

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

**300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND**

8013738

GOMEZ, JOE R., JR.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, 1979

Michigan State University

PH.D.

1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, 1979

By

Joe R. Gómez, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1979

ABSTRACT

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, 1979

By

Joe R. Gómez, Jr.

The literature is replete with urgings by many of the leading figures in the field of College Student Personnel for more abundant and comprehensive evaluative research in the area of student personnel services. Evaluation is a viable concern, for, without research and evaluation, the understanding, knowing and response to student needs can only be speculative. Because of its importance to higher education and because of the increasing emphasis upon accountability to education as a whole, student personnel services must meet student needs.

The purpose of the study, therefore, was to obtain student opinion regarding (1) their knowledge of, contact with and notion of the quality of selected student services on the Michigan State University campus, and (2) to use this information in the appraisal of these selected services. A secondary purpose was to determine if any significant differences existed when the sample population was grouped according to class standing and place of residence.

The selected student services evaluated in the study were:

(1) Admissions and Academic Orientation, (2) University Counseling Center, (3) General Services, (4) Office of the Registrar, (5) Housing

and Food Services, (6) Placement Services, (7) Student Activities, and (8) Judicial Programs.

The study was designed to address itself to the following questions within the various groups surveyed:

1. Were students aware of the selected student services available to them?
2. How much contact did students have with the different services?
3. How did students perceive the effectiveness of the selected student services?
4. What recommendations or criticisms did students have regarding the selected student services?

Methodology of the Study

The total random sample for the study was comprised of three-hundred and ninety-five full-time, undergraduate students enrolled during Winter Term, 1979, at Michigan State University. The instrument, entitled the Student Services Questionnaire, was sent to the entire sample. For those students living in the residence halls, the distribution, collection and follow-up of the instrument was conducted by the Head Advisors of their respective halls. The remaining population received the instrument via U.S. Mail. Two follow-ups, using postal cards as a reminder, were sent to all nonrespondents of that portion of the sample who received the questionnaire through the mail. Two-hundred and eleven, or 53.4 percent, questionnaires of the total distributed were returned.

The data were tabulated by means of a frequency count and percentages to determine a general flow of the responses and by chi-square

tests to compare the differences in responses according to place of residence and class standing.

Summary of Major Findings

1. Generally, students in this sample were very cognizant of the student services evaluated in the study.
2. Slightly less than one-half of the students did not exercise contact with the selected student services.
3. Of those students who did evaluate the effectiveness of the selected student services, the majority were satisfied with the performance of the services.
4. On-campus students were more aware of, exercised more contact with and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than off-campus respondents.
5. On-campus upperclassmen were more aware of, exercised more contact with and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than on-campus underclassmen.
6. Off-campus upperclassmen were more aware of, exercised more contact with and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than off-campus underclassmen.

DEDICATION

Esta tesis es dedicada a mis queridos padres, José y Anita,
sin cual amor y apollo no hubiera terminado esta obra.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the following persons:

Dr. Louis C. Stamatakos, chairman of the doctoral committee, for his professional guidance, support and understanding. It has been a pleasure working with such a fine gentleman and ethical scholar. His interest in and contribution to my professional growth will always be appreciated and remembered.

Dr. Walter Johnson, for his critical reading of the manuscript and encouragement during my studies at M.S.U.

Dr. Donald Nickerson, for his thorough review of the manuscript and for providing the opportunity to work in the Student Affairs Office of the College of Education.

Dr. Stanley Stark, for his insightful suggestions and personal interest in the writer.

Dr. Kay White, for her scholarly input, assistance with some of the finances and logistics of the research and for being a friend.

Dr. Laurine Fitzgerald and Dr. Lowell Dunlop, for permission to use their questionnaires as the model for the construction of my instrument.

The entire staff of the Student Affairs Office of the College of Education, especially Bob, Virginia, Kathy, Cathy and Saretta,

whose concern, encouragement and friendship, will always be remembered and missed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
 CHAPTER	
I. RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Need for the Study	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Procedure Followed	6
Hypotheses	7
Assumptions	7
Limitations of Study	8
Definition of Terms	8
Summary	10
Overview of Dissertation	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
The Need for Student Opinion in Evaluation	12
Studies Using Faculty, Administrators and Students' Perceptions of Student Personnel Services	16
Studies Using Administrators and Students	21
Studies Involving Married Students' Attitudes Toward Student Personnel Services	23
Studies Using Students' Perceptions in the Evaluation of Student Personnel Services	26
Summary	39
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	42
Introduction	42
The Development of the Instrument	42
Pilot Study	44
Population and Sample	45
Method of Collecting Data	46
Tabulation of Data	49
Summary	49

CHAPTER	Page
IV. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	51
Admissions and Academic Orientation	52
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	52
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	61
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	62
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	62
Summary of Admissions and Academic Orien- tation	64
University Counseling Center	64
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	64
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	74
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	76
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	77
Summary of the University Counseling Center . . .	77
General Services	78
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	78
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	88
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	90
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	91
Summary of General Services	92

CHAPTER	Page
Office of the Registrar	92
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	92
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	99
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	101
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	101
Summary of the Office of the Registrar	103
Housing and Food Services	103
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	103
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	114
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	115
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	116
Summary of Housing and Food Services	116
Placement Services	118
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	118
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	126
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On- campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	126
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off- campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	128
Summary of Placement Services	129
Student Activities	130
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	130
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	139

CHAPTER	Page
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On-campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	140
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	141
Summary of Student Activities	142
Judicial Programs	142
Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample . . .	142
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Total On-campus Students With Total Off-campus Students	150
Analysis of the Results When Comparing On-campus Upperclassmen With On-campus Underclassmen	152
Analysis of the Results When Comparing Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-campus Underclassmen	152
Summary of Judicial Programs	154
Ex Post Facto Concerns	154
Summary of Part II of the Student Services Questionnaire	155
Admissions and Academic Orientation	155
University Counseling Center	156
General Services	156
Office of the Registrar	156
Housing and Food Services	157
Placement Services	157
Student Activities	157
Judicial Programs	158
Summary	158
V. THE PROBLEM, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	170
The Problem	170
Methodology of the Study	172
Summary of the Findings	172
Admissions and Academic Orientation	173
University Counseling Center	174
General Services	174
Office of the Registrar	175
Housing and Food Services	176

CHAPTER	Page
Placement Services	177
Student Activities	179
Judicial Programs	180
Conclusions	181
Recommendations	182
Recommendations Based on Responses to Part I of the Student Services Questionnaire	182
Recommendations Based on Responses to Part II of the Student Services Questionnaire	183
Recommendations for Further Research	185
Reflections	185
APPENDICES	188
APPENDIX	
A. Student Services Questionnaire	188
B. Cover Letter	192
C. Student Responses to the Open-Ended Section of the Questionnaire	193
BIBLIOGRAPHY	202

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution and Percentage of Return from Sample Group . .	47
2. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: Services and Information Concerning Admission Are Available to and Approp- riate for Prospective Students	53
3. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: Services and Information Concerning Financial Aid are Available to and Appropriate for Prospective Students	54
4. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: A Well-Coordinated Recruit- ment Program Exists to Inform Prospective Students About Michigan State University	56
5. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: The Academic Orientation Program Provides Academic Advisement and Enroll- ment in Courses Appropriate to Student Needs	57
6. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: Welcome Week Provides a Satisfactory Orientation to University Life	59
7. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: The NEWSLETTERS Received Prior to Arrival on Campus Provide Needed and Appropriate Information about the University	60
8. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Admissions and Academic Orientation	61
9. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Admissions and Academic Orientation	63

Table	Page
10. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Admissions and Academic Orientation	63
11. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for the University Counseling Center: Counselors are Available for Discussing Personal Concerns of Students	65
12. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for the University Counseling Center: Aptitude, Interest and Personality Tests are Available in the Counseling Center to Help Students Make Career Choices	67
13. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for the University Counseling Center: The Counseling Center is the Place to Get Help in Better Understanding Yourself and the Careers Best Suited to You	68
14. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for the University Counseling Center: If You Wanted to Learn How to Get Along Better With Different Types of People, It Would be Appropriate to Talk With a Counselor	70
15. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for the University Counseling Center: Counselors are Able to Help Students Change Personal Attitudes or Behaviors Which May Interfere With Successful School Performance	71
16. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for the University Counseling Center: Learning How to Relax During Stressful Periods in School Can be Done at the Self-Management Laboratory	73
17. Group Analysis of Statement #7 for the University Counseling Center: The Staff of the Counseling Center is Helpful in Examining Alternatives to a College Education	75
18. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of the University Counseling Center	76
19. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the University Counseling Center	77

Table	Page
20. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the University Counseling Center	78
21. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for General Services: Assistance in Improving Reading and Study Skills is Provided for Students	80
22. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for General Services: Faculty and Academic Advisors Assist Students in Planning Coursework and in Selecting Major Fields of Study	81
23. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for General Services: Protection of People and Property and Provisions for Driving and Parking Student Motor Vehicles and Bicycles on Campus are Provided by the Campus Police (DPS)	83
24. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for General Services: The University Student Government (A.S.M.S.U.) Effectively Communicates Student Opinion to the University Administration and Provides Adequate Programs and Services for the Student Body	84
25. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for General Services: The Intramural Program Provides an Opportunity for the Majority of Students to Participate in a Variety of Sports and Recreational Activities	86
26. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for General Services: The Student Newspaper (<u>The State News</u>) is Informative and Generally Reflects Student Opinion	87
27. Group Analysis of Statement #7 for General Services: There Is an Office of the Ombudsman Whose Responsibility Is to Assist in Resolving Student Grievances and Complaints	89
28. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of General Services	90
29. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of General Services	91
30. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of General Services	92

Table	Page
31. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for the Office of the Registrar: Student Academic Records Are Maintained Accurately and Efficiently	94
32. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for the Office of the Registrar: Student Academic Records are Available for a Student's Own Review	95
33. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for the Office of the Registrar: Copies of Student Academic Records, Diplomas and Other Documents Pertinent to the Registrar's Office Can Be Secured Quickly and Efficiently	97
34. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for the Office of the Registrar: Information Concerning Enrollment, Registration, Records, Transcripts, Readmission, Graduate Certification and Diplomas is Adequately Conveyed	98
35. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for the Office of the Registrar: Enrollment and Registration Procedures Are Conducted in a Fair and Well-Organized Fashion	100
36. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of the Office of the Registrar	101
37. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the Office of the Registrar	102
38. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the Office of the Registrar	102
39. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Housing and Food Services: Provisions Exist for the Involvement of Students in Setting the Rules and Regulations in Student Housing	104
40. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Housing and Food Services: Well-Balanced Meals are Provided in Campus Cafeterias/Dining Halls	106
41. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Housing and Food Services: Residence Hall Living Contributes Positively to the Overall Educational Experiences of Undergraduate Students	107

Table	Page
42. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Housing and Food Services: Residence Halls Provide Students With a Wide Variety of Social/Educational/Recreational Programs	109
43. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Housing and Food Services: Residence Hall Staffs Are Responsive to Student Needs and Interests	110
44. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Housing and Food Services: Student Rooms and Social-Recreational Facilities in Residence Halls are Provided for in an Appropriate and Satisfactory Manner	112
45. Group Analysis of Statement #7 for Housing and Food Services: The Residence Hall Provides an On-Going Orientation to University Life	113
46. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Housing and Food Services	114
47. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Housing and Food Services	116
48. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Housing and Food Services	117
49. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Placement Services: An All-University Placement Service Is Available to Assist Students in Securing Suitable Employment	119
50. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Placement Services: The All-University Placement Service Furnishes Information to Students about Job Markets, Salaries, and Placement Trends in a Wide Variety of Fields	120
51. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Placement Services: The Placement Office Provides Adequate Assistance to Students in Resume Preparation and in the Development of Interviewing Skills	122
52. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Placement Services: The Placement Office Provides Adequate and Pleasant Facilities for Employer-Student Interviews	124

Table	Page
53. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Placement Services: Information Is Mailed to Future Employers Regarding Student's Educational Preparation, Job Experience, Extracurricular Activities and Recommendations	125
54. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Placement Services	126
55. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Placement Services	127
56. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off- campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Placement Services	128
57. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Student Activities: There Are Adequate Student Activities to Meet the Needs of Most Interested Students at This University . .	131
58. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Student Activities: Specific Student Activity Groups Are Well Organized and Operate Effectively (Groups With Which You Are Familiar)	132
59. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Student Activities: Student Activities Are Centrally Scheduled, Coor- dinated and Are Adequately Publicized	134
60. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Student Activities: Student Activities Provide Opportunities for Leader- ship and Personal Development	135
61. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Student Activities: Student Organizations Provide for Learning Democratic Processes and Citizenship Responsibilities	137
62. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Student Activities: There Is An Adequate Variety of Plays, Concerts and Movies for Students to Attend on Campus	138
63. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Student Activities	139
64. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Student Activities	140

Table	Page
65. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Student Activities	141
66. Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Judicial Programs: The Campus Judicial System Provides a Mechanism for Attempting to Resolve Important and Serious Student Complaints	143
67. Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Judicial Programs: Actions Taken for the Violation of University Regulations Are for the Purpose of Guidance and Correction--Not for Punishment	145
68. Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Judicial Programs: Opportunities Exist for Sufficient Student Involvement in the Formulation of Regulations Which Affect Their Lives on Campus	146
69. Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Judicial Programs: Records of Student Violations Against University Regulations Are Handled in an Appropriate Manner With Due Respect for the Student's Right to Privacy	148
70. Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Judicial Programs: Expectations for Student's Behavior Are Clearly and Concisely Communicated to Them	149
71. Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Judicial Programs: The Judicial System Attempts to Balance Rights and Responsibilities in a Fair Manner	151
72. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Judicial Programs	152
73. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Judicial Programs	153
74. Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Judicial Programs	153
75. Summary of Statements in Admissions and Academic Orientation Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analysis	159

Table	Page
76. Summary of Statements for the University Counseling Center Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	160
77. Summary of Statements for General Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	162
78. Summary of Statements for the Office of the Registrar Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	163
79. Summary of Statements for Housing and Food Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	164
80. Summary of Statements for Placement Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	166
81. Summary of Statements for Students Activities Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	167
82. Summary of Statements for Judicial Programs Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses	169

CHAPTER I

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

Within higher education, the segment of administration known as student personnel administration has been and continues to be responsible for the functioning of an organized program of services to students within most of the postsecondary institutions of the United States (Baltic, 1975).

Evidence exists that these very programs of student personnel services were the focus of much of the student unrest during the 1960s (Bayer and Astin, 1969; President's Commission, 1970; Carnegie Commission, 1971). These, however, were not the first cries for change and evaluation (Sanford, 1967; Katz, 1968).

In 1961 Mueller recognized this same need and expressed her view through the following statement

There seems to be no disagreement at the moment concerning the need or the authority for the evaluation of the profession of personnel work, for many individuals both inside and outside the profession are asking for it, raising questions and seeking issues (p. 522).

Barry and Wolf (1953) expressed their concern by saying

The demands for research and evaluation seem more insistent than ever before . . . the demand for research and evaluation is today one of the most pressing issues in this field and, for that matter, in education itself (p. 150).

Rackham, as early as 1951, stated that

It is somewhat surprising that, despite the need for such criteria, intensive evaluative studies of the total student

personnel services are extremely rare. Most of what has been written has been segmental rather than comprehensive. One can count on the fingers of one hand those few studies conducted on either a national or local scale which concern themselves with the overall aspect of student personnel services (p. 63).

Arbuckle (1953) followed suit soon after by pointing out that "the tremendous expansion of college personnel services since the end of the Second World War has made the professional need for evaluation even greater . . ." (p. 9). He further pointed out that although progress had been made in the past, most of the research was being conducted in the major institutions, hence, there were scores of colleges that failed to display any leaning to or even plans of evaluating the effectiveness of their services.

Robinson (1962) reiterated what others in the field had said about the need for evaluation in College Student Personnel

. . . evaluation must occupy more than ever, a central place in sound student personnel administration. Substantiation of this point may not be necessary or self-evident. However, current research dealing with the characteristics of students, the college environment, and the impact of college on students may produce findings which will require modification of traditional concepts (p. 22).

In spite of these clamors for evaluation, the early literature in this field revealed a paucity of research done in the student personnel area. Because of its importance to higher education and because of the increasing emphasis upon accountability to education as a whole, student personnel services must meet student needs. During this decade accountability has, indeed, become a commonly used concept in student affairs (Stake, 1970; Scriven, 1972; Rippey, 1973; Lewis, 1973; Trembley and Bishop, 1974) and, one of the important approaches to the achievement of the objective of accountability is through evaluation.

Robinson (1962) saw two factors which should stimulate evaluation: (1) the ever increasing expensiveness of higher education, and (2) the amount of research regarding student characteristics, the impact of college on students, and the nature of the college environment. Kamm (1955) was of the opinion that research and evaluation were as important to a student personnel program as the services themselves. Furthermore, it was recognized, especially with the ever growing student population, and even without this expansion, that the only way to meet the needs of the students would be to periodically subject student personnel services programs to critical study and analysis (Kamm, 1955; Rackham, 1951).

According to Arbuckle (1953), there are two basic reasons for evaluation of student personnel services.

The first of these is . . . professional pride As a matter of professional ethics no personnel worker can be satisfied with what he does unless there is valid evidence to indicate the positive effect of his labors A second reason . . . is more utilitarian, but no less basic. Those who buy a product want to know something about it, but at the present time the purchaser of personnel services is asked to buy largely on faith (pp. 9-10).

Robinson (1962) gave six other reasons why there is a need to conduct frequent, if not ongoing, evaluation.

1. Evaluation provides the best possible means of clarifying program goals and objectives.
2. Evaluation provides a means of relating program objectives to the broad educational objectives of the institution, and clarifying the relationship of the student personnel program to the educational program of the institution.

3. It is only through evaluation that the effectiveness of the total program and its several subdivisions can be measured.
4. When conducted in the proper spirit, evaluation studies cause one to question--to look at one's program through a "one-way mirror." Evaluation insures that all phases of the student personnel program will remain in proper perspective--and the total program remains in focus with institutional objectives.
5. Evaluation of present programs provides the only basis for the program modification which probably will become necessary as student enrollments increase. At any rate, evaluation must lay the groundwork for future planning.
6. Evaluation may well provide the stimulus for basic research regarding the student personnel program.

Williamson (1961) made reference to personnel programs and the determination of the achievement of their objectives. He suggested that such evaluation could come about through student opinion, informal spot checking or through experiment; however, no program could keep pace with time and change without evaluation.

The literature reveals an obvious expressed need for student personnel administrators to periodically analyze and review their programs through whatever means are available to them, as it is only through such efforts that the profession will continue to progress and meet the expressed demands of the students, faculty, legislature and general public.

Need for the Study

In a large, multi-faceted institution such as Michigan State University, certain elements of progress that take years and sometimes decades to evolve, can, over the span of a short time, be lost, confused, or forgotten, simply because of the sheer magnitude of the institution. Prior to the time that Laurine E. Fitzgerald submitted her dissertation Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Michigan State University in 1959, there had ostensibly been no comprehensive study of the student personnel program at Michigan State University. Subsequently, in 1963, Elwyn E. Zimmerman completed his dissertation entitled Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Michigan State University. With two, somewhat similar, extensive studies already completed at the same institution, what can or should justify a repeated effort by another researcher? The justification of the need is as follows:

1. The study done by Fitzgerald (1959) involved only the perceptions of faculty members.
2. Fitzgerald's (1959) study, at this point in time, is twenty years old.
3. Zimmerman (1963) did not utilize a stratified sample (only seniors were taken into consideration).
4. Zimmerman's (1963) study involved a small sample (50 seniors).
5. The study by Zimmerman (1963) is only four years more recent than Fitzgerald's (1959).
6. Because of the large differences in enrollment (1959--20,459 students; 1963--27,597 students; 1979--41,676 students) the

depth and breadth of student services at Michigan State University has undergone some change.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain student opinion regarding selected student services on the Michigan State University campus and to use this information in the appraisal of the services. A secondary purpose was to determine if any significant difference existed when the population was grouped according to class standing and place of residence.

The study was designed to address itself to the following questions within the various groups surveyed:

1. Were students aware of the selected student services available to them?
2. How much contact did students have with the different services?
3. How did students perceive the effectiveness of the selected student services?
4. What recommendations or criticisms did students have regarding the selected student services?

Procedure Followed

This study was basically descriptive in nature. The information gathering tool, entitled Student Services Questionnaire, was a revised form of Dunlop's (1970) Student Perception Form. Dunlop's (1970) instrument was a modification of Fitzgerald's (1959) Student Personnel Services Questionnaire. The Student Services Questionnaire was constructed in two parts. The first part was composed of forty-nine

statements that concerned themselves with student personnel functions on campus. Each statement was then further evaluated in terms of awareness, contact and effectiveness of the different services in question. Part two was an open-ended section which afforded the sampling population the opportunity to make comments.

A stratified random sample of full-time, undergraduate students comprised the sampling population. A detailed description of the method and procedure for analyzing the data is outlined in Chapter III.

Hypotheses

Two major null hypotheses were tested for significant differences. The hypotheses were:

1. There will be no significant difference in the responses provided by the total sample according to class standing when grouped as upperclassmen and underclassmen.
2. There will be no significant difference in the responses provided by the total sample according to place of residence.

Assumptions

Because all students and student services are uniquely distinct, certain assumptions must be established at this point in time. They are as follows:

1. It is assumed that not all students will or need to avail themselves of the available student services.
2. It is assumed that student services are available to those students who need them.

3. It is assumed that because of the specific objectives and goals of each individual student service, the diverse needs of students and the degree of effectiveness of each individual service, that some of the student services will be evaluated more favorably than others.
4. It is assumed that as students progress through their undergraduate years (Freshman to Senior), that they become more knowledgeable of the student services on campus.

Limitations of Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to full-time, undergraduate students at Michigan State University.
2. The study was limited to the questionnaire method.
3. The study did not include all of the available student services and programs at Michigan State University.
4. Due to the nature and "make-up" of the questionnaire, there were instances where respondents indicated they had not had contact with a particular function or service, yet still evaluated the effectiveness of the function or service. These responses were included in the analysis of the data.

Definition of Terms

Student Services Questionnaire. Refers to the instrument used to obtain the data for the study. Hereafter, when referred to, it will be in reference to the modified form and may at times be referred to simply as the "perception form" or the "questionnaire."

Student Services. Term used to identify the services evaluated in this study. These services are:

1. Admissions and Academic Orientation
2. University Counseling Center
3. General Services*
4. Office of the Registrar
5. Housing and Food Services
6. Placement Services
7. Student Activities
8. Judicial Programs

*With the exception of the statement regarding intramural activities, the functions listed under the area of General Services are not truly student personnel functions. However, because they are at times found under the Division of Student Affairs and are at times mistaken by students as being student personnel functions, they were, nevertheless, included to solicit student reaction.

On-Campus Student. Those full-time students living in residence halls or university apartments (e.g., Cherry Lane Apartments, Van Hoosen Apartments, married student housing).

Off-Campus Student. Those full-time students not living in residence halls or university apartments, but includes students living in university approved housing (e.g., sorority or fraternity houses).

Respondent. Those full-time students whose questionnaire was considered valid and which was used in the study.

Non-Respondent. Those full-time students whose questionnaire was not considered valid and therefore not used in the study.

Upperclassmen. Those full-time students whose class standing was either junior or senior.

Underclassmen. Those full-time students whose class standing was either freshman or sophomore.

Summary

This study was descriptive in nature and was intended to solicit student opinion regarding selected student services available at Michigan State University. The Student Services Questionnaire was mailed to a stratified random sample of the entire full-time, undergraduate student population. It is expected that the results of the evaluative study will result in constructive recommendations to the Student Affairs Division of Michigan State University.

Overview of Dissertation

Chapter II contains a review of the literature pertinent to this study. The review includes a brief discussion of the need for student opinion in the evaluation of College Student Personnel Services and an examination of past studies in the area of student perceptions regarding student services. The design of the study, which is presented in Chapter III, includes the description of the sample, data, variables and methods and procedures of analysis. Chapter IV contains the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. The summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations are included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature related to student perceptions of student personnel services is plentiful, however, because of the scarcity of these studies to be found published in professional journals, the sources cited are primarily unpublished dissertation abstracts. This review is by no means exhaustive, and is not proposed as such. Rather, it is intended to be comprehensive in terms of addressing not only those studies that concern themselves with student perceptions, but also those studies which solicited the combined opinions of students and faculty, students and administrators, and students, faculty, and administrators on the topic of student perceptions of student personnel services.

Furthermore, the studies selected for review were those which attempted to assess total or partial programs. No attempt was made to include evaluative studies of an isolated, individual student personnel service in this research.

Although an extensive number of studies contained in this review were conducted and published in the 70s, this expression of concern about the attitudes, needs, and expectations in this area of student college life was given impetus through empirical evidence as early as the 50s, and more so during the 60s (Rogers, 1951; Barret-Leonard, 1963).

The review of related literature is divided in two major parts. The first part is concerned with student input in evaluation of student personnel services. The second part is divided into the following subdivisions:

- (1) Studies using faculty, administrators and students' perceptions of student personnel services.
- (2) Studies using administrators and students' perceptions of student personnel services.
- (3) Studies using married students' attitudes towards student personnel services.
- (4) Studies using students' perceptions in the evaluation of student personnel services.

The Need for Student Opinion in Evaluation

One of the earliest acknowledgments for student input in assessment of student personnel services received support in 1949 when The American Council on Education published The Student Personnel Point of View and made the following declaration

Students can make significant contributions to the development and maintenance of effective personnel programs through contributing evaluation of the quality of the services, new ideas for changes in the services, and fresh impetus to staff members who may become immersed in techniques and the technicalities of the professional side of personnel work (p. 17).

The publication further suggested that the use of students in evaluation should be part of the following evaluative criteria:

1. Students' expression of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with services received. These expressions may be informally collected or may be gathered systematically. Obviously such

expressions need to be critically evaluated in terms of the total situation.

2. The extent of students' uses of the personnel services. Again, their criterion must be applied with full cognizance of the limitations of financial resources and other institutional factors balanced against the needs of the personnel departments (p. 18).

Wrenn (1951) stated that there was a ". . . need to make objective and quantifiable any survey of faculty or student opinion . . ." (p. 500). Although faculty and student opinion about a personnel service may at times seem unacceptable to the personnel worker, he must be able to accept this judgment as an objective valid opinion and realize that it is a basic condition of the success or failure of the service. "The chief value of much judgment," said Wrenn, "when based upon sophisticated and impartial observation, is the highlighting of the strong and weak services in a program" (p. 501). Perceptions of student personnel programs have too often involved the evaluation of the program by specialists or faculty. Furthermore, too often the validity of the evaluation is not possible and the judgments are not independently obtained. In spite of the fact that student opinion is used even less than the opinion of faculty and specialists in assessing the effectiveness of student personnel services, this opinion ". . . as an index of 'consumer attitude' is more significant," continued Wrenn, "than any expert judgment of what ought to be useful to students. By a study of student reaction, one knows whether the service is accepted and used" (p. 501).

Researchers are disinclined to place much reliability in student surveys, according to Jenson (1955), but

. . . those who "want to know" argue, and it would seem sensibly so, that one must be content with using his rough tools until more refined and dependable ones are available . . . we are aware of the weaknesses of using student reactions as evidence Nevertheless, . . . consumer reaction determines the destiny of most, if not all, professional services (p. 498).

Erickson and Hatch (1959) argue that sometimes student personnel programs become sterile because of their implementation, i.e., in some instances, the consumer, for whom the services were initially intended, is ignored during the developmental stage of the personnel programs. Their suggestion to alleviating this shortcoming is a structured survey which affords the student the opportunity to indicate his perceptions of the services available.

According to Williamson (1961)

. . . personnel workers should be encouraged to learn to develop new forms of utilizing participation by students in the formulation and development of personnel programs . . . we believe that the presentation of technical personnel problems of program development of responsible students will in itself, . . . reveal fundamental defects in these programs, from the students' point of view, which might hamper the development of the program if left undetected (p. 102).

He further says that student involvement taps a very important source of direct contact. Although this does not mean that student opinion is of itself valid, or the only valid source, it is a necessary means of valid evaluation since "the consumer's own reaction to the service which he is receiving is, in our Western culture," an important commodity.

Williamson's argument is further strengthened by those who postulate that the client for whom the evaluation was conducted and

who uses the facilities should also be the one who passes judgment and has impact on the results (Kohlan, 1973; Alkin and Fitz-Gibbon, 1975).

Hardee (1962) felt that because the movement for changing traditional student personnel programs by institutions of higher learning was afoot that the emphasis was on the student as never before. But, this emphasis was diminished by the fact that "administrative planners became preoccupied with the shadow rather than the substance of student needs" (p. 134).

Williamson and Cowan (1966) supported Hardee's contention by saying that administrators sometimes legislate policy without knowing what students really want and thus cause "emotional resentment" on both sides (p. 11).

The American Civil Liberties Union (1963) supported Bundy's (1962) statement that ". . . students are themselves one of the great defining elements in the quality of college life as a whole" (p. 34) when the ACLU stated that students all over the world not only had a greater participation in the political endeavors of their countries, but were also attempting to have a greater impact in formulating college policy. Hence, says Schoen (1965), "We must ensure students freedom of expression and self government, and . . . must in addition inform them of their prerogatives freely" (p. 246).

Eddy (1966) echoed the feelings of the American Civil Liberties Union (1963), Bundy (1962), and Schoen (1965), with regard to student involvement in the formulation of educational policy by contending that

Involvement means caring. Students do care and care deeply. Involving them in the total works of the academic community is one important way for the American college to prove its faith in

a generation in which, frankly, we had damn well better believe (p. 171).

Pruitt (1966) capsulized what those before him had advocated

The student personnel worker could profit by stopping and listening to the students rather than by telling them what is good for them.

Student point of view could be a primary source, although it is possibly neglected when the professional assumes that prerogative of determining what is best for the student (p. 15).

Studies Using Faculty, Administrators and
Students' Perceptions of Student
Personnel Services

Johnson's study in 1968 analyzed faculty, administrators and students at selected Illinois four-year colleges and junior colleges of the following selected personnel services: (1) admissions and orientation, (2) counseling services, (3) faculty advisement, (4) activities program, (5) housing, (6) residential counseling, (7) fraternities and sororities, (8) placement services, and (9) financial aids and scholarships. His instrument included forty-five specific services rated on a five point scale. From his data, Johnson concluded that:

1. Admissions and orientation programs generally were regarded as "effective" by all groups.
2. Availability of counseling on personal and social problems received ratings of slightly less than effective. (Religious counseling, generally was regarded as "effective" by all groups, but counseling for married and foreign students received lower ratings.)
3. Placement services and financial aid received ratings of "effective" from all groups, with junior college students

providing a lower evaluation and a substantial percentage indicating that they were uninformed about the service.

4. Student participation in determining institutional policies which directly affected them was accorded a middle rating by junior college students, students living off-campus and commuting students, but received an "effective" rating by student personnel administrators.

Peterson (1968) used a modified form of the Inventory of Selected College Services by Raines (1966) to assess the perceptions of Student Personnel Administrators, faculty, and students at senior colleges of The American Lutheran Church. His study revealed that:

1. There were no significant differences in perceptions by the student personnel administrators, faculty members and students with respect to the scope and quality of some services at each of the ten colleges.
2. Differences in perceptions by the three respondent groups with respect to the quality of the services were found more frequently than differences in perceptions of the scope of the services.
3. One of the most important concerns expressed by the students was their desire to be greater participants in the decision-making process of the institution.
4. There was a need to strengthen the lines of communication among administration, faculty and students.

Emerson (1971) made a study involving the community colleges in North Carolina in which he investigated differences in perceptions on

the independent variables of perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experience used to evaluate the effectiveness of the services and familiarity of the selected services held by faculty, student personnel workers and students.

Significant differences were revealed between colleges on each of the variables. Faculty rated the effectiveness of the services lower than did students and student personnel workers. Faculty and students rated their personal versus vicarious experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the services significantly lower than did the student personnel workers. Also, faculty and students rated their familiarity with the services significantly lower than did the student personnel workers.

In 1972, Swearingen investigated attitudes with the purpose of identifying the attitudes of faculty, administration and student leaders about critical issues in university life as evidenced through the student personnel program. His 87 item instrument which was distributed to 108 faculty, 124 administrators and 103 student leaders, was developed to center on three basic criteria categories: (1) the development of the student, (2) the role of student personnel work, and (3) services. Faculty members revealed stronger attitudes than other participants with regards to the development of the student. Administrators indicated stronger attitudes than others in the areas of discipline, tuition and the availability of certain facilities (e.g., listening center, recreation in residence halls, etc.). Students expressed stronger attitudes in a health program, the desirability of

counseling and the recognition of the student personnel worker as a facilitator, advocate and ombudsman.

A questionnaire developed by Fitzgerald (1959), modified by Rankin (1966) and updated by Cowins (1974) was used to identify and compare the perceptions of student personnel services held by twenty-nine administrators, sixty faculty members and 200 students. The areas tested were (1) admissions, registrar and records, (2) counseling, (3) financial aid, (4) food services, (5) health services, (6) special services, (7) student activities and (8) student conduct. The hypotheses tested were to determine whether there were any significant differences in the responses to the eight areas based on importance, awareness, effectiveness and location between students and faculty, students and administrators and administrators and faculty.

The major conclusions resulted in the rejection of all three hypotheses due to the influence of some particular composite of the variables in each of the four perceptual areas.

A very similar study was done by McIver (1976) at The University of Oklahoma, again using a modified version of Fitzgerald's (1959) instrument. McIver tested the same areas as did Cowins (1974) with the slight difference that he coupled Financial Aid and Placement as one service and did the same with Housing and Food Service. The hypotheses tested were the same as Cowin's (1974) and the results were identical--rejection of all hypotheses due to the influence of some particular composite of the variables in each of the four perceptual areas.

Moyer (1974) used a modified version of the Student Personnel Services As You See Them developed by Mahler (1955), and distributed the instrument to 500 students and 100 faculty members in an attempt to determine the perceptions and reactions of students and faculty members to the student personnel programs at Memphis State University. The four subproblems involved were:

- (1) How do students perceive the student personnel services?
- (2) How do faculty members perceive the student personnel services?
- (3) How do student perceptions compare with faculty member's perceptions?
- (4) How can student and faculty perceptions be used to evaluate the development and management of student personnel services?

Some of Moyer's findings indicated that:

1. Students appeared to be satisfied with Health Services and Food Services. Counseling, New Orientation, Placement and Academic-Social services appeared to be inconclusive and he concluded that students were unfamiliar with these services.
2. Although faculty members gave generally favorable responses, student government, vocational (career) counseling, financial aids information policies and remedial study and academic advising programs were perceived as problem areas.
3. There appeared to be a uniformity between student and faculty groups in their perceptions. (Faculty members rated some services more favorably than students, thus, faculty could be showing a bias in favor of administrative policies.)

4. Comparison by student sub-groups revealed few differences that would indicate that students thought there was discrimination among student sub-groups.
5. There was a certain uniformity among faculty sub-groups that tended to indicate that, with some exceptions, there were no major differences in their views of student services.

Abbott (1976) made an attempt in his study to answer several questions related to the following dependent variables: (1) the perceived importance of the student personnel services to the total educational program at the Medical College of Georgia, and (2) the perceived adequacy of the student personnel services being provided at the Medical College of Georgia. The ratings overall revealed that faculty, students and student affairs staff felt the student services were of moderate to great importance as part of the total educational program and were of minimal to moderate adequacy as performed at the Medical College. There were no differences in the perceptions of the adequacy variable except faculty without the doctorate rated the adequacy of the services significantly higher than the faculty with the M.D. degree.

Studies Using Administrators and Students

A study was reported by Noeth (1972) in which he examined student and student personnel worker perceptions of the Purdue University environment using the four Scales of Academic, Community, Awareness, and Personnel Services. For the Purdue environment with regards to the Personnel Services Scale, student personnel workers showed a more positive perception of helpfulness, understanding and developmental concern for their own services than did the students. Examination of

the ideal environment found student personnel workers and students differing significantly on four items for the Personnel Services Scale. These disagreements pertain to the role, purpose and potential function of various student personnel services within the University. Students did not seem to be as clearly aware of the possible role and function of the student personnel worker as did the student personnel worker envision his own educational contribution.

Hughes (1975) conducted a study whose purpose was to analyze and appraise student personnel programs at selected public junior colleges in the state of Alabama. Initially, the Dean of Students or his/her designate received a questionnaire and those who responded were interviewed. Questionnaires were also sent to all student personnel staff and selected students at each college. From analysis of the data, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Greater than 50 percent of the functions which comprise a basic junior college student personnel program were implemented at less than a satisfactory level in three of the six colleges participating in the study.
2. All of the student personnel programs studied were understaffed in at least one area in relation to the staffing pattern developed in the 1965 study of student personnel programs by the American Association of Junior Colleges.
3. There was a lack of professional in-service training provided in each college for student personnel staff members.
4. Fewer than 52 percent of the students surveyed indicated they had used the counseling service provided by their college.

5. Career information and job placement services were not adequately provided in a majority of the student personnel programs.
6. Limited student personnel services were offered to students who attended evening classes.
7. Lastly, it was concluded that a possible cause for some of the weaknesses inherent in the student personnel programs was a lack of financial resources.

Studies Involving Married Students' Attitudes
Toward Student Personnel Services

Geiken (1972) examined the area of married students' perceptions by attempting to determine whether or not married and single students attending universities in the Wisconsin State University System differed in the use of and rating of selected student personnel services. An attempt was also made to determine whether male and female students differed in their responses to the instruments used in the research. Two basic instruments were used in this research; the first was the College and University Environment Scale (CIES), Second Edition, and the second instrument was the Student Opinion Questionnaire.

Concluded from the findings were the facts that married and single students differed significantly in their use of and ratings of the services offered--married students used the services less and gave them a lower rating. Also, except for the rating of campus activities, male and female respondents did not differ in their use or rating of the selected student personnel services. Males gave campus activities a higher rating than did females.

In the same year as Geiken (1972), Lattore (1972), at the University of Northern Colorado, researched to what degree the existing personnel services in the areas of financial aid, counseling, campus wide activities, health and housing assisted the married student. As an integral part of this main concern, other questions that were asked were:

1. To what extent do married students make use of the five areas?
2. If services are not used, then for what reasons?
3. Do married students feel that present services render adequate programs and/or assistance?
4. What programs in the five areas do they find beneficial?

The results indicated that married students had a strong need for the services available through the Student Activities Office, Financial Aid Office, and Health Center and that the extent of married students' use of the services were in proportion to their expressed need with the exception of campus-wide activities. Reasons for not using the five areas were mostly expressed as "no need" and "received assistance from another source."

Generally, it was found that the five service areas were not rendering adequate programs and/or assistance to the married student population. Differences existed among the five areas in terms of the degree that students rated them satisfactory-unsatisfactory. Health services received the highest positive response while financial aid and housing services were rated somewhat less positive. The most positively rated program was that of a day care center.

An investigation by Flores (1975), while at the University of Texas at Austin, explored married student perception needs through the application of a needs assessment approach. Married student needs or perceived life conditions were defined and implications were made about the management of college and university student personnel programs. The purpose of this study was threefold; the first purpose was to develop and present a needs assessment procedure which would have general applicability in planning for higher education student personnel programs, second, to discover needs of the married student population for student personnel services within a selected area of institutional responsibility, and third, to produce a needs-focused, rationally derived, technically adequate plan for student personnel programs which would reduce or eliminate discovered deficiencies.

Flores' (1975) instrument, Married Student Needs Assessment Instrument, developed by consolidating fifty-one identified responsibility statements and using them as behavioral goals, was utilized in obtaining the data. The most impressive empirical finding of the study was the low incidence of dissatisfaction reported by the married student population. In only seven of the twenty-four condition statements in relation to which need might have existed was need actually reported. Of all responses received on all instruments, only 10.5 percent were expressions of dissatisfaction with the status at that time.

Studies Using Students' Perceptions in the
Evaluation of Student Personnel Services

Atwater (1961) did a comprehensive study of personnel services in protestant theological seminaries. His most significant findings were:

1. There is a need to acquaint new students with the personnel services offered.
2. Little is done in interpreting students' test scores.
3. Students were satisfied with faculty advisers in providing time for interviews, but dissatisfied with the educational or vocational counseling they received.
4. Fourteen percent of the schools studied did not have an infirmary or dispensary.
5. There was a large measure of responsibility for self-government given to students in residence hall activities.
6. Students found it difficult to organize all-school social activities.
7. There was a need for evaluation of the student personnel program.

In 1966, by means of the survey method, Arbuckle and Doyle concluded an evaluative study which was designed to determine the full scope of personnel services offered in Bible Colleges and which would obtain student opinion regarding the effectiveness of these services. The data was summarized and analyzed according to the following variables: (1) size (student enrollment) of college or institution, (2) four-year program versus three-year program, (3) faculty-student ratio, (4) accredited (regionally accredited) versus non-accredited

schools, and (5) denominational affiliation versus non-denominational affiliation.

The findings indicated that the majority of the students appeared to be highly satisfied with help received from faculty members in the orientation process; the majority of the students appeared satisfied with counseling they received for academic problems; and the majority of the students were satisfied with extracurricular activities. It was also found that the majority of the students were only moderately satisfied with housing and health services, and that the Bible Colleges in this study were failing to meet the objectives of a good psychological testing program of assisting students toward the goal of self-understanding as only fifteen of the thirty-seven colleges could interpret test results to students. With regard to financial aid, the highest degree of dissatisfaction was in the area of scholarships and grants-in-aid while the highest degree of satisfaction was in assistance given to students in obtaining part-time employment.

A study was reported by Penney and Buckles (1966) which was concerned with student needs, resources and satisfaction at Boston University. Their primary questions were:

- (1) What are the problems and concerns of the undergraduate student?
- (2) How serious are the problems at two different points in their academic career?
- (3) What resources do they use in dealing with problems?
- (4) What help and satisfaction is derived from the resources used?

The sample and data were controlled by the variables of sex, residence, class standing, and college of enrollment. The significant findings indicated far greater concern among those students with academic adjustment to college life, scholastic difficulties, financial, vocational and emotional problems than with social, health or administrative problems. Inadequate resources for resolving difficulties were quite apparent, especially those of a scholastic or financial nature. Various campus resources such as the counseling services appeared to be improperly, as well as inadequately, used. The student variable which proved most significant was sex.

Rankin (1966) sent a questionnaire to 411 graduating seniors to obtain information which could be used in the evaluation of the student personnel services on the Colorado State College campus and to determine if perceptions of the graduating seniors would differ significantly when they were grouped on the basis of sex, duration of enrollment and residence status. The study was designed to answer the following: how important the services were to seniors, how aware they were of the services, whether they had had any direct contact with them, if they were satisfied with them, if they knew their location and what recommendations could be offered.

The major conclusions were:

1. Graduating seniors perceived the personnel services as being at least "fairly important" to a college education.
2. Graduating seniors were aware of the existence of the personnel services, but were not aware of all of the functions provided by these services.

3. Graduating seniors had had contact with each of the personnel services, but did not use all of the functions provided.
4. The sample population was generally satisfied with the functions with which they had contact.
5. Graduating seniors perceived the Placement Center as being the most important personnel service.
6. The respondents perceived the supervision of off-campus housing as the most unsatisfactory accomplished function.
7. The perceptions of graduating seniors when compared on basis of sex, duration of enrollment and residence status did not differ significantly.

Robinson (1966) developed an inventory of student personnel services developed from an analysis of important literature pertaining to student personnel services. He selected thirty services at four universities in Texas with enrollments in excess of 12,000 students, and 400 students from each university were requested to evaluate the services. Each service was evaluated by students in three ways: (1) the extent to which the service was actually needed, (2) the extent to which the service was actually received, and (3) the extent to which college students should receive the service. A statistical analysis of the responses to the thirty services was made on the basis of the 50-50 proportion. A significant proportion of the respondents actually needed twenty-one of the services, actually received seventeen of the services, and perceived all thirty services as being needed by college students.

Major findings included:

1. Each student personnel service was perceived as being needed for all college students.
2. There was a greater proportion of students needing the services than receiving them.
3. New student orientation was not received by half of the students on an adequate basis.
4. Adequate use was not made of test results in counseling students.
5. Student health services were inadequate.
6. Causes of misbehavior were not examined adequately by the colleges.
7. Student union governing boards experienced undue interference from the administration.

A survey and interview method was used in investigating the scope and effectiveness of student personnel services in eleven junior colleges for women in New England by Wright in 1967. Student reaction neither confirmed nor disconfirmed actual availability of services resulting from inadequate communication and other factors. The results refuted commonly held assumptions that more services would be provided at schools that were smaller, older, had higher fees and lower student-faculty ratios.

Mueller (1968) did an interesting study when she took 76 graduate students and had them list aspects of their undergraduate years which seemed to them satisfactory, favorable, or advantageous and five which they considered disadvantageous. Twenty percent of the comments were directed at personnel services and almost twice as many commented

unfavorably as favorably. Housing, counseling and student government were generally deemed as unsatisfactory while financial aid got little attention. Students seemed very ignorant of available services of the personnel or counseling staffs. The students mentioned understaffing, poorly trained staff and too academic oriented counseling, whereas professional, vocational and placement counseling got little attention. Student governments were criticized as unrepresentative, ineffective in influencing administrators and lacking in good student leadership. Extracurricular programs also got some attention, with the cultural and social programs seeming important and the athletic and religious activities unimportant. Social programs came in for as much blame as praise, but the cultural programs were generally satisfactory.

Using An Inventory of Student Reactions to Student Personnel Services developed by Wrenn and Kamm (1948), Todd, in 1968, surveyed students from a large state university and a small state college. Students from the small college showed a significantly more favorable attitude toward orientation, counseling, financial aid, placement and student personnel records. Students from the university indicated a more favorable attitude toward the service of housing. Students from both institutions indicated at least a moderately favorable attitude toward all the services tested with the exception of health services. The evidence also supported the proposition that students of certain colleges within a university show more favorable perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services than students of other colleges within the university.

Wright (1969) investigated the degree of agreement or disagreement associated by college students with various personnel services, and determined statistically whether social status differences existed among students in their perceptions and use of personnel services at Lamar College and Prairie View College. With a sample population of 304 juniors and seniors, both males and females, Wright gathered his information with the Student Reaction Inventory and Murray's Social Status Index to arrive at the following observations:

1. Race was the best single predictor of a student's choice of services.
2. Sex was the least predictor of a student's choice of personnel services.
3. Race was the best single predictor of the services utilized by students.
4. White and Black students were homogeneous in their opinions with just a small variation.
5. Socio-economic status was a significant predictor of one's choice of personnel services. It was not significant in determining differences between opinions.
6. Most students tended to be highly critical of the services meeting their needs.

Dunlop (1970) completed his dissertation at the University of Wyoming by studying student perceptions of the available student personnel services. His instrument, The Student Perception Form, which has provided the impetus for several studies, is a modified rendition of Fitzgerald's (1959) questionnaire. He surveyed 580 undergraduate

students and divided the conclusions into two types. Ten general conclusions were drawn from the total group while twenty specific conclusions dealt with a specific group or service. Major conclusions were that on-campus students were more positive toward services available than off-campus students and that female students had more positive feelings than did male students toward these services.

Stahl (1970) explored the possibility of whether significant changes took place in freshmen student reactions toward student personnel services at the University of Wyoming. His study was a partial replication of Dunlop's study, but Stahl only investigated the areas of discipline, financial aids, health service, housing and food service and registrar and admissions. The sample population was comprised of 300 freshmen, males and females, who resided in the residence halls. The instrument was administered to students at the beginning of the year and again during the eight month school year. The analysis revealed that:

1. Generally, freshmen perceptions do not change during the first year.
2. Generally, freshmen males and females do not differ in perceptions.
3. Generally, freshmen perceive student personnel services as an important aspect of higher education.
4. Generally, freshmen are aware that student personnel services do exist, but are not familiar with the specific operation of the service.

In 1972, Burns undertook the task of determining community/junior college transfer students' need for and perceptions of the availability and adequacy of student personnel services, their use of these services, and their recommendations to facilitate their adjustment at Eastern Michigan University. With two exceptions, the results revealed no significant differences in the sixty-four comparisons between the two groups being compared. The exceptions were that formerly enrolled transfer students expressed a significantly greater need for help with minor emotional problems, and currently enrolled transfer students recommended significantly stronger that specific publications be prepared for prospective transfer students.

Both groups expressed greatest need for adequate information before deciding to attend, academic advising, adequate academic facilities, help to choose a suitable college major, placement after college and an adequate college hangout. The services most frequently rated "below average" were academic advising, assistance for occupational planning and outlets for enhancing students' personal and social development.

Blakley (1972) conducted a study which involved the concerns of commuter students. The data was gathered by means of the Commuter Student Survey. The instrument contained seventy-two items designed to elicit the necessary data for providing a profile of the commuter student and for analyzing his perceptions of selected student services, functions and facilities at The Ohio State University.

The findings indicated that the commuter student attended regular orientation programs, made extensive use of academic advising

services, used the facilities of the Ohio Union, Library, Listening Center and selected recreational facilities and was aware that other facilities and services existed to a far greater degree than he used them. However, communication, including information about these services, was not effective for a large number of students.

The student personnel services at the University of Mississippi were studied by Jones in 1972 using a modified version of Fitzgerald's (1959) instrument. The study reported perceptions students had of importance of student personnel services to (1) their welfare as undergraduate students, (2) awareness of the existence of the services, (3) use of the services, (4) satisfaction with the service, (5) knowledge of location of the service, and (6) their recommendations.

Responses revealed that admissions, academic records and student activities were meeting student needs, but orientation, pre-college counseling, recruiting, registration, student health service, disciplinary procedures, financial aids service and campus security did not meet the needs. The greatest dissatisfaction was with housing while the counseling center and the placement office were the services students were least aware of.

In the same year that Jones (1972) did her study and at the same university, Kaplan (1972) was simultaneously doing almost the same study, except that she was utilizing the spring graduates of 1971 to evaluate student services. The study addressed itself to the same questions that Jones had posed, and the instrument used was also a modified version of Fitzgerald's (1959) instrument. Kaplan's (1972) major observation from the responses was that student personnel services

available to graduates were not specifically designed for them or effective. Other observations included:

1. Graduates often did not take advantage of services provided because they were not aware of the service.
2. Data indicated lack of knowledge concerning the provisions for the location of the responsibility for the student services functions.
3. Services of major importance as seen by graduates were financial aid and placement--least important was religious life.
4. Student organizations did not exist for cultivation of social relationships among graduate students and findings indicated there was a need for social relationships among those students.
5. Due to a marked lack of interest exhibited by some of the staff in the area of student personnel services, a situation existed among the graduate students in the sample of this study in which the students seemed to be convinced that no one cared enough to help or assist them when they needed help.

Vickers (1972) did research at Lewis-Clark State College which involved an evaluation of the student personnel services arena from the view of presently enrolled and previously enrolled students. Specifically, he was attempting to determine if differences in perceptions existed between full-time students enrolled in the vocational-technical division and those enrolled in the academic division; to compare the perceptions of the then presently enrolled full-time students with previous full-time students enrolled between 1967 and 1971; and to determine if perceptions of the then presently enrolled students would

differ when grouped on basis of sex, place of residence and marital status.

To gather his information Vickers used an adaptation of Dunlop's (1970) Student Perception Form. The major finding of the study was that Lewis-Clark State College students, previously enrolled and presently enrolled, but in particular presently enrolled, were more critical of the services than students reported in other studies.

Amprey (1973) conducted an evaluation of student personnel services as viewed by black and white students on both predominantly black and predominantly white student populated campuses in the state of Maryland. Responses were such that Amprey reported the following:

1. Students' racial backgrounds had no significant influence on students' evaluations of counseling, financial aid and placement services on predominantly black student populated campuses.
2. White students attending predominantly black student populated institutions evaluated the judicial, health and housing services higher than did the black students attending predominantly black student populated institutions.
3. Minority white students evaluated counseling, judicial, financial aid, health, housing and placement services slightly higher than did black majority, black minority, and white majority students.
4. White students attending predominantly black institutions were not favorable to living in campus dwellings.
5. Students who did not visit the counseling centers during the spring 1972 semester evaluated the counseling services

significantly lower than did the students who visited the counseling centers one or more times during the spring 1972 semester.

6. Although the differences were not significant, black students on both predominantly black and predominantly white student populated campuses tended to be slightly more critical of the financial aid services than were the white students on both predominantly black and predominantly white student populated campuses.

The Student Personnel Services Questionnaire developed by Fitzgerald (1959) was the information gathering instrument used by Benson (1975) to investigate perceptions of student personnel functions held by full-time freshmen students at The University of Toledo. Specifically, the study sought to determine if there were any differences in student perceptions when grouped by college, sex and place of residence. Students were questioned about each of the forty student personnel functions in the questionnaire in the following items:

- (1) the importance of a college education
- (2) the existence of a specific office or provision for the function
- (3) the location of the performance of the function
- (4) the actual evaluation of the performance of the function

Student reaction suggested that both the admissions and records and student personnel units should develop and implement some new approaches in student personnel development, education and service

programs directed toward assisting the diverse student population attending The University of Toledo.

Lynch (1976) took a stratified sample of 133 students at Kansas State University and used the questionnaire and interview method in getting at student awareness and utilization of professional and paraprofessional services. Some surprises were in store when students were asked "Are you aware that these sources offer services for student problems?" as some paraprofessional services (a hot line and the Drug Education Center) were better known than their older counterparts, the Counseling Center and the Mental Health Center. There was also evident a general tendency for students to be less willing to seek assistance from helping sources themselves as compared with their willingness to refer someone else for assistance.

Summary

The available literature revealed that authorities in the field of College Student Personnel have, since the early days after the conception of a student personnel point of view, and up to the present, expressed their desire for and need of student input in evaluation of student personnel services. The reasons for this expectation by experts in the field are as varied and as diverse as those who have expressed this particular feeling. However, the reasons can be summarized as follows:

1. Students can provide a fresh impetus through new ideas to student personnel staff who may become too immersed in the technical aspect of the profession.

2. Consumer attitude (student reaction) is the index of whether the service is accepted and used, and it is this consumer reaction which determines the destiny of most professional services.
3. Students must be ensured of their freedom of expression and self government.
4. Student point of view is sometimes the best determinant of what is best for the student.

Studies found by the researcher that concerned themselves with the total or partial evaluation of student personnel services were not as numerous as those which concerned themselves with evaluation of one particular service. This finding tends to indicate that the direction of evaluation of college student personnel is presently skewed towards depth, rather than breadth.

Almost all of the studies cited in the review used some semblance of a questionnaire as their primary tool in gathering the information, with a few studies being supplemented with interviews. There was no one instrument that was used exclusively (although Fitzgerald's instrument developed in 1959, with modification, appeared to be the most prevalent), and some authors either designed their own instrument or replicated with minor modifications, others already in the field. The approach used in any particular study was not a standard procedure as the basic purpose of the study, needs of the locale and resources available varied with each particular study.

Studies which involved students in some combination with faculty and/or administrators seem to indicate a favorable attitude

toward student personnel services in general. This favorable attitude was expressed by the three groups in different combination; however, in some studies the three groups also expressed a less than favorable attitude toward the services.

Findings of married student studies revealed that only one of the three studies indicated a low incidence of dissatisfaction. The remaining two studies perceived the student personnel services as less than adequate or evaluated the services with a low rating.

Studies which were concerned only with student perceptions were split rather evenly in terms of student satisfaction and student dissatisfaction with the services provided. One of the more outstanding complaints was the inadequate utilization and interpretation of test results by some institutions, especially nonsecular institutions.

Three other major themes can be generalized to all of the studies. They are as follows:

1. Generally, students felt there was a need for student personnel services.
2. Generally, students were aware of the existence of the student services, but did not elect to use them.
3. Generally, students were aware of the existence of the student services, but not of the functions provided by the services nor the role of the student personnel worker.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the procedures employed in the study. Included is a description of the development of the instrument, the field study of the instrument, the population sample, the method of collecting data, the development of the hypotheses and the data analysis.

The Development of the Instrument

The questionnaire method of research was employed to obtain students' perceptions of selected student personnel services at Michigan State University. The idea for this instrument was generated when the researcher reviewed a study by Dunlop (1970). Dunlop's (1970) questionnaire, The Student Perception Form, was designed using Fitzgerald's (1959) instrument, the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire, as the basic reference; however, most of the statements were changed to fit the local situation.

The original intention of the researcher was to replicate Dunlop's (1970) study in its totality. However, two local conditions served to alter this intent. First, adjustments to Dunlop's (1970) instrument were necessary since the environment appropriate to his

instrument differed from that of Michigan State University, and second, the investigator believed that suggestions from the directors of the services being evaluated were highly desirable. The input acquired from the directors was used in determining the specific areas of each service to be evaluated.

The Student Services Questionnaire (Appendix B) was constructed in two parts. The first part consists of forty-nine statements which are characteristic of student services functions. Only nine of these statements are taken directly from Dunlop's (1970) study. The areas included in the instrument are the following: (1) Admissions and Academic Orientation, (2) the University Counseling Center, (3) General Services, (4) the Registrar's Office, (5) Housing and Food Service, (6) Placement Services, (7) Student Activities, and (8) Judicial Programs. Notably missing are the areas of financial aid and health services. The reason for omitting these areas is that a more intensive and in-depth evaluation than the researcher could possibly conduct had already been done in financial aid and health services at Michigan State University in the last three years. The second part of the instrument is an open-ended section where the student is invited to make comments or recommendations concerning the service areas.

In order to allow for maximum reliability of the statements contained in Part I of the instrument, the researcher interviewed each of the directors of the services to be evaluated. Each of the directors was given a copy of Dunlop's (1970) instrument and given the option of using those same statements, editing the statements, or disregarding the statements and formulating their own. This approach

afforded the directors the opportunity to assess those segments of their particular area which they felt needed to be assessed in terms of whether the aims and objectives of their service were being met on the Michigan State University campus according to student opinion. It is appropriate to note that, on a few occasions, cooperation of a few directors was less than enthusiastic.

Students were asked to respond to three questions specific to each of the forty-nine statements: (1) are you aware that this function exists on the Michigan State University campus? (2) have you had any contact with this function? and (3) how satisfied are you with this function?

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted during the last week of November, 1978, to pre-test for clarity, physical appearance, length of time needed to complete the form and general comments regarding the instrument. The questionnaire was administered to a group of ten undergraduate students enrolled in a leadership course, Education 415. Further tests, of the same nature, were done by indiscriminately handing out copies of the instrument to residents of the residence hall where the researcher was employed. Also, two seniors majoring in English were asked to critique the instrument for syntax. Finally, selected graduate students from both the Masters and Doctorate program in College Student Personnel were requested to critique the instrument for its overall appearance and completeness and were also invited to make any suggestions, comments or recommendations regarding the instrument. All told, thirty-two people, covering all of the different class

standings in the undergraduate level and both Masters and Ph.D. candidates in the graduate level, were involved in the pilot study.

The criticisms made by this select group were then evaluated by the researcher and his Committee Chairman and recommended changes were instituted.

Population and Sample

The sample necessary for this study was extracted from the total full-time, undergraduate students enrolled during Winter Term, 1979, at Michigan State University. Before the study was conducted permission was obtained from the Committee on Release of Confidential Information for release of data from the Registrar. The request consisted of two listings; one for students living off-campus and one for students living on-campus. The lists were stratified random samples of full-time undergraduate students enrolled Winter Term, 1979, with fifty students randomly selected from each level, 1-4 (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior), for both on and off-campus, for a total of 400 subjects.

The random listing was done by the Office of the Registrar in the following manner. The number of subjects needed per category (50) was divided into the total population of each class standing according to place of residence (e.g., 50 was divided into the total population of seniors living off-campus) to determine a common denominator for each of the eight categories. Once a denominator was achieved, it was matched against the entire population within each category. The first subject that corresponded to the denominator from the population of each category was the first person on the random sample list. The rest

of the random sample list was compiled by utilizing the denominator as the interval for the selection of the rest of the sample until the list was completed. This procedure was repeated eight times, once for each different class level for both on and off-campus. Local addresses, class standings and student numbers were included in the lists.

From the lists that totaled 400 subjects, five individuals were not included in the addressed gum label print-out as the Registrar's Office indicated that for one reason or another, these five individuals had been screened out by the computer. Hence, the total sample population was three-hundred and ninety-five.

Of the 395 subject random sample, a total of 211 or 53.4 percent returned usable questionnaires. Seven questionnaires, or 1.7 percent of the sample, were returned in a nonusable fashion, and only one questionnaire was nondeliverable. A total of 176 subjects, or 44.6 percent, failed to respond. (See Table 1, page 47, for a more complete description of the data.)

Method of Collecting Data

On February 20, 1979, questionnaires were mailed to all students in the sample who were living off-campus and to those students in the sample who were living on-campus, but not in a residence hall (i.e., Spartan Village, University Apartments, Cherry Lane Apartments). Each mailing packet included a cover letter (Appendix A), a single copy of the instrument (all questionnaires, whether on or off-campus, were coded for analysis and follow-up purposes) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The collection point of the instrument was the office of the

Table 1.--Distribution and Percentage of Return from Sample Group.

	n	Returned Usable Questionnaires	Percent of Returned Usable Questionnaires	Returned Nonusable Questionnaires	Returned Nondeliverable Questionnaires	Non- Respondents	Percent of Non- Respondents
<u>Off-Campus</u>							
Sr	50	28	56.0	1	0	21	42.0
Jr	49	28	57.1	2	1	18	36.7
Soph	49	23	46.9	1	0	25	51.0
Fr	47	24	51.1	1	0	22	46.8
Subtotal	195	103	52.8	5	1	86	44.1
<u>On-Campus</u>							
Sr	50	25	50	0	0	25	50
Jr	50	27	54	1	0	22	44
Soph	50	26	52	0	0	24	48
Fr	50	30	60	1	0	19	40
Subtotal	200	108	54	2	0	90	45
Total	395	211	53.4	7	1	176	44.6

Vice President for Student Affairs as all return envelopes had been addressed to this office.

Before the questionnaires were distributed to those students in the sample who resided in the residence halls, permission was obtained from the Coordinator of the Residence Hall Programs Office to approach the Head Advisor of each hall to solicit their help in the distribution, collection and follow-up of the questionnaire. Although cooperation from the Head Advisors was not unanimous, the greater majority of the Head Advisors were enthusiastic in rendering their help.

Between February 19, 1979, and February 26, 1979, questionnaires (accompanied only by a cover letter) were personally hand-carried and delivered to the Head Advisors for distribution to residents in their hall who were included in the study. Once the Head Advisors completed their follow-up, the questionnaires were collected and returned to the researcher via campus mail.

On March 6, 1979, two weeks after the first mailing, 185 usable questionnaires had been returned. On this date, the first follow-up of the off-campus sample was conducted. The first follow-up consisted of a reminder in the form of a postal card to all nonrespondents. This action prompted twenty more students to respond. On April 3, 1979, six weeks after the initial mailing and four weeks after the first follow-up, a second follow-up was conducted by again mailing a postal card as a reminder to the remaining nonrespondents. This action generated six more responses. The return for the entire sample population is indicated in Table 1.

Tabulation of Data

Once the questionnaires were returned, the responses were transposed onto mark-sensor scoring sheets. This method was chosen, as opposed to key punching cards directly from the questionnaires, in anticipation of providing less chance for human error in the handling of the data and, also, as a means of reducing the amount of time expended. After this task was completed, the scoring sheets were taken to the University scoring service to process the responses onto computer cards. The researcher then took the cards with the raw data to the Office of Research Consultants for advice in writing a program which would produce frequency counts and percentages for each of the forty-nine statements. A second program was then written to calculate chi-square values for each statement comparing the expected chance distribution for each statement with the observed frequency distribution of that particular statement. Both programs were run through the CDC 6500 Michigan State University computer utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The results of the chi-square tests were compared with the tabled values of the chi-square distribution at the .01 level of significance. The .01 level was used to protect against Type I errors.

The comments to the open-ended section of the questionnaire are contained in Appendix C. They were compiled under their respective service without regard to place of residence or class standing.

Summary

In this chapter the design of the study was presented. The study was descriptive in nature and a questionnaire was the instrument

utilized for collecting the data. Part I of the instrument contained forty-nine statements which are characteristic of student services functions. Part II consisted of an open-ended section which requested recommendations or comments. The instrument was mailed to a stratified random sample of three hundred and ninety-five full-time undergraduate students at Michigan State University during Winter Term, 1979. After the initial mailing and two subsequent follow-ups, a total of two hundred and eleven students, or 53.4 percent, had responded with questionnaires that were usable for analysis.

The data were tabulated by means of a frequency count and percentages to determine a general flow of the responses and by chi-square tests to compare the differences in responses according to on or off-campus status and upper or lower class standing.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Chapter IV includes the results of the analysis of the data. For each service, the results of Part I of the questionnaire are reported for the total sample group. The total sample group analysis included a frequency count and percentages for each of the choices for provisions, contact and effectiveness on each statement. Chi-square values are reported for questions in each area studied and any significant differences found among the subgroups compared (i.e., on-campus vs. off-campus responses; on-campus upperclassmen vs. on-campus underclassmen responses; off-campus upperclassmen vs. off-campus underclassmen responses) are reported. Some percentages did not total to one hundred due to rounding.

Responses to Part II of the questionnaire, which contained students' comments to the open-ended section of the questionnaires, are summarized at the end of the chapter. The comments are categorized by individual service and listed under Appendix C.

Absolute frequencies and adjusted percentages to indicate the flow of direction of student responses are reported in the ensuing pages. Kamm's (1950) and Ackoff's (1953) arbitrary figure of 67 percent was used as the guide to indicate a "strong direction of response" in any of the categories to which students responded. In some cases,

categories were combined (very good and satisfactory) to indicate a strong direction of response.

Admissions and Academic Orientation

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: Services and information concerning admission are available to and appropriate for prospective students

Table 2 on page 53 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. According to the 94.8 percent response rate, students strongly viewed this function as existing on campus.

CONTACT. The 92.4 percent response strongly indicated that students had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly indicated they were satisfied with the performance of this function.

Statement #2: Services and information concerning financial aid are available to and appropriate for prospective students

Table 3 on page 54 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated this function was provided.

Table 2.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: Services and Information Concerning Admission Are Available to and Appropriate for Prospective Students.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	200	94.8*
No	1	.5
Do Not Know	10	4.7
2. Contact		
Yes	194	92.4*
No	16	7.6
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	26	12.4
Satisfactory	152	72.7*
Unsatisfactory	17	8.1
Do Not Know	14	6.7

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 3.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: Services and Information Concerning Financial Aid are Available to and Appropriate for Prospective Students.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	183	86.7*
No	10	4.7
Do Not Know	18	8.5
2. Contact		
Yes	131	62.4
No	79	37.6
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	18	8.6
Satisfactory	81	38.8
Unsatisfactory	56	26.8
Do Not Know	54	25.8

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. Almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated they had experienced contact with this function. It is noteworthy to point out that although the information in statement #2 is provided to all students, more than one-third of them were not aware of this fact.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percentage of respondents indicated they were satisfied with the performance of this function.

Statement #3: A well-coordinated recruitment program exists to inform prospective students about Michigan State University

Table 4 on page 56 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3. There were no strong directions of response in any category in this table.

PROVIDED. It is interesting to note that almost one-half of the respondents were not aware of a recruitment program at MSU.

CONTACT. Again, it is interesting to note that over one-half of the respondents felt they had experienced no contact with the recruitment efforts at MSU.

EFFECTIVENESS. Only 41 percent of the respondents rated this function as satisfactory. This finding might be related to the fact that only 46 percent of the respondents indicated contact with this function.

Statement #4: The Academic Orientation Program provides academic advisement and enrollment in courses appropriate to students

Table 5 on page 57 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

Table 4.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: A Well-Coordinated Recruitment Program Exists to Inform Prospective Students About Michigan State University.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	113	53.6
No	15	7.1
Do Not Know	83	39.3
2. Contact		
Yes	95	46.1
No	111	53.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	21	10.1
Satisfactory	65	31.3
Unsatisfactory	30	14.4
Do Not Know	92	44.2

Table 5.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: The Academic Orientation Program Provides Academic Advisement and Enrollment in Courses Appropriate to Student Needs.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	188	89.1*
No	19	9.0
Do Not Know	4	1.9
2. Contact		
Yes	199	94.8*
No	11	5.2
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	38	18.2
Satisfactory	82	39.2
Unsatisfactory	80	38.3
Do Not Know	9	4.3

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students were strongly aware of the existence of this function.

CONTACT. Although all undergraduate students attending MSU are required to attend an orientation session, it is interesting to denote that 5 percent of the students were not aware they had participated in an orientation.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents felt this function was performed satisfactorily.

Statement #5: Welcome Week provides a satisfactory orientation to University life

Table 6 on page 59 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly felt this function was provided.

CONTACT. Students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining and rounding the percentages for very good and satisfactory, a strong response was indicated with regard to the effectiveness of this function.

Statement #6: The NEWSLETTERS received prior to arrival on campus provide needed and appropriate information about the University

Table 7 on page 60 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly felt this function was provided.

Table 6.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Admissions and Academic
Orientation: Welcome Week Provides a Satisfactory Orientation
to University Life.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	177	83.9*
No	16	7.6
Do Not Know	18	8.5
2. Contact		
Yes	177	83.9*
No	34	16.1
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	48	22.7
Satisfactory	93	44.1
Unsatisfactory	41	19.4
Do Not Know	29	13.7

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 7.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Admissions and Academic Orientation: The NEWSLETTERS Received Prior to Arrival on Campus Provide Needed and Appropriate Information about the University.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	191	91.8*
No	4	1.9
Do Not Know	13	6.3
2. Contact		
Yes	189	91.3*
No	18	8.7
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	68	32.9
Satisfactory	103	49.8
Unsatisfactory	20	9.7
Do Not Know	16	7.7

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly felt they had experienced contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), students indicated this function was performed in a satisfactory fashion.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students with Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for Admissions and Academic Orientation are presented in Table 8.

In Table 8, significant differences were found in the following statements and questions:

Table 8.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Admissions and Academic Orientation.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	5.20	0.81	0.95
Number 2	3.29	0.00	1.17
Number 3	0.61	0.01	2.26
Number 4	4.46	3.70	9.75
Number 5	6.64	13.76**	17.30**
Number 6	5.57	7.96**	5.06

**Significant at .01 level

1. Statement #5--questions on contact and effectiveness
2. Statement #6--question on contact

In statement #5, more on-campus respondents reported having had contact with the function than did off-campus respondents. With regard to the question on effectiveness, on-campus students were more satisfied with the performance of the function than off-campus students, but more off-campus students did not evaluate the performance of the function than on-campus students.

In statement #6, on-campus respondents had more contact with the function than did off-campus respondents.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen with On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for Admissions and Academic Orientation are presented in Table 9 on page 63.

In Table 9, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen with Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for Admissions and Academic Orientation are presented in Table 10 on page 63.

Table 9.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Admissions
and Academic Orientation.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.43	0.10	1.06
Number 2	1.47	0.17	5.44
Number 3	3.11	2.52	4.17
Number 4	0.33	0.45	9.34
Number 5	0.86	0.01	3.22
Number 6	1.62	0.00	3.87

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Table 10.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Admissions
and Academic Orientation.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	2.61	0.00	3.65
Number 2	2.17	6.37	17.72**
Number 3	2.34	0.01	1.76
Number 4	0.77	0.18	7.06
Number 5	0.13	0.28	10.67
Number 6	1.51	1.71	3.76

**Significant at .01 level

In Table 10, significant differences were found in the following statement and question:

1. Statement #2--question on effectiveness

In statement #2, more upperclassmen were satisfied, than underclassmen with the performance of this function, but more underclassmen were dissatisfied with the performance than upperclassmen. Also, more underclassmen, than upperclassmen, did not evaluate the effectiveness of this function.

Summary of Admissions and Academic Orientation

Students appear to be fairly cognizant of the Admissions and Academic Orientation program. There were instances, however, where students indicated they had not had contact with the function in spite of the fact that all new students at MSU are exposed to the Admissions and Academic Orientation program.

University Counseling Center

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: Counselors are available for discussing personal concerns of students

Table 11 on page 65 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

Table 11.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for the University Counseling Center: Counselors are Available for Discussing Personal Concerns of Students.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	171	81.0*
No	2	0.9
Do Not Know	38	18.0
2. Contact		
Yes	107	51.0
No	103	49.0
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	24	11.5
Satisfactory	97	36.8
Unsatisfactory	31	14.8
Do Not Know	77	36.8

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the 81 percent response rate.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was not indicated by the 51 percent response rate.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of responses (36.8 percent) was the same for those who felt the performance of this function was satisfactory and those who could not evaluate its effectiveness.

Statement #2: Aptitude, interest and personality tests are available in the Counseling Center to help students make career choices

Table 12 on page 67 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. The highest percent (55.9 percent) of the students indicated they were aware of this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they could not evaluate the effectiveness of the function. This could possibly be due to the strong direction of response indicated by those who had not exercised contact with the function.

Statement #3: The Counseling Center is the place to get help in better understanding yourself and the careers best suited to you

Table 13 on page 68 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

Table 12.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for the University Counseling Center: Aptitude, Interest and Personality Tests are Available in the Counseling Center to Help Students Make Career Choices.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	118	55.9
No	2	0.9
Do Not Know	91	43.1
2. Contact		
Yes	39	18.5
No	172	81.5*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	8	3.8
Satisfactory	49	23.4
Unsatisfactory	11	5.3
Do Not Know	141	67.5*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 13.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for the University Counseling Center: The Counseling Center is the Place to Get Help in Better Understanding Yourself and the Careers Best Suited to You.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	124	59.0
No	11	5.2
Do Not Know	75	35.7
2. Contact		
Yes	55	26.4
No	153	73.6*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	8	3.8
Satisfactory	52	25.0
Unsatisfactory	24	11.5
Do Not Know	124	59.6

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. The highest percent of respondents felt this function was provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents indicated they could not measure the effectiveness of this function. This finding could possibly be due to the large number of respondents who had not experienced contact with the function.

Statement #4: If you wanted to learn how to get along better with different types of people, it would be appropriate to talk with a counselor

Table 14 on page 70 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. The highest percent revealed that students were aware of the existence of this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students felt they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly felt they could not evaluate the effectiveness of this function. This finding could possibly be due to the strong lack of contact with the function expressed above.

Statement #5: Counselors are able to help students change personal attitudes or behaviors which may interfere with successful school performance

Table 15 on page 71 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

Table 14.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for the University Counseling Center: If You Wanted to Learn How to Get Along Better With Different Types of People, It Would be Appropriate to Talk With a Counselor.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	97	46.0
No	30	14.2
Do Not Know	84	39.8
2. Contact		
Yes	30	14.4
No	178	85.6*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	5	2.4
Satisfactory	28	13.3
Unsatisfactory	24	11.4
Do Not Know	153	72.9*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 15.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for the University Counseling Center: Counselors are Able to Help Students Change Personal Attitudes or Behaviors Which May Interfere With Successful School Performance.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	87	41.6
No	28	13.4
Do Not Know	94	45.0
2. Contact		
Yes	45	21.7
No	162	78.3*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	11	5.3
Satisfactory	28	13.5
Unsatisfactory	28	13.5
Do Not Know	141	67.8*

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. The highest percent of respondents indicated they were not aware of the existence of this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by those who had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by those who could not evaluate the quality of this function. This could possibly be due to the strong lack of contact with the function as expressed above.

Statement #6: Learning how to relax during stressful periods in school can be done at the self-management laboratory

Table 16 on page 73 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they were not aware of the existence of the self-management laboratory.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had not had contact with the self-management laboratory. This finding is probably due to the fact that 80.4 percent of the respondents indicated that they were unaware of its existence.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly felt they could not measure the effectiveness of the self-management laboratory. This could possibly be due to the fact that students strongly expressed lack of awareness and little contact with the self-management laboratory.

Table 16.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for the University Counseling Center: Learning How to Relax During Stressful Periods in School Can be Done at the Self-Management Laboratory.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	38	18.2
No	3	1.4
Do Not Know	168	80.4*
2. Contact		
Yes	9	4.4
No	196	95.6*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	4	1.9
Satisfactory	15	7.2
Unsatisfactory	6	2.9
Do Not Know	182	87.9*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Statement #7: The staff of the Counseling Center is helpful in examining alternatives to a college education

Table 17 on page 75 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #7.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by the 71.6 percent response rate of students who did not know whether this function was provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated their lack of contact with this function. This finding may be related to the strong response in the direction of lack of knowledge of the existence of the function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by those students who could not evaluate the effectiveness of this function. Again, this result appears to be related to the respondents' expression of lack of knowledge or contact with this function.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students with Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for the University Counseling Center are presented in Table 18 on page 76.

In Table 18, significant differences were found in the following statement and question:

1. Statement #1--question on provision

In statement #1, more on-campus respondents reported that this function was provided than off-campus respondents, but more off-campus

Table 17.--Group Analysis of Statement #7 for the University Counseling Center: The Staff of the Counseling Center is Helpful in Examining Alternatives to a College Education.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	55	26.1
No	5	2.4
Do Not Know	151	71.6*
2. Contact		
Yes	19	9.2
No	188	90.8*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	6	2.9
Satisfactory	14	6.7
Unsatisfactory	11	5.3
Do Not Know	177	85.1*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 18.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of the University Counseling Center.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	14.07**	1.52	2.85
Number 2	5.74	0.81	1.22
Number 3	3.84	0.11	4.63
Number 4	2.85	0.00	0.75
Number 5	0.48	0.00	2.21
Number 6	0.31	0.29	1.02
Number 7	0.54	0.10	1.10

**Significant at .01 level

respondents, than on-campus respondents, indicated they did not know if this function was provided.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for the University Counseling Center are presented in Table 19 on page 77.

In Table 19, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 19.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the University Counseling Center.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	1.89	0.28	3.21
Number 2	4.19	0.04	5.15
Number 3	5.44	1.23	2.25
Number 4	0.69	0.00	2.34
Number 5	1.02	0.00	0.70
Number 6	2.61	0.09	0.74
Number 7	1.37	1.23	4.33

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
Campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for the University Counseling Center are presented in Table 20 on page 78.

In Table 20, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Summary of the University Counseling
Center

The flow of responses appeared to indicate that students were not totally cognizant of all of the dimensions of the Counseling Center.

Table 20.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the University Counseling Center.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	6.21	2.34	3.21
Number 2	0.90	0.19	2.89
Number 3	2.87	0.00	0.91
Number 4	3.55	0.42	3.22
Number 5	0.15	0.21	0.55
Number 6	2.91	0.02	2.20
Number 7	0.04	0.76	0.90

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

However, it is also noteworthy to point out that although students strongly agreed with statement #1 (Counselors are available for discussing personal concerns of students), they strongly disagreed with statement #4 (If you wanted . . . to get along better with . . . different types of people, it would be appropriate to talk with a counselor) which is similar to statement #1.

General Services

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: Assistance in improving reading and study skills is provided for students

Table 21 on page 80 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the 80.6 percent response rate of students who felt this function was provided.

CONTACT. Although respondents were strongly aware of the existence of this function, respondents strongly indicated their lack of contact with it.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percentage of respondents indicated that they could not evaluate the effectiveness of this function. This finding could possibly be related to the fact that students strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

Statement #2: Faculty and Academic Advisors assist students in planning coursework and in selecting major fields of study

Table 22 on page 81 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated that this function was provided. It is interesting to note that in spite of the fact that all students have an advisor, 11.9 percent of the students indicated a lack of awareness of this fact.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they were aware of the existence of this function.

Table 21.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for General Services: Assistance in Improving Reading and Study Skills is Provided for Students.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	170	80.6*
No	3	1.4
Do Not Know	38	18.0
2. Contact		
Yes	66	31.3
No	145	68.4*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	27	12.8
Satisfactory	71	33.6
Unsatisfactory	7	3.3
Do Not Know	106	50.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 22.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for General Services: Faculty and Academic Advisors Assist Students in Planning Coursework and in Selecting Major Fields of Study.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	184	88.0*
No	12	5.7
Do Not Know	13	6.2
2. Contact		
Yes	177	85.1*
No	31	14.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	29	13.9
Satisfactory	86	41.3
Unsatisfactory	70	33.7
Do Not Know	23	11.1

*Indicates strong direction of response

EFFECTIVENESS. After combining responses (very good and satisfactory), just over one-half (55.2 percent) of the respondents found this function to be satisfactory. One-third (33.7 percent) of the respondents were dissatisfied with it.

Statement #3: Protection of people and property and provisions for driving and parking student motor vehicles and bicycles on campus are provided by the campus police (DPS)

Table 23 on page 83 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly felt that this function was provided. Although DPS is quite visible, 15.1 percent of the respondents were unaware of this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent (50.2 percent) of respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with the performance of this function.

Statement #4: The University student government (A.S.M.S.U.) effectively communicates student opinion to the University administration and provides adequate programs and services for the student body

Table 24 on page 84 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. More than one-half (58.9 percent) of the respondents indicated they had not had contact with this function.

Table 23.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for General Services: Protection of People and Property and Provisions for Driving and Parking Student Motor Vehicles and Bicycles on Campus are Provided by the Campus Police (DPS).

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	179	84.8*
No	18	8.5
Do Not Know	14	6.6
2. Contact		
Yes	165	78.2*
No	46	21.8
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	13	6.2
Satisfactory	72	34.1
Unsatisfactory	106	50.2
Do Not Know	20	9.5

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 24.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for General Services: The University Student Government (A.S.M.S.U.) Effectively Communicates Student Opinion to the University Administration and Provides Adequate Programs and Services for the Student Body.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	142	67.3*
No	21	10.0
Do Not Know	48	22.7
2. Contact		
Yes	86	41.1
No	123	58.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	9	4.3
Satisfactory	49	23.4
Unsatisfactory	74	35.4
Do Not Know	77	36.8

*Indicates strong direction of response

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents felt they could not evaluate the effectiveness of the function, followed closely by those who felt it was performed in an unsatisfactory fashion. This finding may be related to the large number of respondents who indicated they had not had any contact with the function.

Statement #5: The Intramural Program provides an opportunity for the majority of students to participate in a variety of sports and recreational activities

Table 25 on page 86 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. Students strongly indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. Students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with the Intramural Program.

EFFECTIVENESS. By Combining responses (very good and satisfactory), 80.6 percent of the students strongly viewed this function as being satisfactorily performed.

Statement #6: The student newspaper (THE STATE NEWS) is informative and generally reflects student opinion

Table 26 on page 87 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the students who viewed this function as being performed.

Table 25.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for General Services: The Intramural Program Provides an Opportunity for the Majority of Students to Participate in a Variety of Sports and Recreational Activities.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	198	93.8*
No	1	0.5
Do Not Know	12	5.7
2. Contact		
Yes	148	70.1*
No	63	29.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	103	48.8
Satisfactory	67	31.8
Unsatisfactory	13	6.2
Do Not Know	28	13.3

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 26.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for General Services: The Student Newspaper (The State News) is Informative and Generally Reflects Student Opinion.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	199	94.8*
No	9	4.3
Do Not Know	2	1.0
2. Contact		
Yes	205	97.6*
No	5	2.4
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	70	33.3
Satisfactory	90	42.9
Unsatisfactory	48	22.9
Do Not Know	2	1.0

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the students who had experienced contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), students strongly indicated (76.2 percent) this function was satisfactorily performed.

Statement #7: There is an Office of the Ombudsman whose responsibility is to assist in resolving student grievances and complaints

Table 27 on page 89 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #7.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of respondents indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. Students strongly indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. Students strongly indicated they could not evaluate the effectiveness of the Office of the Ombudsman. This finding may be related to the fact that the majority of respondents had not had contact with this office.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students With Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for General Services are presented in Table 28 on page 90.

In Table 28, significant differences were found in the following statement and questions:

Table 27.--Group Analysis of Statement #7 for General Services: There
Is an Office of the Ombudsman Whose Responsibility Is to
Assist in Resolving Student Grievances and Complaints.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	128	61.0
No	1	0.5
Do Not Know	81	38.6
2. Contact		
Yes	31	14.8
No	178	85.2*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	13	6.3
Satisfactory	40	19.2
Unsatisfactory	10	4.8
Do Not Know	145	69.7*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 28.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of General Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	2.01	1.21	3.92
Number 2	1.36	1.64	3.97
Number 3	1.29	0.45	2.26
Number 4	1.09	0.33	2.41
Number 5	7.20	8.60**	14.14**
Number 6	1.88	1.20	4.57
Number 7	2.25	1.06	4.51

**Significant at .01 level

1. Statement #5--questions on contact and effectiveness

In statement #5, more on-campus students reported having had contact with the function than off-campus students. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more on-campus students were satisfied with the performance of the function, but more off-campus students reported they could not evaluate the effectiveness of the function.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for General Services are presented in Table 29 on page 91.

Table 29.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of General Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.95	0.10	4.56
Number 2	2.33	0.50	5.84
Number 3	3.23	0.82	7.17
Number 4	5.60	0.00	2.33
Number 5	0.43	2.18	3.14
Number 6	2.52	0.93	5.87
Number 7	5.41	1.84	6.38

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

In Table 29, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen with Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for General Services are presented in Table 30 on page 92.

In Table 30, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 30.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of General Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	3.19	0.01	0.87
Number 2	1.45	5.86	5.49
Number 3	0.22	0.03	2.41
Number 4	3.20	4.66	8.79
Number 5	1.31	3.74	3.21
Number 6	1.04	0.02	3.12
Number 7	9.10	0.88	2.88

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Summary of General Services

The flow of responses seemed to indicate that students were quite cognizant of the General Services available. However, their general lack of contact with this area seemed to indicate that students were not availing themselves of what was being offered to them.

Office of the Registrar

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: Student academic records are maintained accurately and efficiently

Table 31 on page 94 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was evidenced by those who had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), respondents indicated strongly their satisfaction with this function. However, almost one-fourth of the respondents did not evaluate its effectiveness.

Statement #2: Student academic records are available for a student's own review

Table 32 on page 95 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. Students strongly indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. Although students were strongly aware of the existence of this function, over one-half of the respondents (60.4 percent) indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. One-half of the respondents did not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding is possibly related to the fact that more than one-half of the respondents had not had contact with the function.

Table 31.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for the Office of the Registrar: Student Academic Records Are Maintained Accurately and Efficiently.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	175	83.7*
No	5	2.4
Do Not Know	29	13.9
2. Contact		
Yes	151	72.2*
No	58	27.8
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	55	26.4
Satisfactory	88	42.3
Unsatisfactory	15	7.2
Do Not Know	50	24.0

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 32.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for the Office of the Registrar: Student Academic Records are Available for a Student's Own Review.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	142	68.3*
No	2	1.0
Do Not Know	64	30.8
2. Contact		
Yes	82	39.6
No	125	60.4
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	35	16.8
Satisfactory	62	29.8
Unsatisfactory	7	3.4
Do Not Know	104	50.0

*Indicates strong direction of response

Statement #3: Copies of student academic records, diplomas and other documents pertinent to the Registrar's Office can be secured quickly and efficiently

Table 33 on page 97 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. Slightly more than one-half of the students indicated this service was provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students (59.2 percent) indicated they did not know how effectively this function was performed. This finding may be related to the fact that students strongly indicated their lack of contact with the function.

Statement #4: Information concerning enrollment, registration, records, transcripts, readmission, graduate certification and diplomas is adequately conveyed

Table 34 on page 98 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by the respondents. Interestingly enough, 21.8 percent of the students indicated they were not aware of this function in spite of the fact that all students must register and enroll, and all students have their records and transcripts maintained by the Office of the Registrar.

CONTACT. The highest percent of students indicated they had exercised contact with the function. However, 34.9 percent of the

Table 33.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for the Office of the Registrar: Copies of Student Academic Records, Diplomas and Other Documents Pertinent to the Registrar's Office Can Be Secured Quickly and Efficiently.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	113	53.6
No	3	1.4
Do Not Know	95	45.0
2. Contact		
Yes	69	32.9
No	141	67.1*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	20	9.5
Satisfactory	47	22.3
Unsatisfactory	19	9.0
Do Not Know	125	59.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 34.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for the Office of the Registrar: Information Concerning Enrollment, Registration, Records, Transcripts, Readmission, Graduate Certification and Diplomas is Adequately Conveyed.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	164	77.7*
No	1	0.5
Do Not Know	46	21.8
2. Contact		
Yes	136	65.1
No	73	34.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	33	15.7
Satisfactory	90	42.9
Unsatisfactory	28	13.3
Do Not Know	59	28.1

*Indicates strong direction of response

students indicated they had not had contact with this function, which is noteworthy for the reasons stated above.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents viewed this function as being performed in a satisfactory fashion.

Statement #5: Enrollment and registration procedures are conducted in a fair and well-organized fashion

Table 35 on page 100 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. Respondents strongly indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. Respondents strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents evaluated the performance of this function as satisfactory.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students with Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for the Office of the Registrar are presented in Table 36 on page 101.

In Table 36, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 35.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for the Office of the Registrar: Enrollment and Registration Procedures Are Conducted in a Fair and Well-Organized Fashion.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	184	87.6*
No	23	11.0
Do Not Know	3	1.4
2. Contact		
Yes	203	96.7*
No	7	3.3
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	33	15.7
Satisfactory	100	47.6
Unsatisfactory	74	35.2
Do Not Know	3	1.4

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 36.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of the Office of the Registrar.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	2.76	0.99	1.74
Number 2	4.45	1.68	3.72
Number 3	0.73	0.08	4.79
Number 4	1.10	0.18	2.37
Number 5	1.27	0.47	5.01

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with on-campus underclassmen for the Office of the Registrar are presented in Table 37 on page 102.

In Table 37, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with off-campus underclassmen for the Office of the Registrar are presented in Table 38 on page 102.

Table 37.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-Campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the Office
of the Registrar.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	4.47	2.23	4.14
Number 2	4.34	3.33	4.97
Number 3	2.10	0.01	1.89
Number 4	0.54	0.83	0.13
Number 5	5.69	0.00	1.78

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Table 38.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of the Office
of the Registrar.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	2.15	0.58	0.56
Number 2	1.79	0.31	1.09
Number 3	3.36	0.00	4.51
Number 4	1.23	0.71	1.80
Number 5	0.46	0.33	2.43

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

In Table 38, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups.

Summary of the Office of the Registrar

Generally, respondents expressed awareness of the different functions of the Registrar's Office. Notably, in only one case, when students were questioned about the maintenance of academic records, was the effectiveness of any of the functions of the Office of the Registrar evaluated as satisfactory and that was a result of combining responses.

Housing and Food Services

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: Provisions exist for the involvement of students in setting the rules and regulations in student housing

Table 39 on page 104 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1. In Table 39, no strong directions of response was found in any of the statements.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students were aware of the existence of this function.

CONTACT. The highest percent of students indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated they could not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding may

**Table 39.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Housing and Food Services:
Provisions Exist for the Involvement of Students in Setting
the Rules and Regulations in Student Housing.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	126	59.7
No	19	9.0
Do Not Know	66	31.3
2. Contact		
Yes	98	46.7
No	112	53.3
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	13	6.2
Satisfactory	58	27.5
Unsatisfactory	48	22.7
Do Not Know	92	43.6

be related to the high percent of students who indicated they had not exercised contact with the function.

Statement #2: Well-balanced meals are provided in campus cafeterias/
dining halls

Table 40 on page 106 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly viewed this function as being provided. Although all freshmen are required to reside in the residence halls, the 12.3 percent who responded that they did not know the function was provided could possibly be attributed to transfer students or students who resided in on-campus apartments.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students found this function to be satisfactory.

Statement #3: Residence hall living contributes positively to the
overall educational experiences of undergraduate students

Table 41 on page 107 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the respondents who felt the function was provided.

Table 40.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Housing and Food Services:
Well-Balanced Meals are Provided in Campus Cafeterias/Dining
Halls.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	164	77.7*
No	21	10.0
Do Not Know	26	12.3
2. Contact		
Yes	174	82.5*
No	37	17.5
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	18	8.6
Satisfactory	90	42.9
Unsatisfactory	68	32.4
Do Not Know	34	16.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 41.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Housing and Food Services:
 Residence Hall Living Contributes Positively to the Overall
 Educational Experiences of Undergraduate Students.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	162	77.5*
No	18	8.6
Do Not Know	29	13.9
2. Contact		
Yes	158	75.6*
No	51	24.4
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	56	27.1
Satisfactory	71	34.3
Unsatisfactory	40	19.3
Do Not Know	40	19.3

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the respondents who had exercised contact with the function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents indicated that this function was performed satisfactorily.

Statement #4: Residence halls provide students with a wide variety of social/educational/recreational programs

Table 42 on page 109 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated they were aware of this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), the respondents (70.2 percent) indicated strongly that this function was performed in a satisfactory fashion.

Statement #5: Residence hall staffs are responsive to student needs and interests

Table 43 on page 110 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the students who indicated this function was provided.

**Table 42.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Housing and Food Services:
Residence Halls Provide Students With a Wide Variety of
Social/Educational/Recreational Programs.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	177	83.9*
No	7	3.3
Do Not Know	27	12.8
2. Contact		
Yes	158	74.9*
No	53	25.1
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	62	29.4
Satisfactory	86	40.8
Unsatisfactory	23	10.9
Do Not Know	40	19.0

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Table 43.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Housing and Food Services:
Residence Hall Staffs Are Responsive to Student Needs and
Interests.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent
1. Provided		
Yes	171	81.0*
No	6	2.8
Do Not Know	34	16.1
2. Contact		
Yes	152	72.4*
No	58	27.6
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	43	20.5
Satisfactory	83	39.5
Unsatisfactory	34	16.2
Do Not Know	50	23.8

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the students who indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated that residence hall staffs were responsive to student needs and interests.

Statement #6: Student rooms and social-recreational facilities in residence halls are provided for in an appropriate and satisfactory manner

Table 44 on page 112 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

PROVIDED. Respondents strongly indicated that this function was provided.

CONTACT. Respondents strongly indicated that they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated that this function was performed satisfactorily.

Statement #7: The residence hall provides an on-going orientation to University life.

Table 45 on page 113 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #7.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

Table 44.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Housing and Food Services:
Student Rooms and Social-Recreational Facilities in Residence
Halls are Provided for in an Appropriate and Satisfactory
Manner.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	166	79.8*
No	10	4.8
Do Not Know	32	15.4
2. Contact		
Yes	162	77.5*
No	47	22.5
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	28	13.4
Satisfactory	100	48.3
Unsatisfactory	41	19.6
Do Not Know	39	18.7

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Table 45.--Group Analysis of Statement #7 for Housing and Food Services:
The Residence Hall Provides an On-Going Orientation to
University Life.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	165	78.9*
No	10	4.8
Do Not Know	34	16.3
2. Contact		
Yes	153	73.2
No	56	26.8
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	42	20.1
Satisfactory	89	42.6
Unsatisfactory	30	14.4
Do Not Know	48	23.0

*Indicates strong direction of response

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents viewed the performance of this function as satisfactory.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students With Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for Housing and Food Services are presented in Table 46.

In Table 46, significant differences were found in all of the statements and in all of the questions asked of each statement.

In statement #1, more on-campus students, than off-campus students, reported that this function was provided, but more off-campus students, than on-campus students, reported they did not know if this

Table 46.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Housing and Food Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	17.32**	15.22**	22.82**
Number 2	18.90**	35.44**	34.92**
Number 3	26.50**	44.09**	41.56**
Number 4	28.45**	34.99**	39.67**
Number 5	33.53**	38.32**	43.99**
Number 6	33.93**	41.06**	41.28**
Number 7	29.85**	33.20**	35.32**

**Significant at .01 level

function was provided. With regard to the question on contact, more on-campus students reported having had contact with the function than did off-campus students. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more on-campus students were satisfied with the function than off-campus students, but more off-campus students, than on-campus students, did not evaluate the performance of the function.

The results of statements #2 through #6 are exactly alike as described above for statement #1 with the sole exception of statement #2, with regard to the question on effectiveness. In this case, the number of respondents from both on- and off-campus who indicated the performance of this function was satisfactory were very similar. The difference in responses was found in the number of on-campus respondents (50) who reported this function as being performed unsatisfactorily and the number of off-campus respondents (18) who reported the same.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for Housing and Food Services are presented in Table 47 on page 116.

In Table 47, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 47.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Housing and Food Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.05	0.09	1.18
Number 2	6.81	0.58	7.72
Number 3	1.86	0.01	0.63
Number 4	1.09	0.22	3.24
Number 5	0.27	0.02	2.36
Number 6	1.59	0.15	4.03
Number 7	0.86	0.20	1.93

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for Housing and Food Services are presented in Table 48 on page 117.

In Table 48, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Summary of Housing and Food Services

Although all freshmen are required to reside in the residence halls, respondents on a number of occasions indicated they either had not had contact with the function or the function was not provided.

Table 48.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Housing and Food Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.66	1.02	1.23
Number 2	1.77	0.40	1.75
Number 3	3.33	2.25	6.75
Number 4	2.09	3.92	8.41
Number 5	6.36	4.14	6.84
Number 6	4.59	3.83	6.60
Number 7	2.99	3.33	5.10

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

This finding could possibly be attributed to transfer students who are not required to live in the residence halls or to freshmen who reside in on-campus apartments.

Also, quite evident was the fact that in only one case (statement #4), which concerned itself with the social/educational/recreational programs provided by the residence halls, was the performance of the function evaluated as strongly satisfactory by the respondents. And to achieve this, responses were combined.

Placement ServicesAnalysis of the Results of the
Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: An all-University placement service is available to
assist students in securing suitable employment

Table 49 on page 119 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by the 81.4 percent of respondents who viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. It is interesting to note that although students were strongly aware of this function, a strong direction of response was almost attained (65.1 percent) by those who had not had contact with it.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents indicated they could not evaluate this function. This finding may be related to the large number of students who had not had contact with the function.

Statement #2: The all-University placement service furnishes infor-
mation to students about job markets, salaries and placement trends
in a wide variety of fields

Table 50 on page 120 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

Table 49.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Placement Services: An All-University Placement Service Is Available to Assist Students in Securing Suitable Employment.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	171	81.4*
No	0	0.0
Do Not Know	39	18.6
2. Contact		
Yes	73	34.9
No	136	65.1
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	43	20.5
Satisfactory	59	28.1
Unsatisfactory	9	4.3
Do Not Know	99	47.1

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 50.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Placement Services: The All-University Placement Service Furnishes Information to Students about Job Markets, Salaries, and Placement Trends in a Wide Variety of Fields.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	160	76.2*
No	0	0.0
Do Not Know	50	23.8
2. Contact		
Yes	86	41.1
No	123	58.9
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	47	22.5
Satisfactory	65	31.1
Unsatisfactory	4	1.9
Do Not Know	93	44.5

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by those students who viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. In spite of the fact that a strong direction of response was evident with regard to provision, over one-half of the respondents indicated they had not had contact with the function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated they could not evaluate this function. This finding may be related to the large number of students who indicated they had not exercised contact with the function.

Statement #3: The Placement Office provides adequate assistance to students in resume preparation and in the development of interviewing skills

Table 51 on page 122 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated they were unable to evaluate the performance of this function. This finding appears to be related to the number of students who indicated they had not had contact with the function.

Statement #4: The Placement Office provides adequate and pleasant facilities for employer-student interviews

Table 51.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Placement Services: The Placement Office Provides Adequate Assistance to Students in Resume Preparation and in the Development of Interviewing Skills.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	125	59.5
No	1	0.5
Do Not Know	84	40.0
2. Contact		
Yes	39	18.8
No	169	81.3*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	34	16.3
Satisfactory	39	18.7
Unsatisfactory	4	1.9
Do Not Know	132	63.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 52 on page 124 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students (51.4 percent) indicated they were not aware of this function.

CONTACT. A strong direction of response was indicated by those students who had not had contact with this function. This finding appears to be related to the fact that over one-half of the respondents were not aware of this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they could not evaluate this function. This finding may be related to the large number of respondents who had not exercised contact with the function and were unaware of its existence.

Statement #5: Information is mailed to future employers regarding student's educational preparation, job experience, extracurricular activities and recommendations

Table 53 on page 125 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students viewed this function as not being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, the respondents strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. A strong direction of response was indicated by those who did not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding may be related to the number of respondents who indicated they had not exercised contact with the function or were unaware of its existence.

Table 52.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Placement Services: The Placement Office Provides Adequate and Pleasant Facilities for Employer-Student Interviews.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	101	48.1
No	1	0.5
Do Not Know	108	51.4
2. Contact		
Yes	37	17.8
No	171	82.2*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	22	10.5
Satisfactory	42	20.1
Unsatisfactory	4	1.9
Do Not Know	141	67.5*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 53.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Placement Services: Information Is Mailed to Future Employers Regarding Student's Educational Preparation, Job Experience, Extracurricular Activities and Recommendations.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	68	32.4
No	4	1.9
Do Not Know	138	65.7
2. Contact		
Yes	27	13.0
No	181	87.0*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	14	6.7
Satisfactory	26	12.4
Unsatisfactory	0	0.0
Do Not Know	169	80.9*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students With Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for Placement Services are presented in Table 54.

In Table 54, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 54.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Placement Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.03	0.00	6.70
Number 2	0.51	2.02	2.15
Number 3	0.94	0.30	1.25
Number 4	1.43	0.02	1.98
Number 5	4.80	2.22	1.60

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for Placement Services are presented in Table 55 on page 127.

Table 55.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Placement Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	5.52	4.40	12.59**
Number 2	6.87	8.22**	11.42**
Number 3	10.64**	2.28	5.41
Number 4	4.39	0.53	5.84
Number 5	1.66	0.00	1.74

**Significant at .01 level

In Table 55, significant differences were found in the following statements and questions:

1. Statement #1--question on effectiveness
2. Statement #2--questions on contact and effectiveness
3. Statement #3--question on provision

In statement #1, more upperclassmen reported they were satisfied with the performance of the function than did underclassmen, but more underclassmen, than upperclassmen, did not evaluate the performance of this function.

In statement #2, more upperclassmen reported having had contact with the function than did underclassmen. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more upperclassmen were satisfied with the performance of the function, but more underclassmen did not evaluate the effectiveness of the function.

In statement #3, more upperclassmen indicated this function was provided than did underclassmen, however, more underclassmen indicated they did not know if this function was provided.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen are presented in Table 56.

In Table 56, significant differences were found in the following statements and questions:

1. Statement #1--questions on contact and effectiveness
2. Statement #3--questions on contact and effectiveness
3. Statement #4--questions on contact and effectiveness

Table 56.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Placement Services.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	5.40	8.90**	11.94**
Number 2	0.22	4.17	4.23
Number 3	3.48	8.91**	12.08**
Number 4	7.36	8.84**	13.85**
Number 5	5.77	0.17	0.62

**Significant at .01 level

In statement #1, upperclassmen reported they had more contact with the function than did underclassmen. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more upperclassmen were satisfied with the performance of the function, but more underclassmen did not evaluate the effectiveness of the function.

In statement #3, upperclassmen reported having had more contact with the function than did underclassmen. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more upperclassmen were satisfied with the performance of the function, however, more underclassmen did not evaluate the effectiveness of the function.

In statement #4, more upperclassmen reported having had contact with the function than did underclassmen. With regard to the question on effectiveness, more upperclassmen were satisfied with the performance of the function, but more underclassmen did not evaluate the effectiveness of the function.

Summary of Placement Services

In all of the statements, when addressing the question of contact, more than half of the respondents indicated they had not had contact with the function. In all of the statements, when addressing the question of effectiveness, the highest percent of responses was always in the "do not know" category. The two findings may possibly be related.

Student ActivitiesAnalysis of the Results of the
Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentage.

Statement #1: There are adequate student activities to meet the needs
of most interested students at this University

Table 57 on page 131 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, a strong direction of response was indicated by the students who viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), respondents strongly viewed this function as being performed in a satisfactory manner.

Statement #2: Specific student groups are well organized and operate
effectively (Groups with which you are familiar)

Table 58 on page 132 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by those who viewed this function as being provided.

Table 57.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Student Activities: There Are Adequate Student Activities to Meet the Needs of Most Interested Students at This University.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	194	91.9*
No	4	1.9
Do Not Know	13	6.2
2. Contact		
Yes	167	79.5*
No	43	20.5
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	77	36.7
Satisfactory	92	43.8
Unsatisfactory	16	7.6
Do Not Know	25	11.9

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 58.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Student Activities:
 Specific Student Activity Groups Are Well Organized and
 Operate Effectively (Groups With Which You Are Familiar).

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	163	77.3*
No	6	2.8
Do Not Know	42	19.9
2. Contact		
Yes	142	67.6*
No	68	32.4
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	41	19.4
Satisfactory	86	40.8
Unsatisfactory	24	11.4
Do Not Know	60	28.4

*Indicates strong direction of response

CONTACT. A strong direction of response was indicated by those who indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent indicated that this function was performed satisfactorily. The high number of respondents who did not evaluate the effectiveness of this function could possibly be related to the high number who indicated they had not had contact with the function.

Statement #3: Student activities are centrally scheduled, coordinated and are adequately publicized

Table 59 on page 134 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students viewed this function as being performed in a satisfactory fashion.

Statement #4: Student activities provide opportunities for leadership and personal development

Table 60 on page 135 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. Respondents strongly indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. The highest percent of respondents indicated they exercised contact with this function.

Table 59.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Student Activities:
 Student Activities Are Centrally Scheduled, Coordinated and
 Are Adequately Publicized.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	169	80.1*
No	15	7.1
Do Not Know	27	12.8
2. Contact		
Yes	154	73.3*
No	56	26.7
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	32	15.2
Satisfactory	93	44.1
Unsatisfactory	45	21.3
Do Not Know	41	19.4

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 60.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Student Activities:
 Student Activities Provide Opportunities for Leadership and
 Personal Development.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	171	81.0*
No	5	2.4
Do Not Know	35	16.6
2. Contact		
Yes	126	60.0
No	84	40.0
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	50	23.9
Satisfactory	85	40.7
Unsatisfactory	10	4.8
Do Not Know	64	30.6

*Indicates strong direction of response

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents indicated this function was performed satisfactorily. The high number of respondents that did not evaluate the effectiveness of this function could possibly be related to the high number of students who had not had contact with the function.

Statement #5: Student organizations provide for learning democratic processes and citizenship responsibilities

Table 61 on page 137 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by those who viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. The highest percent of students indicated they had not had contact with this function. It is interesting to note that although students strongly viewed this function as being provided, more than one-half of the students had not had any contact with the function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated they could not evaluate the effectiveness of this function. This finding appears to be related to the high percent of students who had not had any contact with it.

Statement #6: There is an adequate variety of plays, concerts and movies for students to attend on campus

Table 62 on page 138 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

Table 61.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Student Activities:
 Student Organizations Provide for Learning Democratic Processes and Citizenship Responsibilities.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	145	69.4*
No	6	2.9
Do Not Know	58	27.8
2. Contact		
Yes	92	44.4
No	115	55.6
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	29	13.9
Satisfactory	61	29.3
Unsatisfactory	24	11.5
Do Not Know	94	45.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 62.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Student Activities: There Is An Adequate Variety of Plays, Concerts and Movies for Students to Attend on Campus.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	202	95.7*
No	4	1.9
Do Not Know	5	2.4
2. Contact		
Yes	197	93.4*
No	14	6.6
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	139	65.9
Satisfactory	53	25.1
Unsatisfactory	8	3.8
Do Not Know	11	5.2

*Indicates strong direction of response

PROVIDED. Respondents strongly indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. Respondents strongly indicated they had experienced contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. By combining responses (very good and satisfactory), students strongly indicated this function was performed satisfactorily.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students With Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for Student Activities are presented in Table 63.

Table 63.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Student Activities.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	4.39	4.80	4.63
Number 2	3.64	2.60	5.71
Number 3	6.44	0.51	1.91
Number 4	10.70**	1.75	10.02
Number 5	5.59	0.01	2.68
Number 6	2.86	2.17	7.18

**Significant at .01 level

In Table 63, significant differences were found in the following statement and question:

1. Statement #4--question on provision

In statement #4, more on-campus respondents, than off-campus respondents, reported that this function was provided, but more off-campus respondents reported they did not know if this function was provided than did on-campus respondents.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for Student Activities are presented in Table 64.

Table 64.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Student Activities.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	2.19	0.03	2.64
Number 2	3.95	0.04	0.33
Number 3	4.46	1.80	4.16
Number 4	4.10	0.52	0.12
Number 5	0.50	0.30	2.93
Number 6	3.85	0.18	3.81

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

In Table 64, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Hence, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for Student Activities are presented in Table 65.

In Table 65, significant differences were found in the following statement and question:

1. Statement #5--question on provision

In statement #5, more off-campus upperclassmen, than off-campus underclassmen, reported that this function was provided, but

Table 65.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Student Activities.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	0.10	1.46	0.89
Number 2	5.58	1.42	5.22
Number 3	3.91	1.68	1.07
Number 4	6.74	3.61	4.30
Number 5	9.26**	0.72	3.42
Number 6	0.87	0.39	1.35

**Significant at .01 level

more off-campus underclassmen reported they did not know if this function was provided than did off-campus upperclassmen.

Summary of Student Activities

All of the statements that evaluated the question of provision for Student Activities reflected a strong direction of response. This occurrence was evident only once else, in the area of Admissions and Academic Orientation.

Judicial Programs

Analysis of the Results of the Total Sample

The results to the three questions asked of each statement are reported below with an accompanying table which indicates the absolute frequency count and the adjusted percentages.

Statement #1: The campus judicial system provides a mechanism for attempting to resolve important and serious student complaints

Table 66 on page 143 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #1.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students indicated this function was provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function. This finding may be related to the high percent of students who reported they did not know if this function existed.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, students strongly indicated they could not evaluate the performance of this

Table 66.--Group Analysis of Statement #1 for Judicial Programs: The Campus Judicial System Provides a Mechanism for Attempting to Resolve Important and Serious Student Complaints.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	107	50.7
No	7	3.3
Do Not Know	97	46.0
2. Contact		
Yes	36	17.1
No	174	82.9*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	7	3.3
Satisfactory	30	14.2
Unsatisfactory	25	11.8
Do Not Know	149	70.6*

*Indicates strong direction of response

function. This finding may be related to the high percent of students who indicated they had not had contact with this function.

Statement #2: Actions taken for the violation of University regulations are for the purpose of guidance and correction--not for punishment

Table 67 on page 145 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #2.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of respondents indicated (49.3 percent) this function was provided.

CONTACT. A strong direction of response was provided by those who indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students indicated they could not evaluate the effectiveness of this function. This finding may be related to the strong direction of response indicated by those who reported they had not exercised contact with this function.

Statement #3: Opportunities exist for sufficient student involvement in the formulation of regulations which affect their lives on campus

Table 68 on page 146 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #3.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students (47.1 percent) viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. Students strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students reported they could not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding

**Table 67.--Group Analysis of Statement #2 for Judicial Programs:
 Actions Taken for the Violation of University Regulations
 Are for the Purpose of Guidance and Correction--Not for
 Punishment.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	104	49.3
No	24	11.4
Do Not Know	83	39.3
2. Contact		
Yes	63	30.0
No	147	70.0*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	2	0.9
Satisfactory	38	18.0
Unsatisfactory	45	21.3
Do Not Know	126	59.7

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 68.--Group Analysis of Statement #3 for Judicial Programs:
 Opportunities Exist for Sufficient Student Involvement in
 the Formulation of Regulations Which Affect Their Lives
 on Campus.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	99	47.1
No	22	10.5
Do Not Know	89	42.4
2. Contact		
Yes	62	29.7
No	147	70.3*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	6	2.9
Satisfactory	35	16.7
Unsatisfactory	46	21.9
Do Not Know	123	58.6

*Indicates strong direction of response

may be related to the strong direction of response indicated by those who reported they had not experienced contact with this function.

Statement #4: Records of student violations against University regulations are handled in an appropriate manner with due respect for the student's right to privacy

Table 69 on page 148 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #4.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students indicated they did not know if this function was provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, students indicated they had not had contact with this function. This could possibly be due to the high percent of students who indicated this function was not provided.

EFFECTIVENESS. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly reported they could not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding may be related to the fact that respondents strongly indicated they had not exercised contact with this function.

Statement #5: Expectations for student's behavior are clearly and concisely communicated to them

Table 70 on page 149 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #5.

PROVIDED. A strong direction of response was indicated by those who felt this function was provided.

CONTACT. The highest percent of students indicated they had exercised contact with this function.

**Table 69.--Group Analysis of Statement #4 for Judicial Programs:
Records of Student Violations Against University Regulations
Are Handled in an Appropriate Manner With Due Respect for
the Student's Right to Privacy.**

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	69	32.9
No	10	4.8
Do Not Know	131	62.4
2. Contact		
Yes	30	14.5
No	177	85.5*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	8	3.8
Satisfactory	23	11.1
Unsatisfactory	20	9.6
Do Not Know	157	75.5*

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 70.--Group Analysis of Statement #5 for Judicial Programs:
 Expectations for Student's Behavior Are Clearly and Concisely
 Communicated to Them.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	146	69.2*
No	29	13.7
Do Not Know	36	17.1
2. Contact		
Yes	138	65.7
No	72	34.3
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	20	9.6
Satisfactory	81	38.8
Unsatisfactory	57	27.3
Do Not Know	51	24.4

*Indicates strong direction of response

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of respondents (38.5 percent) indicated this function was performed in a satisfactory manner.

Statement #6: The judicial system attempts to balance rights and responsibilities in a fair manner

Table 71 on page 151 presents the results of the total group analysis for statement #6.

PROVIDED. The highest percent of students (51.7 percent) viewed this function as being provided.

CONTACT. According to the percentage criterion, respondents strongly indicated they had not had contact with this function.

EFFECTIVENESS. The highest percent of students (60.3 percent) reported they could not evaluate the performance of this function. This finding may be related to the strong direction of response indicated by those respondents who reported they had not exercised contact with the function.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Total On-campus Students With Total
Off-campus Students

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus students with the responses of off-campus students for Judicial Programs are presented in Table 72 on page 151.

In Table 72, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Table 71.--Group Analysis of Statement #6 for Judicial Programs: The
Judicial System Attempts to Balance Rights and Responsi-
bilities in a Fair Manner.

Questions	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
1. Provided		
Yes	108	51.7
No	9	4.3
Do Not Know	92	44.0
2. Contact		
Yes	58	27.9
No	150	72.1*
3. Effectiveness		
Very Good	9	4.3
Satisfactory	49	23.4
Unsatisfactory	25	12.0
Do Not Know	126	60.3

*Indicates strong direction of response

Table 72.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On- and Off-Campus Perceptions of Judicial Programs.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	1.90	0.13	0.20
Number 2	0.60	1.52	2.32
Number 3	6.10	1.29	4.73
Number 4	3.45	0.15	2.22
Number 5	3.72	3.60	9.83
Number 6	3.06	0.08	1.46

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
On-campus Upperclassmen With On-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of on-campus upperclassmen with the responses of on-campus underclassmen for Judicial Programs are presented in Table 73 on page 153.

In Table 73, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Analysis of the Results When Comparing
Off-campus Upperclassmen With Off-
campus Underclassmen

Chi-square test results comparing the responses of off-campus upperclassmen with the responses of off-campus underclassmen for Judicial Programs are presented in Table 74 on page 153.

Table 73.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of On-Campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Judicial
Programs.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	6.20	0.85	2.01
Number 2	0.65	0.01	5.84
Number 3	0.83	0.00	2.59
Number 4	1.85	3.63	7.66
Number 5	0.32	0.00	4.47
Number 6	1.95	0.36	3.59

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

Table 74.--Chi-Square Values Obtained for Comparisons of Off-Campus
Upperclassmen and Underclassmen Perceptions of Judicial
Programs.

Statement	Question		
	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
Number 1	4.91	0.15	1.10
Number 2	1.33	0.01	1.43
Number 3	0.93	0.01	1.19
Number 4	2.93	0.97	3.45
Number 5	1.49	0.11	1.36
Number 6	1.24	0.02	2.69

Chi-square values when noted are significant at the .01 level

In Table 74, no significant differences were found in the perceptions of the two groups. Thus, responses between the two groups were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Summary of Judicial Programs

With the exception of statement #5 which concerned itself with communication of expectations of student behavior, respondents strongly indicated they had not exercised contact with the various functions. This finding appears to be related to the fact that, except for statement #5, more than 50 percent of the students reported that they could not evaluate the performance of the function.

Ex Post Facto Concerns

Once research had commenced there surfaced the question of whether there would be a difference in responses, when evaluating the effectiveness of the different functions of all of the services, between the following two divisions:

- (1) students who had experienced contact with the function, and
- (2) students who had not experienced contact with the function.

Hence, additional analysis, utilizing chi-square tests, was conducted to address this point. The chi-square tests revealed that there existed significant differences in the evaluation of the effectiveness of all of the functions based on responses by students once they were divided into the two above mentioned groups.

Upon closer scrutiny of the parameters of this issue, these results could almost be anticipated as one of the choices available for respondents when evaluating the effectiveness of a function was

the "do not know" category which could possibly have provided the stimulus for the following observations:

- (1) none of the chi-square tests were close to being significant (113.7 was the mean), in fact, more than two-thirds of the tests had values over 100 (below 9.21 was considered significant according to chi-square tables)
- (2) 76.14 percent was the mean for students who indicated they had not experienced contact with a function and who elected to not evaluate the effectiveness of a function by responding in the "do not know" category

Summary of Part II of the Student Services Questionnaire

A general summary of the comments made by students in the open-ended section of the questionnaire is contained in this part of Chapter IV. This summary encompasses the areas of (1) Admissions and Academic Orientation, (2) the University Counseling Center, (3) General Services, (4) Office of the Registrar, (5) Housing and Food Services, (6) Placement Services, (7) Student Activities and (8) Judicial Programs. A more complete description on these student comments and recommendations are found in Appendix C.

Admissions and Academic Orientation

The major portion of student recommendations for this service was directed at the orientation program. The most common section commented upon was that of poor counseling with regard to scheduling. Also mentioned were the ideas that orientation was too confusing, sparse with information (especially financial aid) and lacking in

advice given to transfer students. On the positive side, some students commented that this service was very organized and simple, and that it fulfilled their needs.

University Counseling Center

Reaction to this service was very mixed, however, the most prevalent comment made, not only for this service but for the entire summary, was that the Counseling Center was not publicized enough. Other concerns voiced by a few students were that the quality of counseling was poor and impersonal. There were a number of respondents, though, who felt that the quality of counseling was very good.

General Services

The most addressed section of this area was the Department of Public Safety (D.P.S.). The greatest specific complaint was that D.P.S. paid too much attention to issuing parking tickets and towing cars rather than fulfilling other duties or responsibilities. A second most often repeated complaint was that parking facilities for students were not adequate.

Recommendations for this service were also concentrated on the Intramural Program. General reaction was that more I.M. facilities and sports were needed. Also, several respondents alluded to the notion that faculty advisers were inadequate.

Office of the Registrar

Recommendations to the Office of the Registrar were primarily directed at revamping registration procedures. Some students recommended that registration be done by mail while others suggested the

utilization of a higher degree of computerization as a means of improving the registration process. Very little was said about other functions of the office.

Housing and Food Services

This area received the most negative comments of all the student services. Food was the number one issue for students and almost all of the comments were negative. Specific recommendations included the need for vegetarian diets, more balanced meals, less starch in meals and the prorating of meals.

In the area of housing, criticisms were levied against the control that management has over a residence hall and the tripling of students in rooms.

Placement Services

Generally, students were satisfied with Placement Services. The most common complaints by students were the lack of summer jobs and the idea that the Placement Office facilitated some majors more than others.

Student Activities

This service received more favorable comments of the eight student services surveyed. Students generally felt this was a well-run operation that offered a good variety of activities. The two more common concerns expressed were the insufficient number of concerts and the inadequate publicizing of events.

Judicial Programs

Students generally viewed Judicial Programs negatively. Some of the complaints were that Judicial Programs were "Out to get students . . . ," that the judicial system was too weak and noneffective and that their existence did not lead to constructive change. Students also indicated that the function of this service needed to be more highly publicized.

Summary

An analysis of the data was reported in this chapter. This summarization is comprised of a tabulation of the questions of each statement that resulted in strong directions of response and a tabulation of those statements which resulted in significant chi-square tests.

Table 75 on page 159 presents the summarized data of the Admissions and Academic Orientation service. The following twelve cases of strong direction of response were noted:

1. Provided--all six statements
2. Contact--statements 1, 4, 5 and 6
3. Effectiveness--statements 1, 5 and 6 (statements 5 and 6 were the result of combining responses)

When comparing on-campus responses with off-campus responses, significant chi-square tests were noted in statement #5 under contact and effectiveness and in statement #6 under contact.

Table 76 on page 160 presents the summarized results of the University Counseling Center. Strong directions of response were found in the following fourteen instances:

Table 75.--Summary of Statements in Admissions and Academic Orientation Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness				On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satis- factory	Unsatis- factory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness
#1	*			*			*											
#2	*																	**
#3	*																	
#4	*			*														
#5	*			*		***	***				**	**						
#6	*			*		***	***				**							

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

***Indicates responses were combined to show strong direction of response

Table 76.--Summary of Statements for the University Counseling Center Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness				On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1	*									**								
#2					*				*									
#3					*													
#4					*				*									
#5					*				*									
#6			*		*				*									
#7			*		*				*									

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

1. Provided--statements 1, 6 and 7
2. Contact--statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7
3. Effectiveness--statements 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7

Table 77 on page 162 presents the summarized results of the area of General Services. The following fifteen cases of strong direction of response were noted:

1. Provided--statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6
2. Contact--statements 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7
3. Effectiveness--statements 5, 6 and 7 (statements 5 and 6 were the result of combining responses)

Significant chi-square tests were found in statement #5 under the question of contact and effectiveness.

Table 78 on page 163 presents the summarized results of the Office of the Registrar. Strong directions of response were noted in the following eight instances:

1. Provided--statements 1, 2, 4 and 5
2. Contact--statements 1, 3 and 5
3. Effectiveness--statement 1 (responses were combined)

No significant chi-square tests were found in this area.

Table 79 on page 164 presents the summarized results of Housing and Food Services. Listed below are the thirteen cases where a strong direction of response was noted:

1. Provided--statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7
2. Contact--statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7
3. Effectiveness--statement 4 (responses were combined)

Table 77.--Summary of Statements for General Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness				On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1	*				*													
#2	*			*														
#3	*			*														
#4	*																	
#5	*			*		***	***				**	**						
#6	*			*		***	***											
#7					*				*									

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

***Indicates responses were combined to show strong direction of response

Table 78.--Summary of Statements for the Office of the Registrar Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact			Effectiveness			On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1	*			*		***	***											
#2	*																	
#3					*													
#4	*																	
#5	*			*														

*Indicates strong direction of response

***Indicates responses were combined to show strong direction of response

Table 79.--Summary of Statements for Housing and Food Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness					On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know		Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1											**	**	**						
#2	*			*							**	**	**						
#3	*			*							**	**	**						
#4	*			*		***	***				**	**	**						
#5	*			*							**	**	**						
#6	*			*							**	**	**						
#7	*			*							**	**	**						

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

***Indicates responses were combined to show strong direction of response

All of the questions to all of the statements comparing on-campus respondents with off-campus respondents were found to be significant. No other significant results were found.

Table 80 on page 166 presents the summarized results of Placement Services. Strong directions of response that were found are listed below:

1. Provided--statements 1 and 2
2. Contact--statements 3, 4 and 5
3. Effectiveness--statements 4 and 5

When comparing the perceptions of on-campus upperclassmen with on-campus underclassmen, significant chi-square tests were found in the following:

1. Provided--statement 3
2. Contact--statement 2
3. Effectiveness--statement 1 and 2

When comparing the perceptions of off-campus upperclassmen with off-campus underclassmen, significant chi-square tests were found in the following:

1. Contact--statements 1, 3 and 4
2. Effectiveness--statements 1, 3 and 4

Table 81 on page 167 presents the summarized results of Student Activities. The following twelve cases of strong direction of response were noted:

1. Provided--statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6
2. Contact--statements 1, 2, 3 and 6
3. Effectiveness--statements 1 and 6 (both statements were the result of combining responses)

Table 80.--Summary of Statements for Placement Services Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness				On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satis- factory	Unsatis- factory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness	Provided	Contact	Effec- tiveness
#1	*														**		**	**
#2	*													**	**			
#3					*								**				**	**
#4					*				*								**	**
#5					*				*									

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

Table 81.--Summary of Statements for Students Activities Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact			Effectiveness				On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No		Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1	*			*			***	***											
#2	*			*															
#3	*			*															
#4	*										**								
#5	*																**		
#6	*			*			***	***											

*Indicates strong direction of response

**Significant at .01 level

***Indicates responses were combined to show strong direction of response

When comparing on-campus with off-campus responses, one significant chi-square test was found in statement #4 under the question of provision. When comparing off-campus upperclassmen with off-campus underclassmen, one significant chi-square test was found in statement #5 under the question of provision.

Table 82 on page 169 presents the summarized results of Judicial Programs. Strong directions of response that were found are listed below:

1. Provided--statement 6
2. Contact--statements 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6
3. Effectiveness--statements 1 and 4

No significant chi-square tests were noted in this service.

A total of eighty-nine questions were found to indicate a strong direction of response. From the 441 chi-square analyses, 40 or 9.07 percent were found significantly different at the .01 level.

Table 82.--Summary of Statements for Judicial Programs Which Yielded Strong Direction of Response and Significant Chi-Square Analyses.

	Provided			Contact		Effectiveness					On-Campus vs Off-Campus			On-Campus			Off-Campus		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know		Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness	Provided	Contact	Effectiveness
#1					*				*										
#2					*														
#3					*														
#4					*				*										
#5	*																		
#6					*														

*Indicates strong direction of response

CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The literature is replete with urgings by many of the leading figures in the field of College Student Personnel for more abundant and comprehensive evaluative research in the area of student personnel services. Evaluation is a viable concern, for, without research and evaluation, the understanding, knowing and response to student needs can only be speculative. Because of its importance to higher education and because of the increasing emphasis upon accountability to education as a whole, student personnel services must meet student needs. During this decade, accountability has, indeed, become a commonly accepted concept in student affairs and, one of the most important approaches to the achievement of the objective of accountability is through evaluation.

The literature reveals an obvious expressed need for student personnel administrators to periodically analyze and review their programs through whatever means are available to them, as it is only through such efforts that the profession will continue to progress and meet the expressed needs and expectations of the students, faculty, funding groups or agencies and general public.

The purpose of the study, therefore, was to obtain student opinion regarding (1) their knowledge of, contact with and notion of the quality of selected student services on the Michigan State University campus, and (2) to use this information in the appraisal of these selected services. A secondary purpose was to determine if any significant differences existed when the sample population was grouped according to class standing and place of residence. The selected student services evaluated in this study were:

1. Admissions and Academic Orientation
2. University Counseling Center
3. General Services
4. Office of the Registrar
5. Housing and Food Services
6. Placement Services
7. Student Activities
8. Judicial Programs

The study was designed to address itself to the following questions within the various groups surveyed:

1. Were students aware of the selected student services available to them?
2. How much contact did students have with the different services?
3. How did students perceive the effectiveness of the selected student services?
4. What recommendations or criticisms did students have regarding the selected student services?

Methodology of the Study

The total random sample for the study was comprised of three-hundred and ninety-five full-time, undergraduate students enrolled during Winter Term, 1979, at Michigan State University. The instrument, entitled the Student Services Questionnaire, was sent to the entire sample. For those students living in the residence halls, the distribution, collection and follow-up of the instrument was handled by the Head Advisors of their respective halls. The remaining population received the instrument via U.S. Mail. Two follow-ups, using postal cards as a reminder, were sent to all nonrespondents of that portion of the sample who received the questionnaire through the mail. Two-hundred and eleven, or 53.4 percent, questionnaires of the total distributed were returned.

The data were tabulated by means of a frequency count and percentages to determine a general flow of the responses and by chi-square tests to compare the differences in responses according to place of residence and class standing (upperclassmen vs. underclassmen).

Summary of Findings

The summarized results for the eight student services included in the Student Services Questionnaire (Appendix A) are presented in the following pages. Each service is discussed according to group response. It should be noted that with the exception of the statement regarding intramural activities, the functions listed under the area of General Services are not truly student personnel functions. However, because they are at times found under the Division of Student Affairs

and are at times mistaken by students as being student personnel functions, they were, nevertheless, included to solicit student reaction.

Admissions and Academic Orientation

The majority of respondents were fairly cognizant of the Admissions and Academic Orientation service as all of the statements under the question of provision reflected a strong direction of response. The only other instance where all statements under the question of provision reflected a strong direction of response was in the area of Student Activities. This area, like Johnson's (1968) and Jones' (1972) studies, was generally regarded by students as effective in the performance of its functions. Statements #2 and #3, which dealt with financial aid and student recruitment, were the only ones in which less than one-half of the students did not view the function as being satisfactorily performed. Students indicated much contact with this area; only in statement #4, which was about the recruitment program, did less than one-half (46.1 percent) of the respondents report not exercising contact with the function.

Significant chi-square analyses indicated that on-campus respondents had more contact with Welcome Week than did off-campus respondents, and that on-campus respondents were more satisfied with Welcome Week than off-campus respondents. Further analyses indicated that on-campus students reported more contact with newsletters received prior to their arrival to the campus than did off-campus students and that off-campus upperclassmen were more satisfied than off-campus underclassmen with the financial aid information provided by this service.

University Counseling Center

Unlike Admissions and Academic Orientation, students were not very cognizant of the existence of many of the functions of the Counseling Center. This finding is similar to findings in other studies about counseling centers (Penney and Buckles, 1966; Johnson, 1968; Mueller, 1968; Jones, 1972; Moyer, 1974; Hughes, 1975). Only in statement #1, which concerned itself with the availability of counselors, was there a strong direction of response regarding student awareness of its availability. The only other instance where only one statement in an area was viewed strongly by students as being provided was in the area of Judicial Programs. Student contact with the Counseling Center was very low. For all of the statements, except statement #1 which was about the availability of counselors, a strong direction of response was indicated by students who had not exercised contact with this function. Under the question of effectiveness, the findings were quite similar. All statements, except #1 and #2, which were about the availability of counselors and help in making career choices, respectively, indicated a strong direction of response in the "do not know" category.

The one significant chi-square test found in this area indicated that more on-campus students reported that this function was provided than did off-campus students.

General Services

Students were very aware of the functions provided by this area. The only function which did not indicate a strong direction of response was the one about the responsibilities of the Ombudsman. Over one-half of the statements (2, 4, 5 and 6) also indicated a strong

direction of response as reported by those who had exercised contact with the functions. With regard to the question on effectiveness, only in statement #3, which addressed the responsibilities of the Department of Public Safety, were more than one-half (50.2 percent) of the respondents dissatisfied with the effectiveness of any of the functions. Jones (1972) found a similar finding in her research. On the other hand, by combining responses, statements #5 and #6, which were concerned with Intramural sports and the student newspaper, a strong direction of response was reported by respondents who were satisfied with the effectiveness of these functions.

Significant chi-square analyses were found in statement #5 (which was about the Intramural Program) under the question of contact and effectiveness when comparing on-campus responses with off-campus responses. On-campus respondents reported having more contact with the Intramural Program than off-campus respondents, and more on-campus respondents were satisfied with the effectiveness of this function than off-campus respondents.

Office of the Registrar

Students were very aware that provisions for the Office of the Registrar were available. The only statement which did not show a strong direction of response was statement #3, which was concerned with the procurement of documents pertinent to the Registrar's Office. However, even this function was viewed by over one-half of the respondents (53.6 percent) as being available. The question of contact with this service was not as strong as the question of awareness as the only strong direction of response (statement #3) was due to lack of student

contact. Furthermore, more than one-half (60.4 percent) of the respondents also reported a lack of contact (statement #2) regarding the availability of student academic records.

No significant chi-square analyses were reported for this service, hence, responses among the three different groups (on-campus vs. off-campus students; on-campus upperclassmen vs. on-campus underclassmen; off-campus upperclassmen vs. off-campus underclassmen) were not diverse enough to be statistically significant. This phenomenon occurred elsewhere only once (Judicial Programs) in the study.

Housing and Food Services

Respondents strongly viewed all of the functions of Housing and Food Services as being provided, except for statement #1 which was about student involvement in setting rules and regulations for student housing. But even this function was viewed by over one-half (59.7 percent) of the respondents as being available. The same thing can be said about how respondents reported their contact with this area with the exception of statement #1 where only 46.7 percent of the respondents indicated they had exercised contact with the function. Although respondents expressed their knowledge of and contact with the various functions, only statement #4 (Residence halls provide . . . social/educational/recreational programs) reported a (satisfactory) strong direction of response under the question of effectiveness. However, this strong direction of response was the result of combining very good and satisfactory responses. Arbuckle and Doyle's (1966) findings were somewhat less favorable as their study revealed that the majority of students were only moderately satisfied with housing. On the other

hand, Mueller (1968) and Jones (1972) found that students deemed this service as unsatisfactory.

There were no significant results attained from chi-square tests as a result of comparing the perceptions of both on- and off-campus upperclassmen with underclassmen. However, when comparing on-campus respondents with off-campus respondents, all of the questions for all of the statements, were found to be significant. This was the largest number of significant chi-square tests for any service in the study. In all of the statements, under the questions of provision and contact, more upperclassmen viewed all of the functions as being provided than did underclassmen. Under the question of effectiveness, the same was true with the exception of statement #2 which was about the provision of well-balanced meals. In this case, more underclassmen (by a count of 2) viewed the performance of the function in a satisfactory fashion than did upperclassmen. However, more upperclassmen were dissatisfied with this function than were underclassmen.

Placement Services

Students were somewhat divided in their perceptions of the existence of the functions of Placement Services. Jones (1972) reported an even less favorable finding as Placement Services was one of two services which students were least aware of on the University of Mississippi campus. Response to statements #1 and #2, which were concerned with the availability of the Placement Service to help students procure employment and to furnish students with information about employment, revealed a positive strong direction of response. However, nearly 60 percent of the students reported that the Placement Office did

provide assistance in resume preparation and the development of interviewing skills. Student contact with this service was minimal. Responses to statements #3, #4 and #5 resulted in a negative strong direction of response while statements #1 and #2 also indicated a definite lack of contact by students (65.1 percent and 58.9 percent). Students were unable to give a high rating to the effectiveness of the functions of this service as only statement #2 received a favorable rating by more than one-half of the students (53.6 percent) and this was the result of combining responses. This finding was not totally congruent with the findings of other studies, such as Johnson's (1968) study which reported that Placement Services had received a rating of "effective."

Significant chi-square analyses indicated that more on-campus upperclassmen viewed the effectiveness of statement #1 (. . . the Placement Office assists students in procuring employment) more satisfactorily than did on-campus underclassmen. Other analyses indicated that more on-campus upperclassmen had more contact and were more satisfied with function #2 (The Placement Office furnishes job information and placement trends) than on-campus underclassmen. Also, more on-campus upperclassmen viewed statement #3 (The Placement Office provides adequate assistance in resume preparation and the development of interviewing skills) as being provided than did on-campus underclassmen. Further analyses indicated that for statements #1, #2 and #3, with regard to contact and effectiveness, more off-campus upperclassmen reported having more contact and evaluating the

performance of these functions in a more satisfactory fashion than did off-campus underclassmen.

Student Activities

Students were favorable in their appraisal of the area of Student Activities. This finding is similar to findings in other studies about Student Activities (Arbuckle and Doyle, 1966; Mueller, 1968; Jones, 1972). As in the areas of Admissions and Academic Orientation, all of the statements resulted in a positive strong direction of response with regard to the question of provision. These two instances were the only two of its kind in this study. With regard to contact, only statement #4 (Student Activities provide opportunities for leadership and personal development) and statement #5 (Student organizations provide for learning democratic processes and citizenship responsibilities) did not result in a positive strong direction of response, however, 60 percent of the respondents indicated having exercised contact with statement #4. Under the question of effectiveness, only the functions of student activities meeting the needs of most students and providing an adequate variety of plays, concerts and movies were viewed by students as being performed in a satisfactory manner (this was a result of combining responses). Although the above mentioned were the only functions that reported a positive strong direction of response, only in statement #5, mentioned above, were less than one-half of the respondents (43.2 percent) satisfied with the performance of the function.

Significant chi-square analyses revealed that more on-campus respondents viewed statement #4, mentioned above, as being provided

than did off-campus respondents, and that more off-campus upperclassmen also viewed statement #5, mentioned above, as being provided than did off-campus underclassmen.

Judicial Programs

Respondents did not appear to be very familiar with the office and services of Judicial Programs. Only function #6, which was about judicial systems attempting to balance rights and responsibilities, indicated a strong direction of response. Just over one-half of the respondents (50.7 percent and 51.7 percent, respectively), however, did view statement #1 (The campus judicial system . . . attempts to resolve important and serious student complaints) and statement #6, mentioned above, as being provided. Respondents reported very little contact with this area. Only statement #5, which was concerned with the communication for student's behavior, did not indicate a strong direction of response under the category of "no contact" with the function. But even then, 65.7 percent of the respondents reported not having exercised contact with this function. With the exception of statement #5, mentioned above, all of the functions reported that more than one-half of the respondents could not evaluate the performance of this service.

No significant chi-square analyses were found in this area, hence, perceptions among the three groups compared were not diverse enough to be statistically significant.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from the findings of the study are presented below. Their order of presentation is not meant to designate their importance.

1. Generally, students in this sample were very aware of the existence of most of the functions of the student services evaluated in this study, as evidenced by the fact that 32 of the 49 statements reported a strong (positive) direction of response.
2. Approximately one-half of the students were not able to evaluate the effectiveness of many of the functions. This finding appears to be strongly related to the large number of students who did not exercise contact with the student services, therefore, students were unable and/or hesitant to evaluate some of the functions.
3. Of those students who did evaluate the effectiveness of the student services, the majority were satisfied with the performance of the services. Generally speaking, this finding tends to indicate that once students do make initial contact with the student services, the particular functions are performed to their satisfaction.
4. Since on-campus students and upperclassmen are more positive and knowledgeable about student services, it appears that a more concerted effort is needed to reach underclassmen and off-campus students. This may be related to the fact that on-campus students are geographically closer to the services available

than off-campus students and that upperclassmen have been enrolled longer than underclassmen.

5. Since almost one-half of the students indicated a lack of contact with many of the functions, student services are apparently not reaching the great majority of the student population.
6. Admissions and Academic Orientation received the most favorable rating of all the services evaluated. Thus, according to what students expect from Admission and Academic Orientation, this service is fulfilling its role.

Recommendations

Recommendations, drawn from the findings of this study, will be divided into two categories. The first set of recommendations will be based on student reaction to the forty-nine statements which comprised Part I of the Student Services Questionnaire. The second set of recommendations will be based on student reaction to Part II, section B, the open-ended segment of the questionnaire. Because Part II did not elicit nearly as many responses as Part I, the recommendations included in Part II are derived from a much smaller population; hence, the recommendations should be weighted accordingly.

Recommendations Based on Responses to Part I of the Student Services Questionnaire

1. Since the University Counseling Center and Judicial Programs appeared to be little known by students in this study, it may be that current methods or approaches to disseminating information about them are not effective enough. Therefore, a

- more intense or different approach to publicizing the University Counseling Center and Judicial Programs should be conducted.
2. Since on-campus residents and upperclassmen are more aware of, exercise more contact with and view the effectiveness of the student services more favorably than do off-campus residents and underclassmen, the different student services should direct their program objectives so that a more equitable balance among the recipients of these services is attained.
 3. Because students' needs are subject to change with their goals, objectives, etc., an on-going evaluation should be undertaken or continued by each of the student services to assure that the objectives of each area are being met and that changes in students' needs are recognized.
 4. Because this study addressed only the variables of residence and class standing, a replication of this study might be considered to compare the perceptions of students based on other relevant variables, e.g., marital status, sex, age and college of enrollment, etc., in an attempt to discern possible relationships among the various groups.

Recommendations Based on Responses to
Part II of the Student Services
Questionnaire

1. Academic Orientation needs to improve its counseling when helping students pre-enroll. (Due to prior work experience in this area, this researcher would interpret "counseling" to mean help in "working-out a class schedule.")

2. Since students expressed a lack of knowledge about the functions of the University Counseling Center which were included in this study, the University Counseling Center should make a more concerted effort to familiarize students with the services it can provide for them.
3. Because the Department of Public Safety received more negative criticism than any other area of this study, some research is needed to discern why students view this department in such a manner.
4. In order to accommodate the need of all students who desire to become involved in Intramural activities, more facilities for the existing sports are needed. Also, an effort should be made to provide lesser known and played sports for those who desire them.
5. The registration process is viewed by students in a negative manner, thus, the Office of the Registrar might want to contemplate the idea of registration by mail on an experimental basis.
6. Because of the number and variety of complaints against meals served in the residence halls, a better understanding needs to be established between students and the residence halls management. This understanding should be in terms of what students expect and whether these expectations are feasible enough to be met by Housing and Food Services.
7. Since Placement Services does host a diversified population of potential employers, as supported by the quantitative data, it

should make an attempt to change the image it projects to some students, i.e., that it caters to only a few select majors such as business and engineering.

8. Judicial Programs need to publicize its functions more and picture itself in a more meaningful and positive role.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A general study is needed to ascertain why more students do not avail themselves of the student services available on campus.
2. An in-depth study is needed to determine why more students do not use the University Counseling Center.
3. Further research is needed to determine why students have a rather negative attitude toward the Department of Public Safety.

Reflections

1. It is interesting to note that, although students were generally satisfied with the student services available on campus, as the analysis of the forty-nine statements in Part I indicated, the open-ended section of the questionnaire had much negative criticism. This might imply that, in spite of the pilot study and other precautions taken to produce a questionnaire that was relatively free of biases, the make-up of the statements in Part I may possibly have been positively skewed so as to generate an overall favorable reaction to Part I.

2. Students were highly critical of the Department of Public Safety (D.P.S.); however, more light needs to be shed on this topic. This past year, on the Michigan State University campus, several severe encounters evolved between D.P.S. and the student body, primarily over the right of D.P.S. to tow away illegally parked cars. These attitudes expressed for this past year most probably biased student opinion in a negative vein when asked to evaluate the function of the Department of Public Safety.
3. Meals served in the residence halls were not viewed very favorably by students. Having worked in the halls during the years 1977, 1978 and 1979, and having been exposed to the same meals as students, this researcher is not in total sympathy with student opinion. One wonders whether the existing negative feeling toward meals in the residence halls is not just simply a case of "the peer syndrome" where a student is trapped in a fixed state of mind due to peer pressure or because it is the accepted, prevailing attitude of the time and circumstances.
4. Another insight as to why students in this study may have been critical of the residence halls is the existence of overcrowded conditions. A recent study, conducted by Residence Hall Programs Office (RHPO) (Desler and North, 1978), indicated that students who were assigned to a triple in a normal, double-occupancy room have, in fact, maintained a higher GPA than the rest of the student population; however, this study by RHPO

does not speak to the social and the psychological impact of overcrowding.

5. Judicial Programs did not go unscathed. A hidden determinant in the evaluation of this service might be, as alluded to earlier, that students view this service as another vehicle for expression of authority by the "establishment." It must also be mentioned, however, that this researcher has witnessed the mechanics of the judicial process in operation on this campus for about four years and the amount of red tape (the time between incident and action and the continued abuse of the system by some individuals) lends some credence to lack of respect for the judicial process by students.
6. As a former university counselor, this researcher was not surprised at the lack of contact and knowledge of the various functions of the University Counseling Center expressed by students. The problem may not lie so much with the students as with one of the harder realities of any counseling center, i.e., the age-old problem of having a stigma attached to those who utilized the services.
7. Although most respondents indicated an awareness of the student services examined in this study, more than one-half of the respondents had limited contact with these services. It could be concluded that students do not need these services, that the perceived performance of these services discourages their patronage, that the services are being performed by agencies off campus or any combination of the above.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STUDENT SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this form is to obtain your opinions of some functions or responsibilities of the student services for students on the Michigan State University campus. Part I has 49 statements in total. You are asked to respond to each statement in terms of three questions. Part II concerns itself with comments or recommendations that you may wish to make regarding any of these services.

SAMPLE OF PART I

QUESTION 1			QUESTION 2		QUESTION 3			
Provided at MSU			Contact with Function		Effectiveness at MSU			
Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know

1. All freshmen students are required to live in residence halls. ● ○ ○ ● ○ ○ ○ ● ○

QUESTION 1. Have provisions for this function been made at Michigan State University? (Notice the filled in response under "Yes" indicating that the respondent felt that freshmen were required to live in the residence hall.)

QUESTION 2. Have you had contact with this function? (Notice the filled in response under "Yes" indicating that the respondent had been required to live in the residence hall as a freshman.)

QUESTION 3. How effective do you think this function is performed at Michigan State University? (Notice the filled in response under "Unsatisfactory" indicating that the regulation is not satisfactory according to this respondent.)

If your answer to Question 2 is "No" please answer Question 3 according to what knowledge you have of the quality of the service.

Please continue and complete the remaining 49 statements in Part I according to your present knowledge regarding the statements. After completing Part I, please go on to Part II.

QUESTION 1			QUESTION 2		QUESTION 3			
Provided at MSU			Contact with Function		Effectiveness at MSU			
Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know

ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC ORIENTATION

1. Services and information concerning admission are available to and appropriate for prospective students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Services and information concerning financial aid are available to and appropriate for prospective students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. A well-coordinated recruitment program exists to inform prospective students about Michigan State University.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The Academic Orientation Program provides academic advisement and enrollment in courses appropriate to student needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Welcome Week provides a satisfactory orientation to University life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The NEWSLETTERS received prior to arrival on campus provide needed and appropriate information about the University.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER

1. Counselors are available for discussing personal concerns of students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Aptitude, interest and personality tests are available in the Counseling Center to help students make career choices.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The Counseling Center is the place to get help in better understanding yourself and the careers best suited to you.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. If you wanted to learn how to get along better with different types of people, it would be appropriate to talk with a counselor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Counselors are able to help students change personal attitudes or behaviors which may interfere with successful school performance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Learning how to relax during stressful periods in school can be done at the self-management laboratory.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. The staff of the Counseling Center is helpful in examining alternatives to a college education.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

GENERAL SERVICES

1. Assistance in improving reading and study skills is provided for students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Faculty and Academic Advisors assist students in planning coursework and in selecting major fields of study.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Protection of people and property and provisions for driving and parking student motor vehicles and bicycles on campus are provided by the campus police (DPS).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The University student government (A.S.M.S.U.) effectively communicates student opinion to the University administration and provides adequate programs and services for the student body.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The Intramural Program provides an opportunity for the majority of students to participate in a variety of sports and recreational activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The student newspaper (<i>The State News</i>) is informative and generally reflects student opinion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. There is an Office of the Ombudsman whose responsibility is to assist in resolving student grievances and complaints.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

1. Student academic records are maintained accurately and efficiently.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Student academic records are available for a student's own review.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Go to next page

QUESTION 1			QUESTION 2		QUESTION 3			
Provided at MSU			Contact with Function		Effectiveness at MSU			
Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 3. Copies of student academic records, diplomas and other documents pertinent to the Registrar's Office can be secured quickly and efficiently. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. Information concerning enrollment, registration, records, transcripts, readmission, graduate certification and diplomas is adequately conveyed. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Enrollment and registration procedures are conducted in a fair and well-organized fashion. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICES

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Provisions exist for the involvement of students in setting the rules and regulations in student housing. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2. Well-balanced meals are provided in campus cafeterias/dining halls. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3. Residence hall living contributes positively to the overall educational experiences of undergraduate students. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. Residence halls provide students with a wide variety of social/educational/recreational programs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Residence hall staffs are responsive to student needs & interests. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6. Student rooms and social-recreational facilities in residence halls are provided for in an appropriate and satisfactory manner. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 7. The residence hall provides an on-going orientation to University life. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

PLACEMENT SERVICES

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. An all-University placement service is available to assist students in securing suitable employment. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2. The all-University placement service furnishes information to students about job markets, salaries, and placement trends in a wide variety of fields. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3. The Placement Office provides adequate assistance to students in resume' preparation and in the development of interviewing skills. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. The Placement Office provides adequate and pleasant facilities for employer-student interviews. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Information is mailed to future employers regarding student's educational preparation, job experience, extracurricular activities and recommendations. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

STUDENT ACTIVITIES

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. There are adequate student activities to meet the needs of most interested students at this University. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2. Specific student activity groups are well organized and operate effectively. (Groups with which you are familiar) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3. Student activities are centrally scheduled, coordinated and are adequately publicized. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. Student activities provide opportunities for leadership and personal development. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Student organizations provide for learning democratic processes and citizenship responsibilities. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6. There is an adequate variety of plays, concerts and movies for students to attend on campus. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

JUDICIAL PROGRAMS

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The campus judicial system provides a mechanism for attempting to resolve important and serious student complaints. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|

Go to next page

	Provided at MSU			Contact with Function		Effectiveness at MSU			
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Do Not Know
2. Actions taken for the violation of University regulations are for the purpose of guidance and correction—not for punishment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Opportunities exist for sufficient student involvement in the formulation of regulations which affect their lives on campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Records of student violations against University regulations are handled in an appropriate manner with due respect for the student's right to privacy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Expectations for student's behavior are clearly and concisely communicated to them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The judicial system attempts to balance rights and responsibilities in a fair manner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART II

A. Personal Data: (Check the appropriate blank)

1. Male _____ Female _____

2. Class Standing:

Senior _____ Junior _____ Sophomore _____ Freshman _____

3. Place of Residence:

ON-CAMPUS _____
(Includes Spartan Village, University Apts., Residence Halls)

OFF-CAMPUS _____
(Includes fraternity and sorority houses, apartments, commuters)

B. Please comment or make recommendations below on any area covered by the questionnaire:

1. Admissions and Academic Orientation

2. University Counseling Center

3. General Services (campus police, remedial services, faculty advisers, intramurals, etc.)

4. Office of the Registrar

5. Housing and Food Services

6. Placement Services

7. Student Activities

8. Judicial Programs

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

February, 1979

Dear Michigan State Student:

Enclosed is an important form we are asking you to complete and return. Its purpose is to obtain your reaction to some of the student services available on the Michigan State University campus. Your collective perceptions will be forwarded to the Vice President for Student Affairs and other appropriate University officials in anticipation of improving services offered to M.S.U. students.

This form will take only 15-30 minutes to complete. Please do not throw it away as you are one of only a small sample of students being asked to respond. Take advantage of this opportunity to express your opinion by completing this questionnaire. Please do not write your name on it. Respondents will remain anonymous; the demographic data and coding is for analysis and follow-up purposes only.

Having completed the form, return it to your Head Advisor if you reside in the residence halls. If you are living elsewhere, please use the enclosed envelope.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and interest in M.S.U.'s services to its students.

Very sincerely yours,

Joe R. Gómez, Jr.
Graduate Advisor
Williams Hall

Kay E. White
Asst. Vice President for
Student Affairs and Services

APPENDIX C

**STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED SECTION
OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

APPENDIX C

STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Admissions and Academic Orientation

Hurried and all-around big hassle

Adequately taken care of

Fantastic--my AOP was super and fulfilled my needs (3)

Poor counseling with regard to scheduling (6)

Very organized and simple (5)

More visits to high schools (2)

Too hectic

Some parts were confusing (3)

Financial aid is misinforming (2)

Excellent--especially for "out of staters"

Financial aid information is sparse (2)

More emphasis on minority recruitment

Should be extended to give more time for class scheduling

I have had trouble with credit evaluation

Better advice to transfer students (4)

Very helpful and helped ease a lot of tension

My adviser steered me in the wrong direction

Admissions and Academic Orientation (continued)

Foreign student admissions should be more democratic; undergraduate admissions personnel are prejudicial and discriminatory

Fulfilled all of my needs and answered my questions

Fast service in admitting students

During orientation there was no advisor from my department

Orientation was cold and impersonal

Students should be made more aware of services and programs available

Orientation counselors inadequate

Very efficient

Unclear directions; too much red tape

University Counseling Center

Counselors are impersonal; treat students like statistics

Not publicized enough (20)

Counselors are very good (7)

A run-around service

More communication with high schools

Advice too general

Pass you from one counselor to another (2)

They would rather have the "interest machines" help you

Quality of counseling is poor

Students should be informed through the Resident Assistant

Should employ peer counselors

Make sure staff acts professionally

Colleges are more concerned with ridding themselves of a troubled student rather than advising him

University Counseling Center (continued)

Have excellent counseling possibilities

Very poor

Thought University Counseling Center was for academic counseling only--not aware of career counseling

Need a Native American counselor

Only concerned with graduating seniors and their classes

Terrific

Understaffed

Career counseling was poor--personal counseling was O.K.

General Services

Crimes not handled properly by Department of Public Safety

D.P.S. not type of police needed to construct order

Parking tickets are given out unfairly (2)

D.P.S. pays too much attention to tickets and towing (14)

Parking facilities for students needs to be improved (9)

Not enough attention to student protection by D.P.S. (5)

More information on guest parking

D.P.S. needs better public relations (2)

Traffic flow of cars, pedestrians, bikes is poor

Campus police are often crude and rude--Intramural workers are very courteous

Campus police should be on foot patrol only

Had very good experience with campus police

Better lighting needed in parking lots, frequently traveled paths, etc.

D.P.S. is power hungry and intimidating

General Services (continued)

Towing gives police a bad name when it's the administration's fault

Police are hard working and dedicated with an unfortunate bad image provided by a very few officers

Intramural sports are very good (6)

I.M. and campus police are fair

Adequately handled

The STATE NEWS is too liberal

Faculty advisers are inadequate (5)

Faculty advisers are readily available

Very good (3)

Not enough I.M. sports for everyone to participate (3)

Academic advisers need more orientation

I have high praise for learning resource center

The STATE NEWS leaves a lot to be desired

STATE NEWS reporters go after sensationalism instead of being objective

General Services lacking for campus of this size

Too many nonstudent playing in I.M. sports makes it unfair to students

More minority faculty advisers

Have adviser evaluation forms

Remedial services need to be publicized more

Legal Services are best idea MSU ever had! The attorney's secretary was great!

Make them more clear--where to go for what

Faculty advisers were helpful and showed interest in helping students

General Services (continued)

Very few services for off-campus students

More I.M. facilities (4)

More available help in math and sciences

Students need protection from intruders at I.M. functions

A higher percent of towing fee should go to the university instead of the private gas station contracted to do the towing

I.M. sports are good

Office of the Registrar

Registration needs to be reorganized and improved (6)

Late registration needs improvement

Need another method of registering (6)

Long lines need to be reduced

A lot of run-around

Good (5)

Very efficient

More information on its function

Very helpful

Registration should be done by mail

Registration needs to be computerized

Need better information on services available and how to obtain them

Provides excellent provisions and access to files

Accurate

Tuition could be paid by mail

My only exposure was not good when trying to get copies of my transcript

What is this?

Housing and Food Services

Meals need to be improved (12)

Need vegetarian diet (4)

Some meals unsatisfactory

More balanced meals (3)

Residence halls are kept very clean

Meals should be prorated (2)

Meals too starchy (7)

Much lack of respect for student's rights

Meals well balanced, but not nutritional as vegetables are over-cooked

No triples!

Tripling is a fire and emotional hazard

Cafeteria management unresponsive to student's suggestions

Like idea of hot dogs or hamburgers at every meal

Service is excellent for numbers of students it handles

More energy efficient to lower costs

This area is efficient

Well run

More fresh fruit and vegetables

It's impossible to eat here and not gain weight--if you must, cut down on desserts and starch meals

The Resident Assistant was receptive only to herself (except when a Grad Advisor was around)

Board of Trustees should check into food preparation

It would not hurt to place a little emphasis on taste rather than economy

University housing has restrictions against pets in apartments, but it is not controlled--cleaning of balconies is not good

Housing and Food Services

Need more dorm programs to educate students about Greeks, co-ops, etc.

Dorms are extremely good for Freshmen and Sophomores

Students have little say, residence hall manager has complete control

Married housing program is great

Food lousy, housing okay

Would like to see more ethnic foods

Housing should not be mandatory for Freshmen, would like to do away with triples

Excellent (3)

Residence halls are ridiculously (1) overcrowded (2) under-heated (3) socially insular and (4) oppressive

Good all-around (2)

Residence halls do nothing about illegal happenings in the hall

One of the best in the country

Most de-humanizing zoo I've seen because of their size

Placement Services

Makes job seeking easier and very efficient

Good (10)

Unsatisfactory "summer job" placement (2)

Should inform students about jobs available by mail

Interview rooms are cold and impersonal

Need place to give resumes to interviewers when their schedule is filled

More publicity

Excellent (3)

Placement Services

Have heard promising things of placement--one of the major reasons I re-admitted at MSU

Summer jobs available only for Juniors and Seniors

Little or no help for social science majors

Should offer more jobs for non work-study students, especially between terms

They only facilitate certain majors

Most efficient and effective service on campus

Usually efficient, especially for number of students and employers who use it

Excellent, if you're a business major

All the emphasis is on business and engineering

Student Activities

More activities for students

Too many RHA movies in the same hall

Not enough concerts (3)

Not publicized enough (3)

RHA movies were good

Plenty (2)

Good (8)

A farce

Not enough variety

Very good variety (7)

More plays

These activities make college more enjoyable

Well run--much more than other schools

Student Activities (continued)

Family type activities with children in mind are needed
 Would like to see MSU sponsor Ethnic Week
 Super
 Excellent (2)
 Sometimes too much variety causes overlapping of functions
 and groups

Judicial Programs

Has good and bad points, but could use change in dealing with
 Students
 Need to publicize more (4)
 Unsatisfactory, especially in small student matters
 Student violations not handled with respect to student's
 privacy
 Out to get students, except those that do most damage
 Need to make information more available (2)
 Are "noneffective" threats
 Direction should be to personal protection instead of punitive
 enforcement
 Too weak--is sham justice
 Well run
 The university should be more fair to the Greeks
 More student input in formulating rules and regulations
 Too much time between incident and action--more authority
 needed in dorms for controlling repeated problems
 No constructive changes or decisions are ever heard of
 b.s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, Bernard J. "A Study of Faculty, Student and Student Affairs Staff Perceptions of Selected Student Personnel Services at the Medical College of Georgia." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 821-A. (University Microfilms No. 76-18,591)
- American Civil Liberties Union. Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1963.
- Ackoff, Russel L. The Design of Social Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Alkin, Marvin C., and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol T. "Methods and Theories of Evaluating Programs." Journal of Research and Development in Education (1975): 2-15.
- Amprey, Joseph L., Jr. "An Evaluation of Student Personnel Services As Viewed by Black and White College Students on Both Predominantly White Populated Campuses." Doctoral dissertation, The American University, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 3079-A. (University Microfilms No. 73-28,771)
- Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.
- Arbuckle, Dugald S., and Doyle, Laurence A. "Student Personnel Services in Bible Colleges." Journal of College Student Personnel 7 (1966): 172-75.
- Atwater, Charles R. "A Study of Personnel Services in Protestant Theological Schools." Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1961. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1961, 22, 1872. (University Microfilms No. 61-6215)
- Baltic, Virginia C. "Issues of Student Protest and Change in Student Personnel." Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (1975): 408-12.
- Barret-Leonard, G. T. "Significant Aspects of a Helping Relationship." Mental Hygiene 47 (1965): 223-27.

- Barry, Ruth, and Wolf, Beverly. Modern Issues in Guidance and Personnel Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Bayer, Alan E., and Astin, Alexander W. "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968-69." Educational Record 49 (1969): 337-50.
- Benson, Paul A. "Students' Perceptions of Student Personnel Functions in Higher Education." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1975. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 6498-A. (University Microfilms No. 76-8349)
- Blakley, Dorothy T. "Characteristics of the Commuter Student at the Ohio State University, His Participation In and Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 1309-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-26,970)
- Bundy, McGeorge. "Blueprint for An Ideal College." In Melvne D. Hardee, "Research on College Students: The Student Personnel Worker's View." The Educational Record XLIII (1962): 132-38.
- Burns, Joanne M. "An Exploratory Study of Community/Junior College Transfer Students' Expressed Needs for and Perceptions of Selected Student Personnel Services." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 6110-A. (University Microfilms No. 73-12,688)
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Dissent and Disruption. Berkeley: The Commission, 1971.
- Cowins, Benjamin B. "Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at The University of North Florida." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1974. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 833-A. (University Microfilms No. 74-17,202)
- Desler, Mary, and North Gary. Memorandum, Residence Hall Programs Office, Michigan State University, August 22, 1978.
- Dunlop, Lowell A. "Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at the University of Wyoming." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1970.
- Eddy, Edward D. "Some Suggestions for Student Involvement in Educational Policy." In The College and the Student. Edited by Laurence E. Dennis and Joseph H. Kauffman. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

- Emerson, William P. "Faculty, Student and Student Personnel Worker Perceptions of Selected Student Personnel Services in the Community Colleges of North Carolina." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 3024-A. (University Microfilms No. 71-31,191)
- Erickson, C. E., and Hatch, Raymond N. "Principles for Programming Personnel Services." In National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Fitzgerald, Laurine E. "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.
- Flores, Thomas R. "Student Personnel Programs for Married Students: A Needs Assessment." Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (1975): 154-59.
- Geiken, Duane O. "Married and Single Students' Perceptions of the College Environment, Personal Problems and Student Personnel Services." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 524-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-18,979)
- Hardee, Melvane D. "Research on College Students: The Student Personnel Worker's View." The Educational Record XLIII (1962): 132-38.
- Hughes, Thomas E. "An Analysis and Appraisal of Student Personnel Programs in Selected Public Junior Colleges in Alabama." Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1975. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 734-A. (University Microfilms No. 75-18,031)
- Jenson, Ralph. "Students' Feelings About Counseling Help." Personnel and Guidance Journal XXXIII (1955): 498.
- Johnson, Thomas B. "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Selected Illinois Four-Year Colleges and Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 29, 2093-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-1861)
- Jones, Jean K. "Students' Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at the University of Mississippi." Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 1458-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-25,962)

- Kamm, Robert B. "An Inventory of Student Reaction to Student Personnel Services." Educational and Psychological Measurement 10 (1950): 537-44.
- Kamm, Robert B. "How Effective Are Our Student Personnel Programs?" The Personnel and Guidance Journal 33 (1955): 318-24.
- Kaplan, Charlotte S. "Graduate Students' Evaluation of Student Personnel Services Available to Graduate Students at the University of Mississippi." Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 173-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-20,235)
- Katz, Joseph and et al. No Time for Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Kohlan, Richard G. "Student Feelings About Names for A Counseling Service." Journal of Counseling Psychology 20 (1972): 386-87.
- Lattore, Patrick A. "Evaluation of Selected Personnel Services Offered To and Services Proposed for Married Students at the University of Northern Colorado." Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 971-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-23,810)
- Lewis, Charles L. "College Student Personnel: A Current Estimate." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (1973): 5-9.
- Lynch, Michael L., and Sinnet, E. Robert. "Student Awareness and Utilization of Professional and Paraprofessional Services." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 14 (1976): 22-28.
- McIver, Carolyn R. "A Study of Administrators', Faculty and Students' Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at the University of Oklahoma." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 2627-A. (University Microfilms No. 76-24,387)
- Moyer, George F. "A Study of Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Memphis State University." Doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, 1974. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 7065-A. (University Microfilms No. 75-10,067)
- Mueller, Kate H. "Graduate Students' Opinions of the Undergraduate Experience." In Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Edited by Kate H. Mueller, 31 (1968): 88-90.

- Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Noeth, Richard J. "Differential Perceptions of Real and Ideal University Environments: Student and Student Personnel Workers." Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 4887-A. (University Microfilms No. 73-6082)
- Penney, James F., and Buckles, Delora E. "Student Needs and Services on an Urban Campus." Journal of College Student Personnel 7 (1966): 180-85.
- Peterson, Glen E. "The Perceptions of Student Personnel Administrators, Faculty Members and Students of the Student Personnel Programs of the Senior Colleges of the American Lutheran Church." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 106-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-11,145)
- President's Commission on Campus Unrest. The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. New York: Arno Press, 1970.
- Pruitt, Wilson. "College Students, Their Community and Their Activities." In College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. Edited by Gordon Klopff. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1966.
- Rackham, Eric N. "The Needs for Adequate Criteria When Evaluating College Student Personnel Programs." Educational and Psychological Measurement 11 (1951): 691-99.
- Raines, May W. "The Student Personnel Situation." Junior College Journal 36 (1966): 6-8.
- Rankin, Gary E. "Graduating Seniors' Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Colorado State College." Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1966. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27, 2406-A. (University Microfilms No. 67-1127)
- Rippey, Robert M., ed. Studies in Transactional Education. Berkeley: McCuthcheon Publishing Company, 1973.
- Robinson, Donald W. "Evaluation as a Function of Student Personnel Administration." The Journal of College Student Personnel IV (1962): 20-2, 40.
- Robinson, Seldon C. "Student Evaluation of the Adequacy of Student Personnel Services in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in Texas." Doctoral dissertation, Texas Technological College, 1966. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1966, 27, 2015-A. (University Microfilms No. 66-12,765)

- Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.
- Sanford, Neville. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
- Schoen, Walter T., Jr. "Clarification and Delineation of Areas of Student and Faculty Responsibility." Journal of College Student Personnel VI (1965): 244-46.
- Scriven, Michael. "Prose and Cons About Goal-Free Evaluation." Evaluation Comment 3 (1972): 1-4.
- Stahl, Dick A. "Freshmen Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at the University of Wyoming." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 166-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-13,049)
- Stake, R. E. "Objectives, Priorities and Other Judgment Data." Review of Educational Research 40 (1970): 181-82.
- Swearingen, Thomas R. "A Study of the Attitudes of Selected Members of the Academic Community Regarding the Student Personnel Program at the Big Ten Universities." Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 4133-A. (University Microfilms No. 73-2141)
- The American Council on Education. The Student Personnel Point of View. The American Council on Education 13 (1949): 17-18.
- Todd, Will Roger. "A Study of Student Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Student Personnel Services at a Large State University and a Small State College." Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 1070-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-14,340)
- Trembley, Ed L., and Bishop, John B. "Counseling Centers and the Issue of Accountability." Personnel and Guidance Journal 52 (1974): 647-52.
- Vickers, Lee A. "Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Lewis-Clark State College." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 2726-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-32,803)
- Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- Williamson, E. G., and Cowan, John L. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University Press, 1966.

- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert, and Kamm, Robert B. "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student-Personnel Program." School and Society LXVII (1948): 266-69.
- Wright, Jeanette T. "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Junior Colleges for Women in New England." Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 29, 4210-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-7838)
- Wright, Wilbert. "A Comparative Study Between Socio-Economic Status, Race, Sex, Classification and Student Opinions Related to Personnel Services of Selected Texas Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1969. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 3745-A. (University Microfilms No. 70-4502)
- Zimmerman, Elwynn. "Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Michigan State University." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.