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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the past, American colleges and universities worked with a persistent demand for their services and with ample financial support by which to provide this service. During the 1950's and 1960's there was "unparalleled" growth on campuses (Hossler & Bean 1990). World War II veterans, and later, baby boomers, were flocking to institutions of higher education and state and federal government were increasing their levels of funding. Between 1970 and 1980 higher education enrollment increased by 41 percent. Federal funds for post secondary education rose by 230 percent between 1965 and 1975 (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1991). In the last decade an entirely different picture has emerged on college and university campuses. Demographers had forecasted an enrollment decline during the early 1980's, a plateau period, and a second decline between the late 1980's through the mid 1990's (Astin, 1977; Carnegie Council, 1980; Frances, 1984; Pollock & Wolf, 1989). The Carnegie Council (1980) predicted that full time equivalent enrollment would decline 5-15 percent between 1978 and 1997. These predictions appear to have some merit. Since 1980, total college enrollments have risen at a much slower pace than the 41 percent increase between 1970 and 1980. There was only an 11 percent increase in total enrollment between 1980 and 1989. In addition, the average first-time freshman enrollment actually dropped 5.7 percent at all four year institutions and 7.3 percent at four year public institutions between 1980 and 1990 (College Board, 1992). Looking ahead, for the period 1990-1997 the National Center for Education Statistics (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1991) projects a rise of 16 percent in enrollment of persons over 25 but only an increase of 5 percent in the number of persons under 25.

The funding of higher education has also changed over the years. Federal program funds fell by 5 percent from fiscal year 1980 to fiscal year 1990 (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1991). State appropriations for higher education also showed a decrease, which is thought to be the first two-year drop in the country's history. State support is about 1 percent less than two years ago, which figures
out to be about $300 million less than what was provided to institutions and students in 1991-1992 (Jaschik, 1992).

With the uncertainty of enrollment trends, the stabilization of institutional enrollment is a priority at many colleges and universities. Many researchers and administrators are once again turning their attention to student retention for answers regarding their concerns about enrollment stability. Harman (1982) asserts that the retention of students is one way to significantly impact institutional enrollment stability. Harman goes on the say that a "dominant theme in retention research today is that retention and attrition result from the interactions that take place between students and the institution" (p. 3). This interaction is most recently being described as student-institution fit.

Student-institution fit suggests that "the degree of congruency, or fit, between student needs, abilities, interests, and goals and the ability of the institution to adequately respond to those needs, abilities, interests, and goals could lead to increased student satisfaction, academic achievement, and personal growth" (Williams, 1984, p.69). Williams suggests that a fit or match exists between student and institution when students' needs, goals and interests are sufficiently met by various environmental conditions and when student academic and social abilities engage well with institutional requirements. The idea of student-institution fit is not new to higher education. It expands on the theoretical base of person-environment interaction. Stem (1964) provides the equation B= f(PE) to explain person-environment interaction (cited in Whiston, 1989). This equation translates as B (behavior) is a function of P (person) and E (environment). Williams (1984) further clarifies this in saying "not only do people bring their own physical, social, and psychological characteristics into the environment, but the environment in which they live, will necessarily have an impact and influence on their behavior" (p. 72). The concept of person-environment interaction has elicited several theoretical approaches which Williams (1984) cites: Pace and Stem, college press (1958); Clark and Trow, subculture approach (1966); Barker, theory of behavior settings (1968);
It is suggested that one of the results of optimizing student-institution fit is student satisfaction, which plays a key role in student retention. A student's expectation of satisfaction and actual satisfaction with the college experience is a significant factor in recruitment and retention of students. Pantages and Creedon (1978) assert that the "extent to which the student can meet the demands of the college and derive satisfaction from doing so is the degree to which the student may be expected to persist at the college" (p. 94). Astin (1987) reports that at least one student in four reports overall dissatisfaction with her or his college experience.

Tying in the concept of student-institution fit Astin suggests that "student satisfaction is much more dependent than other outcome measures on the characteristics of the institution and the student's involvement in the institutional environment" (p. 168). It seems obvious that the connection between student - institution fit and student satisfaction is an area that deserves more attention as both the student and college could potentially benefit. This link has the potential to improve a student's college experience, and at the same time help stabilize the institution's enrollment.

**Statement of Purpose**

There is a comprehensive research base that supports the idea of optimizing student-institution fit for improving student satisfaction, achievement, and retention (Williams, 1984). Therefore, it is the purpose of this research to investigate if the level of institutional fit a student within the College of Business, at Iowa State University, experiences with the College of Business is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction and further, whether their "fit" and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's gender, age, or ethnicity.
Research Questions

During the conceptualization of this study and after the review of literature the following research questions were identified.

1) Do students within the College of Business have a high degree of fit with the College of Business?

2) Is the Student's level of fit with the College of Business independent of their degree of satisfaction with the College of Business?

3) Is a student's level of fit and degree of satisfaction independent of the student's gender, age or ethnicity?

Definitions

Student-institution fit: "The degree of congruency, or fit, between student's needs, abilities, interests, and goals and the ability of the institution to adequately respond to those needs, abilities, interests and goals" (Williams, 1984, p. 69). For the purpose of this study, student-institution fit was defined with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers, 1962). First, the individual members of the faculty, administration, and professional staff of the College of Business were asked to complete the MBTI. The predominant type of the faculty, administration, and professional staff was determined as ENTJ. This profile was used to describe the College of Business as a whole for purposes of comparison and determination of student-institution fit. Second, students taking Management 478 were also asked to complete the MBTI. The two component's "type" were compared and the extent to which they match on the four preferences of the MBTI was analyzed. Fit was defined as total fit, matching on all four preferences; partial fit, matching of three preferences; and no fit, matching on two or less of the preferences.
**Satisfaction:** The degree to which a student's needs, expectations, wishes, or desires are met by their college experience. For the purpose of this study, satisfaction will be measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1971). Satisfaction will be operationally defined as the overall satisfaction score and the satisfaction scores achieved on each of the five subscales of the CSSQ.

**Limitations**

1) The participants in this study were drawn exclusively from the student body and the faculty, administration, and professional staff of the College of Business at Iowa State University, a large, midwest, state university. The findings may not be generalizable to other types of institutions.

2) The MBTI and the CSSQ are both self-reporting instruments. Their accuracy depends on the honesty and accurate self-perception of the person taking it.

3) Information about students' social and economic attributes, or pre-college commitment to obtaining a degree will not be available. These variables could possibly affect a student's pattern of social and academic interaction and integration.

**Assumptions**

An assumption was made that the participants in the study would objectively report their preferences on the MBTI and their level of satisfaction on the CSSQ.

It was assumed that the instruments used in this study are valid ways to determine student-institution fit and student satisfaction.

**Significance**

Student-institution fit and student satisfaction is important to a variety of decision makers (Astin, 1975). Academic advisors will have an effective tool by which to help students evaluate their
interests, curriculum and major choices, career choice, performance, and involvement. It will also help institutional administrators who hope to recruit and select the student who will best match the goals of the institution and who are best qualified to take advantage of the particular education programs (Hossler, 1984, Astin, 1975). It would help prospective college students, their parents, and their high school advisors who are in search of the higher education institution that will accentuate whatever benefits the student expects from their college experience. Orientation and retention offices will have the information they need to develop programs around not only the students' characteristics but also the environment's characteristics, thereby facilitating the design of interventions that will make the fit between students and campus most effective (William, 1984).

Organization of Study

The first chapter contains the introduction, purpose of the study, research questions, definitions, limitations, assumptions, significance of the study and organization of the study.

The second chapter contains the review of literature. The review covers the topics of student-institution fit, defining student-institution fit, the campus environment, assessing the campus environment, student satisfaction, and the intervening variables of age, gender, and ethnicity.

Chapter three covers the methodology, including: description of Iowa State University and the College of Business, sample, instruments, procedures, hypotheses of the study and testing and analysis.

Chapter four reports the findings of the research.

Finally, chapter five provides the summary and conclusions with recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Student-Institution Fit

Student-institution fit has its roots in the theory of person-environment interaction. This theory grew out of the idea that human behavior could not simply be explained by looking only to the person or the environment as the sole determinants of behavior. Ekehammer (1974) labeled this perspective interactionism. Interactionism sees both the person and the environment as interacting and contributing to the variation seen in human behavior. It is this interaction and the resulting human behavior that makes the concept of student-institution fit so attractive to professionals in higher education as they consider what they can do to stabilize enrollments and provide a positive college experience.

Williams (1984) contends that to understand and effectively utilize the concept of student-institution fit one must consider three important factors: student characteristics, institutional characteristics, and effects of the interaction between the student and the environment.

Student characteristics include those personal attributes, needs, abilities, goals, expectations, interests, and values that students bring with them to the campus. Institutional characteristics include a complex array of physical, academic, social, and even psychological attributes that make up the campus environment, or climate of learning. Finally, the physical, cognitive, and affective interactions between students and their college or university constitute an important relationship that can lead to varying degrees of student satisfaction, academic achievement, and persistence in the institution. When student's needs, goals, and interests are adequately met by various environmental conditions and when student academic and social abilities mesh well with institutional requirements, then fit, or match, between student and institution is believed to exist (p. 70).
For over seventy years researchers have studied variables which focused on person-environment interaction. This research has elicited several approaches which provide a theoretical basis for the concept student-institution fit including: Pace and Stem (1958), Barker (1968), Clark and Trow (1966), Holland (1973), Pervin (1968), Moos (1973) and Banning (1978).

Pace and Stem (1958) investigated the measurement of psychological characteristics of college campuses based on the premise that “college cultures maybe seen as a complex of environmental press which, in turn, may be related to a corresponding complex of personal needs” (p. 269). This environmental press approach suggests that a student comes to college with individual drives, motives, and goals. Different colleges have different environments and therefore will exert a different "press" or stimulus on these students. This suggests that to maximize student-institution fit one should increase their understanding of the ways in which institution make their impact upon students and vice versa.

In his study of person-environment relationships, Roger Barker (1968) worked of the premise that environments select and shape the behavior of people who inhibit them. This "behavior setting" approach places more emphasis on the role of the environment than on the individual, and it suggests that student's behavior and the environmental conditions on campus that tend to shape or define those behaviors should be carefully assessed.

Clark and Trow (1966) theorized a subculture approach to person-environment interaction. This approach focuses on the environment and the ways in which it influences and molds the behavior of it members. When institutions are aware of the various subcultures which make up their respective campus environment, there is great potential for influencing how students will behave within that environment. Walsh (1978) (cited in Williams, 1984) suggests that subcultures have the potential to provide students with support by providing the needed reinforcement of their attitudes, values, and behaviors, which in turn motivates them to enter and remain in the campus environment.
Huebner (1989) cites another approach to studying person-environment interaction by Pervin (1968). Pervin's transactional approach proposes that it is the interactions and transactions between the individual and the environment that offer the best explanation of human behavior. According to Pervin, there are interpersonal and non-interpersonal environments that tend to match or fit that individual's personality characteristics and the individual's perception of self.

Walsh (1973) reviews the basic assumptions of Pervin's approach:

(a) that people find large discrepancies between their perceived and their ideal selves painful and unpleasant;
(b) that people are positively attracted toward objects in the perceived environment which hold potential for moving them toward their ideal selves and are negatively disposed toward stimuli that may move them away from their ideal selves; and
(c) that similarity between objects of importance and the individual is desirable where the individual has a low self/ideal-self discrepancy and undesirable where the individual has a high self/ideal-self discrepancy. The essence of this last premise seems to be that people with low self/ideal-self discrepancies are healthier and more open to personal growth (p. 110).

In Pervin's transactional approach, individuals are defined in terms of their own self-reported perceptions using the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) (Pervin, 1967). The environment is also conceptualized with the TAPE and Pervin suggests that an interpersonal environment be defined in terms of the perceptions of its members.

Holland (1973) provides another approach to person-environment interaction with his personality theory. Huebner (1989), presents the four formal assumptions that Holland used in developing his theory:

1) Individuals may be described by their resemblance to one or more personality types (that is, clusters of personal attributes) which can be used to measure the person. The six basic
types corresponding to vocational choice are: Realistic, Investigative, Social, Conventional, Enterprising, and Artistic.

2) Environments may be characterized by their resemblance to one or more of six model environments (which correspond to the six personality types).

3) Each personality type (that is, each person) searches for a congruent environment.

4) Congruent person-environment relationships lead to predictable and understandable outcomes with respect to vocational choice, vocational stability, vocational achievement, personal stability, creative performance, and personal development (p. 171).

Walsh (1978) (cited in Williams, 1984) in his review of over 150 research studies conducted using Holland's theory, claims that there is ample support for the existence of a connection between personality type and environmental models. In addition, Walsh relays that "the evidence indicates that people tend to select college environments and occupational environments consistent with their personality type.... and finally, the research also supports Holland's fourth assumption that congruent person-environment interactions are associated with personal and vocation stability and satisfaction" (p. 76).

In their study on person-environment congruency, consistency and differentiation, Nafziger, Holland & Gottfredson (1975) asked the following questions: Are students in congruent college environments more satisfied than students in incongruent college environments? Do the different degrees of congruency result in different levels of student satisfaction? And finally, are the differentiation and consistency of a student's personality profile related to college satisfaction? Personality type was determined by the Self Directed Search (Holland, 1972). Satisfaction was determined by the Inventory of Educational Experience and Opinion (Nafziger, Holland & Gottfredson, 1975). The researchers thought that the most important finding was that there were differences among congruency levels experienced by students and the level of student satisfaction in regards to major fields. This did not generalize to the entire college environment, however, "The
results suggest that congruency with one's subenvironment, major field, is a good predictor of satisfaction with that environment, but does not predict satisfaction with the total environment (p. 137).

Banning (1978) provides the term "campus ecology" to represent the interaction between college students and the college environments. Campus ecology branches off from the social ecological approach which views behavior as a function of the person-environment relationship. Banning proposes that the ecological perspective focuses on the relationship between individual and environment. This approach helps correct the overemphasis on working with individual students. It promotes the shift from perceiving students as individuals to perceiving students as a part of an ecology.

School climate is another area in research that focuses on student and environment interaction. School climate studies have demonstrated that there is a close relationship between school climate and student achievement (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). School climate, also referred to as "environment" or "culture", has been defined as the atmosphere of a school building made up of the impression, moods, and feelings one experiences in that environment (Edmonds, 1982). Rutter et al. (1979) suggests that school climate is created by the beliefs and values as expressed by people in the school. Climate has also been defined as "the product of shared attitudes, beliefs, and values as understood by the people in a school, integral parts of which include areas such as pride, esprit, and cooperation" (Winter, 1987). The perceptions of members within a school, especially that of teachers, form a significant part of the shared belief system of a school, which through their thoughts, feelings, and actions help form the school climate. Stewart (1978) related teachers' perceptions of climate to student climate and achievement.

For those who wish to optimize student-institution fit on their campuses, there is a great deal of research in this area. Twenty-three years ago researchers reported that there appears to be a "fit" or
congruence between the average level of the specific needs of students and the particular environment pressures (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). Walsh and Russell (1969) found that students who make a congruent college major choice reported fewer personal adjustment problems when compared to subjects in the incongruent groups. Chickering and McCormick (1973) took a student-institution fit approach in their examination of subgroups of similar students within institutions. They found that there were different patterns of change among students that were related to factors such as college climate, student characteristics, teaching practices, study activities, and student-faculty relationships. Cope and Hannah (1975) see that the fit between the student and the college as a prime motivating factor for most of the transferring, stopping, and dropping out. A college or university that is insensitive to an individual's experiences, perspectives, motives, abilities and interests does not have much holding power with students who may feel that their needs are not being met and that they do not fit in. Tinto (1975) proposed a model of student attrition that works off the idea of student-institution fit. Tinto speculates that a key ingredient in the retention of students is the extent of the congruency between the abilities, needs, interests expectations, and commitments of the students and the academic and social environments of the college or university they are attending. Tinto's model suggests that the degree of integration or "fit" that a student experiences with a school's social and academic environment plays a determining role in a student's decision to either stay in school or drop out.

Pascarella and Terrenzini (1991) concur with Tinto's idea of a relationship between the degree of integration and student retention. They conclude that there is a growing body of evidence which indicates "that measures of social and academic integration do tend to have a differential influence on persistence for different kinds of students" (p. 411). Pascarella and Terrenzini draw two general conclusions from this body of evidence. First, they found that a student would persist if he, she were highly integrated with one system (either the academic or the social system) on campus, even if there was a poor degree of integration in the other area (Pascarella & Terrenzini, 1983; Pascarella &
Chapman, 1983; Pascarella & Wolfle, 1985) (cited in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Secondly, for students who either enter a residential institution with characteristics predictive of withdrawal (i.e. low family education status, low educational aspirations, or low commitment to the institution or the goal of graduation) the level of either social or academic integration does tend to have a positive influence on freshman-to-sophomore persistence. Pascarella and Terenzini (1979) found that interaction with faculty and peers was a positive influence on students who had characteristics predictive of withdrawal. Conversely, students who had higher levels of family education and graduation commitment, interaction with faculty and peers played a lesser role with regards to persistence.

In their 1982 study, Painter and Painter suggests that the consequences of poor college choice are somber ones. Essentially, choosing a college where there is a poor match (defined by SAT scores and academic interest) between student's abilities and personality can cause frustration and anger or "blame-fixing" by both the student and the college. Whereas a right choice, when a college environment fits a student's personal abilities and personality, will result in feelings of both gratification and self-confidence. Hossler and Bean (1990) consider student-institution fit in their work in the retention of students. They assert that one relatively consistent finding is that students leave school because they do not fit in. Whether its because they feel out of place socially, academically, religiously, or economically, or for any other reason, they leave because the school is not meeting their needs.

Defining student-institution fit

When planning to utilize the concept of student-institution fit, one must be able to describe both the student and the institution (the environment) before the level of fit is determined. Describing a student or a student group is fairly straight forward. Information on student's age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, high school rank, ACT or SAT scores, academic and social interests, goals,
etc. are accessible through admissions applications, personality assessments, and entrance and/or exit surveys. Describing and assessing the campus environment is more complex.


Moo's (1974) classification system consists of six dimensions which would be examined in a specific campus environment for its effects on students. The six dimensions are: 1) geographic, meteorological, architectural, and physical design; 2) behavior settings; 3) organizational structures; 4) personal and behavioral characteristics; 5) organizational climate and psychosocial characteristics; and 6) systematic analysis of reinforcers in the environment.

Blocher (1974, 1978) describes three subsystems or structures that should be examined for the analysis of any given environment. In his environmental subsystems approach to conceptualizing campus environments, each of the three subsystems include two or more environmental conditions. The three subsystems are the opportunity structure, the support structure and the reward structure.

The key conditions in the opportunity structure are involvement, challenge and integration. The environment is examined for opportunities students have to be involved in a variety of experiences, to have challenging experiences, and to be involved in these experiences in a safe, contemplative atmosphere.

The second subsystem, the support structure, consists of environmental resources that students have available to them when dealing with stress. Faculty, staff, and peers serve as "performance" models and "positive human relationships", which are the two key conditions of the support structure.

The reward structure is the third subsystem. It provides the environmental conditions of feedback and applications. Feedback refers to the opportunities students have to receive clear, accurate and immediate information about performance with regards to environmental demands. The application
condition is said to exist when students are provided a variety of opportunities where they are able to actively apply new concepts, attitudes and skills in the environment.

Astin (1968) provides a third way to describe college environments. Astin developed the Inventory of College Activities which measures stimuli in the college environment, the college image, and student characteristics. He describes a campus environment as consisting of four factors: 1) peer environment, 2) classroom environment, 3) administrative environment, and 4) physical environment.

Assessing the campus environments An accurate and systematic method of measuring and assessing all aspects of the environment and its interaction effects with students is needed.

Astin and Holland (1961) and Pace and Stem (1958) provided earlier attempts at the measurement of college environments. Astin and Holland (1961) utilized The Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) in their study. This technique is based on the notion that a major portion of environmental forces is transmitted through people. They suggest that the dominant features of an environment are dependent upon the typical characteristics of its members. If there is an awareness of the character of the people in a group, one can get a better indication of the climate that group creates. A few years earlier, Pace and Stem (1958) used the College Characteristics Index to describe college environments.

The ecosystem model (WICHE, 1973) is another attempt to provide a methodology of assessing environments and constructing environments to produce more optimal person-environment fits. The ecosystem model is based on Banning and Kaiser's (1974) "ecological perspective" of the educational environment and the college student. The transaction between the student and his or her environment is the focal point of the ecological perspective. The ecosystem model offers a way to design environments in which the transactions between the student and environment will foster
optimum educational growth and development. There are seven basic steps in the ecosystem design process:

**Step 1:** Designers, in conjunction with community members, select educational values.

**Step 2:** Values are then translated into specific goals.

**Step 3:** Environments are designed that contain mechanisms to reach the stated goals.

**Step 4:** Environments are fitted to students.

**Step 5:** Student perceptions of the environments are measured.

**Step 6:** Student behavior resulting from environmental perceptions is monitored.

**Step 7:** Data on the environmental design's successes and failures, as indicated by student perceptions and behaviors, are fed back to the designers in order that they may continue to learn about student-environment fit and design better environments. (p. 372)

(Williams (1984) cites a number of other approaches for the assessment of campus environments including: The Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) (Pervin, 1987); the Classroom Environment Scale (Moos & Trickett, 1976); The University Residence Environment Scale (URES) (Moos & Gerst, 1976); The Original Climate Index (Stern, 1970); The Activities Index (Pace & Stern, 1958); The College and University Environment Scales (CUES) (Pace, 1969); and The Institutional Goals Inventory (Educational Testing Service, 1972).

Kalsbeek (1987) suggests using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to assess a college environment. The MBTI is a 168 forced choice instrument developed by Isabel Briggs Myers and Katharine C. Briggs to measure Carl Jung's theory of psychological type. The aspect of Jung's theory that the MBTI is based on posits that when one is attempting to understand the differences in the ways people prefer to take in information and make decisions, variations in behavior are seen as consistent and orderly. Four preferences are scored for each respondent who completes the MBTI. There are two types of perception preferences; EI (extraversion and introversion) and SN (sensing and intuition), and two kinds of judgment preferences; TF (thinking and feeling) and JP (the judging
or perceptive attitude of dealing with the environment). Sixteen psychological types can be
generated through the various combinations of these four preferences. Myers (1962) provides a
description of each of these 16 types which covers characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of
each type. The MBTI has been the subject of over twenty years of research and development. It
has been successfully utilized in educational, clinical, counseling (personal and career counseling),
business and research settings (Carlson, 1985).

Kalsbeek (1987) provides an explanation for his proposal of using the MBTI to assess college
environments, "When one considers any academic major at an institution as an academic and social
environment with its own unique interpersonal dimensions, rewards, constraints, challenges, and
supports, then the profile type of the students (as well as the faculty) is vitally important
environmental information" (p. 37). Walsh (1973) (cited in Kalsbeek, 1987) supports this idea.
Walsh proposes that it is the "prevailing or dominant characteristics of a group that, in effect,
determines the essential nature of the environment" (p. 34). Kalsbeek (1987) goes on to say that
"one needs to identify the type of variables that distinguish specific schools or majors in order to
make sense of the student-environment interaction" (p. 37). Knowing what distinguishes one
program from another, regarding student type, one can learn important information about the flavor
of the environment for students. Lynch (1988) believes the MBTI provides not only a way to
examine personality differences among students but also a way to describe the dominant climates of
particular academic and social environments. Kalsbeek (1989) proposes that "by describing a
specific population of students using MBTI dimensions, one can assess the degrees of congruence
various types of students may experience within a prevailing academic and social climate of a
campus" (p. 2). Kalsbeek also adds that the degree of integration or fit experienced by different
types of students in a particular department can be evaluated by using the MBTI to characterize the
departmental climate via an assessment of its faculty.
There have been numerous studies using the MBTI to describe an institution or college environment by looking to the characteristics of its members (Myers, 1980; McCaulley, 1978). For instance, in a study of 488 undergraduates from the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania, Myers (1980) found the highest percentage of students to be ESTJ (21.7%). Of the sample group, 325 students were categorized as the ST type. An organization or group that is considered the ST type is seen as impersonal. These groups place more emphasis on work and work roles rather than the particular individuals who occupy the role. The style of leadership in ST organizations tends to be hierarchical and authoritarian with well-defined rules. This type of group sets realistic, down-to-earth goals which are limited in their scope and time frame, and, more often than not, these goals are narrowly economic.

The Tracking Retention and Academic Integration by Learning Style (TRAILS) program at Saint Louis University the ST type was also most overrepresented in business majors (Kalsbeek, 1987). The SF type, at Saint Louis University, was most overrepresented in the nursing school, and the NT type was most overrepresented in the College of Arts and Science. When comparing the ideal NT and SF groups, extremely opposite characteristics can be seen. NT's like to deal with general theory and impersonal concepts rather than details. With their emphasis on discovery, invention, and production of new technologies, NT's are characterized as Research and Development organizations. On the other hand, SF's are not concerned at all with theory or issues in general. They focus on the detailed human relations in their particular organization. SF's are concerned with the human qualities of the specific people who fill work roles within the organizations. They focus on the interpersonal environment and work to create a personal, warm, human atmosphere. This differs from the ST groups who, as mentioned earlier, are concerned with impersonal, physical detailed work roles.

Schurr and Ruble (1988) classified majors according to the academic preparation and the MBTI characteristics of the students in the major. Business administration, finance, economics,
management and accounting majors were all made up of students with the ST type. In his analysis of majors in the College of Business and public administration at the University of North Dakota, Tedefalk (1988) found that both accounting and banking and finance majors contained a relatively large percentage of NT types. Aviation and management were predominantly ST types. Apostal (1991) reported that "opposite types develop different interests and choose different majors in college...college students with sensing personality orientation tend to major in finance, commerce, education and nursing, whereas those with intuitive personality orientation tend to major in art, psychology and counseling" (p. 64). Myers (1980) concluded that accounting, banking and sales are related to the sensing personality. In a study of the proportions of teachers holding MBTI preferences at various teaching levels, Lawrence (1979) found that the majority of college and university teachers were INTJ types.

As mentioned earlier, what this type of research has to offer, Kalsbeek (1987) suggests, is important environmental information. By knowing which types of students are attracted to certain majors or to certain types of institutions, or by knowing the MBTI profile of the faculty in a given department, one has a way to describe the environment students encounter. This information can provide vital details on the student-environment interactions taking place; interactions which are integral to the whole concept of student-institution fit.

**Student Satisfaction**

There is also a great deal of research that has focused on student satisfaction (Brown, 1968; Morrow, 1971; Nafzinger et al., 1975; Walsh & Russell, 1969; Starr, Betz & Menn, 1972; Netusil & Hallenbeck, 1975). Astin (1977) stressed the importance of student satisfaction, "Given the considerable investment of time and energy that most students make in attending colleges, the student's perception of value should be given substantial weight. Indeed, it is difficult to argue that student satisfaction can legitimately be subordinated to any other educational outcome" (p. 164).
Pervin (1967) provided strong support for the relationship between perceived self-college similarity and satisfaction using the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) questionnaire. Martin (1968) found that initially freshman are relatively satisfied with college but that their satisfaction decreases by the end of their first year. Morrow (1971) found a significant correlation for congruency between personality types and academic major and increased student satisfaction. Starr, Betz, and Menne (1972) reported that satisfaction scores on the CSSQ of dropouts were the highest followed by dropouts with passing grades, and last, dropouts with inadequate grades. In their study on affiliation and retention, Thomas and Andes (1987), found that students who had a favorable impression of, and a greater affiliation with, their school stayed in school. In an article focusing on the student as consumer and "consumer" satisfaction, Chadwick and Ward (1987) propose that students who are dissatisfied with their college experience may, at worst, leave the school before graduating, and at the least, spread "negative word-of-mouth" communication. Enis (1977) (as cited in Chadwick & Ward, 1987) considers the institutions perspective of why consumer satisfaction is important. He suggests that "...we ignore the long-term satisfaction of our customers....A 'satisfied customer' can be very, very valuable to an educational institution in terms of word-of-mouth advertising, as a source of jobs for future students, contributions of money and time, and sharing...real world experiences" (p. 273). Astin, Kom, and Green (1987) reported that undergraduates, after having completed two years of school, were least satisfied with personal services such as career counseling and advising, academic advising, financial aid and job placement. Astin suggests that dissatisfaction with academic advising should especially be of concern "given that advising is probably the principal tool for helping students get involved in their studies...and involvement, in turn, is probably one of the key elements in student achievement and retention" (p. 41).
Intervening Variables: Ethnicity, Age, and Gender

Robertson (1980) used the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) in a comparison of black and white student satisfaction. With regards to the university's system of rewards (compensation), black student satisfaction was found to be significantly lower than that of white students. On the scales of social life, working conditions, and quality of education, black students' satisfaction level was found to be slightly higher than that of white students. The satisfaction level of black students was slightly lower than that of the white students on the recognition scale but was not statistically significant. In addition, even though the overall level of black student satisfaction was lower than that of white students, no significant differences were found.

Lindsey (1982) also utilized the CSSQ along with The University Involvement Questionnaire (UIQ) to investigate black and white undergraduate university student's degree of satisfaction with various aspects of their university environments and their level of involvement in those environments. Lindsey found that the mean total satisfaction scores for black undergraduates at two predominately white institutions were slightly lower than that of the white students, however the differences were not statistically significant. On the scales of working conditions, compensation, and quality of education in their university environments, as measured by the CSSQ, black students were found to be less satisfied than white students.

Hallenbeck (1978) applied the CSSQ in a study of 494 Kent State University students. The sample population was divided into 10 subgroups: sex, age, academic college, academic classification, place of residence, educational background, academic classification, place of residence, educational background, ACT scores, participation in university-registered organizations, attendance at campus events and ethnic background. Hallenbeck found a significant difference, with regards to age, in satisfaction on the CSSQ recognition scale. Students over 29 were more satisfied than students under 23 years of age. This finding was also supported by Roelf (1975). Nontraditional students were found to be more satisfied than all other classifications of students. Off-
campus apartment and home dwellers expressed more satisfaction than residence hall dwellers. Significant differences in satisfaction were not found when students were grouped by sex, ACT scores, level of participation in university-registered organizations, parents' educational background and ethnic background.

With regards to sex differences, Nafziger, Holland and Goffredson (1975) in their study of student-congruency as a predictor of satisfaction, reported that girls had higher satisfaction scores than boys. Betz, Starr, and Menne (1972) had 3123 undergraduates in 10 selected colleges and universities complete the CSSQ. They found that sex differences had a negligible effect. F values were significant for only one of the six satisfaction measures, compensation, the amount of input relative to desired academic output.

Astin (1977) investigated gender as well as ethnicity and student satisfaction. By utilizing follow-up questionnaires, Astin reported that students, in general, maintained relatively high satisfaction with most aspects of their college experiences. Women students were found to be slightly more satisfied with their college experience than men and whites were found to be relatively more satisfied than blacks.

Sturtz (1971) looked into the issues of age and student satisfaction. Sturtz reported that older women (25 or above) were found to be generally more satisfied than younger women (18 to 24).

Conclusion

There is a general consensus among many researchers (Walsh, 1978; Huebner, 1989; Lenning, Beal & Sauer, 1980) that the fit between students and their campuses result in increased satisfaction, achievement, and retention (Williams, 1986). Therefore, as stated earlier, it is the purpose of this study to investigate if the level of institution fit a student within the College of Business, at Iowa State University, experiences with the College of Business is independent of their degree of satisfaction, and further, whether satisfaction and fit are independent of a student's gender, age or ethnicity.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Setting

Iowa State University

The research was conducted within the College of Business at Iowa State University (I.S.U.). Iowa State University is a comprehensive university with an orientation around science and technology and strong programs in the arts and humanities. I.S.U. first opened its doors in 1868 under the Morrill land-grant Act of 1862. I.S.U. was originally known as the Iowa Agricultural College. Today, Iowa State University is composed of the colleges of Agriculture, Business, Design, Education, Engineering, Family and Consumer Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College.

The total enrollment at Iowa State University as of the Fall 1992 semester was 25,263. The undergraduate enrollment was 20,757. Other characteristics of the Iowa State University undergraduate student population include: 41.9% of the population are women, 58.1% are men; 72.4% of the new undergraduates were Iowa residents, 16.7% were from adjoining states, 5.3% were from other states, and 5.6% were from outside the United States; the mean ACT composite score for new freshmen was 24.0; the mean high school rank for new freshmen was 75.0% (99% is high); the most popular undergraduate area of study was pre-business with 1,465 students, followed by elementary education with 938 students, followed by elementary education with 938 students and mechanical engineering with 876 students; 6.0% of the undergraduate students were minorities; and 92.2% of Iowa State University students were enrolled full-time.

The College of Business

Business related courses have been offered at Iowa State University under various headings for the last 63 years. However, it wasn't until July 1, 1984 that the College of Business was officially
formed. In 1991 the college fulfilled the requirements of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business for accreditation. The undergraduate curricula in business is divided into two general phases: a general education (pre-business) program and a professional program. The College of Business offers two degrees: a BBA with majors in accounting, finance, management, marketing, and transportation and logistics, and a BS with a major in general business. As of the fall semester of 1992, there were 1316 students in the pre-business program and 1465 students in the professional program (Iowa State University General Catalog, 1991-1993). Currently, there are 50 faculty members: 11 in accounting, 9 in finance, 16 in management, 8 in marketing and 6 in transportation and logistics. There are 34 tenured faculty, 15 tenured track faculty and 1 terminal position. Forty-four members of the faculty have their Ph.D. and 5 have their D.B.A. There are four administrative positions: Dean, Assoc. Dean and 2 Department Chairs.

Sample

Subjects consisted of students, faculty, administration, and professional staff within the College of Business at Iowa State University. The student sample came from senior-class students taking Management 478, Business Policy and Strategic Management, during the spring 1993 semester. This researcher was allowed into 6 sections, of Management 478. There were 30-40 students in each section. There were 171 students who actually participated for a response rate of 71%. The faculty, professional staff, and the members of the administration within the College of Business were asked to participate in the study in order to determine the MBTI profile of the College of Business for the purpose of describing the college environment.(N=77). There were 36 participants for this group for a response rate of 47%.
Instruments

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

In order to determine the level of student-institution fit, a descriptive measurement of the student and the institution was needed. Working off Kalsbeek's (1989) suggestion that the MBTI profile of the faculty in a given department may describe the academic climate that students are confronted with, as well as the degree of integration or fit different types of students may experience in that department, this study utilized the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), form F, to provide a profile of the students within the College of Business as well as to provide a description of the College of Business. The MBTI, form f, is a 166-item, self-administering, forced-choice, personality assessment indicator (Appendix A). The MBTI is a result of the lifelong work of Isabel Briggs Myers. It is based on C.G. Jung's theory of personality types. According to Jung's theory, personality is structured into 4 mental processes, two perception processes (sensing and intuition) and two judgment processes (thinking and feeling) (Lawrence, 1979). Perception deals with the processes of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas. Judgment deals with the processes of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. In developing a personality type, people will naturally show a preference for using one of the two perception processes, and one of the two judgment processes. Jung also identified a third dimension of personality structure which he called extraversion-introversion. The extraversion-introversion preference refers to people's use of perception and judgment in regard to their relative interest in their outer world (Myers, 1980). People will either be more involved with the outer world of people and things, (extraversion) or with the inner world of concepts and ideas (introversion). In developing the MBTI, Myers elaborated on Jung's theory and added a fourth dimension concerning the attitude taken toward the outer world. A person will either predominantly use the judgment process or the perception process regarding one's outer live.
To summarize briefly, the MBTI identifies 4 dimensions of personality: extraversion-introversion, sensing-intuition, thinking-feeling, and judgment-perception. Myers (1980) provides a summary of the four preferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCE FOR</th>
<th>AFFECTS A PERSON'S CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E I Extraversion or introversion</td>
<td>To focus the dominant (favorite) process on the outer world on ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S N Sensing or Intuition</td>
<td>To use one kind of perception instead of the other when either could be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T F Thinking or Feeling</td>
<td>To use one kind of judgment instead of the other when either could be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J P Judging of Perception</td>
<td>To use the judging or the perceptive attitude for dealing with the outer world (p. 9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 16 possible combinations of these 4 preferences. A person's "type" is created as they exercise their individual preferences regarding perception and judgment. For a full description of the MBTI one is referred to Myers (1962).

In a review of recent assessments of the MBTI, Carlson (1985) concluded that both internal and test-retest reliability of form f has proven satisfactory with r values on individual scales often surpassing .80. Several recent reviews of the research utilizing the MBTI have indicated the need for additional research into the construct validity of the instrument (Carey, Fleming, Roberts, 1989; Carlson, 1985). Apostle (1991) does report that recent research has established MBTI scale

The College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ)

The degree of student satisfaction was measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ), Form C (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1972). Form C of the CSSQ is a 70 item questionnaire that measures five dimensions of college student satisfaction: compensation, social life, working conditions, recognition and quality of education (Appendix A). Starr, Betz, and Menne, 1971) describe the five scales as follows:

**Working Conditions**: The physical conditions of the student's college life, such as the cleanliness and comfort of his place of residence, adequacy of study areas on campus, quality of meals, and facilities for lounging between classes.

**Compensation**: The amount of input (e.g., study) required relative to academic outcomes (e.g., grades), and the effect of input demands on the students' fulfillment of his other needs and goals.

**Quality of Education**: The various academic conditions related to the individual and vocational development, such as the competence and helpfulness of faculty and staff, including advisors and counselors, and the adequacy of curriculum requirements, teaching methods, and assignments.

**Social Life**: Opportunities to meet socially relevant goals, such as dating, meeting compatible or interesting people, making friends participating in campus events, and informal social activities.
Recognition: Attitudes and behaviors of faculty and students indicating acceptance of the student as a worthwhile individual (p.4).

The format is a 5-choice Likert-type that offers response alternatives ranging from "very dissatisfied," through "satisfied" to "very satisfied". Each of the five scales is scored based on the sum of 14 items and the responses for 70 items are summed for a total satisfaction score.

Starr et al. (1972) reports internal consistency reliabilities range from .78 to .84 with a median of .82. In the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire manual, Starr, Betz, and Menne (1971) reports score reliability's for public schools ranging from .78 to .84, and the score reliability range for private schools or .79 to .84.

Procedure

The researcher obtained permission from the College of Business at Iowa State University to conduct the study using their students and members of the faculty, administration and professional staff (Appendix C). After review of an application for approval, which included a brief description of the research, the various forms and letters that were used in the study, and a copy of the MBTI and CSSQ (Appendix A) the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee granted its approval of the study (Appendix D).

The faculty who taught Management 478 during the spring 1993 semester were contacted first by letter (Appendix E) and then by phone, asking permission to enter their classroom to ask for student participation in the study. A script was read to these students explaining the study and pointing out that participation was voluntary (Appendix F). The MBTI and CSSQ was administered during class-time, with faculty approval, to students enrolled Management 478 during the spring 1993 semester.

All groups were provided a brief description of the study and instructions on filling out the MBTI and
the CSSQ, and a demographic information sheet (Appendix G). The MBTI and CSSQ took approximately 50 - 60 minutes to complete. Students were given a candy bar for participating.

The MBTI was also used to describe the College of Business by determining the predominant type of the faculty, administration and professional staff. Members of the faculty, administration and professional staff received the MBTI with a letter of explanation and instruction through the mail (Appendix G). This group was given 35 cents for a "cup of coffee" as incentive to participate.

**Null Hypotheses of the Study**

1) Students within the College of Business will have a high degree of fit with the College of Business. That is, when comparing student's MBTI profile to the College of Business's profile of ENTJ, a higher percentage of the students will match on all four preferences (total fit) than students who vary by one preference (partial fit) or by those who differ on two or more preferences (no fit).

2) There will be no differences in the level of satisfaction between the three levels of student-institution fit (total fit, partial fit and no fit).

3) There will be no difference in the level of satisfaction and student-institution fit when students are compared on the basis of gender, age and ethnicity.

**Testing and Analysis**

To reiterate, the purpose of this study is to investigate if the level of fit that a business student experiences with the College of Business is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction and further, whether their fit and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's gender, age or ethnicity.

To determine the level of fit a student experiences with the College of Business this researcher looked to how the students' MBTI profiles compared with the College of Business faculty, administration and staff's predominant MBTI profile. Data collected from the MBTI were scored to
obtain individual student's personality profiles, as well as the MBTI profile of the individual members of the faculty, administration and staff within the College of Business. This information was compiled with the use of a computer procedure known as the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) (Granade, Hatfield, Smith & Bessley, 1987). Type tables were established for students, and the faculty and administration of the College of Business.

The SRTT program was developed for use in the Myer's Longitudinal Medical Study (McCaulley, 1978). The name, selection ratio, comes from its use in determining which physicians had "selected" certain medical specialties. Other relevant terms can be substituted for selection ratio depending on the research problem. For example it could be called a "dropout ratio" or "index of attractiveness". A selection ratio is calculated by figuring the ratio of the observed frequency to the expected frequency or by dividing the percentage in a type or type grouping by the comparable percentage in the comparison population.

The predominant type for the faculty, administration and professional staff was ENTJ. Other types were, however, also represented within the College of Business (Table 10). Fit between students and the College of Business was defined as total fit, students who matched with the College of Business type on all four preferences; partial fit, those who matched on three preferences; and no fit, those who matched on two or less preferences. The students were divided, based on their MBTI profiles, into these three groups: Group 1 - total fit; Group 2 - partial fit; and Group 3 - no fit.

Hypothesis one was analyzed by comparing the percentages of students in each of the 3 groups (total fit, partial fit, and no fit).

To determine the level of student satisfaction, the CSSQ was scored for each student. Students had a satisfaction score for five scales, plus a total satisfaction score. The analysis used to test hypothesis two was accomplished with the use of SPSS computer program. The three student groups, total fit, partial fit, and no fit, were the independent variable. The student's satisfaction scores on the five scales plus the total satisfaction score was the dependent variable (for a total of 6
satisfaction scores for each student). Six analysis of variances (ANOVA) were run to test for significance. ANOVA is an inferential statistic which is used to determine if three or more group means on one variable are significantly different from each other.

Hypotheses 3 was tested with the 3-way ANOVA. Gender, age and ethnicity were separately tested with the 3 student groups: total fit, partial fit, and no fit, on each of the 5 CSSQ satisfaction scales and the total satisfaction scale.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The following chapter presents the statistical analysis of the data collected from the 171 student respondents and the 36 faculty, administration and professional staff respondents. A summary of the student and faculty, administration and staff demographic characteristics is provided. The students' Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) results are reviewed as well as the faculty, administration and professional staff's MBTI results. The data analysis results used to test the hypotheses are then discussed.

Student Demographic Variables

Age

The majority of the student respondents were traditional-aged college students under the age of 25. Of the 171 respondents, 84.2% were under the age of 25 (Table 1).

Ethnicity

The student group consisted of 88.9% white students, 1.2% African American students, 2.9% Asian American students, 1.2% Hispanic American, and .6% Latin American students (Table 2).

Table 1. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for age of student respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 25</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major

All the students were seniors. Finance and marketing were the two majors with the highest percentage of students, 21.6% each. Management Information Systems (MIS) had 18.1% and accounting had 18.7% students (Table 3).

Attendance

There were 156 full-time students which represented 91.2% of the respondents (Table 4).

Gender

There were 108 male respondents (63.2%) and 61 female respondents (35.7%) (Table 5).

Table 2. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for ethnicity of student respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Amer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Amer.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Amer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Amer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for major of student respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans/Log</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for attendance status of student respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for gender of student respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty, Administration and Staff Demographic Variables

Department

The management department had the highest percentage of respondents with 30.6%. There were 4 respondents from the professional staff (11.1%) and zero respondents from administration (Table 6).

Gender

There were 25 male respondents (69.4%) and 10 female respondents (2.8%) (Table 7).

Position

Nineteen of the respondents were assistant professors (52.8%). Five members of the professional staff responded (13.9%). There were no respondents from the administration (Table 8).

Ethnicity

There were 30 white respondents (83.3%), 2 Asian American respondents (5.6%), and 1 African American respondent (2.8%) (Table 9).
Table 6. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages and cumulative percentages for department of the faculty, administration, and staff respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans/Log</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for gender of faculty, administration and staff respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages and cumulative percentages for position of the faculty, administration and staff respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Frequencies, percentages, valid percentages, and cumulative percentages for ethnicity of faculty, administration and professional staff respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Amer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Amer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Results**

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) results for the faculty, administration and professional staff respondents and for the student respondents were compiled using the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT). Type Tables were established for the faculty, administration and professional staff respondents (Table 10) and for the students respondents (Table 11).

The predominant type for the faculty, administration and professional staff was determined by examining the dichotomous preferences. For the El preference, 55.56% of this group preferred E, while 44.44% preferred I. For the SN preference, 55.56% preferred N over S (44.44%). For the TF preference there was a strong preference for T with 80.56% of the respondents. Finally, for the JP preference, 63.9% of the respondents preferred J. Therefore, the predominant type for the faculty, administration, and professional staff of the College of Business was determined to be ENTJ.

As a group, the students' predominant type was ESTJ. For the El preference, 58.24% of the students respondents preferred E to I (41.76%). For the SN preference, 69.41% preferred S over N (30.59%). This is where the students differed as a group with the faculty, administration and professional staff. For the TF preference there was a strong preference for T (72.94%). Finally for the JP preference 58.24% of the respondents preferred J, while 36.11 % preferred P.

As discussed earlier, this study was concerned with the individual student's fit with the College of Business, not the group fit. For the purpose of defining this fit, the students were divided into 3 groups based on how their individual MBTI profile compared with the College of Business profile of
Table 10. Type Distribution of the Faculty, Administration and Professional Staff of the College of Business and SRTT Comparison with the Business Students in Management 478.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sixteen Complete Types</th>
<th>Dichotomous Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ ISFJ INFJ INTJ</td>
<td>N  %  I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 7 N= 0 N= 1 N= 3</td>
<td>E 20 55.56 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=19.44 %=0.00 %=2.78 %=8.33</td>
<td>I 16 44.44 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I=1.07 I=0.00 I=0.00 I=2.83</td>
<td>S 16 44.44 0.64#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ ISFP INFP INTP</td>
<td>N= 1 N= 0 N= 2 N= 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=2.78 %=0.00 %=5.56 %=5.56</td>
<td>J 23 63.89 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I=0.47 I=0.00 I=2.36 I=1.18</td>
<td>P 13 36.11 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP ESFP ENFP ENTP</td>
<td>N= 1 N= 0 N= 1 N= 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=2.78 %=0.00 %=2.78 %=16.67</td>
<td>F  7 19.44 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I=0.28 I=0.00 I=0.67 I=1.89</td>
<td>N 20 55.56 1.82#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ ESFJ ENFJ ENTJ</td>
<td>N= 6 N= 1 N= 2 N= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=16.67 %=2.78 %=5.56 %=8.33</td>
<td>T 29 80.56 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I=1.01 I=0.34 I=3.15 I=1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 36  I = Self-selection index: Ratio of percent of type in group to % in sample.
* implies significance at the .05 level
# implies significance at the .01 level
* * implies significance at the .001 level

Base population used in calculating selection ratios:
Students/College of Business
Base total N = 170 (missing data = 1). Sample and base are independent.

ENTJ. Group 1 (total fit) were those students who matched on all four preferences (N=10). Group 2 (partial fit) consisted of students who's MBTI profile varied by 1 preferences (N=50). Finally, group 3 (no fit), with the largest number of students (N=111) represents those who matched on 2 or less of the preferences (Table 12).
Table 11. Type Distribution of the Business Students in Management and SRTT Comparison with the Faculty, Administration and Professional Staff of the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sixteen Complete Types</th>
<th>Dichotomous Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>N=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ISTP  | N=10   | N=5    | N=4   | N=8 |
| %     | 5.88   | 2.94   | 2.35  | 4.71 |
| l     | 2.12   | 0.00   | 0.42  | 0.85 |

| ESTP  | N=17   | N=5    | N=7   | N=15 |
| %     | 10.00  | 2.94   | 4.12  | 8.82 |
| l     | 3.60   | 0.00   | 1.48  | 0.53 |

| ESTJ  | N=28   | N=14   | N=3   | N=10 |
| %     | 16.47  | 8.24   | 1.76  | 5.88 |
| l     | 0.99   | 2.96   | 0.32  | 0.71 |

N=170 (missing data =1)  I = Self - selection index: Ratio of percent of type in group to % in sample.  
* implies significance at the .05 level  
# implies significance at the .01 level  
* implies significance at the .001 level  

Base population used in calculating selection ratios: faculty, administration, and professional staff of The College of Business. Base Total N = 36. Sample and base are independent.

Table 12. Frequencies, percentages, and cumulative percentages of students in each of the three groups, which are based on the degree to which student fits with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1/Total Fit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2/Partial Fit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.24%</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3/No Fit</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64.91%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire Results

The following section presents the mean, variance and standard deviation for the five satisfaction scales and the total satisfaction scale of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Table 13). As discussed earlier the format of the CSSQ is a 5-choice Likert-type that offers response alternatives ranging from "very dissatisfied," through "satisfied" to "very satisfied".

Table 13. Mean, variance and standard deviation for the five satisfaction scales and the total satisfaction scale of the CSSQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Working Condition</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>64.49</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Compensation</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Quality of Education</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>58.86</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Social Life</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>69.82</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Recognition</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Total Satisfaction Score</td>
<td>216.64</td>
<td>1029.90</td>
<td>32.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the five scales is scored based on the sum of 14 items and the responses for all 70 items are summed for a total satisfaction score. The resulting scores for the five scales ranges from 14 to 70, with 14 being very dissatisfied, 42 being satisfied, and 70 being very satisfied. This was calculated based on the fact that there were 5 possible answers (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) for each of the 14 items on the five scales. The total satisfaction score for each student potentially ranged from 70 to 350, with 70 being very dissatisfied, 210 being satisfied, and 350 being very satisfied. This was calculated based on the fact that all 70 items were summed for the total satisfaction score and, as stated earlier, there were 5 possible responses (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) for each item. The student results in the form of mean, variance, and standard deviation for each item on the CSSQ can be found in appendix B.

Data Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

Null hypothesis 1: Students within the College of Business will have a high degree of fit with the College of Business. That is, when comparing student's MBTI profile to the College of Business's
profile of ENTJ, a higher percentage of the students will match on all four preferences (total fit), than students who vary by one preference (partial fit) or by those who differ on two or more preferences (no fit). This null hypothesis was rejected. When the dichotomous preferences are examined for the student group as a whole it was determined that the overall type for the student group was ESTJ (Table 11). For the El preference, 58.24% of the students preferred E over I (41.78). When the SN preference was compared, the results indicated that 69.41% preferred S over N (30.59%). For the TF preference, 72.94% of the students preferred T over F (27.06), and 58.24% preferred J over P (41.76). The College of Business's predominant type was determined to be ENTJ (Table 10). For the El preference, 55.56% of this group preferred E over I (44.44%). When looking at the SN preference it was found that 44.44% preferred S over N (55.56%). For the TF preference 80.56% preferred T over F (19.44) and 83.89% preferred J over P. It appears that the only difference lies with the SN preference. The faculty, administration, and professional staff showed a stronger preference for N (55.56) than for S (44.44), while the student group showed a stronger preference for S (69.41%) over N (30.59%). The two groups were fairly close on the other 3 preferences, with regards to the percentage of respondents who preferred E over I, T over F, and J over P.

Even though when comparing the groups as a whole they only differ by one preference, this research is focusing on the individual student's fit with the College of Business. The hypothesis was rejected based on the definition of fit that was established for this study. Students, based on their individual type profile, were divided into three groups. Group 1, total fit, consisted of the students who's type profile matched on all four preference with the College of Business's type profile of ENTJ. Group 2, partial fit, consisted of the students who type profile only differed by one preference. Group 3, no fit, contained the students who matched only on 2 or less of the preferences (Table 12). Group 1 had 10 student respondents (5.85%). Group 2 had 50 respondents (29.24%). Group 3 - No Fit, had the largest number of respondents at 111 (64.91%). Therefore, based on this definition of fit and the fact that Group 3 had over well over half of the respondents, the null hypothesis was rejected.
Null hypothesis 2: There will be no difference in the level of satisfaction between the three levels of student-institution fit (total, partial, and no fit).

This hypothesis failed to be rejected. Six analysis of variances (ANOVA's) were run to test this hypothesis. The 6 scales on the CSSQ, which were used to determine the students' level of satisfaction were the dependent variables. The three student groups (total, partial and no fit) were the independent variables. There were no significant differences at the 0.05 level (Tables 14-19).

Table 14. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on Scale 1 and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1-Working Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.8963</td>
<td>.5009</td>
<td>.6069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>55.6879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Count Mean Standard Deviation Standard Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.2000</td>
<td>4.8488</td>
<td>1.5333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.8163</td>
<td>7.6965</td>
<td>1.0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57.7477</td>
<td>7.53.47</td>
<td>.7152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>57.9118</td>
<td>7.4404</td>
<td>.5706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on Scale 2 and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2-Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.8037</td>
<td>.2044</td>
<td>.8154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>82.2113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Count Mean Standard Deviation Standard Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.7000</td>
<td>7.1500</td>
<td>2.2610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.8170</td>
<td>9.9095</td>
<td>1.4454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46.9806</td>
<td>8.8173</td>
<td>.8688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>47.0875</td>
<td>9.0216</td>
<td>.7132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data = 11
Table 16. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on Scale 3 and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>64.0715</td>
<td>1.1987</td>
<td>.3043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 161</td>
<td>8605.6619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.1000</td>
<td>4.9989</td>
<td>1.5808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.2857</td>
<td>6.3213</td>
<td>.9030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.0476</td>
<td>7.8830</td>
<td>.7693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>41.5854</td>
<td>7.3110</td>
<td>.5716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on Scale 4 and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Life</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>38.5534</td>
<td>.5377</td>
<td>.5851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 161</td>
<td>71.7002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.2500</td>
<td>6.1354</td>
<td>2.1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5918</td>
<td>8.7510</td>
<td>1.2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41.2130</td>
<td>8.4699</td>
<td>.8150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41.1818</td>
<td>8.4437</td>
<td>.6573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on Scale 5 and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 5-Recognition</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.9627</td>
<td>.5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>66.5978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43.4444</td>
<td>8.1411</td>
<td>2.7137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.1429</td>
<td>7.7487</td>
<td>1.1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43.6147</td>
<td>8.3388</td>
<td>.7987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>43.1737</td>
<td>8.1388</td>
<td>.6298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data = 4

Table 19. Analysis of Variance for students' level of satisfaction on the Total Satisfaction Scale and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Satisfaction Score</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.0878</td>
<td>.1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1102.7222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>232.000</td>
<td>21.4009</td>
<td>7.5664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>228.5556</td>
<td>30.6798</td>
<td>4.5735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>231.3861</td>
<td>34.9127</td>
<td>3.4739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>230.5909</td>
<td>33.0159</td>
<td>2.6605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data= 17

**Null Hypothesis 3:** There will be no difference in level of satisfaction and degree of student-institution fit when students are compared on the basis of gender, age, and ethnicity.

This null hypothesis was rejected. The affects of gender, age, and ethnicity were tested with the three student groups: total fit, partial fit, and no fit, on each of the 5 CSSQ satisfaction scales and the total satisfaction scale. There was a significant difference found for both gender (.003) and ethnicity (.009) on scale 2, compensation (Table 20 & 21). There were no significant differences at the .05 level for age, and the three student groups (fit) on satisfaction. For gender, female students were
more satisfied than male students (.003, p,.05). The other scales showed no significant differences for gender. To analyze the effect of ethnicity and the three student groups (fit) on satisfaction the African American, Asian American, Hispanic American and the Latin American students were combine into one group due to the small number of respondents in these categories. A significant difference between white students and the combined student group was found on scale 2, compensation, (.009, p<.05) (Table 21). White students were more satisfied than the combined student group. The other scales showed no significant difference for ethnicity.

Table 20. 3-Way ANOVA. Student Satisfaction on Scale 2 (Compensation) by gender and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>708.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>708.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>50.745</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.372</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=158 (data missing=13)

Table 21. 3-Way ANOVA. Student Satisfaction on Scale 2 (Compensation) by ethnicity and degree of fit with the College of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>560.727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>560.727</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>19.828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.914</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=152 (data missing =19)
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate if the level of fit that a business student experiences with the College of Business at Iowa State University, is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction and further, whether their fit and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's gender, age or ethnicity. Williams (1984) suggests that there is a comprehensive research base that supports the idea of optimizing student-institution fit for improving student satisfaction, achievement, and retention.

The study was conducted at Iowa State University, a major midwestern university of approximately 25,000 students, located in Ames, Iowa. The respondents selected to participate in this study were senior level business students who took Management 478 during the spring 1993 semester and the faculty, administration, and professional staff within the College of Business. Eighty-four percent of the student subjects were under 25. The majority of the student subjects were white (88.9%). The major with the highest number of student subjects was marketing (21.6%) followed by accounting (18.7%) and MIS (18.1%). There was a higher percentage of male student subjects (63.2) than women student subjects (35.7). Of the faculty, administration, and professional staff who responded to the study, 83.3% were white, 5.6% were Asian American, and 2.8% were African American. There were 69.4% male respondents in this group and 27.8% female respondents. The position of assistant professor was the most represented among the respondents (52.8%).

There were 5 members from the professional staff who responded (13.9%) and zero members of the administration participated in the study.

The testing instruments utilized in this study were the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers, 1962), and the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1972). The MBTI, a personality assessment indicator, was used to describe both the students and the College of Business (by testing the faculty, administration, and professional staff within the college).
to determine the level of student-institution fit. The CSSQ was used to determine the degree of student satisfaction.

The student respondents completed the MBTI and the CSSQ during classtime. Participation was voluntary and within the guidelines approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee. There were 10 sections of Management 478 offered during the spring semester of 1993, with 30 - 40 students in each class. This researcher was given permission to enter 6 of these sections. The response rate was high from these 6 sections. The questionnaires took approximately 50 minutes to complete. The faculty, administration, and professional staff were contacted through the mail and were asked to complete the MBTI. There was a response rate of 47%. Of interest was the fact that none of the members of the administration choose to participate in the study. The information gather from the MBTI was organized with the use of the Selection Ratio Type Tables (SRTT). The hypotheses were analyzed using SPSS.

Null Hypothesis one stated that students within the College of Business will have a high degree of fit with the College of Business. That is, when comparing a student's MBTI profile to the College of Business's profile of ENTJ, a higher percentage of the students will match all four preferences (total fit), than students who vary by one preference (partial fit) or by those who differ on two or more preferences (no fit). This hypothesis was tested by using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to provide a description of the College of Business and the students within the college. The faculty, administration and professional staff within the College of Business were asked to complete the MBTI. The resulting predominant type of ENTJ was used to describe the College of Business. Students also completed the MBTI and were divided into 3 groups based on how their MBTI profile matched with the College of Business profile of ENTJ. Group 1, total fit, consisted of students who matched on all four preferences. Group 2, partial fit, consisted of students who matched on at least 3 of the preferences and group 3, no fit, consisted of those students who only matched on 2 or less of the preferences. Hypothesis one was analyzed simply by looking at the percentage of the students
in each of the 3 students groups. Group 3, no fit, had the largest percentage of students at 64.91%.

Therefore, based on the definition of fit that was established for this study, the hypothesis was rejected.

This finding could possibly indicate that students do not necessarily choose an environment that is consistent with their personality. If this finding is accurate it conflicts with theories such as Holland's (1973) personality theory. Holland held the assumption that people search for congruent environments. As stated in Chapter 2, Walsh (1978), in his review of studies using Holland's theory, found consistent support for the assumption that people do choose college environments that are consistent with their personality type. Because this finding does go against the majority of research in the area of student-institution fit, it could also indicate that a different method to measure the level of student-institution fit within the College of Business is warranted.

Null hypothesis two stated that there will be no difference in the level of satisfaction between the three levels of student-institution fit (total, partial and no fit). Hypothesis two was tested by running an analysis of variance (ANOVA) between the three student groups (total fit, partial fit and no fit) and the student's satisfaction scores on each of the 6 scales of the CSSQ. There were no significant differences found, hypothesis two failed to be rejected. This finding suggests that student-institution fit was not a primary factor in the level of student satisfaction. This finding also contradicts research done in this area. In general, research supports the idea that students who fit, who are congruent with, who feel integrated with their environment, have a higher degree of satisfaction and are more likely to persist in the institution (Walsh & Russell, 1969; Chickering & McCormick, 1973; Cope & Hannah, 1975; Tinto, 1975; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Painter & Painter, 1982; and Hossler & Bean, 1990).

Null hypothesis three stated that there will be no difference in level of satisfaction and student-institution fit when students are compared on basis of gender, age and ethnicity. Hypothesis three was tested with the 3-way ANOVA. Gender, age, and ethnicity were separately tested with the 3
student groups (total fit, partial fit, and no fit) on each of the 5 CSSQ scales and the total satisfaction scale. This null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference found for both gender (F=.003, p<.05) and ethnicity (F=.009, p<.05) on scale 2, compensation. Female students were more satisfied than male students and white students were more satisfied than the combined student group of African, Hispanic, Latin, and Asian Americans. This finding suggests that in the area of compensation, that is, "the amount of input required relative to academic outcomes and the effect of input demands on the student's fulfillment of his other needs and goals" (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1971, p. 4) there is a difference between males and females, and between whites and non-whites.

Research supports this finding. As discussed in Chapter 2, Robertson (1980), and Lindsey (1982), both found that black students satisfaction was lower than that of white students with regards to the university's system of rewards (compensation). Nafziger, Holland and Goffredson (1975) reported the females had higher satisfaction scores than boys. Astin (1977) researched gender as well as ethnicity and student satisfaction. He reported that in general, women students were found to be slightly more satisfied with their college experience than men and that whites were found to be relatively more satisfied than blacks.

Recommendations for Future Studies

1) The sample size of students could be increased, and/or students from a variety of classes could be asked to participate to include students who are freshmen, sophomores, or juniors as well as seniors. This could determine whether or not students are more or less satisfied as freshmen, sophomores, juniors or seniors. This research could help the college identify weak and/or strong areas of programming for their students.

2) A different instrument could be used to measure the level of student-institution fit and the degree of student satisfaction. By using different instruments the researcher could see if the results
to this study are replicated or not, again helping the College of Business identify areas for improvement.

3) If the degree of student-institution fit is as low as this study indicates, it would be interesting to investigate the retention rate within the College of Business. This could include follow-up questionnaires to students who do change majors, or drop-out, again to help identify areas within the College of Business that need some sort of intervention.

4) It would also be interesting to follow student after graduation to see how many stay in the business field and to determine their level of satisfaction working in this field. This line of research could offer some insight into career and academic advising by asking such questions as; Are students choosing an appropriate major, and career for themselves? Are students taking advantage of the career and academic advising available?

5) Another consideration is the time it took students to fill out both the MBTI and the CSSQ. Students may have lost interest or hurried through the questionnaires simply to get out of class early, again making the results less than accurate. Perhaps the shorter version of the MBTI could have been used. The use of the CSSQ, as a measure of satisfaction, could be eliminated and a question simply asking if student are satisfied or not satisfied with their college experience could be added.

6) A study could explore student-institution fit, student satisfaction and school climate. School climate is defined as the beliefs, values and attitudes expressed by people in a particular environment (Rutter et al. 1979). One focus in this line of research is the relationship between teachers' perception of the climate to student climate and student achievement (Stewart, 1978). Teachers' perception of satisfaction and dissatisfaction and the effect this has on the climate and student achievement as also been investigated (Hoy & Mishel, 1987). Pulling this all together, it would be interesting to investigate if there is a relationship between teacher satisfaction, student satisfaction, student-institution fit, and student achievement and retention.
Summary

Enrollment stability has been a concern on college and university campuses for years. Whether its the desire to attract and maintain a student population of high quality with certain identifiable characteristics, or its out of concern for attracting and retaining a sufficient number of students to assure the survival of the institution, optimizing enrollment has become a priority for professionals in higher education.

One aspect of student enrollment is that of retention. Retaining students has become just as important as attracting them (Hossler, 1984). Harman (1982) suggests it is the interactions between students and the institution that deserves attention when discussing retention. The concept of student-institution fit speaks to this interaction between student and institution. Williams (1984) contends that one of the results of optimizing student-institution fit is student satisfaction which plays a key role in student retention.

This study investigated the level of student-institution fit and the degree of student satisfaction within the College of Business at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. This study sought to answer the following research question: 1) Do students within the College of Business have a high degree of fit with the College of Business? 2) Is the student level of fit with the College of Business independent of the degree of satisfaction with the College of Business? 3) Does gender, age and ethnicity affect levels of student-institution fit?

There were two groups who were asked to participate in this study, the students enrolled in Management 478, a senior level business course, and the faculty, administration and professional staff within the College of Business. Both groups completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to establish the level of fit between the students and the College of Business. Fit between the students and the College of Business was defined by comparing the individual student's MBTI profile to the predominant MBTI profile of the faculty administration and professional staff. Students were divided into three groups based on their level of fit: group 1 - total fit, matching on all four
preferences; group 2 - partial fit, matching on at least 3 of the preferences; and group 3 - no fit, matching on 2 of less of the preferences. Students also completed the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) to determine the degree of student satisfaction. Demographic characteristics were also collected. Class, age, ethnicity, full-time or part-time status, gender, and major information was requested from the students. Position, department, ethnicity, and gender information was requested from the faculty, administration and professional staff.

The first hypothesis was rejected. There was not a high degree of fit between students and the College of Business. Group 3 - no fit, had 64.91% of the respondents.

The second hypothesis failed to be rejected. There was no significant difference between the student's level fit with the College of Business and their degree of satisfaction with the College of Business. Six ANOVA's were run between the three student groups of total fit, partial fit, and no fit, and student's satisfaction scores on the CSSQ.

The third hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis was tested with the 3-way ANOVA. Gender, age and ethnicity were separately tested with the 3 student groups: total fit, partial fit, and no fit, on each of the 5 CSSQ satisfaction scales and the total satisfaction scale. For both gender and ethnicity, there was a significant difference on scale 2, compensation, of the CSSQ. The other scales showed no significant differences.

While this research did not provide a lot of support for the concept of student-institution fit and student satisfaction, it did raise several questions. One question is whether or not the method used to describe the College of Business was accurate? Even though there was a fairly high response rate of 47% from the faculty, administration, and professional staff within the College of Business, this may not have provided a completely accurate representation of the environment. Of interest is the fact that none of the members of the administration chose to participate in the study. A possible explanation for this is that three of the four administrative position changed July 1, 1992. This is a period of transition for the administration which may have been a factor in their lack of participation.
However, if one assumes that the administration has a great deal of influence over the environment, a reasonable assumption, and if one considers that the College of Business's profile of ENTJ was not the only type represented within this group, but only the predominant type, it brings to question whether or not their lack of participation could have affected the resulting profile of the College of Business. Therefore, the level of fit between students and the College of Business could have been misrepresented.

This group also may have been misrepresented based simply on the nature of the MBTI. It could have possibly had something to do with the profile of the faculty, administration and professional staff who choose to participate and the profile of those who choose not to. Certain profiles are more apt to participate in research studies and take the time to fill out questionnaires. NT's are more likely to deal with general theory and impersonal concepts rather than details. Research and Development organizations are characterized as NT's. It would make sense, therefore, that there was a predominance of NT's in the group of faculty, administration, and professional staff who choose to participate in this research. However, this could have resulted in an inaccurate profile of the College of Business as a whole and thereby not accurately portraying the actual degree of fit between students and the College of Business.

The results of this study should raise some concerns within the College of Business. Two areas of concern that this study does draw attention to is the lack of fit a student experiences with the College of Business and the degree of satisfaction a student receives with regards to compensation. This study indicated that there was a greater percentage of students who did not "fit" with the College of Business than those students who did "fit". Student-institution fit, according to Williams (1984), occurs when student's needs, goals, and interests are sufficiently met by various environmental conditions and when student academic and social abilities interlace well with institutional requirements. Student satisfaction with regards to compensation also appears to be an issue with some students. This research indicated that there was a significance difference found for both
gender and ethnicity when analyzed with the three student groups (total fit, partial fit, and no fit) on student satisfaction. Compensation was defined on the CSSQ as "the amount of input required relative to academic outcomes and the effect of input demands on the student's fulfillment of his other needs and goals" (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1971, p. 4).

Based on the results of this study it is apparent that the College of Business should address the issue of providing an environment where students' needs, interests and goals are met and where students feel that the amount of compensation, with regards to the academic outcome and the fulfillment of goals, and needs, they receive from the environment, is worth the effort students expend.

There are several areas that the College of Business could focus on in the attempt to increase the level of student-institution fit and student satisfaction. A systematic evaluation of the environment, including the various components that make up the environment, is needed to allow for the careful design of interventions which focus on improving the interactions between students and the college. Student marketing and recruitment, orientation, academic and career advising, academic assistance programs, and student and faculty interaction should all be routinely assessed.

Hossler (1984) insists that institutional leaders need to be aware of their current and potential markets when recruiting. Institutional leaders must ask themselves whether or not their college is prepared to meet the particular needs of these students. Another consideration in marketing and recruitment is an accurate assessment and portrayal of the college. The marketing of a program has a great deal to do with the type of student who is attracted. "The ultimate goal is to recruit matriculants who will find attendance at the institution satisfying, stimulating, and growth-producing" (p. 6).

Once students have made their college choice the orientation program should serve to help prepare these students for the environment they are entering. This, again, takes careful assessment
of both the entering students and the environment to allow for the careful planning of programs that can help reduce the anxiety and facilitate student's success in their new environment.

Academic and career advising is one component of the environment that is an important variable in student-institution fit. Hossler (1984) asserts that academic and career advising "has an important influence on the career decisions students make and is related to student satisfaction and persistence" (p. 6). There are several questions that the College of Business should be addressing with regards to academic and career advising. Is there enough contact between students and their advisors? What is the type, quality, and frequency of advising that student receive throughout their education? Are prospective students receiving any type of interest and/or ability assessment to determine if this is particular program is an appropriate choice for them or to determine what interventions the college must take to meet the needs of these students? Do advanced students receive continued career assessment and advise? What type of advising interventions are in place to identify students who may be unsatisfied, who are struggling with academics and/or social demands, who may have made a poor decision with regards to college choice? What happens to the students who appear to have made a wrong choice with regards to major and career?

Academic assistance programs can be of great help is keeping up to date on student characteristics and needs. Current data on the characteristics of potential and actual matriculants, student satisfaction, and student outcomes, is needed to design appropriate intervention programs within the college.

Finally, the college should be routinely assessing the interactions between students and faculty. Terenzini and Pascarella (1977, 1980) assert that this interaction between student and faculty is an important variable in student satisfaction and retention. Also, in terms of compensation a student experiences, student-faculty interaction has the potential to make a significant impact. Several key questions should be asked. How much contact is there between students and faculty both inside and outside the classroom? Are the faculty aware of characteristics such as age, interests, abilities, and
learning styles of the students they are teaching? Are teaching styles being evaluated and possibly adjusted according to the needs of the these students? What do students want in regards to relationships with the faculty? What is the students' perception of this relationship?

In conclusion, the results of this study did not provide conclusive support for the concept of student-institution fit and student satisfaction. However, because of the uncertainty in regards to the accuracy of the level of fit between the student and the College of Business as determined by this study, and because there is a great deal of research that does support the positive impact that student-institution fit could have on a college or university campus, more research is merited. Through accurate conceptualization of the environment, assessment of student-environment interaction, and intervention to optimize the fit between students and their campus, a significant impact could be made in terms of student satisfaction and, consequently, student retention, thereby, meeting the needs of both the student and the institution.
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APPENDIX A.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FROM THE MBTI AND CSSQ
College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire - Form D, 1989 Revision
by Ellen L. Betz, Nancy E. Betz, and John W. Menne

Direction given for answering questions on the CSSQ

Mark your answers on the answer sheet by blackening the space, numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 which best represents how satisfied you are. Use the following key:

1 – If you are VERY DISSATISFIED.
2 – If you are SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3 – If you are SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4 – If you are QUITE SATISFIED.
5 – If you are VERY SATISFIED.

Sample question from the CSSQ

INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOUR ARE WITH:
1. The chance you have of doing well if you work hard.
2. The chance to work on projects with other students.
3. The places provided for students to relax between classes.
4. The ability of advisors in helping students develop their course plans.
5. The concern here for the comfort of students outside of classes.
6. The chance to explore important ideas.
7. The pressure to study.
8. The size of the classes I'm required to take.
9. The things you can do to have fun here.
10. The appropriateness of the requirements for your major.
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator - Form F
by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers

Directions Given in Question Booklet

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to these questions. Your answers will help show how you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people's can help you understand where your special strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy and be successful doing, and how people with different preferences can relate to each other and be valuable to society.

Read each question carefully and mark your answer on the separate answer sheet. Make no marks on the question booklet. Do not think too long about any question. If you cannot decide on a question, skip it but be careful that the next space you mark on the answer sheet has the same number as the question you are then answering.

Read the directions on your answer sheet, fill in your name and any other facts asked for, and work through until you have answered all the questions.

Sample questions from the Myers - Briggs Type Indicator

Which answer comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?

1. When you are with a group of people, would you usually rather
   a) join in the talk of the group, or
   b) talk individually with people you know well?

2. In reading for pleasure, do you
   a) enjoy odd or original ways of saying things, or
   b) like writers to say exactly what they mean?

3. Is it harder for you to adapt to
   a) routine, or
   b) constant change?

4. Do you admire more the people who are
   a) conventional enough never to make themselves conspicuous, or
   b) too original and individual to care whether they are conspicuous or not?

5. Do you think that having a daily routine is
   a) a comfortable way to get things done, or
   b) painful even when necessary?

Which word pair appeals to you more?

6. (a) firm-minded           warm-hearted (b)

7. (a) foundation            spire (b)

8. (a) accept                change (b)

9. (a) affection             tenderness (b)

10. (a) theory               experience (b)
APPENDIX B.

STUDENT CSSQ RESI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Covariance</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Item Variances = 61.02  
Coefficient Alpha = 0.95

Total Satisfaction Score
Mean = 216.64  
Variance = 1029.90  
STD = 32.09
APPENDIX C.

LETTER FOR APPROVAL FROM COORDINATOR OF UNDER

THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
February 12, 1993

To: Human Subjects Review Committee

From: Ann Coppernoll Farni
Coordinator-Undergraduate Programs
College of Business

Re: Thesis proposal for Rachel Baron-Hanson

Rachel has the support of the administration in the College of Business to utilize the student and faculty resources in the college for the study proposed in her master's thesis.
APPENDIX D.

INFORMATION FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects
Iowa State University
(Please type and use the attached instructions for completing this form)

1. Title of Project: Masters Thesis - Student - Institution Fit and Student Satisfaction

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

   Rachel Baron - Hanson  2-15-93
   Typed Name of Principal Investigator  Date  Signature of Principal Investigator

   Professional Studies - Higher Education  100 Alumni Hall  29A-0627
   Department  Campus Address  Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of other investigators

   Date  Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   □ Faculty  □ Staff  □ Graduate Student  □ Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)
   □ Research  □ Thesis or dissertation  □ Class project  □ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   □ # Adults, non-students 300-400  # ISU student  □ # minors under 14  □ other (explain)  □ # minors 14-17

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.)

   The purpose of this research is to investigate if the level of fit (or congruency) that a business student experiences with The College of Business at Iowa State University is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college experience, and further, whether their "fit" and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's age, gender, or ethnicity.

   The sample will consist of 300 - 400 students, the 50 faculty members, and the 4 members of the administration within The College of Business. Two instruments will be utilized: The Myers - Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and The College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Starr, Betz, Menne, 1972).

   Continued on next page

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent:
   □ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
   □ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)
   □ Not applicable to this project.
The MBTI is a 166 item, self-administering, forced choice, personality assessment indicator. The MBTI will be used to provide a description of both The College of Business and the individual students. The students will be asked during classtime (with faculty approval) to fill out the MBTI. The faculty and administration of The College of Business are being asked to participate to provide a description of the college. The faculty and administration will receive a letter of explanation, a copy of the MBTI, and information sheet and an answer sheet in the mail. The resulting predominant MBTI profile of this group will be used to describe The College of Business for purposes of comparison with the student MBTI profile and for determination of the various levels of fit that students within The College of Business are experiencing.

The CSSQ is a 70 item questionnaire that measures five dimensions of college student satisfaction: compensation, social life, working conditions, recognition and quality of education. The format is a 5-choice Likert-type that offers response alternatives ranging from "very dissatisfied", through "satisfied", to "very satisfied". A total satisfaction score is figured for each student. The student satisfaction score will be compared to the student's level of fit to determine whether or not the level of fit a student experiences is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college experience. The students will be asked to complete this questionnaire during the same class period that they receive the MBTI.
Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9.)

All participation by faculty and staff will be voluntary. Results of the MBTI and CSSQ will be kept confidential with limited access. All test results will be kept by the researcher in a locked file. At the conclusion of the study any coded information used for the purpose of follow-up will be deleted.

(Access will be limited to this investigator, Dr. Dan Robinson for scoring and Dr. Ann Coppenoll Farni for advising and programming within the College of Business.)

What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.)

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts for the subjects.

CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research:

- □ A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- □ B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- □ C. Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- □ D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- □ E. Deception of subjects
- □ F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or □ Subjects 14 - 17 years of age
- □ G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prisons, etc.)
- □ H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D  Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E  Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F  For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents or legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Items G & H  Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.

Approval is needed from the College of Business at Iowa State University. Letter of Approval is attached.
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. [X] Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. [ ] Consent form (if applicable) 1NA

14. [X] Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. [X] Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Contact</th>
<th>Last Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/22/93</td>
<td>3/26/93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Month / Day / Year  Month / Day / Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

[ ]

Month / Day / Year

18. S

Date

Department or Administrative Unit

[ ]

2/5/93

21/8/93

Prof. Keith

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

[X] Project Approved  [ ] Project Not Approved  [ ] No Action Required

Patricia M. Keith

Name of Committee Chairperson

Date

Signature of Committee Chairperson

6:1/90
APPENDIX E.

LETTER TO FACULTY REQUESTING PERMISSION TO UTILIZE CLASS - TIME FOR RESEARCH
Dear
My name is Rachel Baron - Hanson. I am a graduate student in higher education - student services. I am conducting a research study for my masters thesis which focuses on student - institution fit and student satisfaction. The purpose of my study is to investigate if the level of fit (or congruency) that a business student experiences with The College of Business at Iowa State University is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college experience, and further, whether their "fit" and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's age, gender, or ethnicity.

The sample will consist of The College of Business faculty, administration and professional staff and 300 - 400 students currently majoring in business. I would like to request the use of 1 class period of each section of Management 478 to conduct my research with the students. The students will be asked to fill out 2 questionnaires and an information sheet, hopefully during class time. This should take approximately 1 hour.

I will be contacting you in person during the week to February 22 to see if we can arrange a class time in which I can conduct the research with the students. If at all possible, I would like to contact the classes during the first and third week of March.

I know giving up a whole class period is asking a lot, however, I feel I will have a better return rate and will also lower the costs of the study by asking the students to complete the questionnaires during class time.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (h)233-6083 or (w)294-0827, or call Dr. Ann Coppemoll Farni at 4-8343, or Dr. Dan Robinson at 4-9550. Your help would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rachel Baron - Hanson
APPENDIX F.

ID TO EACH CLASS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY
Script to be read to class

My name is Rachel Baron-Hanson. I am a graduate student in higher education, student services and am conducting a research study for my master's thesis.

My research is focused on Student - institution fit and Student satisfaction. The purpose of my study is to determine if a student's level of fit with The College of Business is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college environment and further, whether their "fit" and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's gender, age, or ethnicity. The phrase student - institution fit refers to "the degree of fit or congruency between student needs, abilities, interests, and goals and the ability of the institution to adequately respond to those needs, abilities, interests, and goals. The "institution" in this case is the College of Business and the "student" will be students, such as yourselves, who are majoring in Business. I have the approval and cooperation of the administration of the College of Business to conduct this research and I would greatly appreciate your help.

Your participation in this study will only consist of completing two questionnaires, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and The College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. This will take approximately 1 hour to complete. The faculty and administration of the College of Business are also being asked to complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This questionnaire is being used to define the level of fit between students and The College of Business. The College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire is being used to determine the degree of student's satisfaction with their college experience.

Your participation is voluntary and if you do choose to participate confidentiality is assured. Please take the time to read the letter of explanation in your packets for further information and clarification of the study, as well as the instructions for each of the questionnaires. Be sure to use the appropriate answer sheet for each of the questionnaires. Also, please fill out the information sheets. When you have finished the questionnaires and information sheet please return all the material in the envelope to me. If you choose not to participate, simply return the packet intact to me.
APPENDIX G.

LETTERS OF INSTRUCTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

N TO STUDENTS IN MANAGEMENT 478 AND THE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION AND

PROFESSIONAL STAFF WITHIN THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Dear College of Business student:

The faculty, administration and a student sample from The College of Business has been selected to participate in a research study on student-institution fit and student satisfaction. Student-institution fit has been described as "the degree of congruency, or fit, between student needs, abilities, interests, and goals and the ability of the institution to adequately respond to those needs, abilities, interests, and goals (Williams, 1984). The purpose of the study is to determine if a student's level of fit with The College of Business is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college environment and further, whether their "fit" and satisfaction levels are independent of the student's gender, age, or ethnicity.

The student's degree of satisfaction will be measured with the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1972). The CSSQ is a 70 item questionnaire designed to measure the satisfactions and dissatisfactions of college and university students. Satisfaction is measured on five scales: compensation, social life, working conditions, recognition and quality of education. The CSSQ will take 10-15 minutes to complete.

To determine the level of fit a descriptive measure of both the college and the student is needed. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) will be used to describe both The College of Business and the students involved in the study.

The MBTI is a 166 item, self-administering, forced choice, personality assessment indicator. It identifies 4 dimensions of personality: extraversion or introversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perception. A person's "type" is created as they indicate their individual preferences on the MBTI with regards to perception processes and judgment processes. The MBTI will take 30-40 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be strictly confidential and the results will be kept in a locked file with limited access. Participation will be anonymous, you do not need to provide your name. All participation is voluntary. A summary of the results will be made available at the completion of the study. The data collected from this research will be used for the author's thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a MS in Education. This research will hopefully prove to be very beneficial to you, as students, with regards to improved academic and career advising, improved methods of teaching, and use in further research. YOUR PARTICIPATION WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED!!

Please complete the two questionnaires using the corresponding answer sheets and the information sheet and return them to me in the envelope as soon as you are finished. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to ask questions during the testing time or contact me at (w) 294-0827 or (h) 233-6083. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rachel Baron - Hanson
Graduate Student in Higher Education

Dr. Dan Robinson
Professor and Section Leader
Higher Education
You do not need to fill in your name, or any other facts on either of the questionnaire answer sheets. Please do fill out this information sheet.

1) Year in school (Junior, Senior....)

2) Major

3) Male     Female

4) Ethnicity

5) Age

6) Attending school full-time     or part-time
Dear College of Business faculty, administration, and professional staff member:

The faculty, administration, professional staff, and a student sample from the College of Business has been selected to participate in a research study on student-institution fit and student satisfaction. Student-institution fit has been described as "the degree of congruency, or fit, between student needs, abilities, interests, and goals and the ability of the institution to adequately respond to those needs, abilities, interests, and goals" (Williams, 1984). The purpose of the study is to determine if a student's level of fit with the College of Business is independent of the student's degree of satisfaction with their college environment.

The student's degree of satisfaction will be measured with the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1972). To determine the level of fit a descriptive measure of both the college and the student is needed. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) will be used to describe both the College of Business and the students involved in the study.

The MBTI is a 166-item, self-administering, forced choice, personality assessment indicator. It identifies 4 dimensions of personality: extraversion or introversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perception. A person's "type" is created as they indicate their individual preferences on the MBTI with regards to perception processes and judgment processes.

The MBTI has been used in many settings including: educational, clinical, counseling, business and research settings. It has also been used to describe specific environments by providing a profile of the members of the environment in question. **This is where your participation is greatly needed.** The faculty, administration, and professional staff of the College of Business are being asked to complete the MBTI. The resulting predominant MBTI profile of this group will be used to describe the College of Business for purposes of comparison with students MBTI profile and for determination of the various levels of student-institution fit.

Your participation will require only 30-40 minutes to respond to the 166 items on the MBTI and the information sheet. Your responses will be strictly confidential. Participation will be anonymous, you do not need to provide your name. A summary of the results will be made available at the completion of the study. The data collected from this research will be used for the author's thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a MS in Education. This research will hopefully prove to be very beneficial to you, your students, and the College of Business with regards to academic, and career advising, evaluating methods of teaching, and use in further research. **YOUR PARTICIPATION WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED!!**

Please return the questionnaire, answer sheet and information sheet to myself at 396E Carver no later than March 5. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (w) 294-0827 or (h) 233-6083. Thank - you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rachel Baron - Hanson
Graduate Student in Higher Education

Dr. Dan Robinson
Professor and Section Leader
Higher Education
Faculty, Administration, Professional Staff information sheet

You do not need to fill in your name, or any other facts on the MBTI answer sheet. If you would like to know the results of your MBTI, please note the number in the upper right hand corner of the answer sheet. Results will be left with Dr. Ann Coppemoll Farm in 396 Carver. Please do fill out this information sheet and turn in with the questionnaire.

1) Position (faculty, full professor/ asst. professor, etc. or administration position).

2) Department

3) Male_________ Female_________

4) Ethnicity