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INTRODUCTION

In *A Guide to Research Design: Institutional Research Program for Higher Education* (33) the authors suggest that in the last decade the study of the college student and his environment has accelerated remarkably. A host of books, such as Sanford's *The American College* (59), has reported a variety of research by social scientists. In the span of five years the informal National Institutional Research Forum has grown from several dozen workers to include, as the newly-constituted Association for Institutional Research, several hundred professionals from as many institutions who hold a major and formal responsibility for studying problems of local or national interest. A number of major conferences on student development have been held by individual colleges, foundations, and educational associations. Major institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and M.I.T. have elaborate long-term studies involving masses of data on students and their development or change over the college years. This emphasizes the surge of interest which has recently occurred in research regarding the study of the college student and his environment.

This surge of interest has not occurred in a complete vacuum of earlier landmark studies. In the 1920's the work of R. C. Angell (1) exhibited many of the characteristic concerns and procedures that are reflected in the best thinking of the current decade. Learned and Wood (32) reported in 1938 the classic analysis of lower and higher education in the state of Pennsylvania that was begun in the late 1920's. The frequently cited eight
year study (14), or the important institutional studies such as those at the University of Minnesota (52), Bennington College (44), or Stephens College (34) have dealt with such matters as follow-up of alumni, attitudinal change as a function of college experience, and specification and revision of the general educational program. Studies concerned with the prediction of performance date back to the introduction of ability testing.

Yet, as Bidwell (10) has pointed out, many of the early studies viewed simply the student, environment, or outcome variables. Students were conceived as capable or not capable in terms of scholastic aptitude and academic preparation, a single factor such as "good teaching" represented the crux of the environment, and grades or persistence constituted the evidence of educational results.

New and pervasive interest in institutional research and in the student surely derives essentially from the rapid change that is possible within any institution of higher education in the current decade. Larger numbers of applicants force expansion, or permit, through selective admissions, new levels of instruction; the larger proportions of the college age population which seek higher education, together with changes in the labor market precipitated by technological development, force consideration of new curricula and increasingly diversified programs. Facts are needed to facilitate the decisions that must be made, or to suggest solutions for periodic problems. Those who manage institutions or programs within them cannot wait to see what the next year may bring, and then
accommodate with casual adjustments to a slightly modified reenactment of the year past. The change within a single year can be so great that last year's admissions philosophy, or staff, or budget is not only inapplicable but also impertinent.

With the need for action research has come to be a new enlistment of a variety of social scientists. Some of these have challenged the most basic and cherished beliefs that academia have taken for granted, as did Jacob (31) in suggesting that not much change in the basic values of the student takes place. Others, like Heist (25) and his co-workers at the University of California's Center for the Study of Higher Education, or the team of personality theorists at Vassar in the 1950's, have legitimized through fresh and basic work a broader formulation. Sociologists such as Newcomb (44) and Gottlieb and Hodgkins (23) have investigated student subcultures, and Eckland (18) has devoted major attention to follow-up studies of college dropouts. Astin (2), Stern (65), and Pace (49, 50) have given substantial thought and energy to new and productive ways of characterizing and measuring some significant dimensions of the college environment. Cooperative studies that cut across many campuses, such as current programs of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, or the College Research Center initiated by a number of eastern women's colleges with assistance from the College Entrance Examination Board, produce a host of useful cooperative data while offering an opportunity for united efforts on common problems. Longitudinal studies such as those of Davis (15) at the
National Opinion Research Center show the value of sustained inquiry over time. The sum total of these varied efforts is an invigorating and productive attitude toward research in this area; and the accumulation of findings stand as evidence that, although the problems are complex with many significant factors, research in higher education is assuming a full maturity. No longer does a simple demonstration that intelligence is related to grades, or that students remember instructors longer than texts, cause much excitement or free the researcher to study nonacademic activities.

Still another modern development is a better recognition that institutions of higher education differ in important ways. The American college is, in reality, many different colleges. As Eble (17) reflects, the university diversity may be commonly perceived along a value continuum from good to bad. Yet, a case can be made for this diversity as a source of strength. The growing democratization of higher education, the establishment of new institutions and programs to meet genuine needs of a changing society, add honest and credible value to variety in educational environments. But whatever an institution may be within this diversity, it may define itself most effectively by placing itself in the range that exists on the significant dimensions. Change in desirably or effective directions may be facilitated by establishing points of reference.

When viewing the American college as not one large institution but rather a number of smaller groups within one large structure it becomes important to determine the elements of the smaller groupings. It is with this in mind that the investigator under-
took to determine differences in the perceptions among various groups in residence centers at Mankato State College and to compare the expressed perceptions of Mankato State College students with students' perceptions at other institutions.

In the spring of 1963, under the direction of Dr. David N. Hess, Vice President for Student Services, a re-evaluation was made of the residence center environment at Mankato State College. The conclusion of this evaluation indicated that the centers in the past, as well as at present, had been little more than living units. Very little academic or extra-curricular programming occurred within the residence centers. Therefore, it was the decision of the administration of the institution to employ five new positions within the residence centers. These positions were termed "Educational Coordinators." The people serving in these positions have the following qualifications: one has a masters degree in philosophy, one has completed the course of study for a Ph.D. in Russian-Chinese relations, one has a masters degree in political science, one has a masters degree in guidance and counseling, and the fifth is pursuing a masters degree in guidance and counseling.

It is the function of these people to assess the personal, social and academic needs of students in their particular residence center and innovate programs to meet those needs. This may be in the form of academic programming as well as extra-curricular and social programming. Each of these people has a staff of graduate Resident Advisers and undergraduate Resident Assistants. The number of staff in each hall varies depending on the capacity and occupancy
of each hall. These persons are mainly concerned with the everyday operations of the center and with the maintenance of discipline within the centers. A number of the Resident Adviser positions are filled by Civil Service personnel – the state of Minnesota still maintains this system. Therefore, there are four distinct categories of personnel within each hall. These are as follows: Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students. Since this is the start of a new program in the residence center area at Mankato State College, it was determined that it would be useful to obtain measures of perceptions of residence center personnel and perceptions of the students regarding their environment.

The purpose of this study was to compare perceptions among groups within the institution (residence centers specifically) and to compare perceptions of the Mankato State College students with national norms established by Pace (47) with regard to 48 institutions of higher education.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In a paper presented to the National Council on Measurement in Education in 1967, Menne (39) outlined three approaches to the study of the college environment. The first approach is concerned with objective readily-measured institutional characteristics such as number of students, percentage of males, tuition, operating budget per student, number of library books, etc. Astin and Holland (9) seem to be the first to have used this technique. Its development has been reported through a series of studies by Astin (4, 5, 6). Richards, Rand, and Rand (58) have also reported a thorough study of junior colleges using this objective method. This procedure has been called the Environmental Assessment Technique and will be discussed later in this chapter.

The second approach is concerned with student perceptions of the institutional environment. Pace and Stern (54) seem to have originated this approach with the development of the College Characteristics Index (CCI) from which Pace (51) developed his College and University Environment Scales (CUES). Using a similar approach Hutchins and Nenneman (29) have developed and used an instrument (the Medical School Environment Inventory, MSEI) especially designed for the study of medical schools. Fanslow (19) has developed the College Environment Inventory for Women (CEIW). In this approach students are asked to respond whether an item does or does not pertain to their institution. The items pertain to various aspects of the college environment. Institutional scores are derived. This
approach will also be further discussed in this chapter.

The third approach is less developed than the first two approaches. It measures specific observable student behaviors such as time spent in study, number of social activities per week or attendance at certain events (7). A similar study at the University of Massachusetts was reported by Shomer and Stanfield (60). This approach will also be briefly described later in this chapter.

The remainder of this chapter will be developed around these three techniques for the evaluation of college environments. Special consideration will be given to student perceptions research.

Institutional Characteristics

One approach to environmental assessment employs student input and output variables in assessing the environmental effects. Most of these studies have been done under auspices of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation or through government grants. The rationale for such evaluations of college environments is the belief that the character of a social environment is dependent on the nature of its members.

Astin (4) used this theoretical framework in studying the doctoral output of two hundred sixty-five colleges and universities. He reported that the actual doctoral outputs of a variety of institutions could be predicted with substantial accuracy from a knowledge of the abilities, major fields, and sex ratios of the student bodies. No consistent relationship between a college's
productivity and specific characteristics of its environment were found. This led to the suggestion that colleges do not differ appreciably in the extent to which they stimulate their students to seek higher academic attainment or inhibit them from seeking such attainment. The only exceptions to this were the overproductivity of public institutions and the underproductivity of eastern men's colleges. Astin hedged somewhat on these significant differences and interpreted them as resulting from his not making allowances for all the relevant differences in student input. The results also suggest that doctoral productivity may not be a sensitive measure of the effectiveness of undergraduate institutions.

Soon after reporting the above findings, Astin and Holland (9) developed the Environmental Assessment Technique. Based on the notion that the character of any social environment is dependent upon the nature of its members, the Environmental Assessment Technique measures the campus climate in terms of some characteristics of the student body: size, average intelligence, and six personal orientations (determined by the percentage of students majoring in courses defined as Realistic, Intellectual, Social, Conventional, Enterprising, and Artistic). These orientations were derived from Holland's theory that an individual's choice of major (vocation) is related to his personality type. According to the authors, the major advantage of the instrument is that it assesses the campus in terms of eight readily-available measures, which reduces both the expense and computational procedures.
This assessment technique is based on the premise that a major portion of the environmental forces is transmitted through other people. It can be inferred from this that the character of a social environment is dependent upon the nature of its members. Moreover, the dominant features of the environment are seen to be dependent upon the typical characteristics of its members. It follows then that if the character of the people in a group can be determined, the climate that group creates can be determined. Astin and Holland then assume that the college environment, or press, is a product of the following attributes of the student body: (1) number of students in the college, (2) average intelligence of the students, and (3) six personal orientations. Each of the personal orientations is determined by the number of students majoring in specific curricula. These eight variables comprise the Environmental Assessment Technique variables, and provide the researcher with a means of studying environment in terms of a variety of educational and personal outcomes. Tests of the validity of the Environmental Assessment Technique were made by correlating results obtained by using the Environmental Assessment Technique with results obtained by using the College Characteristics Index. The results led Astin and Holland to conclude that the attributes of the student body reflect a major portion of what has been called the college press or environment. The press characteristics (as measured by the College Characteristics Index) of a particular school can be predicted with modest success by using the Environmental Assessment Technique.

Astin (5) also reports on a factor analysis of thirty-three
major attributes of colleges that he performed in order to ascertain the principal dimensions along which higher educational institutions differ. The institutional characteristics analyzed consisted of financial, student, faculty and miscellaneous. Six identifiable factors emerged in the initial analysis. These factors were termed affluence (wealth), size and graduate emphasis, private versus public, masculinity versus femininity, homogeneity, and realistic (technical) emphasis. Astin proposes the use of these factors to represent the principal dimensions along which collegiate institutions vary and then profile the institutions in terms of factor scores derived from one or two of the highest loading variables on each factor. If these factors are expressed in normalized standard score units, it becomes possible to compare the profile of different institutions.

Heist (25) also illustrated the diversity among college and university students by viewing the range of academic abilities among institutions. He also presented differences in personality characteristics among select and supposedly rather homogeneous groups of students of superior ability. This difference among student bodies and within student bodies is a part of the overall environment and influences the productivity of an educational institution.

An input-output design for controlling differential student input was designed and applied by Astin (3) in a four-year longitudinal study of 6544 high aptitude students. Doctoral aspiration was found to be negatively related to the size of the student body, the
percentage of males in the student body, and the conventional orientations of the student body. The social orientation also affected the doctoral aspiration significantly, but the relationship was rather complex and diversified, with the largest positive and largest negative effects occurring in adjacent intervals. Attendance at a coeducational liberal arts college appeared to increase a student's motivation to seek the doctoral degree, whereas doctoral aspiration tended to be reduced by attending one of the northeastern men's colleges. In a quasi-experimental study like this, there remains the possibility that the significant results are due to uncontrolled input variables, rather than to differential influence of the institutions. However, Astin controlled a variety of input variables while using a large sample of subjects, which would make it seem likely that the significant differences found between expected the actual doctoral aspiration rates are in part a result of different environmental influences.

Another study by Astin (5) produced findings relevant to the above findings. In this study, Astin found that the aspiration of the talented student to obtain the doctoral degree was negatively related to the size of the student body and conventional rigid orientation. Institutions with high scores on these two Environmental Assessment Technique variables tended to emphasize sports and social activities at the expense of academic pursuits. According to the student informants, faculty members at these institutions had fewer contacts with the students, were poorer teachers, and were resentful of criticism. In addition, size and the conventional orientation were
the only Environmental Assessment Technique variables significantly related to the perceived effect of college on important improvement in study habits. For both variables the correlation was negative. It was concluded that a college environment characterized by this complex of attributes tends to discourage the pursuit of higher academic degrees.

A survey of the freshman classes enrolling at 248 colleges and universities was conducted by Astin (8) in the fall of 1961 to determine some of the major distinguishing characteristics of entering student bodies. Six major distinguishing characteristics of the students were: (1) intellectualism, (2) estheticism, (3) status, (4) leadership, (5) masculinity, and (6) pragmatism. The six factors identified in these analyses seem to represent a meaningful and concise scheme for describing some of the more important characteristics of the entering freshman classes, and could provide a means of characterizing or describing student bodies objectively. Perhaps this would be an aid in describing the typical student to the high school student who is attempting to choose the most appropriate college.

Astin (8) then explored the way these six student input variables were distributed among different types of colleges and universities. He found that the characteristics of entering freshman classes were highly related to certain characteristics of the college. Multiple regression analyses indicated that five of six freshman input factors (intellectualism, estheticism, status, masculinity, and pragmatism) could be estimated with substantial accuracy from known
characteristics of the institution. When the type of institution was controlled, differences between entering student bodies in different geographic regions were found to be negligible.

In attempting to determine the personal and environmental factors associated with college dropouts among high aptitude students, Astin (7) completed a four-year longitudinal study of 6660 high aptitude students. An analysis of the effects of fifteen college characteristics was performed, using thirty-eight student input variables as control data. The fifteen characteristics were affluence, size, rational orientation, intellectual orientation, social orientation, conventional orientation, enterprising orientation, artistic orientation, masculinity I & II, homogeneity, private control, women's colleges, northeastern colleges for men, and technical institutions. No significant college effects on the male student's tendency to drop out of college were found. The female student's chances of dropping out were found to be increased if she attended a college with a relatively high proportion of men in the student body. This was indicated by the masculinity I & II characteristics which proved significant at the one percent level. The variables women's college, affluence, and private university affected dropping out of college significantly at the five percent level.

Nichols (45) studies a sample of 356 National Merit Finalists attending ninety-one colleges in an attempt to assess the effects of colleges on student Graduate Record Examination performance.
He found that northeastern men's colleges tended to increase verbal relative to quantitative scores while technical institutes and state universities tended to increase quantitative scores relative to verbal. The student's major field of study had a similar reciprocal effect on the verbal and quantitative scores, but most of the differences between colleges remained when the effect of major field of study was controlled. The size of the college effects was small relative to the variability attributable to differences between students which existed before the students entered college. This would seem to indicate that there is a different type of academic press between these types of schools.

Perceptual Approach

Inventory of College Characteristics

Thistlethwaite (68) attempted to identify features of effective learning environments by examining the validities of the CCI items. The criterion of item validity was the extent to which the responses differentiated between high- and low-ranking colleges on a measure of adjusted productivity. Thistlethwaite (68) combined items on the basis of intercorrelations and item content and added new items of similar content to each cluster. The new inventory, called the Inventory of College Characteristics, consisted of nine faculty and nine student press scales, six of which were related to student aspirations to seek advanced training.

In an effort to improve the instrument and reduce redundancy, Nunnally, Thistlethwaite, and Wolfe (46) disregarded the scales...
and separated the 180 items into two equal groups, one containing statements concerning faculty behavior and the other items concerning student behavior. Each set of items was administered to over 550 University of Illinois freshmen and sophomores. To increase reliabilities, the students responded along a seven-point scale instead of dichotomously. The sets were then individually factor analyzed, with six factors emerging from each analysis. The "faculty press" factors were termed Systematized Energy, Toughness, Availability to Students, Interestingness of Lectures, Interest in Arts and Humanities, and Vocational Emphasis. The dimensions of "student press" were identified as Intellectual Drive, Personal Appearance and Manners, Competition, Science Interest, Pressure Against Scholarly Activities, and Interest in Visiting Speakers.

**College and University Environment Scales**

As was true of the Inventory of College Characteristics, the College and University Environment Scales represents a derivation of the CCI. Research by McFee (38), in which the matched AI-CCI responses of the same students were analyzed, had indicated that the CCI and AI were not entirely parallel. Stern (65), however, has continued to employ the need-press concepts in his research on college environments, noting that, within schools the patterns of student needs and environmental press are similar. Pace (51), on the other hand, has focused his attention on an approach which "is a direct analysis of environmental differences between institutions and proceeds without reference to any personality measures."
In developing the CUES, Pace started with a sample of 50 institutions representative of the national distribution of student enrollments in four-year, regionally accredited colleges and universities, and roughly stratified according to geographical region and public-private control. A factor analysis of the CCI responses of random samples of students in these institutions yielded five factors. Specific item responses (percentage of students responding in the keyed direction) were available for 48 schools. These 300 CCI item responses were then correlated with the five factor scores across the norm group of 48 institutions to determine the most discriminative items. Finally, comparisons were made between the 13 highest-scoring and 13 lowest-scoring institutions on each item. The result of these analyses was a set of five factors consisting of 30 items each.

A general description of the CUES and the five scale factors, as provided by Pace (48) is presented in the Method and Procedure chapter.

According to Michael and Boyer (40) the CUES should provide at least three important advantages over its forerunner, the CCI: (1) a more parsimonious evaluation of institutional differences, (2) greater score reliability, and (3) scores that can be related to somewhat more representative normative data.

In Comparison of CUES Results From Different Groups of Reporters, Pace (47) traces his work with the development of measures of college environment. In 1956-1957 a grant from the
College Entrance Examination Board supported the first effort to develop measures of the college environment. Further refinements and alternative approaches were subsequently supported by grants to Pace from the Carnegie Corporation, the Social Science Research Council, and the United States Office of Education. With the publication of the College and University Environment Scales in 1963 by Educational Testing Service, a reasonably reliable and valid instrument became available for general use. This report (33) was the first in a series. It describes a number of comparisons that have been made between results obtained from different groups of reporters on the campus. Basically it is concerned with three topics: (1) evidence of the reliability and validity of the CUES scores, (2) advice about the interpretation of CUES under various conditions, and (3) some special ways in which CUES have been used. Further topics are being planned to deal with the following: (1) the use of CUES with prospective and entering students, (2) the uses of CUES in junior colleges, and (3) the use of CUES for describing subculture in complex universities.

The following conclusions were drawn by Pace. It was concluded that when based on comparable samples of students, CUES scores are highly stable over a period of one or two years. When CUES are administered in the same institution five or seven years apart, there is still considerable stability in the results. At the same time, the direction of change in the perceived environment over this span of years reflects differences which one would expect from the national evidence of student unrest, independence, and concern about
the larger society and thus CUES scores appear to provide a valid documentation of the changing character of college environments.

In comparing perceptions of men and women at Cornell College, Colorado, Beloit, Brigham Young, Earlham, Miami (Ohio), Wheaton (Ill.), Ripon, Coe, Macalester, and Montreat-Andreson, Pace found scores of men and women to be the same on the Practicality and Scholarship scales and nearly the same on the Awareness scale. Substantial differences were apparent between the perceptions of men and women on the Community and Propriety scales.

In comparisons from 16 institutions there were substantial differences between student and faculty perceptions except on the Practicality scale.

In comparisons among freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, Pace indicates freshmen view the environment much differently than the upperclassmen. The conclusion was based on responses from seven institutions. Comparisons obtained from four institutions indicated that tentatively the perceptions of residents and commuters are basically similar. Comparisons among different academic fields yielded mostly small unimportant differences on the Practicality, Community, and Propriety scales. Large differences did occur on the Scholarship scale.

Comparisons between successful and unsuccessful students yielded no important differences.
The College Characteristics Index (CCI), developed by C. Robert Pace and George G. Stern at Syracuse, represents the first effort to provide an objective assessment of college environments. The CCI was developed as the environmental counterpart to Stern's previously developed Activities Index (AI). The theoretical framework on which these instruments is based is Henry Murray's dual concept of need and press. Murray defines a need as "a construct...which stands for a force...in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, unsatisfying situation." The term "press" represents a property or attribute of an environmental object of a person which enhances or impedes the efforts of the individual to reach a given goal. Thus, a press can either satisfy or frustrate a need. In Murray's words, "the press of an object is what it can do to the subject or for the subject—the power that it has to affect the well-being of the subject in one way or another."

Each instrument consists of 30 ten-item scales, designed to assess 230 of Murray's hypothesized needs and their corresponding press. The Activities Index (AI) items are statements of socially acceptable activities to which the student indicates his "Like" or "Dislike." The CCI items are general statements about college life relative to which the student responds "True" or "False" depending on whether or not the statements are characteristic of his college.
The study of environmental perceptions had its beginning in 1938 when Murray (41) described the need-press concept. Individuals were seen as having characteristics of needs, and the strength and relationships of these needs were what characterized the personality. In a corollary fashion, the environment was seen as having potential for satisfying or frustrating these needs. The model for studying behavior was thus the interaction between personality needs and environmental press.

In 1956, Stern, Stein, and Bloom (66) elaborated on this need-press concept by applying it to assessment studies and showing that the prediction for performance was improved as one defined the psychological demands of the situation in which the performance was to occur. The psychological demands of the situation are the environmental presses.

In 1957, Pace and Stern (55) constructed the first version of the College Characteristics Index, applying the concept of environmental press to the study of college atmosphere. The instrument was constructed as a parallel to the Activities Index, which is an inventory of personality needs that had been previously constructed by Stern. Thus, a pattern of personality-needs scales was paralleled by a corresponding pattern of environmental-press scales. An environmental press for order would be suggested by such features of the college as: "professors usually take attendance in class," or "in many classes students have an assigned seat," and so forth. A personality need for order would be suggested by liking such activities as: "keeping an accurate
record of the money I spend," or "arranging my clothes neatly before going to bed," etc. In answering the College Characteristics Index, students act as reporters, saying what they believe is generally true or not true of their college. The items refer to a wide variety of topics - rules and regulations, facilities, student-faculty relationships, classroom methods, extra-curricular activities, etc. The rationale for its conception was that "all these characteristics and events and practices, added together, constitute an educational press upon the awareness of the students. The aggregate awareness of students about their college environment constitutes as much of a press in the sense of exerting a directive influence on their behavior."

In 1959, Thistlethwaite (68) reported the results of a study he had conducted that was aimed at determining the kind of environment which was conducive to National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test participants' realization of their potentialities. He used the percentage of the alumni who later earned their doctorates as a criterion of environmental effect on achievement. The College Characteristics Index was used to measure the environmental press and identify student cultures and faculty characteristics which apparently motivate students to seek the doctorate. The student reports on the College Characteristics Index provided abundant evidence that the environmental press differs considerably among different colleges. The college environment appeared to be an important determinant of the student's motivation to seek advanced
intellectual training. The environmental conditions which stimulated achievement in the natural sciences appeared to differ from those which stimulated achievement in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

In another similar study where the differences in talent supply were adjusted, and motivation to seek the doctoral degree was used as a measure of productivity, Thistlethwaite (67) reported the following behavior as being characteristic of the faculties of schools which were high in natural science productivity: (1) their contacts with students are characterized by informality and warmth, (2) they emphasize high academic standards and give examinations which are genuine measures of the student's achievement and understanding, (3) they have high standards for evaluating faculty productivity and selecting new faculty members, they value pure scholarship and basic research, and the course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are otherwise outstanding, (4) the faculty does not play the role of Big Brother (students need not sit in assigned seats and attendance is not taken; student organizations are not closely supervised to guard against mistakes; faculty members are tolerant and understanding in dealing with violations of rules), and (5) they tend to be more nondirective in teaching methods (students find it relatively hard to predict examination questions and to take clear notes in class; instructors less frequently outline explicit goals and purposes for courses; students are not required to submit outlines before writing term papers and reports). By contrast, the traits of faculty members who are out-
standingly successful in productivity within the arts, humanities, and social sciences are described as: (1) excellent social science faculty and resources, (2) a high degree of energy and controversy in instruction, (3) broad intellectual emphasis, (4) frequent contacts with students outside the classroom, (5) a flexible, somewhat unstructured curriculum, (6) emphasis on independent study and the development of a critical attitude, (7) excellent offerings in the arts and drama, and (8) relatively infrequent appraisals of student performance. The emphasis upon preparing for graduate study and freedom from close supervision appeared to be the only similarities in the two productivity measures or factors.

Pace (49) reported in 1960 on the use of the Activities Index and the College Characteristics Index in distinguishing differences between college environments. When administered across a wide segment of schools, several fairly clear patterns of environments emerged. Two such patterns were both strongly intellectual, with one more strongly oriented toward humanism, sentience, and reflectiveness, and the other more strongly oriented toward scientism, uncertainty, and competition. The third pattern emphasized the practical and applied rather than the abstract or theoretical, and is heavily concerned with establishing status in relation to peers and accepting status in relation to authority. The fourth cluster exhibited a strong press toward group welfare, human relations, and social responsibility. The fifth cluster suggested a rebellion against the well-managed, group welfare oriented community.
Pace (50), in another publication, reported on the patterns of inter-relationships these clusters form:

The humanistic and scientific clusters are positively related, because of their common intellectual component, and both are negatively related to the practical, status-oriented cluster. The humanistic cluster, however, is unrelated to either the social welfare or the rebellion clusters. The scientific cluster, on the other hand, is negatively related to social welfare, and positively related to rebellion. The practical, status-oriented cluster has a positive, but low relationship to social welfare, and a somewhat higher positive relationship to rebellion.

Using the Activities Index and the College Characteristics Index to measure respectively the needs and press at different universities, Stern (65) noted that the same dimensions were involved in the organization of needs and presses and that these dimensions were not artifacts attributable to the parallel nature of the Index forms. Stern (65) then described the intellectual orientation in the high intellectual climate as compared to the schools having a low intellectual climate. It is interesting to note that the twenty-five items representing the climate with the high intellectual orientation were answered in the same way by 90.8 percent of the students representing the eleven schools that were seen as having low intellectual orientation. The twenty-five items characterizing the low intellectual orientation received a 79.8 percent consensus of student response.

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

Stern (65) also reported findings indicating definite differences
in the administrative and organizational make-up of the schools with
high versus low intellectual orientation. These differences were:
(1) low schools had, on the average, six times as many students as
the high schools, (2) the low schools have almost four times as many
men undergraduates as women, whereas the high schools have a near sex
balance in their undergraduate population, (3) the high schools were
all private and non-sectarian, whereas five of the seven accredited
low schools were public institutions, (4) the middle and low
schools offer a variety of technical and occupational programs,
whereas the top eleven were oriented toward a general program in the
liberal subjects and teacher preparation, (5) great differences in
faculty-pupil ratio and faculty characteristics existed between the
high and low schools, (6) the financial assets of the high schools
are substantially greater than the financial assets of the low
schools for all forms of capital except buildings and grounds, and
(7) the cost of a college education at a high school and low school
were substantially different. Perhaps it should be noted that these
factors are similar to those Astin and Holland employed when constructing the Environmental Assessment Technique.

Using a somewhat different approach, Davis (16) undertook the study of intellectualism by surveying 33,982 seniors at 135 American colleges and universities. He had the students respond to certain questions about the purposes of a college or university. These responses were divided into two groups—answers that related to or were important to the student personally, which were considered a measure of the true value climate of intellectualism; and responses that were important to the typical student at the campus, which were considered as a measure of the perceived climate of intellectualism. The study revealed the following findings: (1) a large proportion of students at private, small institutions of high quality endorsed intellectual values, whereas only a small proportion of students at lower quality institutions (principally large public institutions and technological schools) supported intellectual values, (2) the climate of perceived values was positively related to the climate of true values, (3) the perceptions that students held regarding an institutional climate were distorted toward their own values, (4) students who maintained relatively high grade point averages tended to furnish lower estimates of the intellectuality of their campuses, and (5) relatively marked discrepancies between the degree of perceived intellectuality and true intellectuality were associated with the geographic location of the college. Davis interpreted this as being the snob factor. Davis based his index of school
quality on the average level of ability of the freshmen enrolled at each college.

Birney and Taylor (11) describe two broad realms of activity the college student is faced with: (1) college classes, study, exams, intellectual activities, and (2) peers whose norms regarding dating, socializing, and so on, have a demand character. Effects of these two main types of activity will depend in part on the nature of reinforcement which the student finds within them. The curriculum offers grades, faculty recognition, prestige, and a sense of mastery of a certain body of material. The student culture offers prestige for a social leadership, peer recognition, and a sense of escape from the curricular demands. The student in this demanding situation, presumably attempts to maximize his rewards and minimize his penalties by developing a mode of operation which he hopes will be successful. Birney and Taylor designed a study based on the above theoretical foundation to test the theory that curricular behavior would be systematically related to the conception of attitudes toward scholastic and social areas of activity. They developed a sixty item Likert-type questionnaire dealing with college life that would yield a scholastic and social score for each subject. Their findings indicated different attitudinal patterns regarding school endeavors are held by students characterized as: (1) high SCHOLASTIC - high SOCIAL, (2) high SCH - low SOC, (3) low SCH - high SOC, (4) low SCH - low SOC. It appeared to Birney and Taylor that the chief variables at work were ability, talent, orientation to college, and reinforcement patterns provided
by the college. These variables were seen to constitute stable patterns of behavior by the senior year and have value in estimating the educational experience of the student.

Standing (64) used the College Characteristics Index to obtain a measure of student and prospective student perceptions of the environment at both the University of Utah and Brigham Young University. An analysis of the data revealed that there were significant differences between the anticipations of the University of Utah and Brigham Young University environments, though the environments are similar. He also found that the anticipations of the environment by prospective students remained relatively stable over a two-year period. The anticipated perceptions differed significantly on many CCI scales from the environment as seen by the students attending BYU. Generally, the entering student expected more emphasis on intellectual variables than was present within the environment. Significant differences were noted between the two measures of the existent Brigham Young environment as reported by students attending Brigham Young University a year apart. The environment at Brigham Young University seemed to be moving in the direction anticipated by entering students; i.e., more emphasis on intellectual variables.

Webb and Crowder (69) found significant differences in student perceptions of Emory University as reported by upper division and lower division students in their responses to items on the College Characteristics Index. The upperclassmen seemed to see a less ordered and controlled environment and a more placid, less intense,
less cautious environment, and freer of pragmatic and status-seeking demands. They also saw less demand for achievement, scientism, and reflectiveness than the lower division students. There were twelve scales on which the faculty differed from the students. The faculty saw more evidence for press supportive of dependency on the part of the student - more affiliation, nurturance, succorance, adaptiveness, and conjunctivity, but less order and less change, but more impulsion and play. There seemed to be close agreement in respect to the intellectual press.

When Webb and Crowder analyzed the faculty-student differences at the level of individual items, they were able to note definite and significant differences in the area of campus life. The items of difference seemed to indicate considerable formality in faculty-student relations along with indications of aggression by the students. This formality seemed to result in misunderstanding and conflicts on attitudes, activities, and objectives. The student wanted greater faculty contact, but the faculty, to a large extent, was unaware that such contact was not available.

Weiss (70) conducted a study of student and faculty perceptions of the environment at St. Louis University. He found significant differences existed in the intra-institutional comparisons of responses. The five undergraduate divisions varied significantly on all factors of the College Characteristics Index. He reported that faculty ratings of the environment were generally higher than those of students. In general, the ratings given by women students and freshmen were
significantly higher than other student ratings. The freshmen rated
the environment conditions higher at the beginning of the semester
than they did at the end of their first semester of attendance.

In a recent review of studies of college environments, Pace
and McFee (53) came to the conclusion that a variety of concepts
and methods have been useful, that there is no general agreement
about what concepts or methods are most powerful or essential, and
tabulations show that no general theory or pattern of analysis has
yet found wide acceptance. This reviewer would concur in this
conclusion.

It would seem that the crucial issue is not the choice or
development of methods, but the choice of questions to which the
methods may be addressed. The fullest advancement of understanding
about college environments will come not only from applying the
most rigorous methods, but also from using a variety of methods to
explore the wisest questions researchers can formulate.

Objective Measures

In this third section the studies of student performance can
be further divided into the following aspects: academic achievement,
attrition, and changes in academic major.

Academic achievement

The forecasting of academic achievement has probably received
more attention than any other area in the educational-psychological
literature. Motivation for this research has been attributed to a
number of related factors, including: (1) the emphasis by certain institutions practicing selective admissions, (2) an increased concern in guidance procedures, especially with regard to underachievement, (3) the increased number of college applicants, and (4) the development of standardized aptitude and achievement tests, which require subsequent validation (22). Another concern is in the identification of high-potential students for placement into advanced honors programs.

Despite continuous efforts to determine the correlates of successful academic performance, the gain in predictive efficiency during the past quarter century has been negligible (40). The most common finding is that previous academic performance is the most accurate indicator of collegiate performance. In their comprehensive survey of the literature covering 580 studies during the period from 1948 to 1958, Fishman and Pasanella (22) found high school rank to correlate about .50 with first-year college grade point average (based on 263 studies), and .48 with grade point beyond the first year (based on 31 studies). Combining high school record with one or two aptitude measures increases the correlation with first-year grades to around .62 but rarely does it exceed .70. Another finding is that predictive validities are generally higher for women than for men (61).

The usual explanation given for the limited success in predicting scholastic achievement is the unreliability of the grade point average criterion. Fishman (21) has pointed out that students with
higher ability tend to enroll in more difficult courses and that there exists large variances in grading practices both within and between departments at any given college. To overcome these problems, he has advocated the use of specific area gradepoint averages and the use of uniform achievement tests as criterion measures.

Some investigators have even questioned the validity of measuring "educational success" solely on the basis of grades (26, 35). Nevertheless, overall gradepoint continues to be the most frequently used index of college performance since it is quantitative, ever available, and has certain practical utility.

Recognizing the limited value of prior achievement and aptitude measures, researchers have attempted to identify nonintellective variables (personality traits, study habits, social adjustment, motivation, etc.) related to achievement. Although several studies have yielded considerable relationships between these variables and grades, when the effects of intellective factors are removed, the gain in prediction has generally been quite small. The obvious reason for these results is that high school performance (the most commonly used "intellective" factor) is affected to a large degree by the same nonintellective variables that influence college performance. Another problem in the use of these variables is the possible existence of nonlinear relationships with the criterion. For example, test anxiety may either hinder or enhance performance depending on the student.
Attrition

High dropout rates, especially among the academically capable, represent one of the more visible problems in higher education. Summerskill's 40 year survey of college dropout research, as summarized by Boyer and Michael (12), indicated a median student loss of 50 percent. In his recent review of attrition studies, Marsh (36) cited evidence showing that each early-leaver represents a financial loss of over $1,000 to the college or university.

Attrition studies are generally considered an extension of academic achievement research, with the dichotomous classification of students as persisters or dropouts replacing grade point average as the criterion of success. Ability measures, while known to account for a portion of dropouts at the low end of the scale do not explain why students with average or high ability and grades often leave. As in the studies of discrepant achievement, investigations have attempted to determine nonintellectual factors associated with attrition.

Heilbrun (24) attempted to predict first-year dropout among 169 University of Iowa freshmen women on the basis of their responses to Gough's Adjective Check List (ACL) Need Scales. By combining ACL scores with ability level, four groups were identified: (1) negative index – low ability, (2) positive index – low ability, (3) negative index – high ability, and (4) positive index – high ability. The attrition rates for these groups were 72, 46, 37 and 16 percent, respectively.
Prediger (57) investigated the usefulness of a biographical inventory as a supplement to cognitive measures in predicting persistence through two early years of college. The sample consisted of 1710 entering students at the University of Missouri who were categorized into four groups on the basis of attrition status and grade point average. The results indicated that the biographical data made no unique contribution to group differentiation. Ability and past achievement helped only to the extent that persistence is partially dependent upon grades.

Three studies seem especially relevant, in that they have attempted to examine both personal and environmental factors related to attrition. Two of these studies were inter-institutional in scope, while the third focused directly on one campus situation.

Nasatir (42) showed the importance of the student's immediate environmental surroundings on his tendency to persist. The subjects were 310 University of California (Berkeley) men who were assigned to one of six dormitories in a more or less random manner. At the end of two years, the attrition rates varied from 0 to 56 percent. These differences were explained by the interaction of three variables: (1) individual orientation (academic or nonacademic), (2) dormitory orientation (academic or nonacademic, defined by the proportion of students with an academic orientation), and (3) individual integration (integrated or not integrated, defined by the amount of time the student spent with other members of his dormitory). Analyses suggested that
harmony between the student and his surroundings was an important factor in persistence.

In a four-year longitudinal study of 6660 high ability students attending 120 institutions, Astin (3) explored withdrawal, while holding 38 student input variables constant. The predictor (input) data included 18 items concerning the students' educational aspirations, vocational plans, socio-economic status, aptitude and high school achievement, and (for 1080) responses to the California Personality Inventory (CPI) and Inventory of Beliefs (IB). The environmental variables consisted of the EAT variables and certain factors from Astin's (4) analysis of 335 institutions. A dropout was defined as a student who had not yet received his bachelor's degree and was not currently enrolled in school. Eleven input variables were related to the dropout criterion (.05 level), of which 7 were significant for both sexes. Dropouts were more likely to: (1) have ranked relatively low in their high school class, (2) have not planned initially to attain an advanced degree, and (3) come from a relatively low socio-economic background.

An analysis of personality factors (for 502 men and 200 women) indicated that none of the IB scores and six of the eighteen CPI scales were significantly predictive of withdrawal, based on point-biserial correlations. Dropouts tended to: (1) over-emphasize personal pleasure, (2) be more aloof, (3) be more self-centered, and (4) be more assertive. However, the highest multiple correlations (four variables, uncross-validated) were only .44
(women) and .29 (men). None of the 15 college variables significantly influenced attrition among men, while five showed significant effects for women. But when masculinity entered the equation, the effects of the other four variables disappeared. Thus, women who enter predominantly male colleges are more likely to drop out, possibly due to dating, early marriage and responsibilities, or because of an intellectual climate that is incompatible with their interests or aspirations. Astin suggests that future research, among other things, should include data about the student's expectations about his college.

Nelson (43) compared 100 randomly selected four-year institutions with very low freshman attrition rates (5 percent or less) to a similarly derived sample of 100 institutions with higher rates (5.1 percent or higher) on 22 college variables. These included seven nonpersonal variables (i.e., cost, type of control, size of library, etc.) and 16 personal variables (relating to the student body; i.e., the eight Environmental Assessment Technique variables, five input factors from Astin's 1964 study, etc.). Statistical analyses revealed that 15 of the variables, 10 of which referred to student body characteristics, differentiated between the high and low institutions. These 15 variables fell into four general categories, suggesting that institutions that are large or in large towns, are less affluent, more masculine, or less selective tend to have higher attrition rates. The author concluded that both personal and nonpersonal factors are relevant on the dropout problem. It is interesting
to note that Astin's study provided no evidence that environmental factors were important (except masculinity, but for women only), whereas Nelson concluded that they were.

**Changes in academic major**

Compared to achievement or attrition research, relatively little effort has been expended in identifying the factors related to the student's decision to change his major field of study. Two studies on the topic were uncovered.

In his study of talented students, Thistlethwaite (67) also collected data regarding the "holding power" and attractiveness of various fields of study. During the first three years of college, the proportions of men and women majoring in the natural and biological sciences decreased while the proportions majoring in the social sciences and humanities increased. However, the retention rate for men in the natural sciences (81 percent) was significantly greater than the rates for the biological sciences (64 percent) or arts and humanities (69 percent). The reason for the decrease in the natural and biological science fields was their failure to recruit new students. For women, arts and humanities had the highest retention rate (75 percent), which was significantly greater than the natural sciences (60 percent), social sciences (60 percent, or 61 percent), or biological sciences (51 percent). Like men, the women were least attracted to the natural sciences as a new field of study. Thistlethwaite concluded from other portions of data that failure to find a stimulating instructor in the student's
initial major field is a deterrent to his remaining in that field, that the student is reattracted to new majors by exposure to more stimulating instructors, and that many students drop out of a field because their expectations of certain career fields prove to be incompatible with reality.

Pierson (56) found that 30 percent of the bachelor degree candidates at Michigan State University (class of 1958) were scheduled to graduate in majors other than those first selected. In a further analysis of 403 seniors who had altered their initial study plans, 29 percent did so during the freshman year, 45 percent while sophomores, 26 percent did so while juniors, and two students changed during the senior year. The general tendency was for students to leave the scientific or technical fields. Reasons for and feelings about having changed majors were obtained from a 10-item questionnaire. Eighty-five percent of the students indicated no dissatisfaction over the consequences of having switched majors. The most frequent reasons for changing were: (1) "After being in college awhile I learned about another major that suits me better" (68 percent), (2) "The content of many courses required in my original major was quite different from what I had expected" (49 percent), and (3) "My knowledge about the jobs (related to my original major), at the time I chose that major, was incomplete or incorrect" (43 percent). The author concluded that the university should provide entering students with more accurate information regarding curricular and vocational opportunities and requirements in its various majors.
Bushnell (13) approaches the student culture at Vassar in just the way an anthropologist would approach the study of an American Indian tribe. He offers a picture of life as it is lived by the students from day to day and from semester to semester. In Bushnell's conceptual scheme there is in each American college a student culture and an academic (faculty and administration) culture. The two are in a contact situation in which the faculty has accepted the task of acculturating the underdeveloped nation of students, while the students are much taken up with socialization and the enculturation of these students within their own group. It is within this scheme that Bushnell describes some of the bases and forms of student resistance to the acculturation endeavors of the faculty.

Hughes, Becker, and Geer (27) conceptualize student culture much as Bushnell does. They see it as a system of definitions of the problems and situations with which students are confronted and asset of understandings and agreements concerning ways in which the problems might be solved and the situations mastered. Student culture in medical school seemed to have two major functions: (1) to provide modes of adaptation that make the pressures of the school tolerable and not too upsetting to the individual students, and (2) to provide support for patterns of behavior which, though they are in the interest of students as they see it, may be at variance with what is desired by the faculty and administration. Sometimes this pattern of behavior was in direct defiance of faculty assignments.
and goals. The researchers provide an accurate and detailed account of the enculturation process and group cohesiveness that develops from shared goals, pressures, and needs that are brought on by the school environment and interacting elements within the environment.

Siegel and Siegel (62) reported findings that the environmental membership group affects an individual's attitude even if it is an imposed group and is not accepted by the individual as his reference group. If the person does accept the membership group as his reference group, then the change in attitudes toward the level of the group norm is even more pronounced. These findings were arrived at through a well-controlled and thorough study of housing assignments at Stanford University. Even though this study and the study by Gottlieb and Hodgkins (23) used different approaches to the study of attitude and behavior change, both studies point out the need to consider the diversity of reference groups within the student population.
Summary

In summarizing this review the investigator has discussed three approaches to the study of college environment as outlined by Menne (39). The first of these approaches was concerned with the objective readily-measured institutional characteristics. The second approach was concerned with student perceptions of the environment. The approach dealt with specific observable student behaviors.

The importance of environmental study can best be summarized by the following quote (37):

What is the relationship between the press exerted by the institution and the kind of student attracted and affected by it? How do students respond to men and women instructors? What are the characteristics of the various subcultures which exist on a college campus, and how do they interact and interrelate? What differences exist among patterns of courses elected by different types of students? How do students differ from each other with respect to their reaction to administrative regulations? Are there ways in which some marginal students can be supported in order to allow successful completion of a college experience? What evidence is there to support changes in the curriculum? What are typical and atypical college life patterns? Are they different for men and women?

If an institution goes far enough even to consider such issues through the tools of research, it will have begun to modify its program for the better. If it actually accumulates data, it may find support for the critical decisions that lie ahead. And if it acts on the basis of evidence, education might be improved.

By reviewing the three approaches to the study of college environments the investigator learned that there is more than one way in which to investigate the college environment. With this as background the investigator selected the perceptual approach to investigate the problem as defined at Mankato State College.
METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Description of Sample

During the 1968 New Faculty Orientation at Mankato State College the investigator administered the College and University Environment Scales to the Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, and Resident Assistants, all of whom are residence center employees.

The institution created five new positions during the summer of 1968, and the people employed in these positions were to act as "Educational Coordinators." Each of these persons is in charge of one of the four residence centers, with the exception of one center accommodating 1200 women. There, two Coordinators are employed. These people are charged with the responsibility of developing the residence centers into living-learning units. Their functions are primarily focused on programming rather than that of discipline. A response was obtained from each of the five Coordinators.

The college also employs Resident Advisers who live in, and are responsible for, specific wings of the residence centers. Each wing houses approximately 200 students. The Resident Advisers' functions are primarily concerned with the procedural operation of the center and the maintenance of discipline within the centers. Most of these positions are filled by graduate students or Civil Service personnel (referred to as nonstudents in order to distinguish them from the full-time undergraduates). However, two of these positions are filled by undergraduates. From 20 Resident Advisers, 13 responses were
obtained. (Table 1) Of the four responding Resident Advisers in

Table 1. Resident Advisers responding to the College and University Environment Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence center</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Nonstudent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElroy (Men)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 36.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searing (Men)</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford (Women)</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage (Women)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 100.0</td>
<td>11 100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McElroy Center, all were graduate students or Civil Service employees. Of the four responding Resident Advisers from Searing Center, one was an undergraduate student and the other three were graduate students or Civil Service employees. Of the two responding Resident Advisers from Crawford Center, one was an undergraduate while the other was a graduate student or Civil Service employee. Of the three responding Resident Advisers from Gage Center all were graduate students or Civil Service employees. In the case of the two undergraduates (one was a freshman and the other a sophomore) both were older people who recently began their college careers, and due to their age and levels of maturity were given these positions.

Resident Assistants are employed to work and live with approximately 50 students on each individual residence center floor. The Housing Office employs 75 of these people, all but one of whom are undergraduate
students. Sixty-seven responses were obtained. (Table 2)

Table 2. Resident Assistants responding to the College and University Environment Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic classification</th>
<th>McElroy (Men)</th>
<th>Searing (Men)</th>
<th>Crawford (Women)</th>
<th>Gage (Women)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstudent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 17 responding Resident Assistants in McElroy Center, one was a sophomore, three were juniors, and 13 were seniors. Of the nine responding Resident Assistants in Searing Center, four were juniors, four were seniors, and one was a nonstudent. Of the 16 responding Resident Assistants in Crawford Center, two were sophomores, 10 were juniors, and four were seniors. Of the 25 responding Resident Assistants in Gage Center, six were sophomores, 11 were juniors, and eight were seniors.

During the first week in October the investigator randomly selected 125 students from each of the four residence centers to complete the College and University Environment Scales. There are approximately 3500 students living in the residence centers; thus, the selected
sampled students encompassed approximately 14 percent of those eligible for participation (residing in residence centers). A guide to sample size was provided by Pace (48) when he stated:

It is not necessary to have a large number of reporters in order to obtain a reasonably stable picture of the institutional environment. Because only statements about which there is a high degree of consensus are counted in determining the score, one does not need to poll the entire student body to uncover what by definition are the more obvious features of the campus climate. As a suggestion, the number of reporters might range from 50 to several hundred, depending on the size and complexity of the institution. In the norm group of 48 colleges and universities, the scores were based (in all but five instances) on the replies of between 35 and 250 students, the median number being about 85.

The College and University Environment Scales were administered to the selected sample in each specific residence center during that week. A response of 353 (70.6 percent of the 500 selected) was obtained. (Table 3)

Table 3. Students responding to the College and University Environment Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th>Residence Center</th>
<th>McElroy (Men)</th>
<th>Searing (Men)</th>
<th>Crawford (Women)</th>
<th>Gage (Women)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>10 10.8</td>
<td>10 12.1</td>
<td>19 20.8</td>
<td>11 12.5</td>
<td>50 14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>38 41.4</td>
<td>28 34.2</td>
<td>47 51.7</td>
<td>45 51.2</td>
<td>158 44.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>26 28.3</td>
<td>21 25.6</td>
<td>11 12.1</td>
<td>17 19.2</td>
<td>75 21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>18 19.5</td>
<td>23 28.1</td>
<td>14 15.4</td>
<td>15 17.1</td>
<td>70 19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92 100.0</td>
<td>82 100.0</td>
<td>91 100.0</td>
<td>88 100.0</td>
<td>353 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of 92 respondents (73.6 percent of 125 selected) in McElroy Center, 10 were freshmen, 38 were sophomores, 26 were juniors, and 18 were seniors. Of the 82 respondents (65.6 percent of 125 selected) in Searing Center, 10 were freshmen, 28 were sophomores, 21 were juniors, and 23 were seniors. Of the 91 respondents (72.8 percent of 125 selected) in Crawford Center, 19 were freshmen, 47 were sophomores, 11 were juniors, and 14 were seniors. Of the 88 respondents (70.4 percent of 125 selected) in Gage Center, 11 were freshmen, 45 were sophomores, 17 were juniors, and 15 were seniors.

Description of the Instrument

The College and University Environment Scales consists of 150 statements about college life (Appendix) - features and facilities of the campus, rules and regulations, faculty, curricula, instruction and examinations, student life, extracurricular activities, and other aspects of the institutional environment which help to define the atmosphere or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the college as students see it. The 150 items are divided into five scales. Each scale indicates an area of the academic environment about which the student expresses his individual perceptions. These are described by Pace (48) as follows:

Scale 1 - Practicality  This combination of items suggests a practical, instrumental emphasis in the college environment. Procedures, personal status, and practical benefits are important. Status is gained by knowing the right people, being in the right groups, and doing what is expected. Order and supervision are characteristic of the administration and of the classwork. Good fun, school spirit, and student leadership in social activities are evident.
Scale 2 - Community  The combination of items in this scale describes a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. The environment is supportive and sympathetic. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses the college as a whole. The campus is a community. It has a congenial atmosphere.

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

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

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

The items in the CUES are ordered in such a way that each sequence of 15 items belongs to one of the five scales as follows:
Items 1-15  Scale 1
Items 16-30  Scale 5
Items 31-45  Scale 2
Items 46-60  Scale 3
Items 61-75  Scale 4
Items 76-90  Scale 1
Items 91-105  Scale 5
Items 106-120  Scale 2
Items 121-135  Scale 3
Items 136-150  Scale 4

**Scoring Method**

Since the purpose of this study was twofold, to compare perceptions among different groups within the institution and to compare Mankato State students' perceptions with national norms, it was necessary to use two different scoring methods.

In comparing perceptions within the institution, scores on each of the scales were obtained for each individual by counting the number of items answered in the keyed direction as listed by Pace (43). This resulted in each respondent having five scale scores.

In comparing student perceptions of Mankato State with national norms, the student responses were scored by the so-called "66 plus" scoring method (48). By this method the institution's score for a scale consists of the number of items on that scale that were answered in the keyed direction by 66 percent or more of the respondents. Thus, the institution's scores for the students as one group were based on 353 student responses. To obtain the institution's scores for the student subgroups (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, men, and women) the scale scores were computed on the number of students in the particular subgroup. The scoring key for the CUES
items may be found in the technical manual cited in the bibliography (48). This scoring procedure provided a basis upon which to compare Mankato State students' perceptions with students' perceptions at other institutions, giving indication as to whether perceptions of Mankato State were relatively low or high.

**Hypotheses**

The null hypotheses tested in this study are as follows:

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference among the perceptions of freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of men students and women students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

**Hypothesis Four:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of Crawford Center and Gage Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

**Hypothesis Five:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of McElroy Center and Searing Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.
Environment Scales.

No comparison was made between mens' and womens' residence centers because of the ambiguity of determining whether possible significant differences would be attributable to sex differences or residence center differences.

Method of Analysis

In comparing perceptions among different groups within Mankato State College, two nonparametric methods of analysis were used.

A nonparametric statistical test is a test whose model does not specify conditions about the parameters of the population from which the sample was drawn. Certain assumptions are associated with most nonparametrical statistical tests but these assumptions are fewer and less demanding than those associated with parametrical tests.

The first two null hypotheses were comparisons among four groups. Therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used initially for testing, and the Mann-Whitney U test was then used to elaborate on the significant differences in perceptions. The last three hypotheses were comparisons between only two groups so the Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine significant differences on the five scales.

The Mann-Whitney U test may be used to test whether two groups have been drawn from the same population. This is one of the most powerful of the nonparametric tests and is the most useful alternative to the parametric t test when one wishes to avoid the parametric assumptions. The null hypothesis states that the groups do not differ
significantly from each other (the two groups come from the same population). To apply the Mann-Whitney U test the scores from the two groups are ranked together in order of increasing size. The smallest score is replaced by rank 1, the next smallest by rank 2, and the largest by rank n. When tie scores occurred, each of the tied observations was given the average of the ranks they would have had if no ties had occurred. Then the sum of ranks in each group is found, and a U statistic is calculated. If both of the groups has an n of less than 20, interpretation is based on a tabled value of U. If either or both of the groups has an n larger than 20 (which was the case with the last three hypotheses), the U statistic is converted to a Z statistic (standard normal) and interpretation is made on the basis of a Z table.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks is a nonparametric technique for testing whether three or more sample values signify genuine population differences or whether they represent merely chance variations such as are to be expected among several random samples from the same population. The null hypothesis states that the groups do not differ significantly from each other (the groups come from the same population or identical populations with respect to averages).

In the computation of the Kruskal-Wallis test, each of the n observations are replaced by ranks. That is, all of the scores from all of the groups being compared are combined and ranked in a single series. The smallest score is replaced by rank 1, the next smallest
by rank 2, and the largest by rank n. When this has been done the sum of ranks for each group is found. (There was no correction for tied ranks unless the final calculated H value was close to the tabled value. Correcting for ties has the effect of increasing the H statistic, so it is not necessary to correct for ties if the H value already exceeds the tabled value). The Kruskal-Wallis test determines whether these sums of ranks are so different that they are not likely to have come from samples which were all drawn from the same population. It can be shown that if the groups are all from the same population or from identical populations, then the H statistic is distributed as chi-square with the degrees of freedom equal to the number of groups known minus one.

When comparing Mankato State College student responses with those of other institutions, no method of analysis was used. The comparisons were made solely on the basis of the raw scores obtained by the "66 plus" scoring method.

The norm scores were obtained using the same method. When using the College and University Environment Scales the notion that any event or condition is characteristic of an institution implies that there has been some dominant consensus that it is so. There are 30 items in each scale, and a ratio of two to one was arbitrarily set as the level of consensus that must be reached or exceeded to warrant calling the items a "characteristic." This method (66 plus) was used to obtain an institution's score because there is one weakness in the use of
mean scores (the average of individuals' scores). A mean score would not indicate dominant consensus. It is merely an average score, and there may be a large or small dispersion of scores around the mean.

When using the "66 plus" scoring method, one can argue that if each item on a scale was to be answered true by 50 percent of the students and false by 50 percent, none of the items should be regarded as "characteristic" of the school.

The school's mean score, however, would be at the midpoint of the range instead of at the bottom. In this case, the real characteristic of the school is that the students disagree about the school's characteristics. The mean score would be mistaken for a "characteristic."

Hence, the only "method of analysis" involved in comparing Mankato State students' perceptions with those of the national norm group is simply comparing the perceptions scored by the "66 plus" scoring method.

For the purposes of this study, the following two definitions are being utilized:

Environment - In the broadest sense, everything to which an object or organism responds.

Perception - Becoming aware of, and interpreting environmental stimuli that impinge on the sense organs.
FINDINGS

Introduction

The major thesis to be examined is the relationship between four variables and perceptions of the academic environment as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales. Specifically these four variables were: employee-student status, academic classification, sex of students, and residence centers.

Each of these variables was compared according to the hypotheses listed in the Method and Procedure chapter, and comparisons were analyzed according to the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance and Mann-Whitney U tests also described in the Method and Procedure chapter.

Since the Kruskal-Wallis test is based on the comparison of two or more groups, a table has been prepared for the first two hypotheses where the Kruskal-Wallis test was applicable. Included in the table are the four classes of the variable, number of respondents in each class, mean rank, and the $H$ statistic for each scale. Asterisks after the $H$ statistic indicate a significant difference on that scale between the four groups at the .05 significance level.

For the remaining three hypotheses, which were comparisons between only two groups, the Mann-Whitney U test was used. Thus, in those three cases a table has been prepared showing the five scales, the number of respondents in each class, the sum of ranks, the mean rank, and the $Z$ statistic. Asterisks after the $Z$ statistic indicate a significant difference at the .05 significance level between the
two groups on the corresponding scale.

In addition to knowing whether the groups differ from each other, additional interpretation of the scores can be made by knowing whether they are high or low scores, and how much higher or lower they are than scores of other institutions. The "66 plus" scoring method was used to obtain figures which could be compared with national norms.

To provide this basis for national comparison of Mankato State students' perceptions with those obtained at other institutions, a group of 48 colleges and universities has been used. Statistics on this norm group of institutions were obtained by Pace (48) and the group of 48 was selected so as to conform approximately with the national distribution of enrollments in accredited colleges and universities offering the bachelor's degree or graduate degrees. They were further selected to be representative of geographic regions, public and private control, and institutional size and complexity. Within this nationally determined stratification the institutions that were selected also reflected other variations, such as variations in wealth and poverty, in rural and urban setting, in highly selective to open admission policy, and coeducational or non-coeducational enrollment. In brief, the total norm group was designed to reflect much of the broad spectrum of American higher education (exclusive of junior colleges, theological schools, and non-accredited schools).

As a result, this chapter has been divided into two sections: comparisons between groups within Mankato State College, and
comparisons of Mankato State College students' perceptions with national norms.

Comparisons Within Mankato State College

**Educational Coordinators-Resident Advisers-Resident Assistants-Students**

**Null Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

The rationale for this comparison was that all four groups have varying levels of formal educational attainment as well as varying levels of maturity. It was thus suspected that the four groups would differ in their perceptions of the environment at Mankato State College. The employees (Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, and Resident Assistants) are responsible for creating an atmosphere conducive to the students' personal, social and academic development and maintaining that atmosphere. If groups do not perceive their environment the same way, there may be a conflict regarding programming and the role of residence halls in the academic community.

In comparing these groups, responses of five Educational Coordinators, 13 Resident Advisers, 67 Resident Assistants and 353 students were compared by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test. (Table 4) Significant differences among the four groups occurred only on Scale 5 (Scholarship), which produced an H statistic of 14.96.

Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the perceptions
Table 4. Comparisons among perceptions of Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H Statistic$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>154.9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>199.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>225.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Educational Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>221.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>220.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>266.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>221.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Educational Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>228.0</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>246.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>212.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Educational Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>14.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>188.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>226.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$At the .05 significance level with three degrees of freedom the critical value for the H statistic is 7.82.

of Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales on Scales 1 (Practicality), 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), and 4 (Propriety). The null hypothesis can be rejected for Scale 5 (Scholarship).

Scale 5 (Scholarship) produced an average rank of 246.2 for
Resident Advisers, 226.9 for students, 188.3 for Resident Assistants, and 48.5 for Educational Coordinators. To further investigate the differences on Scale 5, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare these four groups two at a time, to determine where the specific differences in perceptions occurred. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident Advisers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Resident Assistants</th>
<th>Educational Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked means</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td>226.9</td>
<td>188.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the groups underscored by the same line do not differ significantly from each other on Scale 5. There were no significant differences in perceptions on the scholarship scale between Resident Advisers, students, and Resident Assistants. The Educational Coordinators, however, differed significantly from each of these three groups on Scale 5 (Scholarship).

According to Pace (48) a high score indicates emphasis upon intellectual speculation, interest in ideas as ideas, and in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. It seems that the Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants and students, most of whom are engaged in academic coursework at either the undergraduate or graduate level, perceive more emphasis on intellectual speculation than do the Educational Coordinators.

The Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students apparently perceive that there is an emphasis on high academic ability and a serious interest in scholarship while the Educational
Coordinators apparently feel that this is not emphasized as much at Mankato State College as at other institutions where they have attended. Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students apparently perceive that the pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific or philosophical, is carried on rather rigorously. The Educational Coordinators apparently do not perceive this to be the case. This difference seems to indicate that students at the college perceive the environment to be a more academically difficult one than do the Educational Coordinators.

The scales on which there were no differences are as follows:

Scale 1 (Practicality) describes "a practical, instrumental emphasis in the college environment. Procedure, personal status, and practical benefits are important." (48)

Scale 2 (Community) describes "a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. The environment is supportive and sympathetic. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses the college as a whole. The college is a community." (48)

Scale 3 (Awareness) reflects "a concern and emphasis upon three sorts of meaning - personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggest the search for personal meaning." (48)

Scale 4 (Propriety) suggests "an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important." (48)
Null Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

In comparing the responses of 50 freshmen, 158 sophomores, 75 juniors, and 70 seniors by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test, there were found to be no significant differences among the four groups on Scale 1 (Practicality). There were, however, significant differences between the four groups on Scales 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), 4 (Propriety), and 5 (Scholarship). (Table 5) The significant H statistic values were 23.00, 28.54, 19.24, and 59.84 respectively.

Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the perceptions of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales on Scale 1 (Practicality). The null hypothesis can be rejected for Scales 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), 4 (Propriety), and 5 (Scholarship).

Scale 2 (Community) produced an average rank of 233.0 for freshmen, 176.2 for sophomores, 173.9 for juniors, and 142.9 for seniors. The Mann-Whitney U test was then used to compare these four groups two at a time on Scale 2 to determine where the differences in perceptions occurred. The most outstanding difference occurred
Table 5. Comparisons among perceptions of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H Statistica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>23.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>176.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>241.3</td>
<td>28.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>19.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>181.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>273.3</td>
<td>59.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAt the .05 significance level with three degrees of freedom the critical value for the H statistic is 7.82.

between the freshmen and the other groups - freshmen were significantly different in their perceptions from the sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Sophomores also differed significantly from juniors, and the juniors differed significantly from the seniors. This can be summarized as follows:
Those groups underscored by the same line do not differ significantly from each other in their perceptions on Scale 2. (It should be noted that the Z-statistic between the sophomores and the seniors did approach significance).

According to Pace (48) high scores indicate a supportive and sympathetic environment. Low scores suggest perceptions of an environment where privacy is important and detachment prevalent. It seems that the ranked means indicate the freshmen perceive a more supportive, sympathetic, group-oriented environment than do any of the other three groups. It is significant to note that as one ascends in academic classification, detachment and privacy become more important. These results seem to emphasize the uniqueness of the freshmen as well as suggesting the type of environment they perceive.

Scale 3 (Awareness) produced an average rank of 241.3 for freshmen, 175.1 for sophomores, 171.0 for juniors, and 141.7 for seniors. Using the Mann-Whitney U test to compare these groups two at a time for differences, again the freshmen differed from each of the other three groups. In the following summarization of the results, the underscoring connecting the groups represents no significant differences in perceptions between the appropriate groups:
According to Pace (48) high scores indicate a concern for self-understanding and identity. A high score also reflects a concern for three sorts of meaning—personal, poetic, and political. The ranked means indicate the freshmen have a higher concern for these three types of meaning than do the sophomores, juniors, or seniors. The sophomores also differed significantly in their perceptions from juniors, and juniors differed significantly in their perceptions from the seniors. One might conclude that the emphasis on the three sorts of meaning diminishes during the college experience simply because students do in fact discover meaning in the three areas as they progress through the college experience. (It should be noted that the Z statistic between the sophomores and seniors did approach significance).

Scale 4 (Propriety) produced an average rank of 230.6 for freshmen, 181.5 for juniors, 169.0 for sophomores, and 151.9 for seniors. Comparing the groups two at a time by the Mann-Whitney U test, it was found that there were no differences in perceptions between juniors, sophomores, and seniors. The following summary again shows by use of the underscore that these groups do not differ significantly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Means:</td>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>181.5</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>151.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pace (48) high scores on Scale 4 (Propriety) indicate an environment which emphasizes decorum, politeness, consideration, thoughtfulness and caution. A low score indicates an environment that is relatively demonstrative, assertive, impulsive and free-wheeling.
The high ranked mean achieved by the freshmen indicates they perceive the environmental emphasis to be on politeness and consideration more than do the other three classes. It is again significant to note that the freshmen differ from every other class. The relative emphasis placed on politeness and consideration may be attributable to their unfamiliarity with the academic community when the instrument was administered.

Scale 5 (Scholarship) produced an average rank of 273.3 for freshmen, 177.3 for juniors, 166.3 for sophomores, and 132.1 for seniors. Using the Mann-Whitney U test on Scale 5 it was found that there were no significant differences in perceptions between juniors and sophomores. The underscores in the following summary illustrate the findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Means:</td>
<td>273.3</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pace (48) high scores on Scale 5 (Scholarship) indicate emphasis upon intellectual speculation, interest in ideas as ideas, and in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. The higher ranked mean obtained by the freshmen when compared with other classes indicates they do tend to perceive a more intellectual environment than do the seniors.

Scale 1 (Practicality) was the only scale on which no significant difference between the groups was found. Scale 1 describes "to what extent the campus atmosphere emphasizes the concrete and realistic rather than the abstract and speculative." (48)
Men Students—Women Students

Null Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of men students and women students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

The background and rationale for this comparison was explained in the Review of Literature chapter. Hypothesis Three was based on research evidence that in comparing ten institutions there was no difference on the Practicality, Awareness, and Scholarship scales between men and women, but there were substantial differences on the Community and Propriety scales (47).

In this study the responses of 174 men students were compared with the responses of 179 women students. (Table 6) Analysis was by the Mann-Whitney U test.

The comparison between men and women students yielded two significant Z statistics. The significant Z statistics occurred on Scale 2 (Community), with a Z statistic of -2.4262, and Scale 4 (Propriety), with a Z statistic of -1.9743. These results support the findings of Pace (47).

Consistent with Pace's (47) findings, a significant difference was found between men and women on Scale 2 (Community). Consequently men and women do differ in their perceptions of the cohesiveness and supportive nature of Mankato State College environment. There apparently is a difference in their concern for group welfare and feeling of group loyalty. The mean rank scores were 165.9 for men
Table 6. Comparisons between perceptions of men students and women students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>29058.0</td>
<td>28478.0</td>
<td>29165.0</td>
<td>28907.0</td>
<td>30533.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>165.96</td>
<td>167.61</td>
<td>166.70</td>
<td>175.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>33423.0</td>
<td>34004.0</td>
<td>33316.0</td>
<td>33574.0</td>
<td>31948.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>189.96</td>
<td>186.12</td>
<td>185.53</td>
<td>178.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z statistic(^a)</strong></td>
<td>-1.8229</td>
<td>-2.4262*</td>
<td>-1.7063</td>
<td>-1.9743*</td>
<td>-.2769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Rejection region at .05 level: If calculated Z is less than -1.96 or greater than 1.96.

and 189.96 for women. The higher mean rank score obtained by the women students indicates they perceive a more supportive and sympathetic environment than do the men. The lower mean rank obtained by men suggests a perceived environment where privacy is important and detachment prevalent.

Also consistent with Pace's (47) findings it was found that the mean rank of the men was lower than the mean rank of the women on Scale 4 (Propriety). As indicated in Pace's "Comparison of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters" (47) this result would indicate that the lower mean rank obtained by the men suggests an
atmosphere perceived by them that is relatively demonstrative and assertive, more impulsive than cautious, more free-wheeling than polite and mannerly. The result seems to be that the women perceive the environment at Mankato State College as being more polite and considerate than do the men.

All other scales indicated no difference between the perceptions of men and women students in regard to college environment.

Scale 1 (Practicality) describes perceptions of organization, system, and procedure.

Scale 3 (Awareness) indicates concern for self-understanding and identity.

Scale 5 (Scholarship) reflects interest in scholarship, in academic achievement and competition for it. There were no significant differences in perceptions between the two groups on this scale, hence the investigator concluded both have essentially the same perceptions of this aspect of the environment.

Thus, in conclusion, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of men students and women students at Mankato State College for Scales 1 (Practicality), 3 (Awareness), and 5 (Scholarship) as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales. The evidence was sufficient to reject the hypothesis concerning Scale 2 (Community) and Scale 4 (Propriety).
Crawford Center-Gage Center

**Null Hypothesis Four:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of Crawford Center and Gage Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

In comparing Crawford Center (women) with Gage Center (women) no significant differences in perceptions were found on any of the five scales. (Table 7)

Table 7. Comparisons between perceptions of Crawford Center and Gage Center student residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crawford Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>8321.0</td>
<td>8414.0</td>
<td>8231.0</td>
<td>8450.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>90.45</td>
<td>92.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gage Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>7789.0</td>
<td>7695.0</td>
<td>7878.0</td>
<td>7660.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>87.44</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>87.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z statistic</strong></td>
<td>- .3797</td>
<td>- .6497</td>
<td>- .1199</td>
<td>- .7527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R^a* Rejection region at .05 level: If calculated Z is less than -1.96 or greater than 1.96.
This seems to indicate that occupants of the two women's residence centers do not perceive the environment significantly different on any of the five scales.

Scale 1 (Practicality) measures perceptions that organization, system and procedures, status and practical benefit are important. Also, order and supervision are characteristic of the administration and classwork.

Scale 2 (Community) describes perceptions of a friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented campus. It also measures feelings of group welfare and group loyalty.

Scale 3 (Awareness) measures perceptions of emphasis upon the three sorts of meaning - personal, poetic, and political.

Scale 4 (Propriety) measures perceptions of the environment that it is polite and considerate, and the presence of caution and thoughtfulness.

The items on Scale 5 (Scholarship) describe an academic scholarly environment, that emphasis is on competitively high academic achievement and a serious interest in scholarship.

In conclusion, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of Crawford Center and Gage Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.
McElroy Center-Searing Center

Null Hypothesis Five: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of McElroy Center and Searing Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

In comparing Searing Center (men) with McElroy Center (men) a significant Z statistic of -2.031 occurred on Scale 1 (Practicality) and another significant Z statistic of -2.2214 occurred on Scale 5 (Scholarship). (Table 8)

Table 8. Comparisons between perceptions of McElroy Center and Searing Center student residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McElroy Center</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>8721.0</td>
<td>7728.0</td>
<td>7521.0</td>
<td>7492.0</td>
<td>7314.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>93.91</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>81.43</td>
<td>79.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searing Center</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6504.0</td>
<td>7497.0</td>
<td>7704.0</td>
<td>7733.0</td>
<td>7910.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ranks</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>91.42</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>94.30</td>
<td>97.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>-2.031*</td>
<td>-0.9733</td>
<td>-1.5978</td>
<td>-1.6889</td>
<td>-2.2214*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rejection region at .05 level: If calculated Z is less than -1.96 or greater than 1.96.
The Searing residents obtained a significantly lower mean rank of 79.31 on Scale 1 than did the McElroy residents (93.91). On Scale 1 (Practicality) these rankings seem to indicate that organization, system and procedure, status and practical benefit, and order and supervision are perceived as being more emphasized by the McElroy residents than by the Searing Center residents.

On Scale 5 (Scholarship) Searing residents obtained a significantly higher mean rank (97.68) than did the McElroy residents (79.39). The significantly higher mean rank obtained by the Searing residents seems to indicate perception of more emphasis in Searing Center on intellectual speculation, interest in ideas as ideas, and in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

There were no significant differences on Scales 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), or 4 (Propriety).

Scale 2 (Community) describes perceptions of a friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented campus. It also measures feelings of group welfare and group loyalty.

Scale 3 (Awareness) measures perceptions of emphasis upon the three sorts of meaning - personal, poetic, and political.

Scale 4 (Propriety) measures perceptions of the environment that it is polite and considerate, and the presence of caution and thoughtfulness.

In conclusion, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of McElroy Center and Searing Center student residents.
at Mankato State College on Scale 2 (Community), Scale 3 (Awareness), and Scale 4 (Propriety) as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales. The evidence was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis concerning Scale 1 (Practicality) and Scale 5 (Scholarship).

Comparisons With National Norms

To provide the basis for comparing Mankato State College students' perceptions with other institutions a norm group of 48 colleges and universities was used. (A description of the 48 colleges and universities is included at the beginning of this chapter). The 353 Mankato State College students' responses were compared with this norm group to identify whether or not Mankato State students ranked relatively high or low on the five scales in their perceptions of their environment. Viewing the 353 students as one group, it was found that their perceptions of Mankato State College were relatively low in comparison with students' perceptions of other institutions. (Table 9)

Table 9. Comparison of Mankato State College students' perceptions with national norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale 1 (Practicality) ranked highest of the five scale scores with a percentile rank of 37 and a scale score of 9. A scale score of 7 on Scale 2 (Community) placed the students at the 26th percentile. Scale 3 (Awareness) had a scale score of 3, which ranked the group at the 9th percentile. Scale 4 (Propriety) ranked the lowest of the five scales with a scale score of 1 which ranked the students at the 5th percentile, and on Scale 5 (Scholarship) the students ranked at the 12th percentile with a scale score of 2.

In order to pursue these low scores further and in order to detect possible differences between, and trends among, student subgroups, the students were divided according to two criteria and compared with national norms. The two criteria were academic classification and sex of the students.

Freshman-Sophomore-Junior-Senior

In the first section of the Findings chapter, it was found that the freshmen as a group were unique in their perceptions of Mankato State College environment. In order to elaborate on their uniqueness, the students were compared by year in a school to the national norm group of 48 institutions. (Table 10)

In comparing 50 freshmen responses by the "66 plus" scoring method with the national norm group of 48 institutions, the findings were as follows:

On Scale 1 (Practicality) the freshmen obtained a scale score of 8 which placed them at the 31st percentile when compared with the 48 institution norm group. On Scale 2 (Community) the freshmen obtained a scale score of 8, which again placed them at the 31st
Table 10. Comparison by academic classification with national norms of student response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juniors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A scale score of 10 placed the freshmen at the 38th percentile on Scale 3 (Awareness). On Scale 4 (Propriety) a scale score of 11 ranked them at the 18th percentile, and a scale score of 11 on Scale 5 (Scholarship) ranked the freshmen at the 50th percentile. It is significant to note that on Scale 5 the freshmen obtained their highest percentile ranking.

In comparing 158 sophomores' scores obtained by the "66 plus" method of scoring with the national norms the findings were as follows:

On Scale 1 (Practicality) the sophomores obtained a scale score...
of 10 which placed them at the 43rd percentile when compared with the national norm group. Scale 2 (Community) produced a scale score of 7, placing the sophomores at the 26th percentile. On Scale 3 (Awareness) the sophomores obtained a scale score of 4 which ranked them at the 12th percentile. This ranking was the lowest obtained by the sophomores. On Scale 5 (Scholarship) a substantial decrease between the freshmen and sophomores was noted. The sophomores obtained a scale score of 1, compared with the freshmen's score of 11. These scale scores placed the freshmen at the 50th percentile, while it placed the sophomores only at the 8th percentile.

In comparing 75 juniors with the national norm group, the findings were as follows:

Scale 1 (Practicality) produced the highest percentile ranking for the juniors. They obtained a scale score of 12 which placed them at the 57th national percentile. Scale 2 (Community) produced the next highest percentile rank, which was the 56th percentile, as a scale score of 12 was obtained. On Scale 2 (Awareness) the juniors obtained a raw score of 6, which placed them at the 19th percentile when compared with the national norms. Scores on Scales 4 (Propriety) and 5 (Scholarship) were both quite low in comparison with national norms. On Scale 4 a scale score of 4 was ranked at the 13th percentile. On Scale 5 (Scholarship) a scale score of 2 ranked at the 12th percentile.

In comparing 70 seniors' responses with national norms, the findings were as follows:

On Scale 1 (Practicality) the seniors obtained a raw score of 13
which ranked them at the 63rd percentile. The seniors scored the highest on the Practicality scale. It is also interesting to note that as the length of time in the institution increased, the scores also increased. On Scale 2 (Community) the seniors attained a scale score of 6 which ranked them at the 21st percentile. The seniors ranked the lowest of all the groups on the Awareness Scale (Scale 3) where they had a scale score of 3 which ranked them at the 9th percentile. They ranked at the 7th percentile on Scale 4 (Propriety) with a scale score of 2. The seniors also ranked the lowest of the four groups on the Scholarship scale (Scale 5), with a scale score of 0, which placed the group at the 8th percentile when compared with national norms.

**Men-Women**

The remaining comparison with national norms compared the responses of men students and women students with the norm group. (Table 11)

**Table 11. Comparison by sex with national norms of student response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First the male student responses were compared with the national norm group of 48 institutions. The findings were as follows:

On Scale 1 (Practicality) the men obtained a scale score of 11 which placed them at the 50th percentile when compared with the norm group. On Scale 2 (Community) the men obtained a score of 6. This score ranked the group at the 21st percentile. A scale score of 4 on Scale 3 (Awareness) ranked them at the 12th percentile. On Scale 4 (Propriety) the raw score of 1 ranked them at the 5th percentile, and a scale score of 2 on Scale 5 (Scholarship) ranked them at the 12th percentile.

In comparing 179 female student responses obtained by the "66 plus" scoring method, the findings were as follows:

On Scale 1 (Practicality) women obtained a scale score of 10 which ranked at the 43rd percentile. On Scale 2 (Community) a scale score of 7 ranked them at the 26th percentile. A scale score of 3 on Scale 3 (Awareness) ranked at the 9th percentile. A scale score of 3 ranked the respondents at the 10th percentile on Scale 4 (Propriety). On the Scholarship scale (Scale 5) a score of 4 ranked the women at the 18th percentile.
DISCUSSION

The data presented in the previous chapter were collected in an effort to detect different perceptions of the Mankato State College environment as expressed by each of four groups of people engaged either in residence center work or living in a residence center. These four groups included Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students. These perceptions were also compared with national norms on the five scales of the GOES.

In testing the first hypothesis the investigator found that the Educational Coordinators differed significantly from the other three groups on Scale 5 (Scholarship). It is suggested that each of the three groups not differing (Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students) are engaged in academic endeavors at Mankato State College and therefore tend to perceive an environment stressing the scholarly aspects of that environment. On the other hand, the Educational Coordinators have all attended other institutions and are not taking coursework at Mankato State College. Consequently with a broader frame of reference and with the absence of any pressure to excell academically at Mankato State, the Educational Coordinators apparently perceive the environment to be less stringent than the other three groups on the Scholarship scale. It is also significant that the Educational Coordinators did not differ on Scales 1-4 from the other three groups. This may indicate that they were able to "tune in" to the way in which the students perceived the environment.
It is encouraging that the Educational Coordinators did not differ on more than one scale from the rest of the groups. They seemed to perceive the environment similarly to students on the other scales. Some familiarization with Mankato State and the students apparently had taken place and this may suggest the Educational Coordinators had communicated with students. It would seem this communication would be of necessity to the Educational Coordinators if they are to relate to the needs of the students.

Hypothesis Two compared the perceptions of students from different academic classifications. The investigator found that the freshman student perceived a very different environment than did students from other academic classifications. The freshman seems to perceive a group-oriented environment and maintains a concern for self-understanding and identity and a search for meaning. Decorum, politeness, and thoughtfulness are also emphasized. Scale 5 (Scholarship) also had yielded an interesting difference between the freshmen and seniors. Freshmen placed an emphasis upon intellectual speculation, interest in ideas and in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

In summary, the data indicated the uniqueness of the freshmen. Their perceptions differ significantly from other groups. They seem to maintain different perceptions regarding their experience in higher education than do those students who have been at the institution for a longer period of time.
One may ask why at Mankato State College the freshmen are unique due to the fact that they differ from the other three academic classifications in their perceptions of their college environment.

In comparing the expressed perceptions of men and women students, the findings were consistent with those of Pace (47). The investigator suggests that female undergraduates perceive a more cautious, polite, and mannerly environment than do male students. This may for example be reflected in the number of discipline cases which in general is fewer in number for females. The data on Scale 2 (Community) suggests that women perceive a more supportive and sympathetic environment than do men.

They also apparently perceive a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses the college. The college is perceived as a community. They also apparently perceive the atmosphere as being a congenial one.

These results are not surprising inasmuch as they do mirror previous research findings. These two differences seem to clearly indicate that women tend to find the college environment a more congenial, friendly community than do men, and also tend to find it more mannerly and less rebellious than do men. This suggests that similar programs in mens' and womens' environments and residence centers may not be received equally well in both.

In testing the fourth hypothesis it was also not surprising that
Crawford Center and Gage Center did not differ significantly on any of the five scales. One might however suggest that differences might occur as the programs in each center are developed autonomously by each Educational Coordinator.

Hypothesis Five tests yielded two interesting significant differences. On Scale 1 (Practicality) the higher mean rank obtained by McElroy Center respondents indicated an emphasis on organization and procedure. It is suggested that this difference might be explained by the fact that McElroy Center is a newer facility and its architectural design lends itself better to the development of more orderly organizational patterns. One could not conclusively attribute the difference to academic level because the compositions of the two residence centers do not differ regarding the academic classification of the occupants.

The second significant difference occurred on Scale 5 (Scholarship). This is an interesting difference in that the majority of the discipline problems occurring in men's centers have occurred in Searing Center, which is the poorest physical facility in the residence center complex. Searing Center is also isolated physically from the other centers which may be another factor. This may be an instance where the development of a program by a specific Educational Coordinator is reflected in the perceptions of the environment by men in Searing Center. This may also have been the case in the previous instance. These differences may simply be reflections of a perceived effort in the programming area. One center may have focused on the development of organization on the floor or wing level while the other focused on
academic programming. This proposition must be advanced cautiously but is one which is possible and one which those directing program development in the specific centers must further discuss and investigate.

The last section of the Findings chapter compared Mankato State College students' perceptions with those of a national norm group of 48 institutions.

The comparisons generally showed that Mankato State students were ranked relatively low in their perceptions as compared with the norm group. Only a few student subgroups ranked above the 50th percentile on any of the scales. When the students were viewed as one unit (all 353 together) all percentile rankings were below the 40th percentile on all of the scales.

The students as a whole ranked highest on Scale 1 (Practicality) where they placed at the 37th percentile. The lowest scale in perception ranking was Scale 4 (Propriety) which ranked at the 5th percentile. It is extremely difficult for the investigator to make valid suggestions why Mankato State College respondents were consistently lower than the norm group. If the perceptions expressed by the respondents were true one can only suggest that respondents at Mankato State perceive less emphasis in the environment on any of the five scales than do the students at norm group institutions. The only valid explanation would simply be that the Mankato State College environment is perceived much differently by its students than are the other 48 institutions.

When comparing the academic classification groups with national
norms, the investigator found that on Scale 1 (Practicality) the scale scores and percentile ranks increased as the student progressed through the institution. This seems to indicate that as a student at Mankato State College progresses through the institution there is developed a very practical and instrumental emphasis in the environment. Procedures, personal status and practical benefits seem to become more important. This result seems to support the thesis that students arrive on the campus scene with idealistic expectations which tend to become more and more practical as the student progresses through the college.

On Scale 2 (Community) the scale scores and percentile ranks decreased as the student progressed from freshman to senior status (with the exception of the juniors). This indicates that the friendly, cohesive, group-oriented nature of the environment perceived by freshmen decreases as the student progresses from freshman to senior status. It is also interesting that on Scale 2 only one percentile rank was higher than 31, that being obtained by the juniors with a percentile rank of 56. The majority of respondents ranked in the lower one-third of the 48 institution norm group.

On Scale 3 (Awareness) a declining trend in percentile rank was also noted as the student progressed from freshman to senior status. This seems to indicate that the emphasis on personal, poetic, and political meaning, self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity decreases the longer the student is in the college environment. Again, in comparison with the norm group Mankato State College students
ranked quite low, and no group obtained higher than the 38th percentile.

On Scale 4 (Propriety) little patterned change occurred as the student progressed through the institution. The consistently low percentile ranks (all below 18) indicate that when compared with the norm group, Mankato State students perceived little emphasis on the polite, considerate, and cautious elements of the environment where group standards of decorum are important.

The investigator felt that the most significant change on any of the scales occurred on Scale 5 (Scholarship). On this scale, the freshmen respondents ranked at the 50th percentile when compared with the national norm group. A drastic drop in percentile rank occurred as the scale score of the sophomores placed them at the 8th percentile of the national norm group. The juniors and seniors remained consistently low. This result seems to emphasize the drastic change occurring during the freshman year. This change is a discouraging one which seems to indicate that the institution fails the freshman student significantly when it is unable to maintain and nurture the academic expectations he might maintain. Efforts must be made by the administration and faculty to more fully realize the expectations of students.

In comparing men and women respondents with national norms the investigator found both groups consistently ranked in the lower one-third of the norm group percentiles. Only on Scale 1 (Practicality) did the groups come close to the 50th percentile - on this scale the men were exactly at the 50th percentile but the women were at the 43rd percentile. The lower rankings in this comparison are consistent with other findings in this study. Again no valid explanation can be offered
as to why the Mankato State respondents are consistently lower except to say that the environment is perceived much differently than the environment as perceived by students at the other 48 institutions.

Based on the results of this study the investigator has four recommendations for further study:

First, it is recommended that further studies investigate the perceptions of the academic community as expressed by various classes of faculty members, as opposed to those maintained by students.

Secondly, it would seem significant to compare the perceptions of parents of students as opposed to the perceptions maintained by the students themselves.

Thirdly, the investigator recommends further study be done regarding the specific reasons for the changes in perceptions that occur during the freshman year.

Fourthly, the investigator would recommend that the perceptions of the academic environment maintained by administrators be compared with the perceptions maintained by students and faculty.
This study was designed to compare environmental perceptions among groups within Mankato State College and to compare Mankato State College students' perceptions with national norms.

A random sample of 125 students was selected from each of the four residence centers to participate in this study. The sample size was determined by the guidelines described by Pace (48). These 500 students were informed that the College and University Environment Scales would be administered in their residence center on a certain date. A response of 353 was obtained.

Also participating in this study were residence center employees - Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, and Resident Assistants. During the 1968 New Faculty Orientation at Mankato State College the investigator administered the College and University Environment Scales to the entire group of these employees. Responses were obtained from all five of the Educational Coordinators, 13 Resident Advisers, and 67 Resident Assistants.

Four variables were used to compare perceptions within the institution. These included the following: employee-student status, academic classification, sex of students, and residence center.

The College and University Environment Scales is a series of 150 statements which the respondent suggests are either indicative or not of the environment he is in. The responses to the 150 statements are scaled on five scales as follows: Scale 1 (Practicality), Scale 2 (Community), Scale 3 (Awareness), Scale 4 (Propriety), and Scale 5 (Scholarship).
Two different scoring methods were used. In comparing perceptions within the institution, scores on each of the scales were obtained for each individual by counting the number of items answered in the keyed direction as listed by Pace (48). This resulted in each respondent having five scale scores.

In comparing student perceptions of Mankato State College with national norms, the student responses were rescored by the "66 plus" scoring method. This means that the number of items on each scale that were answered in the keyed direction by 66 percent or more of the respondents were counted.

In comparing perceptions between different groups within Mankato State College two methods of analysis were used. The first two hypotheses were comparisons among four groups. Therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was used initially. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to elaborate on the significant differences. The last three hypotheses were comparisons between only two groups and therefore the Mann-Whitney U test was used.

No method of analysis was necessary when comparing Mankato State students' perceptions with those of other institutions. The comparisons were made solely on the basis of the raw scores obtained by the "66 plus" scoring method.

The major findings drawn from these data were as follows:

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference among the perceptions of Educational Coordinators, Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students at Mankato State College as measured by scores
on the College and University Environment Scales.

Other than on Scale 5 (Scholarship) the Educational Coordinators did not differ significantly from the Resident Advisers, Resident Assistants, and students. Except for the Scholarship scale the four groups seem to perceive the environment at Mankato State College in similar ways. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for all scales except Scale 5. The null hypothesis was rejected for Scale 5.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference among the perceptions of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

The freshmen seem to perceive the environment much differently than do sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The only scale which indicated no significant difference was Scale 1 (Practicality). Significant differences did occur on all other scales which emphasize the uniqueness of the freshmen. Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for Scale 1. The null hypothesis was rejected in regard to Scales 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), 4 (Propriety), and 5 (Scholarship).

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of men students and women students at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

Women students differed from men students on Scale 2 (Community) and Scale 4 (Propriety). No significant differences were found on
the other scales. These findings were consistent with the findings of Pace (47). Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on Scales 1 (Practicality), 3 (Awareness), and 5 (Scholarship). The evidence was sufficient to reject the hypothesis concerning Scale 2 (Community) and Scale 4 (Propriety).

**Hypothesis Four:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of Crawford Center and Gage Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

No significant differences in perceptions were found when comparing these two women's residence centers. Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for any of the five scales.

**Hypothesis Five:** There is no significant difference between the perceptions of McElroy Center and Searing Center student residents at Mankato State College as measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

With the exception of Scale 1 (Practicality) no significant differences in perceptions were found when comparing the two men's residence centers. Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on Scales 2 (Community), 3 (Awareness), 4 (Propriety), and 5 (Scholarship). The null hypothesis was rejected for Scale 1 (Practicality).

Comparison of student perceptions of Mankato State College with other students' perceptions of their academic environments revealed that students involved in this study had relatively low perceptions of their environment on all five scales. The students
as a whole ranked in the lower one-third of the national norm group, and only a few student subgroups ranked at or above the 50th percentile. No student subgroup ranked in the upper one-third of the national norm group. Therefore, it was apparent that the students at Mankato State College had different perceptions of their environment than did students at the 48 institution norm group.
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1. Students quickly learn what is done and not done on this campus.
2. Students must have a written excuse for absence from class.
3. There are lots of dances, parties, and social activities.
4. Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices.
5. Campus buildings are clearly marked by signs and directories.
6. There is a lot of apple-polishing around here.
7. New fads and phrases are continually springing up among the students.
8. Student organizations are closely supervised to guard against mistakes.
9. Religious worship here stresses service to God and obedience to His laws.
10. It's important socially here to be in the right club or group.
11. The professors regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are being carried out properly and on time.
12. Student rooms are more likely to be decorated with pennants and pin-ups than with paintings, carvings, mobiles, fabrics, etc.
13. Some of the reactions of professors to questions in class are as if they feel the students are criticizing them personally.
14. Education here tends to make students more practical and realistic.
15. New jokes and gags get around the campus in a hurry.
16. It is fairly easy to pass most courses without working very hard.
17. Most of the professors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects.
18. Students almost always wait to be called on before speaking in class.
19. Laboratory facilities in the natural sciences are excellent.
20. Learning what is in the textbook is enough to pass most courses.
21. A lecture by an outstanding scientist would be poorly attended.
22. Students set high standards of achievement for themselves.
23. The professors really push the students' capacities to the limit.
24. Class discussions are typically vigorous and intense.
25. Everyone knows the "snap" courses to take and the tough ones to avoid.
26. Long, serious intellectual discussions are common among the students.
27. Personality, pull, and bluff get students through many courses.
28. Standards set by the professors are not particularly hard to achieve.
29. Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading student papers, reports, or discussions.
30. Students put a lot of energy into everything they do - in class and out.
31. Students spend a lot of time together at the snack bars, taverns, and in one another's rooms.
32. There is a great deal of borrowing and sharing among the students.
33. There are definite times each week when dining is made a gracious social event.
34. Faculty members rarely or never call students by their first names.
35. Students commonly share their problems.
36. The professors go out of their way to help you.
37. Most students respond to ideas and events in a pretty cool and detached way.
38. There are frequent informal social gatherings.
39. Most people here seem to be especially considerate of others.
40. Students have many opportunities to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of others.
41. Very few things here arouse much excitement or feeling.
42. Many upperclassmen play an active role in helping new students adjust to campus life.
43. This school has a reputation for being very friendly.
44. The history and traditions of the college are strongly emphasized.
45. It's easy to get a group together for card games, singing, going to the movies, etc.
46. Tutorial or honors programs are available for qualified students.
47. Public debates are held regularly.
48. Quite a few faculty members have had varied and unusual careers.
49. Many of the social science professors are actively engaged in research.
50. There is a lot of interest here in poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc.
51. The student newspaper rarely carries articles intended to stimulate discussion of philosophical or ethical matters.
52. The library has paintings and phonograph records which circulate widely among the students.
53. A lecture by an outstanding literary critic would be poorly attended.
54. Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily accessible.
55. There are paintings or statues of nudes on the campus.
56. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding.
57. Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs.
58. There would be a capacity audience for a lecture by an outstanding philosopher or theologian.
59. There are many facilities and opportunities for individual creative activity.
60. A controversial speaker always stirs up a lot of student discussion.
61. Students rarely get drunk and disorderly.
62. There are a number of prominent faculty members who play a significant role in national or local politics.
63. Most students show a good deal of caution and self-control in their behavior.
64. Students here learn that they are not only expected to develop ideals but also to express them in action.

65. Many students drive sports cars.

66. The person who is always trying to "help out" is likely to be regarded as a nuisance.

67. Nearly all students expect to achieve future fame or wealth.

68. Students often start projects without trying to decide in advance how they will develop or where they may end.

69. Some of the most popular students have a knack for making witty, subtle remarks with a slightly sexy tinge.

70. Students are conscientious about taking good care of school property.

71. Student publications never lampoon dignified people or institutions.

72. Student parties are colorful and lively.

73. People here are always trying to win an argument.

74. Society orchestras are more popular here than jazz bands or novelty groups.

75. Drinking and late parties are generally tolerated, despite regulations.

76. Many courses stress the speculative or abstract rather than the concrete and tangible.

77. Many students try to pattern themselves after people they admire.

78. The big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support.

79. Frequent tests are given in most courses.

80. In many classes students have an assigned seat.

81. Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling.

82. There is an extensive program of intramural sports and informal athletic activities.

83. The college offers many really practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc.
84. Anyone who knows the right people in the faculty or administration can get a better break here.

85. Student pep rallies, parades, dances, carnivals, or demonstrations occur very rarely.

86. Students take a great deal of pride in their personal appearance.

87. Everyone has a lot of fun at this school.

88. There is a recognized group of student leaders on this campus.

89. The values most stressed here are open-mindedness and objectivity.

90. The important people at this school expect others to show proper respect for them.

91. Students who work hard for high grades are likely to be regarded as odd.

92. There is a lot of interest in the philosophy and methods of science.

93. There are so many things to do here that students are busy all the time.

94. Students are sometimes noisy and inattentive at concerts or lectures.

95. Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class.

96. Course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are outstanding.

97. Few students here would ever work or play to the point of exhaustion.

98. Most courses are a real intellectual challenge.

99. Courses, examination, and readings are frequently revised.

100. Students are very serious and purposeful about their work.

101. People around here seem to thrive on difficulty - the tougher things get, the harder they work.

102. Professors usually take attendance in class.

103. Examinations here provide a genuine measure of a student's achievements and understanding.

104. There is very little studying here over the weekends.
105. The school is outstanding for the emphasis and support it gives to pure scholarship and basic research.

106. There is a lot of excitement and restlessness just before holidays.

107. Students often run errands or do other personal services for the faculty.

108. Graduation is a pretty matter-of-fact, unemotional event.

109. The college regards training people for service to the community as one of its major responsibilities.

110. All undergraduates must live in university approved housing.

111. When students run a project or put on a show everybody knows about it.

112. Students are expected to work out the details of their own programs in their own way.

113. Students' mid-term and final grades are reported to parents.

114. Students exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to the expected codes of conduct.

115. There is a lot of group spirit.

116. Students are frequently reminded to take preventive measures against illness.

117. Most of the faculty are not interested in students' personal problems.

118. Proper social forms and manners are important here.

119. The school helps everyone get acquainted.

120. Resident students must get written permission to be away from the campus overnight.

121. Most of the professors are dedicated scholars in their fields.

122. Modern art and music get little attention here.

123. Many students here develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life.

124. Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussions, etc.
125. An open display of emotion would embarrass most professors.

126. Many of the natural science professors are actively engaged in research.

127. Special museums or collections are important possessions of the college.

128. Few students are planning post-graduate work in the social sciences.

129. To most students here art is something to be studied rather than felt.

130. The expression of strong personal belief or conviction is pretty rare around here.

131. Concerts and art exhibits always draw big crowds of students.

132. There are a good many colorful and controversial figures on the faculty.

133. The school offers many opportunities for students to understand and criticize important works in art, music, and drama.

134. There is considerable interest in the analysis of value systems, and the relativity of societies and ethics.

135. Students are encouraged to take an active part in social reforms or political programs.

136. Students occasionally plot some sort of escapade or rebellion.

137. Students pay little attention to rules and regulations.

138. Instructors clearly explain the goals and purposes of their courses.

139. Bermuda shorts, pin-up pictures, etc., are common on this campus.

140. Spontaneous student rallies and demonstrations occur frequently.

141. There always seem to be a lot of little quarrels going on.

142. Most student rooms are pretty messy.

143. Few students bother with rubbers, hats, or other special protection against the weather.

144. It is easy to take clear notes in most courses.

145. Students frequently do things on the spur of the moment.
146. Rough games and contact sports are an important part of intramural athletics.

147. Students are expected to report any violation of rules and regulations.

148. Dormitory raids, water fights and other student pranks would be unthinkable here.

149. Many students seem to expect other people to adapt to them rather than trying to adapt themselves to others.

150. Students ask permission before deviating from common policies and practices.