92.14	111.08	104.51
Grad.	M	10	52.30	58.45	57.20	31.40	44.40	46.30	10.80	28.30	8.70	83.70	102.85	103.50
	F	37	41.36	55.02	54.72	26.37	46.10	41.85	10.78	23.05	8.78	67.74	101.13	96.58

Legend: EX-SG: Expression/Student Government; EX-CD: Expression/Class Discussion;

EX-CS: Expression/Community Service; ACT-SG: Action/Student Government;

ACT-CD: Action/Class Discussion; ACT-CS: Action/Community Service; C.Sat.: College Satisfaction;

Part.: Participation Issues; Govern.: Appropriateness of Student Involvement in Governance;

T-SG: Total Student Government; T-CD: Total Class Discussion; T-CS: Total Community Service.

- (3) the highest "action" component scores are recorded for class discussion activities followed by community service concern and finally student government/class meeting scores; and
- (4) when the "expression" and "action" sub-scores for each of the three attitude toward participation scales are combined and analyzed as total scores, class discussion scores are higher than either community service or participation in student government/class meeting scores.

In addition, an analysis of mean scores for males and females and class grouping indicates the following:

- (1) senior men seem most satisfied with the college learning environment and graduate males and women seem least satisfied;
- (2) junior men and graduate men students indicate a greater desire to participate in matters related to decision-making whereas freshmen and sophomore women view student participation in such decision-making functions as less desirable; finally
- (3) senior and junior men view student involvement in institutional planning and governance more appropriate than other student groups.

### Summary

The findings of the study support the hypothesis that there is a difference between "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes concerning participation in three specific phases of college activities, namely, (1) student government/class meeting processes; (2) class discussion activities; and (3) community service projects.

The results of the multiple regression analysis utilized in the study indicate that only the scores on the scale dealing with student involvement in decision-making consistently serve as a predictor variable. Although sex, class, and college satisfaction variables appear once as important predictor variables, nevertheless, only scores on the participation issues scale seem to predict to any degree student attitudes toward participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussions, and community service.

Finally, students seem willing to experiment, to make choices, and to concur with the actions of others who feel participation is important, but they seem reluctant to expend energy to implement any meaningful participation in a number of student activities and student government processes. It would seem that the "expression" component might be equated with the concept of "rhetoric." Although students give substantial approbation to participation in college decision-making processes and activities and view

these as highly beneficial and of real value, nevertheless, there is no assurance that they are willing to undertake those sacrifices necessary to operationalize their concerns and beliefs.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This chapter is divided into three major sections indicated by the chapter title. Part I is devoted to summarization of results obtained from the testing of the study's hypothesis and from additional testing of data pertaining to the research population.

Part II is a summary of the methodological issues and recommendations for further research.

Part III presents a comprehensive model for involving students in educational decision-making, planning and development.

#### Part I: Summary of Results

The present study is concerned with one major hypothesis: the difference between the "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects. In addition to the testing of this hypothesis, additional relationships in regard to class, sex, college

satisfaction, legitimate participation issues for student involvement, and student involvement in institutional planning and governance were investigated. The results of these findings are reported together with a brief comment on the major implications of these findings.

The research population for this study consisted of 450 male and female students enrolled at Siena Heights College, Adrian, Michigan. The 80-item questionnaire utilized in the study is presented in the Appendix.

#### Attitudes Toward Participation (H-1)

In testing this hypothesis, the attitude toward participation scales were divided into three specific areas in order to measure student attitudes. Each of these three major scales were subdivided into "expression" and "action" components.

An analysis of the "expression" and "action" subscales demonstrates that there is a significant difference between these two components in each of the three scales. The significance test for difference which was performed (Table 21) supports the hypothesis.

The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between "expression" and "action" components in the three participation scales of (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects is rejected.

Subsequently, the hypothesis that there is a significant difference between "expression" and "action" components in the three mentioned participation scales is supported at the .01 level of significance using a two-tailed t test.

#### Other Significance Tests

The multivariate tests presented in Tables 22, 23, and 24 (Chapter IV) indicate the following:

There is a significant difference at the .01 level between freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students in regard to

- (a) the degree of student satisfaction with the college environment;
- (b) the appropriateness of student participation in decision-making;
- (c) student concern for being involved in institutional planning and governance; and
- (d) attitudes toward student government/class meeting processes, class discussions, and community service projects.

An analysis of each independent variable separately by means of the univariate tests indicates that only the attitude toward participation in student government is significant in relation to the difference between classes (Table 22).

### Multiple Regression Analysis

Tables 31, 32, and 33 (Chapter IV) indicate the results of regression analysis on the three attitude scales (including both "expression" and "action" components). The multiple correlation coefficients for student government/class meeting processes is  $r=.33$ . The class discussion activities multiple correlation coefficient is  $r=.26$  and the multiple correlation coefficient for community service project participation is  $r=.22$ .

In all regression procedures that sought to predict student participation in student government processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects, the participation in decision-making scale consistently is significant at the .05 level in explaining variance with the dependent variables presented in the three tables. In Table 32 (Chapter IV), three independent variables, namely, (1) college satisfaction scores, (2) participation in decision-making scores, and (3) involvement in institutional governance and planning scores are significant at the .05 level in explaining variance and serving as predictors of student participation in student government processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects.

### Additional Analysis

An examination of the matrix of the cell means for the six major scales and the six subscales of the study, presented in Table 34 (Chapter IV) indicates the following:

- (1) Freshmen and sophomore women express the highest degree of concern regarding student government/class meeting processes. Junior men and women graduate students show the least concern for these processes.
- (2) Freshmen males feel class discussion to be most important, whereas junior and graduate women indicate the least need for such activity.
- (3) Senior men and graduate women indicate the least amount of interest in community service project involvement.
- (4) Sophomore women demonstrate the greater willingness to act in student government areas, while junior men and graduate women are the least inclined to act in such matters.
- (5) Junior men and senior women demonstrate the highest action level in class discussion activities, whereas junior women felt such action to be less important.
- (6) Senior and graduate men indicate the greatest desire to actively participate in community service projects, whereas freshmen and sophomore men indicate the least concern for action in this area.

- (7) The most satisfied group of students with their total academic experience are senior men, followed by both sophomore men and women.
- (8) Junior men see the need for greater student participation in decision-making, whereas sophomore men and women see such action as less beneficial.
- (9) Junior and senior men indicate the greatest desire to be involved in institutional governance and planning. Senior women see such activity as less necessary.
- (10) Student government/class meeting processes are of greatest concern to freshmen and sophomore women and less important to junior and senior males.
- (11) Class discussion is most important to senior women and junior men and less important to junior women and men and women graduate students.
- (12) Senior women and male graduate students demonstrate the greatest interest in community service projects, whereas freshmen and sophomore men indicate less concern or interest in such activity.
- (13) An analysis of the total research population's preferences and attitudes indicates that class discussion is the major interest, followed by community service involvement and, finally, concern for student government/class meeting processes.

## Summary

This study indicates that there is a significant difference between the "expressed" concerns of students and their willingness to "act" in order to effect participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, and community service projects. Data demonstrates that with this limited research population students are willing to expend most energy in matters concerned with class discussion activities.

The consistent low "expression" and "action" attitudes regarding student government/class meeting processes might be explained by the following considerations:

- (1) The existence of some disillusionment with present student government activities;
- (2) The tendency to elect the same people to student government positions, reinforcing the notion that only a select few have power and influence;
- (3) Elected officers in both student community and class groups may well represent a very limited and small segment of their constituencies;
- (4) Student elections usually fail to attract a large response, and consequently most elected officials are elected by means of slight pluralities;
- (5) Students seemingly are more willing to express concern but seem reluctant or unwilling to make

those sacrifices necessary to effect change or to make student government/class meeting processes viable;

- (6) Student meetings may be too lengthy and too prone to deal with what some students consider trivia;
- (7) Student government/class meeting activities are frequently called at a time that is not convenient for part-time students, working students, or commuter students.

It would seem essential that college officials distinguish between the "expression" and "action" levels of student demand for participation in institutional affairs. The degree and dimension of participation ought to be clearly defined by both administration and students before implementation of any type of participation is attempted. Although attitudes correlate to a limited degree with behavior, nevertheless there is a significant difference between the "expression" and "action" components in such attitudes.

#### Analysis of Student Attitudes and Concerns

1. In general, research on college students indicates a shift toward increased liberalism. Webster, Freedman, and Heist [96] report that change occurs in the direction of greater liberalism and sophistication in social,

political, and religious attitudes. Feldman and Newcomb [97] indicate that college students portray declining authoritarianism, dogmatism, and prejudice, together with decreasing conservative attitudes toward public issues.

Data provided in this study is in agreement with the above findings. In this research population, there is evidenced an increasing liberalism and decreasing dogmatism and ethnocentrism.

2. The research population is significantly concerned with attitudes and values. This concern is closely related to establishing identity and clarifying purposes since attitudes and values provide at least a tentative guide to behavior and life-style.

3. The strong response to attitudes/values and a philosophy of life rather than an overriding concern for formal religion suggests that the research population is primarily interested in fundamental value principles in life. The apparent lack of concern for formal religion toward value and a philosophy of life suggests that students in this population are attempting to formulate belief systems or a meaningful Christian humanism that does not rely solely on religious doctrine or formalism. Students at this particular college apparently are unwilling to accept an automatic application of uncompromising beliefs, rooted either in religious tradition or doctrine, and seem inclined to accept a more comprehensive human value and ethic system.

4. Institutional size and satisfactory peer and faculty interaction play a major role in accounting for dominant satisfaction response of students to the college environment. Data in this study indicates that students feel that the educational environment is assisting them to become more complex persons, more able to tolerate complexities of life, and more autonomous individuals. These are student developmental changes long advocated by educationists who have attempted to construct educational experiences that provide valuable impact.

5. Although marriage per se does not seem to be a major concern for the students in this study, students may well be seeking further development and stabilization of their own identities rather than rejecting concern for marriage. The seeming lack of concern for marriage may well indicate that these students desire to stabilize their interests and to define and refine their concepts of future life-styles and vocation. Given the data of this study, with its heavy emphasis upon self-identity and freedom, the latter explanation seems more probable.

6. The concern for sex education and pre-marital sex experience also indicates attempts by the student population to establish self-identity and to develop meaningful inter-personal relationships. Intimate relationships primarily serve self-discovery and self-definition. Physical intimacies and sexual relationships are an

important domain for further exploration and self-definition.

7. Concern for education rather than concern for occupations should not be interpreted as being unrelated. The academic program at this college accommodates a large percent of students preparing for teacher education. Consequently, concern for education undoubtedly reflects exploratory and preparatory activities closely related to future vocation and occupation. Education is seen as a necessary first step in pursuing teacher certification and employment; the decided response to education and learning reflect a major concern and clarification of vocational plans. Education for this research population probably does not indicate concern solely for abstract intellectual endeavors; rather, since the student community is predominantly goal oriented toward teaching as a profession, the response is more than likely of vocational or occupational interest.

8. The research population, perceptive of the need for social change and concerned about social problems, does not indicate "disaffiliated" or "alienated" college students. Data indicate a sensitivity to problems of poverty, ecology, drugs, and population.

Part II: Theoretical and Methodological  
Issues and Recommendations

The central focus of the study is upon the relationship of "expression" and "action" components in student attitudes toward participation in (1) student government/class meeting processes, (2) class discussion activities, and (3) community service projects. The assumption was made that a significant difference exists between "expression" and "action" components in the measured attitudes of students in the three specific areas listed above.

Theoretical Issues

The theoretical framework for the measurement of attitudes is that suggested by May [98] who proposed four major changes in the taxonomy developed by Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia. May's Modified Taxonomy II proved highly reliable in the present study and his refinements may well provide researchers and investigators with a more sensitive instrument for measuring attitudes.

Although the theoretical framework of the present study seems to be consistent with the findings of Nettler and Golding [99], DeFleur and Westie [100], and Title and Hill [101], which demonstrate a positive correlation between attitudes and behavior (see Table 34, Chapter IV)

Nevertheless, there is evidence in this study to demonstrate that there is a significant difference between "expression" and "action" components in attitudes. Although attitudes may signify values and belief, they do not necessarily indicate the degree or dimension of action a person will take to effect action consistent with his values and beliefs.

The present research provides some empirical support for the hypothesis that the "expression" and "action" components in attitudes can be measured separately and that there is a significant distinction between the two components.

The present study failed to indicate that satisfaction with college environment, student concern for participation in decision-making, or appropriateness of student involvement in institutional planning and development could serve as a reliable predictor of student participation in student government/class meeting processes, class discussion activities, or community service projects.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations should be considered before further research similar to the present study is undertaken.

1. Efforts should be made to construct an experimental study wherein controlled and experimental group attitudes

toward participation in various facets of institutional governance and planning can be analyzed. One serious obstacle to any such study will be to distinguish between "expression" and "action" components in attitude manifestation.

2. The methodology of the present study should be extended to additional small private liberal arts colleges which have a more balanced male-female student population. In addition, non-church related institutions ought to be studied to determine whether patterns of response exist which are similar to those reported in this study.

3. A randomized method of sampling ought to be employed in future studies in order to conserve time and energy. This perhaps will necessitate a departure from the group administration procedure.

4. The scales concerned with college satisfaction, participation in decision-making, and the appropriateness of student involvement in institutional planning and governance need further validation. Perhaps new instruments for measuring these attitudes need to be constructed.

5. The scale concerning appropriateness of student involvement in institutional planning and governance seems highly defective and needs revision or replacement.

6. Factor analysis might be employed as a data reduction method since it appears to have potential value in reducing multiple predictor variables and selecting a smaller but equally predictive set.

### Part III: A Comprehensive Plan

The following comprehensive plan is proposed for involving students in institutional planning and governance at a small private four-year liberal arts college. The plan is predicated upon the findings of this study, social-action theory, and administrative experience.

The review of literature (Chapter II) and the data provided in this study indicate that (1) students ought to be involved in institutional decision-making and governance, (2) where students have already been active in such processes their contributions have been substantial, and (3) a significant number of students evidence both concern and willingness to act in order to affect involvement in institutional decision-making and governance.

However, before students can hope to be involved in institutional decision-making and governance, the campus climate must radiate support in the belief that such active participation of students is beneficial to the academic community and that such participation serves the developmental aspects of the learning environment.

Students must first work for the respect and admiration of their peers as well as that of faculty and administration. Tradition at most small liberal arts colleges is opposed to any extensive student involvement in decision-making. In addition, there is fear on such campuses that

students might well develop more influence than the faculty in effecting institutional goals and curriculum. Tradition and fear can be diminished and overcome in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. It is abundantly clear that students, faculty, and administrators commence to reason, judge, and act in consort along evolutionary lines, as Stamatakos [102] has suggested, rather than along revolutionary lines. The evolutionary process necessitates student-faculty-administration communication, insight, meetings, discussions, etc., and arrangements that will provide students with a "reasonable partnership" status in the realm of academe.

The suggested model for involving students in decision-making and institutional governance is predicated upon the development of a process that is evolutionary in nature rather than confrontive, abrasive, or revolutionary.

### Basic Assumptions

The comprehensive plan outlined in this section rests upon two fundamental tenets, namely, (1) participation of students, faculty, and administrators in the decision-making process is essential, and (2) sponsorship for such involvement must come from within the institution.

Participation in planning, development, and institutional governance seems essential because (1) such participation specifies the conditions under which

self-determination and identity can be experienced, (2) it involves and tests the constituencies' capacities as integrated individuals, (3) it engages the emotional, moral, and intellectual faculties of those involved, (4) there is an extension of learning beyond the place of occurrence, (5) a proper environment for the testing of ideas is made available, (6) knowledge and practice of "give and take," together with the notion of compromise, is fostered, and (7) it provides a fertile and meaningful field for limited democratic practice.

Second, Sower's concept of the Normative Sponsorship Theory is fundamental to the projected comprehensive plan. As Sower states,

It is predictable that an innovation will be sponsored within the leadership structure of an organization when it is designed to be normative to the goals of the system, and when the involvement process does not violate the rules of initiation. These include the process of initiating the innovation into the organization in a manner which will maximize the potential of support, and will minimize the amount of either boundary maintenance, lethargy, or dedicated organized opposition.  
[102]

### Theory

The comprehensive plan relies upon organizational theory which is briefly outlined in this section.

All social systems, according to Parsons, must solve four basic problems: (1) adaptation; (2) goal

achievement; (3) integration; and (4) latency (maintaining over a period of time the system's motivational and cultural patterns). [104] An attempt is made in the proposed plan to synthesize three levels of behavior in organizations: (a) organizational structure and functioning; (b) group composition and interaction; and (c) individual personality and behavior.

McGregor's theory of human involvement in organizational enterprise is incorporated into the comprehensive plan. McGregor's theory has been adapted for this specific comprehensive plan in the following manner: (1) the educational institution is responsible for organizing the enterprise--persons and processes--in the interest of educational goals and objectives; (2) students and faculty are not innately passive or resistant to institutional needs, they have become so as a result of previous experience in organizations; (3) the motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people; (4) the essential task of an educational institution is to arrange conditions and methods of operation so that students, faculty, and administrators can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward institutional goals and objectives. [105]

According to Likert [106] once a decision has been

reached by consensus, there are strong motivational forces, developed within each individual as a result of his membership in the group and his relationship to the other members, to be guided by that decision.

An effective group depends upon certain factors being present, such as:

- (1) Certain skill in leadership and membership roles and function required for interaction must be developed.
- (2) Sufficient time to develop a well-organized and established relaxed working relationship and environment is a sine qua non.
- (3) There must be some attraction to the task that the group is going to address.
- (4) The environment must be conducive to development of confidence and trust among the members.
- (5) The values and goals of the group must be relevant to the values and needs of the members.
- (6) All the interaction, problem-solving, decision-making activities of the group must occur in a supportive atmosphere.
- (7) Members of the group will generally be motivated to abide by the major values and goals that are found to be important and relevant to the entire group.

Eugen Pusic stresses the need for self-direction coordination as opposed to hierarchical coordination as a means of conserving organizational resources while increasing organizational performance and individual satisfaction. In discussing institutional transformation, he states,

The new structures will have to be, in a way, looser and more unified at the same time. They will have to give greater scope to the individual, to his creativity, to the independence of his specialized professional contribution, to the multitude of existing interests. They will have to isolate conflicts instead of reinforcing them to the highest emotional pitch. They will have to diffuse power into a network of mutual influence instead of concentrating it. Instead of facilitating goal-displacement they will have to counteract it. At the same time, these new institutional structures will have to simplify large-scale planning, to reflect the growing interrelatedness of human activity, in order to prevent an uncontrolled increase in social entropy. [107]

### The Plan

There are certain prerequisites necessary before meaningful response to student participation in decision-making can be attained. First, there is need for serious communication among all members of the academic community. Second, internal leadership must be organized and given support by its constituencies. Third, proper emphasis must be placed upon accountability, participation, and responsibility. Fourth, a spirit of trust and community must be fostered and engendered by all parties of the

college community. Fifth, limited and proper re-distribution of authority and decision-making will benefit the general college community. However, means of re-distributing responsibility and shared-authority ought to be undertaken in an orderly and prudent step-by-step approach.

Step One: The institution of higher learning ought to conduct its own student-faculty-administration surveys periodically in order to determine the goals, objectives, needs, and aspirations of the total academic community. The degree and dimension of participation in decision-making and governance matters can then be more clearly defined and outlined.

Step Two: A number of seminars, under the combined direction of faculty, appropriate administrators, and competent students, outlining a variety of topics, such as the nature and prerogatives of the board of trustees, the history and implications of academic freedom, processes utilized in budget formulation, and methods of educational priority setting, ought to be given in order to inform all constituencies about the nature and operation of the college. These seminars ought to be conducted throughout each academic year and offered at least once a semester or quarter.

Step Three: There is need to establish solid and firm guidelines for dealing with all types of grievances. Grievance machinery ought to include (a) an official

"hearing officer" who has been trained in group processes and who is competent in legal and academic areas, (b) provision for advance hearings open to all parties wherein sufficient time is provided all parties involved, (c) reducing of antagonism, rumors, charges and counter-charges that tend to build on any campus when meaningful communication breaks down, (d) evidence that the administration is "open" and wishes to insure fair treatment to all parties if confrontation should happen to develop.

Step Four: The small liberal arts college ought to seriously consider establishing an office of student savants. This office would mobilize influential, responsible, and intelligent students who would be available to serve any group, meeting, or situation of confrontation. The process of choosing and appropriately training such volunteer students would be coordinated by the student personnel service office. The primary function of this group would be to "cool" any over-heated situation before it becomes explosive. The rationale for this action is based on the fact that students can confer, gain trust, and communicate with their peers far more advantageously than any other institutional representative or group.

Step Five: The president of the institution ought to take the initiative to employ weekly briefing sessions with the entire academic community in order to articulate institutional problems. This action might be modeled

after the popular "Meet the Press" television program, allowing selected individuals to ask questions and administrators to candidly and openly discuss pertinent issues. Supplementary "off-the-record" sessions might be arranged where information could be given to responsible individuals who represent students and faculty. In this latter context, the chief administrative officer could share concerns and complexities with student and faculty leaders and outline the rationale for both present and future action.

Step Six: Students who are duly elected and represent at least a simple majority of their constituencies ought to be placed on major faculty and administrative committees. These students ought to be given voice and vote and held accountable for their representative position.

Step Seven: The small private liberal arts college ought to establish an office of charistat. An elected faculty member with broad and acceptable support from students and faculty might be given released time to handle the duties of this office. Job definition ought to include the responsibility to spot trouble areas and mobilize all necessary resources to solve the problem. The office could serve an initiation-investigation function. It is essential that this office be open to the needs of and use of students, faculty and administrators. A joint committee composed of students, faculty and administrators would be responsible for selecting this person.

Step Eight: There is need to restructure present student government mechanisms. Revamped student government structures must not simply represent a return to paternalistic models of limited representation and attention to trivia; rather, they must be constructed along the lines of a student parliament or congress which would permit various factions and minorities true and viable representation. A college administration receiving recommendations from such a representative student government might feel more convinced about action to be taken and more reassured that the action demanded by students is not fashioned out of the clamor of a small but vocal minority.

Step Nine: Development of an Institutional Planning and Development Council.

- (1) To report to the president and board of trustees.
- (2) To change the posture of the institution vis-a-vis the future. Instead of reacting to educational, economic, and other crises, the college would be prepared to plan aggressively for the immediate and long-range future.
- (3) To maintain contact with its own constituencies as well as with others whose business it is to probe the future; planners in business, industry, and government, as well as agencies and organizations whose interests are specifically focused on higher

education and the future.

- (4) To maintain and develop plans and cost-out options for the consideration of those responsible for charting the institution's future.
- (5) To maintain advisory surveillance over the execution of plans and over internal and external developments which might change the expected future and condition of the institution.
- (6) To involve students, faculty members, administrators, trustees, alumni and/or alumnae, community leaders, and other appropriate persons who could contribute valuable ideas and suggestions to the council and the institution of higher learning. Each constituency would be represented by retaining membership on the council.
- (7) To recommend outside expertise and competency in resolving problems that seem beyond the talents and competency of council members.

A significant number of faculty, administrators, and students should be elected to serve on this council. The following criteria ought to be taken into consideration when involving students:

- (a) At least two representatives from each class ought to be given membership on the council.
- (b) Election of representatives to the council should be such that those elected truly represent at

least a simple majority of their constituency.

- (c) Representatives should be retained for at least one year in order to insure some type of continuity of membership.
- (d) Student representatives should be held accountable for providing adequate and frequent communication with their constituencies.

Step Ten: An evaluation process ought to be established in order to determine the effectiveness of the council's action and to analyze the impact of such action upon students, faculty, and administrators. The evaluation process ought to include:

- (1) A clearly formulated and defined plan of action articulated by the council specifying goals and objectives.
- (2) Periodic surveys of various constituencies ought to be conducted to determine the council's impact and to further determine whether the council is fulfilling its objectives.
- (3) The conducting of open hearings to permit constituencies an opportunity to voice concerns, needs, and expectations.
- (4) Each member ought to submit a written report twice a year concerning accomplishments and failures of the council.

- (5) Reports of appraisal from the president and the board of trustees ought to be provided.
- (6) Yearly analysis and re-definition of goals and objectives ought to be undertaken to insure that needs are met and that resources are properly utilized.

### Summary

Research and study concerning student involvement in institutional planning, development, reform, change, and governance is not an esoteric subject for irrelevant academics, but it is a matter of utmost concern to the individual college, and perhaps in the long run to society itself. As higher education opportunities expand and attract larger and more heterogeneous student populations and become increasingly more important in American culture and political life, student involvement in institutional government will be even more relevant.

Policy-making and institutional response to legitimate student demand for change and reform ought to be based on enlightened analysis and not simply as reaction to internal and external pressure. The phenomenon of student involvement in decision-making and institutional governance may well provide the institution of higher learning new and relevant ideas that will enhance and benefit higher education as well as the institution itself.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. U.S. News and World Report, Oct. 1969, 13:38-40.
2. The Detroit Sunday News, Jan. 1979, 17:8-A.
3. "Statement of Governance of Colleges and Universities." AAUP Bulletin (1967), 53 (2):1-5.
4. "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." AAUP Bulletin (1969), 55 (1):1-6.
5. "Draft Statement on Student Participation in College and University Governance." AAUP Bulletin (1970) 56 (1):33-35.
6. Frankel, Charles. "Student Power: The Rhetoric and the Possibilities." Sat. Rev., Nov. 1968, 2:23.
7. Thurstone, L. L. "Comment." Am. J. Sociol. (1946), 52:39-40.
8. May, Frank B. "An Improved Taxonomy Instrument for Attitude Measurement." College Student Survey. 1969, 3:33-38.
9. Krathwohl, David R., et al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain, New York: David McKay, 1964.
10. Guttman, L. "The Problem of Attitude and Opinion Measurement." Measurement and Prediction. Edited by S.A. Stauffer, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950, Chapter 3.
11. Altback, Philip G. Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States: A Select Bibliography. St. Louis, Mo.: United Ministries in Higher Education, 1968, 1-14.
12. Sanford, N. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

13. Williamson, E., and Cowan, J. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press, 1967.
14. Goodman, Paul. "The Calling of American Youth." Commentary. 1960, 29:217-229.
15. Schwartz, Edward, ed. Student Power. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1969.
16. Lunn, H. H. The Student's Role in College Policy Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.
17. Falvey, Frances E. Student Participation in College Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.
18. Friedson, E., ed. Student Government, Student Leaders, and the American College. Philadelphia: United States National Students Association, 1955.
19. Carr, Alden J. Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1959.
20. Stern, G. G. "Environments for Learning." The American College. ed. by N. Sanford, New York: Wiley, 1962.
21. Feldman, K.A., and Newcomb, T.M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
22. Vroom, V.H. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
23. Coch, L. and French, J. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Hum. Relat., 1948, 1:512-532.
24. Willerman, B. "Relations of Motivation and Skill to Active and Passive Participation in the Group." J. Appl. Psychol., 1953, 37:387-390.
25. Tannenbaum, A. and Allport, F. "Personality Structure and Group Structure: an Interpretive Study of Their Relationship through an Event Structure Hypothesis." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol. 1956, 53:272-280.

26. Maier, N. R., and Hayes, J. J. Creative Management. New York: Wiley, 1962.
27. Likert, R. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
28. Strauss, G. "Some Notes on Power-equalization." The Social Science of Organizations. Edited by H. J. Leavitt, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 45-59.
29. Blau, Peter M., and Scott, R. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Study. San Francisco: Chandler, 1960.
30. Abbot, Max, and Lovell, J. T. Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn, Ala.: School of Education, Auburn University, 1965.
31. March, J. G., and Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958, 36-46.
32. Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, 71-91.
33. Argyris, Chris. "Individual Actualization in Complex Organizations." Mental Hygiene, 1960, 44:226-237.
34. Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961, 162-177.
35. Thompson, V.A. "The Innovative Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by T. Sergiovanni and F. Carver, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969, 393-403.
36. Williamson, E.G. "The Need for Consultation between Students and Administration." College and University. 1951, 26:326.
37. Brown, J. A. C. The Social Psychology of Industry. Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1954, 72.
38. Whyte, W. H. The Organization Man. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1957.
39. Weeks, Ila D. "Student Participation in College Administration." School and Society. 1950, 71:386.
40. Friedson, E., ed., Student Government, Student Leaders and the American College. Philadelphia: United States National Students Association, 1955.

41. Hynes, R. J. "Cooperative Relationships with Students and the University of Minnesota." School and Society. 1951, 74:124-25.
42. McKown, Harry C. The Student Council. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944.
43. Hand, Harold C., ed. Campus Activities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
44. Morrison, Robert H. Internal Administrative Organization in Teachers Colleges. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933.
45. Carr, Alden J. Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1959.
46. Boren, James E. Cooperative Government at the University of Minnesota. Washington, D.C.: National Student Association, 1966.
47. Davis, John B. A Survey of Practices Related to Student Membership on Academic Committees. Greenville, N.C.: Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, East Carolina University, 1969.
48. Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes are Catching Colleges by Surprise, a National Survey Shows." College and University Business, 1969, 47:29-31.
49. Hodgkinson, Harold. Student Participation in Campus Governance. Berkeley: the University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1969.
50. Golden, M. P., and Rosen, N. A. "Student Attitudes Toward Participation in University Administration: An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Prerogatives." Journal of College Student Personnel (1966), 7 (6): 323-329.
51. Orcutt, John. "How Deans and Students See It." Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
52. U.S. News and World Report, June, 1969, 2:34-35.

53. Wilson, R., and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Voice-Faculty Response." Research Reporter 4. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1969, 1-4.
54. "Governing a College: How Much Should Students Have to Say?" College Management. 1969, 4:53-54.
55. Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Student Protest--An Institutional and National Profile." Teachers College Record, 1970, 5:537-555.
56. Aceto, Thomas D. Student Participation in Policy Making and the Use of Direct Action at the Mid-West Committee on Institutional Cooperation Universities." Disc. Abstra., 68,4700. (Abstract).
57. Hekhuis, Louis F. "A Comparison of the Perceptions of Students and Faculty at Michigan State University with Respect to Student Participation in University Policy Formulation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
58. Bradley, Dorothy P. "Student Participation in the Governance of Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities: A Comparison of Views Held by Administrators and Students." Disc. Abstra., 69,3957. (Abstract).
59. Evans, Thomas D. "A Case Study of Southern Illinois University President's Commission to Study the Role of the University in Society and the Role of the Student in the University." Disc. Abstra., 68, 14065. (Abstract).
60. Volkwein, James F. "Relationship of College Student Protest and Participation in Policy-making to Institutional Characteristics." Disc. Abstra., 69,7308. (Abstract).
61. Vaughan, Charles E. "An Empirical Study of the Relationship between Participation in University Extracurricular Activities and Student Alienation." Disc. Abstra., 69, 16454. (Abstract).
62. Pierce, Milo C. "Administrators' Preferences for Faculty and Student Participation in University Policy-making." Disc. Abstra., 69, 15362. (Abstract).

63. Holt, Andrew W. "Student Participation in Decision-making in Academic Affairs." Disc. Abstra., 70, 1585-A. (Abstract).
64. Follett, Charles W. "Student Participation in the Decision Making Process in College and Universities of Ohio." Disc. Abstra., 70, 617 A. (Abstract).
65. Muston, Ray A. "Policy Boards and Student Participation." Disc. Abstra., 70, 976 A. (Abstract).
66. Committee on the Student in Higher Education. The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Conn.: Hazen Foundation, 1968.
67. The Chronicle of Higher Education. The Scranton Report. 1970, 5 (2):1-24.
68. The Chronicle of Higher Education. The Carnegie Report. 1971, 5 (15):1-2.
69. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 1971, 5 (15):1-11.
70. Foote, Caleb, and Mayer, Henry. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
71. Bell, David, and Kristol, Irving, eds., Confrontation. New York: Basic Books, 1968, 20.
72. Morison, Robert S. Students and Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1970.
73. Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the University. Report to the University Committee. Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1968.
74. Duster, Troy, "Student Interests, Student Power, and the Swedish Experience." Am. Behavioral Scientist. 1968, 11:21-27.
75. Duff, James, and Berdahl, Robert O. University Government in Canada. Report of a commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

76. McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power?  
Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
77. Caffrey, John, ed., The Future Academic Community.  
Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education,  
1969, 150-159.
78. McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power?  
Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
79. Collins, Barry E. Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.:  
Addison-Wesley, 1970, 68-69.
80. Thurstone, L. L. "Comment." Am. J. Social., 1946,  
52:39.
81. Krathwohl, David R., et. al. Taxonomy of Educational  
Objectives; Handbook II: Affective Domain, New  
York: David McKay, 1964.
82. May, Frank B. "An Improved Taxonomy Instrument for  
Attitude Measurement." College Student Survey.  
1969, 3:33-38.
83. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 5 (15):1-2.
84. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 5 (14):1-3.
85. Golden, M. P., and Rosen, N. A. "Student Attitudes  
toward Participation in University Administration:  
An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Preroga-  
tives." Journal of College Student Personnel.  
1966, 7 (6):323-329.
86. Thornburg, Hershel. "Student Assessment of Contem-  
porary Issues." College Student Survey. 1969, 3,  
(2):33-36.
87. May, Frank B. "An Improved Taxonomy Instrument for  
Attitude Measurement." College Student Survey,  
1969, 3, (3):33-38.
88. Wilson, R., and Yager, G., Office of Education Research,  
East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1971.
89. Ward, J. H. "Multiple Regression Models." Computer  
Applications in the Behavioral Sciences. Englewood,  
J.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
90. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 5 (13):6.

91. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 5, (14):1-3.
92. May, Frank B. "An Improved Taxonomy Instrument for Attitude Measurement." College Student Survey. 1969, 3, (3):33-36.
93. Wright, David J. Fortrap: A Fortran Test Analysis Package. Occasional Papre No. 10. Office of Research Consultation. Michigan State University, 1970.
94. Finn, Jeremy. State University of New York at Buffalo. Adopted for CDC 3600 computer at Michigan State University by the University Computer Center, 1969.
95. Rafter, Mary E., and Ruble W. L. Stepwise Deletion of Variables from a Least Squares Equation. Michigan State University Computer Laboratory, 1969.
96. Webster, H., Freedman, M. B., and Heist, P. "Personality Changes in College Students." The American College. Edited by N. Sanford. New York: Wiley, 1962, 811-846.
97. Feldman K. A., and Newcomb, T. M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
98. May, Frank B. "An Improved Taxonomy Instrument for Attitude Measurement." College Student Survey. 1969, 3, (3):33-36.
99. Nettler, G., and Golden, E. H. "The Measurement of Attitudes toward Japanese in America." Am. J. Sociol., (1946), 52:31-39.
100. DeFleur, M. L., and Westie, F. R. "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Acts: An Experiment on the Salience of Attitudes." Am. Sociol Rev., 1958, 23:667-673.
101. Tittle, C. R., and Hill, R. J. "Attitude Measurement and Prediction of Behavior: An Evaluation of Conditions and Measurement Techniques." Sociometry, 1967, 30:199-213.
102. Stamatakos, Louis C. Student Involvement: Opportunity for Development of Responsible Leadership and Educational Reform. Proceedings of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. Oct. 6-7, 1967, mimeo., 14.

103. Sower, Christopher. The Normative Sponsorship Theory of Updating Organizations. Draft of proposed paper for administrative science quarterly. Mimeo., 1969, 13.
104. Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
105. McGregor, Douglas. "The Human Enterprise." Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by T. Sergiovanni and F. Carver. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
106. Likert, Rensis. "The Nature of Effective Groups." Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by T. Sergiovanni and F. Carver. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969, 256-258.
107. Pusic, Eugen. "The Political Community and the Future of Welfare (Social Self-management)." Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by T. Sergiovanni and F. Carver. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969, 276.

## **APPENDIX**

APPENDIX

STUDENT SURVEY

DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ON THIS FORM

This is not a test.

This is a study of student attitudes concerning questions of college life and practice.

We have tried to cover many different subjects and points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. The best answer to each statement is your own honest and personal opinion. Please respond to each question and leave no blanks.

Thank you for your time and effort.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

543608

EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

Please check (✓) the following appropriate category that applies to you. We ask that you kindly respond to each question as best you can. When in doubt simply check the response that seems most appropriate.

(   ) MALE

(   ) FEMALE

1. Class now enrolled in:

- ☐ Freshman
- ☐ Sophomore
- ☐ Junior
- ☐ Senior
- ☐ Graduate

2. At the present time my family's neighborhood could be characterized as:

- ☐ Upper Class
- ☐ Upper-Middle Class
- ☐ Middle Class
- ☐ Working Class
- ☐ Lower Class

3. My current political preference is:

- ☐ Far Left
- ☐ Liberal
- ☐ Middle of the road
- ☐ Conservative
- ☐ Far Right

4. My present grade point average is:

- ☐ 0 to 1.0
- ☐ 1.0 to 2.0
- ☐ 2.0 to 3.0
- ☐ 3.0 to 3.5
- ☐ over 3.5

5. My urban-rural background while growing up was:  
(for the longest period of time.)

☐ Farm  
☐ Small town  
☐ Moderate size city  
☐ Suburb of large city  
☐ Large city

6. In general, how satisfied are you with the college as a place to get an education, taking into account professors, courses, administrative practices, campus facilities, personal relationships, etc.?

☐ Very satisfied  
☐ Mildly satisfied  
☐ Undecided  
☐ Mildly dissatisfied  
☐ Very dissatisfied

7. According to my own personal estimation, I feel that my development is beyond the level of this college and my fellow students.

☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Mildly agree  
☐ Undecided  
☐ Mildly disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree

8. This college has helped me to clarify my own purposes and potentials and to accelerate my own development.

☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Mildly agree  
☐ Undecided  
☐ Mildly disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree

9. My experiences at this college have helped me to become a more independent person; able to express my impulses and to tolerate the complexity of life.

☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Mildly agree  
☐ Undecided  
☐ Mildly disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree

10. The teachers at this college have had a significantly beneficial impact upon me.

☐ Strongly agree  
☐ Mildly agree  
☐ Undecided  
☐ Mildly disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree

Listed below are concerns that college students generally express. Please indicate your personal rating of each group of concerns. 1 indicates the greatest concern while 5 would indicate your least concern.

(Example:    1 Cars  
                  5 Ships  
                  4 Rockets  
                  3 Planes  
                  2 Motorcycles)

Please rate each concern with the number 1,2,3,4 or 5.  
 Leave no blanks and do not use any number more than once.  
 Please use legible numbers.

11.    ☐ Competition  
       ☐ Occupation  
       ☐ Education  
       ☐ Economic stability  
       ☐ Automation

12.    ☐ Emancipation  
       ☐ Self-esteem  
       ☐ Social identity  
       ☐ Self-responsibility  
       ☐ Self-identity

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 13. <input type="checkbox"/> Popularity    | 14. <input type="checkbox"/> Nuclear war        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher approval  | <input type="checkbox"/> Overpopulation         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Societal approval | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S.-Russian relations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Peer approval     | <input type="checkbox"/> Viet Nam               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parental approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Communism              |
| 15. <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Rights  | 16. <input type="checkbox"/> Moral Code         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 18 yr. old vote   | <input type="checkbox"/> Formal Religion        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Law & order       | <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poverty           | <input type="checkbox"/> Philosophy of life     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ecology           | <input type="checkbox"/> Values & Attitudes     |
| 17. <input type="checkbox"/> The "pill"    | 18. <input type="checkbox"/> Cigarettes         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex education     | <input type="checkbox"/> Commune Living         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Meaningful        | <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Premarital sex    | <input type="checkbox"/> Gambling               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Abortion          | <input type="checkbox"/> Liquor                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Birth Control     |   |
| 19. <input type="checkbox"/> Reform        | 20. <input type="checkbox"/> Learning           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bureaucracy       | <input type="checkbox"/> Participation          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Revolution        | <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Repression        | <input type="checkbox"/> Cheating               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Freedom           | <input type="checkbox"/> Grades                 |

Please Circle the response that you feel is appropriate to you. Do not leave any statement unanswered. (Example: American troops should be immediately withdrawn from Viet Nam.) (1-Strongly agree 2-Mildly agree ③-Undecided 4-Mildly opposed 5-Strongly opposed)

21. How do you feel about class meetings and other student government activities in general?

- 1-Strongly favorable
- 2-Mildly favorable
- 3-Undecided
- 4-Mildly opposed
- 5-Strongly opposed

22. How do you feel about participating in class meetings and other student government activities?  
  
1-Strongly favorable  
2-Mildly favorable  
3-Undecided  
4-Mildly opposed  
5-Strongly opposed
23. If you attend a class meeting or other student government activity, how much time do you usually spend?  
  
1-Stay for the whole meeting  
2-Stay for about half the meeting  
3-Stay less than 15 minutes  
4-Just look in  
5-Don't bother going
24. How often have you attended a class meeting or other student government activity during the past year?  
  
5-Never  
4-Once  
3-Seldom  
2-Frequently  
1-Every time
25. Have you begun to attend class meetings or other student government activities; if so, when did you commence?  
  
1-Freshman yr.  
2-Sophomore yr.  
3-Junior yr.  
4-Senior yr.  
5-I haven't started
26. Would you be interested in attending a class meeting or other student government activity at the present time?  
  
1-Very interested  
2-Mildly interested  
3-Undecided

4-Disinterested

5-Very disinterested

27. How often during the past year have you chosen to attend a class meeting or student government activity?

1-Every time

2-Frequently

3-Seldom

4-Once

5-Never

28. Some students feel class meetings and student government activities are worthwhile attending. How do you feel?

1-Strongly agree

2-Mildly agree

3-Undecided

4-Mildly disagree

5-Strongly disagree

29. Some students find attending class meetings and other student government activities worthwhile. Would you enjoy this activity, provided you could do it with students you like?

1-Very much

2-A little

3-Undecided

4-Not very much

5-Not at all

30. How often during the past year have you attended a class meeting or other student government activity with someone else?

5-Never

4-Once

3-Seldom

2-Frequently

1-Every time

31. How often during the past year have you found yourself conversing with others about some aspect of a class meeting or student government activity?
- 1-Several times a day
  - 2-Couple times a week
  - 3-Once a month
  - 4-Once a year
  - 5-Never
32. Would you be willing to encourage others to attend a class meeting or other student government activity?
- 1-Most willing
  - 2-Mildly willing
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly unwilling
  - 5-Totally unwilling
33. How many people do you recall encouraging to attend a class meeting or other student government activity?
- 1-Over eight
  - 2-Six to eight
  - 3-Four to six
  - 4-Two to four
  - 5-Less than two
34. How much of your free time would you be willing to spend in attending a class meeting or student government activity?
- 1-One hour a week
  - 2-One hour every two weeks
  - 3-One hour a month
  - 4-One hour a semester
  - 5-None
35. What sacrifices, if any, have you made in order to attend a class meeting or student government activity?
- 1-Gave up a week-end
  - 2-Gave up considerable leisure time
  - 3-Gave up a couple of hours

4-Gave up a few minutes

5-Didn't make any sacrifices

Please rank the following statements in both the "IT IS BENEFICIAL" and the "ACTUALLY DO" categories according to your personal preference. Use 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to rank the statement. The category "ACTUALLY DO" pertains to your campus and not to other colleges. Please use legible numbers.

1-always 2-usually 3-sometimes 4-seldom 5-never

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>IT IS BENEFICIAL</u>	<u>ACTUALLY DO ON THIS CAMPUS</u>
STUDENTS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN:		
36. Establishing library codes. . . . .	_____	_____
37. Selecting visiting speakers and lectures. . . . .	_____	_____
38. Controlling dormitory policies. . . . .	_____	_____
39. Planning the curriculum . . . . .	_____	_____
40. Establishing academic policy on class attendance, class cuts, etc. . . . .	_____	_____
41. Membership on all major administrative-faculty committees. . . . .	_____	_____
42. Establishing grade policy and procedures. . . . .	_____	_____
43. Meeting with college trus- tees and/or regents . . . . .	_____	_____
44. Establishing tuition costs. . . . .	_____	_____
45. Regulation of scholarships and loan policies . . . . .	_____	_____

Please Circle the response you feel is most appropriate.  
Do not leave any statement unanswered.

46. How do you feel about class discussions?
- 1-Strongly favorable
  - 2-Mildly favorable
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly opposed
  - 5-Strongly opposed
47. How do you feel about participation in class discussion?
- 1-Strongly favorable
  - 2-Mildly favorable
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly opposed
  - 5-Strongly opposed
48. If you do participate in class discussion how much effort do you expend?
- 1-More than the others
  - 2-More than half the class
  - 3-About average
  - 4-Very little
  - 5-None
49. How often during the past year have you participated in class discussion?
- 5-Hardly at all
  - 4-On occasion
  - 3-About half the time
  - 2-Frequently
  - 1-Very frequently
50. If you actively participate in class discussion, when did you commence?
- 1-Before last year
  - 2-Last semester
  - 3-Last month
  - 4-Last week
  - 5-I haven't started

51. Would you be interested in becoming more involved in class discussion?
- 1-Very interested
  - 2-Mildly interested
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disinterested
  - 5-Not interested
52. How often during the past year have you chosen to speak in class?
- 1-Very frequently
  - 2-Frequently
  - 3-On occasion
  - 4-Seldom
  - 5-Never
53. Some students feel class discussion is worthwhile. How do you feel?
- 1-Strongly agree
  - 2-Mildly agree
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disagree
  - 5-Strongly disagree
54. Some students find participation in class discussion worthwhile. Would you enjoy such discussion, provided you could do it with students you like?
- 1-Very much
  - 2-Somewhat
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Seldom
  - 5-Very seldom
55. How often have you been involved in class discussion where you were the principle participant?
- 1-Very frequently
  - 2-Frequently
  - 3-On occasion

- 4-Hardly ever
  - 5-Maybe once
56. How often during the past year have you found yourself conversing with others about some aspect of class discussion?
- 5-Once a year
  - 4-Once a semester
  - 3-At least once a month
  - 2-Couple of times a week
  - 1-Daily
57. Would you be willing to encourage others to participate in class discussion?
- 1-Very willing
  - 2-Mildly willing
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly unwilling
  - 5-Unwilling
58. How many persons do you recall encouraging to participate in class discussions?
- 1-Very many
  - 2-Four or five
  - 3-Two or three
  - 4-Maybe one
  - 5-None
59. How much of your free time would you be willing to expend in helping develop good class discussion leaders?
- 1-One hour a week
  - 2-Two hours a month
  - 3-Two hours a semester
  - 4-Two hours a year
  - 5-None

60. What sacrifices, if any, would you make in order to help develop good class discussion leaders?
- 1-Give up a week-end
  - 2-Give up leisure time
  - 3-Give up a lunch hour
  - 4-Help if nothing else was going on
  - 5-Wouldn't make any sacrifice
61. How do you feel about community service projects? (Tutoring, charity projects, helping persons and civic groups, etc.)
- 1-Strongly favorable
  - 2-Mildly favorable
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly opposed
  - 5-Strongly opposed
62. How do you personally feel about participating in such community service projects?
- 1-Very interested
  - 2-Mildly interested
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly opposed
  - 5-Strongly opposed
63. If you participate in such community service projects, how much time do you expend?
- 1-More than ten hours a month
  - 2-About two hours a week
  - 3-One hour a month
  - 4-Less than three hours a year
  - 5-None
64. How often during the past year have you participated in some type of community service project?
- 5-Not at all
  - 4-Once
  - 3-About twice
  - 2-About five times
  - 1-More than eight times

65. Have you begun to participate in community service projects? If so, when did you begin?
  - 1-Before last year
  - 2-About ten months ago
  - 3-About five months ago
  - 4-Started recently
  - 5-I haven't started
66. Would you be interested in becoming involved in community service projects?
  - 1-Very interested
  - 2-Mildly interested
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disinterested
  - 5-Not interested
67. How often during the past year have you chosen to become involved in some type of community service projects?
  - 1-Many times
  - 2-Four or five times
  - 3-Two or three times
  - 4-Maybe once
  - 5-Never
68. Some students feel that participating in community service projects are worthwhile. How do you feel?
  - 1-Strongly agree
  - 2-Mildly agree
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disagree
  - 5-Strongly disagree
69. Some students find participation in community service projects worthwhile. Would you enjoy such activity provided you could do it with students you like?
  - 1-Very much
  - 2-Somewhat
  - 3-Undecided

- 4-Not very much
  - 5-Not at all
70. How often, if ever, have you been involved in community service projects with other students?
- 1-Very frequently
  - 2-Frequently
  - 3-On occasion
  - 4-Very seldom
  - 5-Never
71. How often during the past year have you found yourself conversing with others about some aspect of community service projects?
- 1-Several times daily
  - 2-Couple of times a week
  - 3-About once a month
  - 4-Maybe two or three times during the year
  - 5-Less than twice last year
72. Would you be willing to encourage others to participate in community service projects?
- 1-Very willing
  - 2-Mildly willing
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly unwilling
  - 5-Very unwilling
73. How many persons do you recall encouraging to participate in community service projects during the past year?
- 1-More than eight
  - 2-More than five
  - 3-Two or three
  - 4-Maybe one
  - 5-None

74. How much of your free time would you be willing to expend participating in community service projects?
- 1-Four hours a week
  - 2-Two hours a week
  - 3-Five hours a semester
  - 4-Five hours a year
  - 5-Less than five hours a year
75. What sacrifices, if any, would you make in order to participate in community service projects?
- 1-Give some vacation time
  - 2-Give a number of week-ends
  - 3-Give a couple hours a week
  - 4-Give about an hour a month
  - 5-Give less than one hour a month
76. Students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended.
- 1-Strongly agree
  - 2-Mildly agree
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disagree
  - 5-Strongly disagree
77. This college would be much more successful if "participatory democracy" existed in all governance matters.
- 1-Strongly agree
  - 2-Mildly agree
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disagree
  - 5-Strongly disagree
78. Students are sufficiently mature to actively participate in college governance procedures.
- 1-Strongly agree
  - 2-Mildly agree
  - 3-Undecided
  - 4-Mildly disagree
  - 5-Strongly disagree

79. It is important and necessary that students be involved in institutional planning and governance.

1-Strongly agree

2-Mildly agree

3-Undecided

4-Mildly disagree

5-Strongly disagree

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293105958403