DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 627 CG 008 557

AUTHOR Morill, Weston H., Ed.; And Others
TITLE Student Development Series - 1972-73. Volume X, Student Development Reports.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 251p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Admission Criteria; *College Admission; *College Freshmen; College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Financial Needs; Predictor Variables
IDENTIFIERS *Project GO

ABSTRACT

Project GO (Generating Opportunities) established at Colorado State University in 1968, attempts to meet the academic and financial needs of financially disadvantaged students. This study was designed to produce comparative descriptive data on Project GO and regularly admitted CSU freshmen samples and to evaluate the efficiency of traditional academic predictors for all freshmen. Comparison of the 1968, 1969 and 1970 Project GO freshmen classes revealed significant differences on predictor variable scores (SAT-Verbal, SAT-Math and High School Percentile Rank (HSPR), as well as significant differences in GPA and persist rates. These differences were attributable to relaxed admittance requirements in 1969. Similar sex differences were found for Project GO and regularly admitted freshmen, with females having significantly higher HSPR and males obtaining higher SAT-M scores. Project GO students scored lower on all of the predictor and performance measures than the regularly admitted 1970 freshmen. The 1969 GO persisters showed a significant downward trend in GPA with each successive quarter. Regression equations calculated to predict Fall GPA for both both GO and regularly admitted CSU freshmen were strikingly similar and accounted for only a small portion of the variance. This lends support to the contention that traditional academic predictors such as SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR need to be augmented by nontraditional variables. (Author)

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERIES - 1972-73

Colorado State University

Student Development Reports Volume X

Foreward

The Student Development Series is published by the University Counseling Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80521. It is directed to the interest of counselors, psychologists, and other student development professionals as well as administrators, faculty and students in higher education. Contributions to the Series are made by members of the Colorado State University community. The Series include Student Development Reports, which are of a research or program evaluation nature, and Student Development Staff Papers, which relate to theoretical or philosophical issues.

Table of Contents

Page Number

Student Development Reports 1972-73 Volume X

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC PREDICTORS AND ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT GO AND REGULARLY ADMITTED FRESHMEN AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY, 1968-71

Carolie J. Coates and Raymond L. Hall

Student Development Report
Vol X, No. 1, 1972-73

ABSTRACT

Project GO (Generating Opportunities) was established at Colorado State University in 1968 in an attempt to meet the academic and financial needs of financially disadvantaged students seeking a university education. This study was designed to produce comparative descriptive data on Project GO and regularly admitted CSU freshmen samples and to evaluate the efficiency of traditional academic predictors for both Project GO and regularly admitted freshmen.

Comparison of the 1968, 1969 and 1970 Project GO freshmen classes revealed significant differences on predictor variable scores (SAT-Verbal, SAT-Math and High School Percentile Rank (HSPR)), as well as significant differences in GPA and persist rates. These differences were found attributable to relaxed admittance requirements in 1969 which resulted in lower prediction and performance scores. Similar sex differences were found for Project GO and regularly admitted freshmen, with females having significantly higher HSPR and males obtaining higher SAT-M scores. Project GO students scored lower on all of the predictor and performance measures than the regularly admitted 1970 freshmen. The 1969 GO persisters showed a significant downward trend in GPA with each successive quarter. Regression equations calculated to predict Fall GPA for both GO and regularly admitted CSU freshmen were strikingly similar and interchangeable and each accounted for only a small portion of the variance. This lends support to the contention that traditional academic predictors such as SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR need to be augmented by nontraditional variables from the areas of motivation, and social and background factors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank several people and offices for making this study possible. Mr. Don Lucero, current Project GO Director, and Mr. Claude Gallegos, former Project GO Director, were extremely helpful in providing information. Additional valuable assistance on records was obtained from the Admission and Records Office. Thanks are also in order to Mr. Wayne Becker, who provided the computer data analysis, and to Dr. John Hinkle for editing.

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC PREDICTORS AND ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT GO AND REGULARLY ADMITTED FRESHMEN AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Project GO (Generating Opportunities) was initiated by Colorado State University in the fall of 1968 as an attempt to meet the academic and financial needs of students who might not otherwise be able to attend the university. Although the recruiting practices have varied in the three years of operation, the goal remains one of admitting students of lower socio-economic strata who appear capable of university level performance. The traditional academic predictors such as Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and high school performance were considered in student selection. In addition, eligibility was based on other significant factors such as personal recommendations, family income, student attitudes, and other more subjective evaluations.

To assist the students admitted, Project GO offers academic and/or financial assistance to students in the program. Since Project GO students are required to take classes which are a part of the regular university curriculum, academic assistance has been provided in the University Learning Laboratory, where students may receive aid with study skills, course work, and tutoring. Financial assistance is offered in the form of work-study. (This is essentially the same type of financial assistance which is open to other students of the university.) Students are expected to take part in work-study every quarter after their initial one. In addition, other services have been provided to the students by Project GO in the form of summer orientation, counseling, and faculty and paraprofessional advisors.

The two basic results of the present study of Project GO are stated below:

1. Descriptive and comparative academic predictor and performance data are outlined for the Project GO and regularly admitted freshmen samples at CSU.
2. The efficiency of the traditional academic predictors are assessed for both the Project GO and the regularly admitted samples at CSU.

Several studies exist in the literature comparing the academic performance of students from the lower socio-economic levels and that of samples of students representing "students in general." Rhodes and Caple (1969) studied the academic performance of Economic Opportunity Grant (EOG) students at the University of Missouri - Columbia. They found no significant differences between the college GPA's of EOG and non-EOG members during the freshman year. Similarly no significant differences in School and College Ability Test (SCAT) scores appeared. EOG students did have a significantly higher average high school rank than non-EOG students.

Merritt (1970) compared work-study students (who "represent the lower socio-economic levels" (p. 173)) and Greek fraternity and sorority students ("who tend to come from the upper socio-economic levels" (p. 173) and whose academic performance is representative of the general school population) on the American College Test (ACT) and freshman grade point averages (GPA's) at Delta State College. Students with Greek membership had significantly higher ACT scores (20.6) than the work-study students (19.0). There were, however, no significant differences between fall GPA's for the Greeks (2.6) and the work-study

students (2.5). While work-study males did not have significantly higher ACT scores than work-study females, the work-study females earned significantly higher fall GPA's (2.6) than the work-study males (2.3).

When studying educational opportunity grant (EOG), persisters and non-persisters (a persister being defined as a student who returned for his Sophomore year) at the University of Missouri - Columbia, Baber and Caple (1970) discovered there were statistically significant differences in high school rank, SCAT scores, and college GPA's with persisters scoring significantly better than non-persisters. No significant differences were found between the two groups for parents' average income.

Turning to descriptive data from the freshman classes of Colorado State University for the last three years, the mean SAT Verbal (SAT-V) scores for all entering freshmen (including the Project GO students) during the last three years have ranged from 483 to 486. Mean SAT Math (SAT-M) scores for freshmen in the last two years have been 527; three years ago the mean was 513. From grouped data supplied by the Colorado State University Admissions and Records Office, it appears that the average entering freshman was at approximately the 74th percentile of his high school class. The cumulative freshman GPA (including the Project GO students in the sample) was 2.27 in 1968, and 2.48 in 1969, and 2.53 in 1970.

Miller (1967) studied prediction of fall GPA with 2,955 Colorado State University freshmen utilizing high school rank, SAT-V, and SAT-M scores as independent variables. The multiple correlation was .52, the multiple coefficient of determination was .28, and the standard error of estimate was .72. The equations Miller developed are currently being used by Colorado State University to predict fall quarter grade point averages for all new students.

By referring to a study by Munday (1970), the prediction of fall GPA in the Miller study may be compared to national norms. In his study for the American College Testing program, Munday examined several hundred multiple correlations utilizing ACT scores and high school rank as predictors of college GPA. Multiple r's ranged from .29 to .80, with .62 as the average. The average predictable variance (r^2) was .38. From this information, it can be seen that the Miller multiple regression completed at Colorado State University performs below the national average found in the Munday study.

Stanley (1971) in his recent review of the literature regarding selection of disadvantaged students concluded that, "Test scores predict the college grades of educationally disadvantaged students at least as well as they do the advantaged. High school grades considerably augment the prediction for both groups" (p. 645). Bowers (1970) has also pointed out the similar predictive validities for commonly used ability tests for black and white college freshmen, but his study concluded that separate predictive equations be derived for each specific group.

Methods

Information utilized in this study was gathered with the aid of the Project GO staff and the Office of Admissions and Records at Colorado State University for the freshman classes of Project GO students for the years 1968, 1969, and 1970. Information for Project GO students included sex, SAT Verbal scores (SAT-V), SAT Math scores (SAT-M), high school percentile rank (HSPR), grade point averages (GPAs) for fall, winter, and spring quarters of their freshman year, cumulative freshman GPA, CSU predicted GPA (based on Miller's equation), and whether the students successfully persisted or not at the end of the freshman year.

The respective numbers (Ns) of GO students who have fairly complete data for the three years were 53, 125, and 136. The sex ratios for each year were approximately equal with males slightly more represented than females. With regard to ethnic group membership, the majority of Project GO students have been Black or Chicano, with fewer mumbers of Anglos, Indians, and Orientals.

For comparison purposes, a ten percent random sample of the 3,292 non-Project GO regularly admitted 1970 freshman class was drawn. The same variables were obtained for this comparison group (with the exception of CSU predicted GPA). Males and females were almost equally represended, consistent with population statistics.

It should be noted that Colorado State University calculates its GPA's on a four-point scale. In addition for purposes of this study, a cumulative GPA was calculated for each student where GPA information was available even if he did not complete all three quarters. Therefore, if a student only completed one quarter, that GPA value was also treated as his cumulative GPA. There are instances of incomplete data, especially for the Project GO group, as not all students took the SAT, and certain other information was not always recorded.

Results

Descriptive Data

Academic predictor variable differences among the three Project GO freshman classes. The three years of freshman Project GO classes (1968, 1969, and 1970) were compared on one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for the three academic predictor variables of SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR. As illustrated in Tables 1-3, the ANOVAs were each significant at the .001 level, apparently due to the consistently lower scores of

the 1969 group. According to information about Project GO recruiting practices, there was some relaxation in entrance requirements for the 1969 class.

Performance differences among the three Project GO freshman classes. Tables 4-7 contain the GPA means and one-way ANOVAs across years for fall, winter, spring, and freshmen year cumulative GPA's. All of the ANOVAs were significant at the .001 level with the exception of winter quarter GPA, which was significant at the .01 level. Again, as was the case with the predictor variables, the 1969 class demonstrated lower academic performance in terms of academic grade points.

Another indicator of academic performance is rate of academic dismissal. Scholastic standards, which were in effect for these three years, called for academic suspension for first quarter freshmen who attained a GPA less than 1.00, or a GPA of less than 1.50 at the end of the freshman year. Table 8 contains a summary of the academic dismissal data across all three Project GO years. The chi square computed on this data was significant at the .001 level with a value of 24.25 with 2 df. The poorer academic performance of the 1969 Project GO freshmen is demonstrated by this measure, in that 52% received academic dismissals, compared to 32% of the 1968 class and only 23% of the 1970 class.

Another way of defining persist behavior is to include in a non-persist category all those students who either were suspended for academic reasons or simply failed to complete all three quarters of their freshman year. Table 9 contains the cell frequencies across years for this type of persist analysis. A chi square computed on these frequencies was significant at the .001 level with a value of 20.81 and 2 df. The 1969 group clearly had a higher rate of non-persist behavior with 63% receiving

TABLE 1

DIFFERENCES IN SAT V SCORES AMONG THE

THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	53	411.45	82.12
1969	120	348.75	73.02
1970	127	406.72	88.71
	Total N=300	Grand $\bar{X}$=384.37	Grand SD=86.39

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	299	2,231,311.67		
Treatment(years)	2	254,548.24	127,274.12	19.12***
Residual	297	1,976,763.43	6,655.77	

***p<.001

TABLE 2

DIFFERENCES IN SAT M SCORES AMONG THE

THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	53	439.21	94.02
1969	120	367.48	84.78
1970	127	449.35	96.49
	Total N=300	Grand $\bar{X}$=414.81	Grand SD=99.16

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	299	2,939,766.17		
Treatment(years)	2	451,806.73	225,903.37	26.97***
Residual	297	2,487,959.44	8,376.97	

***p<.001

TABLE 3

DIFFERENCES IN HSPR AMONG THE

THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	53	74.91	16.97
1969	122	55.92	21.31
1970	130	64.76	20.08
	Total N=305	Grand $\bar{X}$=62.76	Grand SD=21.15

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	304	135,941.95		
Treatment (years)	2	14,034.63	7,017.32	17.38***
Residual	302	121,907.32	403.67	

***$p<.001$

TABLE 4

DIFFERENCES IN FALL QUARTER GPA AMONG THE THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	53	2.02	.80
1969	123	1.46	.81
1970	135	1.87	.86
	Total N=311	Grand $\bar{X}$=1.73	Grand SD=.86

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	MS	SS	F
Total	310	227.87		
Treatment (years)	2	15.57	7.78	11.29***
Residual	308	212.30	.69	

***p<.001

TABLE 5

DIFFERENCES IN WINTER QUARTER GPA AMONG THE

THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	50	1.86	.94
1969	86	1.63	.75
1970	109	1.96	.75
	Total N=245	Grand $\bar{X}$=1.82	Grand SD=.81

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	244	158.26		
Treatment (years)	2	5.42	2.71	4.29**
Residual	442	152.84	.63	

**p<.01

TABLE 6

DIFFERENCES IN SPRING QUARTER GPA AMONG THE THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	47	1.90	1.03
1969	75	1.46	.92
1970	99	2.10	.85
	Total N=221	Grand $\bar{X}$=1.84	Grand SD= .96

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	220	201.35		
Treatment (years)	2	18.06	9.03	10.74***
Residual	218	183.29	.84	

***p<.001

TABLE 7

DIFFERENCES IN CUMULATIVE FRESHMAN YEAR GPA AMONG THE THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

Year	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1968	53	1.84	.83
1969	123	1.31	.75
1970	131	1.86	.76
	Total N=307	Grand $\bar{X}$=1.64	Grand SD=.81

ONE-WAY ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Total	306	201.99		
Treatment (years)	2	22.48	11.24	19.04***
Residual	304	179.50	.59	

***p<.001

TABLE 8

ACADEMIC DISMISSAL FREQUENCIES FOR THE THREE PROJECT GO FRESHMAN CLASSES

	Non-Academic Dismissals	Academic Dismissals	Totals
1968	36	17	53
1969	59	64	123
1970	105	31	136
Totals	200	112	312

TABLE 9

PERSIST-NONPERSIST FREQUENCIES FOR THE THREE FRESHMAN PROJECT GO CLASSES

	Persist	Nonpersist	Totals
1968	33	20	53
1969	45	78	123
1970	86	50	136
Totals	164	148	312

academic dismissals or failing to complete three quarters, while 1968 and 1970 classes were more similar with 38% of the 1968 class non-persisting and 37% of the 1970 class.

Academic predictor variable differences between male and female Project GO students. T tests were computed between males and females for all three years of Project GO combined. Utilizing two-tailed tests of significance, significant differences were found for HSPR and SAT-M but not for SAT-V.

Females achieved a significantly higher HSPR, 67.18 (N = 148), than the males, 59.04 (N = 157), $t = 3.42$, df = 303, significant at the .001 level. Males achieved significantly higher (.001 level) SAT-M scores than females; the mean for the males was 437.22 (N = 154) and the mean for the females was 391.17 (N = 146), $t = -4.13$, df = 298.

Academic performance differences between male and female Project GO students. No significant differences were found in GPA performance measures between males and females, as tested in t tests, for fall, winter, spring, or cumulative GPAs. A chi square computed for males and females on persist-nonpersist at the end of the freshman year was also nonsignificant.

Academic predictor variable differences between male and female non-Project GO students. When sex differences were computed for regularly admitted 1970 freshmen, trends very similar to the Project GO freshmen were found. Females achieved a higher HSPR than males with a score of 76.16 compared to 68.68 for the males ($t = 4.03$, df = 327, $p < .001$). There were no significant differences on the SAT-V scores; however, males scored significantly higher (mean of 556.94) than females (mean of 513.62) on the SAT-M ($t = -4.00$, df = 327, $p < .001$).

Academic performance differences between male and female non-Project GO students. While t tests computed between male and female regularly admitted freshmen students for fall, winter, and spring quarter GPAs were all nonsignificant, females achieved higher freshman year cumulative GPAs than males (female mean = 2.53, male mean = 2.35; t = 2.22, df = 326, $p < .05$). A chi square computed for persist and non-persist behavior of the regularly admitted males versus females was nonsignificant.

Comparisons between Project GO and non-Project GO freshmen. Table 10 contains the means and t tests for 1970 Project GO students and the sample of regularly admitted 1970 freshmen. Project GO students were significantly lower on the predictive criteria (SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR). In addition, the Project GO group scored significantly lower on all freshman year GPAs. Another set of t tests was performed with the entire Project GO sample from all three years versus the 1970 regularly admitted sample (which provided more equal group N's). Essentially the same findings were obtained: the Project GO students scored significantly lower on predictor and performance measures.

When persist behavior (students who achieved acceptable GPAs and stayed in school all three quarters of their freshman year) was compared between the 1970 Project GO group and the 1970 non-Project GO group, a similar picture emerged. A chi square computed on the frequencies shown in Table 11 achieved a value of 25.25 with 1 df, significant at the .001 level. Sixty-three percent of the 1970 Project GO students persisted, while 85% of the sample of non-Project GO students persisted.

GPA performance across quarters. Table 12 contains the means and summary statistics for a repeated measure one-way ANOVA computed across all three quarters for Project GO freshmen (from all three years combined

TABLE 10

SIGNIFICANT t TESTS BETWEEN 1970 PROJECT GO AND NON-PROJECT GO STUDENTS

Variable		N	$\bar{X}$	St. Dev.	df	t
SAT V	GO	127	406.72	88.71	454	-9.68***
	Non-GO	329	495.74	87.82		
SAT M	GO	127	449.35	94.49	454	-8.25***
	Non-GO	329	534.95	100.42		
HSPR	GO	130	64.76	20.08	457	-4.12***
	Non-GO	329	72.48	17.23		
CUM. GPA	GO	131	1.86	.76	457	-7.63***
	Non-GO	328	2.44	.72		
F GPA	GO	135	1.87	.86	461	-7.23***
	Non-GO	328	2.46	.72		
W GPA	GO	109	1.96	.75	407	-6.53***
	Non-GO	300	2.51	.74		
S GPA	GO	99	2.10	.85	387	-5.83***
	Non-GO	290	2.59	.76		

***p<.001

TABLE 11

PERSIST BEHAVIOR OF 1970 PROJECT

GO VERSUS NON-PROJECT GO FRESHMEN

	Persist	Non Persist	Totals
1970 Project GO	86	50	136
1970 Non Project GO	279	50	329
Totals	365	100	465

TABLE 12

REPEATED MEASURE ONE-WAY ANOVA ON FRESHMAN YEAR GPAs ACROSS QUARTERS FOR TOTAL PROJECT GO FRESHMEN WHO COMPLETED THREE QUARTERS

Quarters	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fall	202	2.07	.13
Winter	202	1.90	-.04
Spring	202	1.84	-.10
		Grand $\bar{X}$=1.94	

ONE-WAY REPEATED MEASURE ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Subjects	201	255.55	1.27	
Treatment(quarters)	2	5.83	2.91	8.56***
Residual	402	139.50	.34	

***p<.001

who had completed all three quarters of their freshman year. The F ratio was significant at the .001 level, and an inspection of the mean GPAs demonstrated a lower average achieved GPA with each successive quarter.

In order to see if a particular year was contributing to this finding, similar one-way ANOVAs were computed for each year separately. The results for 1968 and 1970 were nonsignificant. The 1968 Project GO group exhibited a downward trend with each successive quarter, but the ANOVA was nonsignificant (F = 2.16, W = 1.98, S = 1.92). The 1970 group did not exhibit a consistent downward trend (F = 2.18, W = 2.07, S = 2.14). Table 13 contains the results of an ANOVA computed with the 1969 group who had completed three quarters; a significant downward trend was found ($p < .001$). Apparently the 1969 group, which was the lowest achieving group of the three years, also experienced a deterioration effect with regard to GPA performance across quarters.

A similar one-way ANOVA computed for the 1970 regularly admitted students was found not significant and did not exhibit a downward trend (F = 2.56, W = 2.53, S = 2.60).

Predictive Data

Table 14 presents a correlation matrix for predictor and performance variables for a combined sample of 1968, 1969, and 1970 Project GO freshmen. All of the correlations reached the .01 level of significance with a two-tailed test. All of the correlations were positive, with the exception of those r's involving persist behavior (student in good academic standing at the end of three full quarters of the freshman year), since the variable was coded 1 = persist and 2 = nonpersist. All three predictor variables (SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR) correlated between .36 and .43 with F GPA, and between .39 and .44 with Cum. GPA.

TABLE 13

REPEATED MEASURE ONE-WAY ANOVA ON FRESHMAN YEAR GPAs ACROSS QUARTERS FOR 1969 PROJECT GO FRESHMEN WHO COMPLETED ALL THREE QUARTERS

Quarters	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fall	73	1.90	.23
Winter	73	1.65	-.02
Spring	73	1.45	-.2
		Grand $\bar{X}$=1.67	

ONE-WAY REPEATED MEASURE ANOVA SUMMARY STATISTICS

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Subjects	72	69.22	.96	
Treatment	2	7.23	3.62	9.78***
Residual	144	53.85	.37	

***p<.001

TABLE 14

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR PROJECT GO FRESHMEN ALL THREE YEARS COMBINED

	P/NP	SAT V	SAT M	HSPR	CUM. GPA	F GPA	W GPA	S GPA	CSU PRED. GPA
SAT V	-.32 (300)								
SAT M	-.28 (300)	.60 (300)							
HSPR	-.22 (305)	.29 (295)	.36 (295)						
CUM. GPA	-.73 (307)	.43 (296)	.44 (296)	.39 (300)					
F GPA	-.57 (311)	.36 (299)	.43 (299)	.39 (304)	.84 (307)				
W GPA	-.58 (245)	.33 (239)	.25 (239)	.20 (239)	.80 (243)	.50 (245)			
S GPA	-.65 (221)	.27 (215)	.28 (215)	.24 (216)	.78 (220)	.37 (221)	.55 (218)		
CSU PRED. GPA	-.32 (284)	.55 (281)	.58 (281)	.88 (283)	.50 (280)	.45 (283)	.27 (220)	.31 (198)	
NEW PRED. GPA	-.27 (312)	.63 (300)	.85 (300)	.73 (305)	.46 (307)	.47 (311)	.26 (245)	.26 (221)	.85 (284)

All r's significant at .01 level or higher.

Table 15 presents a similar correlation matrix for predictor and performance variables for the 1970 regularly admitted non-Project GO sample (with the exception of two correlations, all reached the .01 level of significance of higher). Correlations of the predictor variables with GPA performance were very similar to those found for the Project GO group; the three predictor variables correlated between .30 and .42 with F GPA and between .31 and .52 with Cum. GPA.

In order to assess the efficiency of the three academic predictors (SAT-V, SAT-M, HSPR) in combination, two stepwise multiple regressions were computed to predict fall GPA's. Table 16 contains the two regression equations derived, one for all Project GO freshmen combined and one for the sample of regularly admitted freshmen. Table 17 confirms that the regression multiple correlations appear to be very similar for both groups. High school percentile rank accounted for the most variance for both regressions as has been found by other investigators (Bowers, 1970; Stanley, 1971). With all three predictor variables included, the multiple r for the Project GO group was .47, which accounted for only 22 percent of the variance. However, the regularly admitted group multiple regression results were similar with a multiple r of .46, which accounted for 21 percent of the variance. Both r^2 are below the average predictable variance of .38 found by Munday (1970).

From inspection of table 14 it appears that the Project GO regression-predicted F GPA computed in this study is highly related to the CSU predicted GPA (r = .85) for the sample of Project GO students. When both predicted F GPA values are related to obtained F GPAs the results again are very similar. The CSU predicted F GPA correlated .45 with actual F GPA and the new regression equation correlated .47 with actual F GPA.

TABLE 15

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR NON PROJECT GO 1970 FRESHMEN

	P/NP	SAT V	SAT M	HSPR	CUM. GPA	F GPA	W GPA	S GPA
SAT V	-.09 (329)							
SAT M	-.07 (329)	.48 (329)						
HSPR	-.17 (329)	.32 (329)	.27 (329)					
CUM. GPA	-.55 (328)	.32 (329)	.31 (328)	.52 (328)				
F GPA	-.44 (328)	.32 (328)	.30 (328)	.42 (328)	.86 (328)			
W GPA	-.43 (300)	.27 (300)	.25 (300)	.48 (300)	.88 (300)	.60 (300)		
S GPA	-.35 (290)	.24 (290)	.23 (290)	.47 (290)	.83 (290)	.50 (290)	.61 (290)	
NEW PRED. GPA	-.17 (329)	.67 (329)	.64 (329)	.87 (329)	.55 (328)	.48 (328)	.49 (300)	.46 (290)

NOTE: All r's significant at .01 level or higher with the exception of the first two correlations in column one.

TABLE 16

REGRESSION EQUATIONS[+] TO PREDICT FALL GPA

a.	Project GO Freshmen all 3 years N=312	$.27070 + .00046x_v + .00202x_m + .00786x_r$
b.	Non-Project GO Freshmen 1970 N=329	$.22314 + .00120x_v + .00104x_m + .01482x_r$

[+] x_v = SAT V, x_m = SAT M, x_r = HSPR.

TABLE 17

SUMMARY OF REGRESSION MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS TO PREDICT FALL GPA

a. Project GO Freshmen--all 3 years (N = 312)

	Variable	Multiple r	r^2	Standard Error of Estimate
1	HSPR	.42	.18	.78
2	SAT M	.46	.21	.77
3	SAT V	.47	.22	.77

b. Non-Project GO Freshmen--1970 (N = 329)

	Variable	Multiple r	r^2	Standard Error of Estimate
1	HSPR	.40	.16	.72
2	SAT M	.44	.20	.71
3	SAT V	.46	.21	.70

An inspection of Table 15 suggests that the new regression predicted GPA derived specifically for the regularly admitted group also only achieved moderate success with a .43 correlation with the actual F GPA.

An indication of the similarity of the two regression equations specially derived for the present study is that when the Project GO prediction equation is applied to the data for the regularly admitted students and the values correlated with the values obtained from the equation specially designed for the regularly admitted students, the correlation is .93.

Discussion

When a comparison is made between the three Project GO freshman classes from the years 1968, 1969, and 1970, the relaxed admittance requirements utilized in 1969 resulted in significantly lower scores on predictor variables as well as significantly lower GPAs and a lower persist rate than for the 1968 and 1970 classes.

Similar sex differences were found for both the Project GO combined group and the regularly admitted students. Females had significantly higher HSPRs, and males achieved significantly higher SAT-M scores. No GPA differences related to sex were found for the Project GO students; however, for the regularly admitted students, females received significantly higher Cum GPAs than males.

Project GO students scored significantly lower on all of the predictor and performance measures in the present study than the sample of regularly admitted freshmen. For Project GO students who completed three quarters of their freshman year, only the 1969 group exhibited a significant downward trend in GPA with each successive quarter. The regularly admitted freshmen exhibited no downward trend of GPA across quarters.

When separate multiple regressions to predict fall GPA were calculated for the Project GO students and the regularly admitted students, both equations accounted for a small percent of the variance for their respective samples. The equation for Project GO students accounted for 22 percent of the variance, and the equation for the regularly admitted students accounted for 21 percent of the variance. This finding suggests that the traditional academic predictors of SAT-V, SAT-M, and HSPR do not account for a major portion of the variance for either specially admitted or regularly admitted Freshmen at Colorado State University.

This conclusion coincides with Stanley's (1971) literature review and assessment that test scores predict the grades of the disadvantaged at least as well as for the advantaged students.

This study reiterates the need to proceed with research focused on increasing the predictability of academic performance with the utilization of nontraditional predictors. Efforts must be renewed in the areas of individual motivation and additional social and background factors which might augment the academic predictability for both advantaged and disadvantaged students.

References

Baber, B. B., Jr. and Caple, R. B. Educational opportunity grant students: persisters and nonpersisters. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 115-119.

Bowers, J. The comparison of GPA regression equations for regularly admitted and disadvantaged freshmen at the University of Illinois, Journal of Educational Measurement, 1970, 1, 219-225.

Merritt, R. Academic performance of work-study students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 173-176.

Miller, D. Regression equation for Colorado State University freshmen to predict fall grade point. Personal communication, 1967.

Munday, L. A. Factors influencing the predictability of college grades, American Educational Research Journal, 1970, 7, 99-107.

Rhodes, L. L. and Caple, R. B. Academic aptitude and achievement of educational opportunity grant students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1969, 10, 387-390.

Stanley, J. C. Predicting college success of the educationally disadvantaged. Science, 1971, 171, 640-647.

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND SOURCES OF HELP

Carolie J. Coates, James C. Hurst
and
Wayne Becker

Student Development Report
Vol X, No. 2, 1972-73

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire on student problems and sources of help was mailed to a random sample of 500 Colorado State University Students. The 314 respondents indicated their main concerns were academic, identity, financial, vocational, lack of friends, and lack of information about college services. A majority of students selected no one for assistance, but peers, faculty, and certain college offices were also elected. Year in school provided some significant differences in problem relevance.

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND SOURCES OF HELP

Introduction

The demise of the "en loco parentis" viewpoint in the field of college student personnel has created some concern as to whether the traditional forms of college sponsored assistance are actually meeting the current needs of the student population. One question that arises is the nature of the problems and pressures that face college students today. A second concern is where students go for help with their problems and if they are satisfied with the level of assistance they receive.

Suinn (1967) reviewed a series of studies from the 1940's and 1950's which utilized the Mooney Problem Check List of 330 items to study the primary problems faced by samples of education students. The most recent and representative of these studies, one by Koile and Bird (1956) merits review as it provided information on sources of help as well as primary problems. Utilizing freshmen subjects at a teachers college, they found the most checked area for men and women was adjustment to college work, followed by personal psychological, and social-recreational activities.

More recent studies employing the Mooney Problem Checklist have found essentially the same problem areas most prevalent as Koile and Bird. Suinn (1967) utilized a sample of men and women freshman through senior liberal arts college students and Hartman (1968) utilized a sample of male and female freshmen and sophomores at a commuter college, with both studies replicating the same three problems as most prevalent.

Koile and Bird (1956) and Suinn (1967) reported that women indicated a greater number of problems than men, while Hartman (1968) found the reverse. Suinn (1967) found lowerclassmen more concerned with social issues, found men more concerned with academic problems, and women more concerned with morals-religion and personal-psychological problems.

As to preferred sources of help, Koile and Bird reported that a majority of their freshmen saw no one, followed by counselor-psychologist, faculty advisor, instructor, and student friend. Suinn (1967) found over 70 percent of the problems experienced by his total sample were taken to either no one, a student friend, or a parent. Suinn noted that the private liberal arts college sample in his study relied less on school sources than the state teachers college sample of Koile and Bird. Suinn also found few differences between males and females or year in college as to where students sought help with their problems.

A number of other studies have chosen to develop their own questionnaires. The results of these studies tend to follow different patterns, possibly because of the questionnaire differences, the fact that the studies were conducted in different academic years, or because of the differences among the types of institutions studied. In a study at Southern Connecticut State College, Rust and Davie (1961) found no single problem as significantly high, however, difficulties with specific peers, finances or commuting, family, and academic-vocational problems received moderate ratings. Rust and Davie reported that for all types of problems, friends were chosen first as sources of help, followed by parents and faculty, and psychological services were last. In contrast, Kinnane (1967) in a study of freshmen through senior college women from colleges and universities in six states found the overwhelming majority of women would turn to a college officer over any other source.

In an article in School and Society (1970) which summarizes a survey of Stanford University undergraduates, the type of institution seems to prove important as their undergraduates come up with a list of problems divergent from previous studies. The primary problems identified by

Stanford undergraduates were dissatisfaction in quality of communication with fellow students and uncertainties about future plans. Other high ranking problems were poor relations with the opposite sex, lack of self-confidence, despondency or depression, too much studying, and ineffective use of time. When asked how they handled their problems, 29% indicated they relied on themselves, 18% reported they consulted a friend, 12% faculty, 6% parents, and 6% counseling center.

In a recent study conducted by Snyder, Hill and Derksen (1972) with Southern Illinois University sophomores, the most common problems cited were depression, choice of major, future, and personal problems. For personal and social problems, students indicated they would go to a friend, close relative, and lastly, faculty or counseling service. However, they indicated a reversed ordering of the sources of help for vocational problems.

Although there is some commonality of results across the studies reviewed, the type of sample drawn, the type of institution, and the time of the study appear to have some influence upon the results. Therefore, a study conducted at the institution in question seems appropriate to consider. Donk and Hinkle (1971) reported on a series of surveys conducted with the same student sample at Colorado State University with data gathered during their first, sixth, and eleventh quarters at the University on preferred sources of help for academic and personal problems. The faculty remained the major source of academic help for all three surveys; however, there were increasing trends to choose a friend or no one for help with an academic problem. For personal problems, friends and parents remained highly chosen sources of help across the three surveys, while no one made a large increase over time, and deans and counseling center made slight increases.

The large percentage of the "no one" choice of help category in a number of studies, suggests that students tend not to utilize college offices as their source of help in a great many cases. From the results of the Donk and Hinkle survey it appears that this independence seems to increase with years in school.

Given the somewhat contradictory findings of earlier studies, a questionnaire was designed to assess the types of problems and sources of help most often faced by students at Colorado State University, a moderately large land grant university. The study included males and females, and freshmen through graduate students.

Method

Questionnaire

A mailable questionnaire format was devised with three main parts: demographic information, an open-ended section where a student could write about problems he had actually faced that school year, and an objective section where a student could rate the degree to which a problem statement applied to him (on a four point scale) and where he would probably go for help or assistance if faced with such a problem. (See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire and answer sheets). The open-ended section was coded by a single judge into predetermined categories. The objective section consisted of 38 problem statements covering major problem areas as identified by previous investigators: vocational, academic, financial, interpersonal relationships with peers and family, identity, health; and some questions concerning specific issues (i.e., drugs, lack of information about student services, availability of campus activities, birth control information, discrimination against women, and military service).

A list of 21 potential sources of help was devised for use by students in responding to the objective section:

> 1. Campus Police Department, 2. Clergyman, 3. Close friend (peer), 4. Counseling Center, 5. Faculty member or adviser, 6. Family member, 7. Financial Aids Office, 8. Health Center, 9. Housing Office, 10. No one, 11. Office of Academic Advising, 12. Office of Student Relations, 13. Office of Women's Relations, 14. Placement Center, 15. Private professional (attorney, physician, psychologist, etc.), 16. Residence Hall staff member, 17. RoadHouse (student manned call-in center), 18. Student Employment Office, 19. Student Center staff member, 20. Student Government, 21. Other.

Specific sources of help designations were used with the intention that the information might be potentially useful for student services offices to see how they were perceived by students. The initial draft of the questionnaire was pre-tested with forty introductory psychology students for clarity, independence of items, and format.

Sampling

The revised questionnaire was sent by mail to a random sample of 500 of the approximately 17,000 students enrolled at Colorado State University, Fall quarter, 1971. Two follow-up letters were utilized urging return of the questionnaires. A 63% return (314 of the 500) was obtained by the end of Fall quarter.

Description of the Sample

Of those students completing the questionnaire, 55%* were male and 45% were female. The majority of the sample (88%) were single, while only 12% were married. A large percentage of the respondents (50%) were residence hall residents, however, 44% lived in off-campus housing, 14% lived in sororities or fraternities, and 1% indicated they commuted from another town.

---

*All percents expressed to nearest whole percent.

With regard to year in school, 35% were freshmen, 19% sophomores, 18% juniors, 17% seniors, 10% graduate students, and 1% indicated some other classification. Most of the subjects (44%) had only been in attendance at Colorado State University the quarter in which the questionnaire was administered, and a total of 80% had been on the CSU campus up to and including seven quarters. Twenty-four percent indicated they were transfer students. With this information and the information on student class, it appears that the majority of respondents were new to the campus, either because they were freshmen or transfer students.

Thirty-four percent did not answer the item as to current grade point, presumably because they were freshmen. However, of the students responding, the modal grade point category was 2.5-2.99, and only 4% of the respondents indicated a grade point below 2.0. The most predominant major was science and math (24%), with business, sociology and psychology, forest and natural resources, and home economics, the next highest with 14%, 13%, 11% and 11% respectively. Clearly the majority of students indicated they were fairly comfortable with their choice of major. Forty-two percent indicated they were very certain of their major choice, and 38% indicated they were moderately certain, while only 6% indicated they were very uncertain, and 13% indicated they were moderately uncertain.

The ethnic group returning the questionnaire was primarily Anglo (91%). Although the ethnic minority population at Colorado State University is not very large, the lack of their representation in the results is disappointing. Two percent of the subjects did not answer the item on ethnic group, 1% indicated Black, 1% Chicano, and 5% marked Other.

Another approach was attempted with student self-descriptions. Four typologies were used which bear a degree of resemblance to Clark and

Trow's (1966) student subculture types and Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder's (1961) conceptual system personality types. For each of the four student descriptions, students were asked to rate "most like them" to "least like them" on a four point scale. The following description was used for the Vocational-practical student:

> I am in college to attain occupational skills for my future. As I see it, education consists of a body of skills and information to be mastered. I like to lead an orderly life, and I'm not overly interested in politics or culture.

This student description elicited a fairly even distribution with 24% selecting the Vocational-practical orientation as most like them, 29% given it second choice, 21% giving it third choice, and 20% ranking it fourth (least like them), and 5% not responding.

The Alienated-artistic student description is reproduced below:

> I see myself as a seeker, who rejects the phoney middle class way of life. Often I feel like a loner. I like artistic and creative endeavors, and feel pretty apathetic about "organized campus life." Authority figures or very straight people make me feel nervous or hostile.

This description received a fairly clear rejection from the Colorado State University student sample. Five percent failed to answer the item, only 5% rated it number 1 in describing them, 15% rated it number two, 17% as number three, and a majority of 58% rated it least like them.

The Friendly-collegiate oriented description found 17% ranking it number 1, 31% ranking it number 2, 33% ranking it number 3, and only 14% ranking it as least like them, while 5% failed to respond. The friendly-collegiate description is stated below:

> I see myself as a very friendly and warm person. I like people and my main rewards in life are from friendships and interaction with others. I especially like the extra-curricular aspects of college life. It is very important that my peers accept and like me. Most of the middle class values are okay, but I'm certainly not overly devoted to all of them.

A somewhat surprising finding was that the majority of the sample saw themselves as primarily Intellectual and independent. Typically Colorado State University students have been stereotyped as rather conventional and vocationally oriented. This information suggests that they may see themselves in quite a different light. Forty-nine percent indicated this description best fit them, 19% rated it second, 23% rated it third, and only 3% rated it least like me, and 5% failed to rate the item. The intellectual-independent student description is given below:

> I view education as a means to sharpen and express my desire to explore, explain, and understand for the sake of understanding. I would like to be described as independent, politically liberal, and culturally aware. I am skeptical of authority, but not hostile. I like to question things and to devise creative solutions to problems; I reserve the right to decide questions of value for myself.

Results

Part I

Responses to Open-ended Questions about Problems Encountered.

With regard to the number of problems in the open-ended section of the questionnaire, the mean number of problems reported was 1.56. The rater categorized each of the problems reported into one of 16 categories. It was found that 16% of the respondents either indicated they had no problems or left the open-ended section blank. Data is reported for the entire group only for problem 1, as the majority of subjects reported at least one problem.

The most frequently cited problem was primarily academic, i.e., concern about coursework, grades, quality of teaching, and unfair grading, with 17% of the total subjects indicating this as their first cited problem. The next three ranking problems with 11%, 10% and 10%, respectively, were financial, identity problems, and an "other" category of miscellaneous concerns. Another group of problem areas with percentages ranging from 5-7% were administrative hassles (registration, poor advising, etc.), choice of major, personal health, problems associated with the opposite sex, and roommate problems. The categories that received only 1-3% were vocational, family-related, dorm living, meeting people, religion, serious emotional problems, and the draft.

With regard to this first cited problem, the majority of subjects indicated the problem was in the past (41%), and that it was of extreme concern to them (49%). When asked where they turned for help with this problem, 16% were unanswered, but 23% indicated they relied on themselves and turned to no one, 11% turned to a close friend, and 11% turned to a faculty member or advisor. Several other sources of help received from 4-6% selection; they were family member, Health Center, Counseling

Center, the "other" category and residence hall staff member. The remaining 13 source of help categories received only 0-3%. It should be noted that many of these offices and sources have highly specialized functions and were possibly not selected simply because they were not appropriate to solving the student's problem.

When the subjects were asked to indicate the type of ideal source of help to which they would have liked to turn, unfortunately 27% did not respond, while 10% would rely on themselves, 9% indicated faculty member or advisor, 8% someone who cares, 7% some type of center on campus where they could meet and mix with people, 7% other, 7% don't know, 5% family member, and 4% Counseling Center. The remainder of the sources of help categories received scattered responses from 0-3%. Another way to look at the degree of satisfaction with the source of help actually used was to note the finding that only 17% indicated the ideal source of help was the same as the real, while a majority of 56% indicated a new source of help or an improved real source of help they would like to use. This suggests some dissatisfaction with the type of help they received in the past.

Part II

Relevance of Objective Problem Statements.

Several counts were made of problems achieving scores higher than "definitely does not apply to me" across the list of given problems. Of the list of 38 potential problems, the undergraduate male sample reported an average of 13.5 problems, while the undergraduate female sample reported a mean of 15.2 problems. Table 1 contains the mean number of problems by sex and year in school. It is interesting to note that male

seniors reported the fewest problems, a mean of 10.7.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

For the overall student sample, most of the subjects indicated that the majority of specific problem statements did not apply to them. Students rated each of the 38 given statements as 1. "Definitely does not apply to me," 2. "Somewhat does not apply to me," 3. "Somewhat does apply to me," or 4. "Definitely does apply to me." Several explanations seem feasible for the generally low averages across the sample as a whole. It may be that the behaviorally worded problem statements were simply too specific to be agreed upon as an applicable problem statement by a majority of students. Another possibility is that students simply encounter fewer problems in general than anticipated, or perhaps the survey was completed too early in the year (Fall quarter) for some potential problems to develop.

Table 2 contains eight items of the 38 with the highest "concerns me" means. Also included are the percentage of students electing each

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

of the 21 sources of help to which they would probably turn if faced with such a problem. In order of decreasing importance to the students, the problems with highest means were:

1. Item 5: I would like to know more about my potential job possibilities after graduation.
2. Item 22: I want more practical involvement in my major instead of traditional course work.
3. Item 11: I need some information on how to look for a job when nearing graduation.

4. Item 15: I am searching for a significant life goal for myself and for a way to achieve it.

5. Item 6: I am confused about what student services are actually available at CSU.

6. Item 27: I would like to get involved in an effort to improve social conditions--such as ecological problems.

7. Item 8: I would like to establish more real friendships with others.

8. Item 24: I am looking for my own philosophy of life, but seem only to uncover more unanswerable questions.

The first and third most important problems across the entire sample concerned jobs and had a similar pattern with regard to source of help. For both items the faculty and the campus placement center are most frequently chosen. The second ranking item on more involvement in the field instead of traditional coursework found the faculty an overwhelming source of help (63%) with this issue. Items ranking 4 and 8 concerned establishing a philosophy of life and the most frequently chosen help sources were a close friend, the counseling center, or relying on one's own resources and turning to no one. The fifth ranked problem indicates a general confusion about what student services are available; students seem divided as to where they could seek advice on this issue, although the Office of Student Relations was a clear choice (23%). The 6th ranking problem, a desire to be more involved in social problems found most students turning to the student government or another source such as student organizations for that purpose. The need for more friends (7th ranking) finds turning to close friends or to no one as the most chosen sources.

Although the source of help chosen was highly dependent upon the type of problem, peers, faculty, no one, and the Placement Office received several high ranking percentages.

Descriptive Analysis of Sources of Help Objective Data.

Aside from the description of sources of help for the eight overall most relevant problems just mentioned, another approach was to assess percentage of sources of help choices across all of the 38 items for all respondents. In addition to the 11% which were not completed, a count was made of the number of items for which a source of help received 10% or more of the total sample's selections. The category "no one" received choices of 10% or more for 16 items, and the second most selected source of help was "faculty member" for 15 items. "Peers" and the "Counseling Center" were next with 11 and 10 items of 10% or more. Next in order came the "Office of Student Relations," "family," and "student government" with 7, 6, and 5 items respectively, with 10% choices or greater. Although the content of the item was clearly important for relevance of source of help choices, this type of analysis still seems to indicate a strong trend not to go to anyone for assistance.

An inspection of the percentage of the total sample with regard to where they indicated they would go for assistance with particular types of problems was made. Seven (#9, 12, 20, 21, 26, 28, 29) of the 38 items were concerned with academic problems such as poor study habits, dissatisfaction with instructors, irrelevance of coursework, failing coursework, and academic advising. The most frequently chosen sources of help for the seven academic items across the total of all subjects were faculty member and the Office of Academic Advising. The Counseling Center received a moderate number of choices for four of the items also. No one received a moderate number of choices on two of the seven academic items. The remaining choices were too scattered and diverse to form a coherent pattern.

Six items (#13, 15, 16, 18, 24, 30) in the objective part of the survey on source of help to which the student would probably turn if faced with such a problem concerned issues of personal identity, i.e., standing up for what you believe, establishing goals, value conflicts with the family, meaning in life, and day to day planning. The category of no one was a significant choice for six of the seven items. A close friend, family member, and to a somewhat lesser degree the Counseling Center and clergy were also chosen.

Four items (#7, 8, 10, 23) concerned problems of interpersonal relationships as relating to the opposite sex, establishing more friendships, and missing home. A close friend to consult for help was the clear first choice for all of these items. The category no one was clearly a highly rated second choice. The Counseling Center and family received a moderate number of choices on two of the items (the Counseling Center for feelings of inadequacy with the opposite sex and family for homesickness problems).

Three of the items (#3, 19, 33) concerned student activism of a mild variety, i.e., wanting more student impact on decisions at CSU, feeling restricted by college rules, and wanting to change an academic policy. Student government was a significant choice for all three items. The faculty and the Office of Student Relations was a significant choice for two of the three items. No one, the Counseling Center, and the Office of Academic Advising received significant choices on one of the items.

Faculty was the number one choice for three items (#1, 22, 32) concerned about confusion in choice of a major and wanting more involvement in a major field. The Office of Academic Advising was second for two items, and the Counseling Center and the Office of Student Relations received moderate percentage choices.

Two items (#5, 11) were concerned with wanting information on job possibilities and how to look for a job. The faculty and the Placement Center were the top two choices for these job related items. The Student Employment Office also received a moderate number of choices for how to look for a job.

Two items (#31, 36) concerned finances, i.e., not having enough money to stay in school and having trouble managing money. Family member was a significant choice for both items, although the Financial Aid Office and no one received a significant number of choices.

Two items (#4, 17) concerned drugs, i.e., concern about student drug abuse and possible marijuana use on the part of the student. No one was a large category for both items. RoadHouse (the student hotline), and the Health Center were important for the general concern item; and a friend and RoadHouse were important for the temptation to use marijuana item.

Two health related items (#2, 35) were included, not feeling well and desiring birth control information. For both items, the Health Center was the clear first choice (70% for not feeling well and 54% for birth control information), and private professional (probably a physician) was second.

A number of where do you go for information questions (#6, 14, 25, 27, 34, 37, 38) were included. As they are a miscellaneous conglomerate of questions, they will be considered separately. For resolving confusion about what student services are available on campus, students selected the Office of Student Relations, the Student Center, and the Counseling Center as the most likely places for such information. For information on joining a campus activity, students selected the Office of Student Relations, the Student Center, a friend, and the student government as

primary sources. For getting involved in a social action group for something like ecology, students selected the other category (a specific organization), student government, the Student Center, or the Office of Student Relations. For information on Greek organizations, the majority selected the Office of Student Relations, other (Greek organizations), or a friend. Students indicated that if they were concerned about the cheating of a fellow student, 50% would tell no one and 25% would consult a faculty member. For the question for women concerning discrimination in pursuit of their education, the majority of women responding would consult the Office of Women's Relations. For the male oriented question on concern with military service, the majority of males elected the other category, usually an organization concerned with draft counseling.

Effect of Sex and Year in School on Importance of Problem.

In order to assess the influence of sex and year in school (freshmen through senior) on the rated importance of the 38 objective problem statements, a series of two-way analysis of variance tables (ANOVAS) were computed. A summary of the results significant at the .05 level or better appear in Table 3.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

As indicated in Table 3, sex was not a very important variable in the analyses, as it was a significant main effect variable for only three items. Females said they missed not being at home more than males. The two other items were concerned with jobs and coursework; females indicated more often than males that they needed some information for how to look for a job when nearing graduation, and females more frequently than males agreed that their courses seemed irrelevant to their goals.

Year in school proved significant for 12 of the 38 problem statements. The item about missing home was also significant for year in school with the item receiving a rating of less importance from subjects with each additional year in school. Both items concerned with choice of a major ("I am confused about what to major in," and "I feel I don't have enough information to select a major.") found higher scores for lowerclassmen than upperclassmen, indicating more concern about choice of major in the earlier years of college.

Many of the items significant for subjects of different years in college were concerned with academic matters. Two items expressing dissatisfaction with instructors showed higher "applies to me" ratings for upperclassmen than for lowerclassmen. Sophomores rated the item about considering dropping out of school the highest, while freshmen and seniors tended to rate it the lowest.

An interesting trend appeared for two items concerned with university rules and policies. For both items (feeling restricted by college rules and wanting to change a university policy) sophomores rated the items higher than any other group. Freshmen rated the item about wanting to find a campus activity with which to get involved higher than respondents of any other class. Freshmen also scored the highest on the item about wanting information on sororities or fraternities. Lowerclassmen were more concerned about their relationships with the opposite sex than upperclassmen. A one-way ANOVA on concern about military commitment for males yielded significant findings with freshmen and sophomores indicating more concern than upperclassmen.

Five items had significant interactions between year in school and sex. Females scored lower than males on confusion about choice of major for every year except the freshman year where they scored higher

than males. For the item "I want students to have more impact on how things are run at CSU," males had a fairly stable pattern across the school classes with a slight dip in the senior year. On the other hand, females had a highly fluctuating pattern across the four classes. For freshmen, females scored extremely low (much lower than males), however, senior females had a much higher score on this activism item than any other group. Freshmen and junior males scored the highest on confusion about student services, while sophomore and senior males and junior females tended to score lower. Sophomore and junior males scored considerably higher than sophomore and junior females on the item expressing feeling inadequate with members of the opposite sex, while the ratings for males and females for the freshman and senior classes were more similar. Senior females scored much higher than any other group in agreement with the item of it getting harder to resist pressures to go along with the crowd.

Effects of Sex and Year in School on Choice of Sources of Help for Objective Data.

A series of 2 by 6 chi squares was calculated by sex and types of sources of help for the 36 relevant objective items. Types of sources of help were divided into six groupings: No one (#10); pragmatic offices and faculty (#5, 7, 11, 14, 18); personal contacts, counseling-health related offices, or peers (#2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 17); housing related staff (#9 and 16); student relations and student center (#12, 13, and 19); and other (#1, 15, 20, 21). (See Methods section for actual sources.) A few significant findings were recorded for the influence of sex of subject in choice of source of help.

Item 7, "I feel so inadequate with members of the opposite sex" found the majority of both males and females tending to select the

personal-counseling type of help; however, males more than females also tended to select no one or some other source (chi square significant at .01 level). For a related item, number 23, "I am concerned about my relationship(s) with the opposite sex," the majority again favored personal counseling source types; however, males also tended to choose no one, student relation type offices, or other sources (chi square significant at .02 level). For item 13 regarding it being harder to resist pressures to go along with the crowd, the chi square was significant at the .02 level. For both males and females, about 55% selected the personal-counseling source of help. However, males also tended to select no one and females indicated housing sources.

For item 11 on seeking job information, both males and females tended to select faculty and school offices, but males also tended to utilize student relation offices more than females (chi square significant at .01 level). Most students (males and females) tended to select student relations for Greek organization information, but males also tended to go to no one or to housing more than females (chi square $p<.01$). For the item about being afraid of flunking a course, most students selected student relations offices; however, there was a trend for males more than females to select no one, personal sources, or other sources (chi square significant at .005 level). For item 29, "My advisor is little help in planning my program", most students selected the faculty-pragmatic school offices grouping or student relations offices; however, males more than females tended to select no one or personal sources of help (chi square $p<.02$).

The significant chi squares for a series calculated on year in school x type of source of help were so few in number as to suggest they might be due to chance. For this reason, they were omitted from discussion.

Discussion

Obviously the limitations of the survey must be kept in mind when evaluating the results. Selective factors probably were involved in the return of the questionnaire. The sample was over-represented by students new to the campus, and was marked by few minority respondents. Most students saw themselves as intellectually motivated, somewhat surprising in view of the school's strengths in vocational training.

For the sample as a whole, academic problems were the most frequently mentioned, followed by financial, identity, and other in the open-ended section. However, for the objective ratings of given problems, job information, academic, identity, friendship, and information about student services received the highest ratings. It appears that the type of questionnaire format may have influenced the results. Academic and identity problems appeared in both formats and have been found primary by previous investigators utilizing the Mooney Checklist. It appears that the current difficult job market for students may have influenced their high ratings of financial and vocational problems. The higher number of problems reported by females coincides with the findings of Koile and Bird (1956) and Suinn (1967).

As to the sources of help selected, the open-ended questionnaire revealed the most frequently chosen source was no one, followed by a close friend, and a faculty member. An overview of sources of help selected from the list provided in the objective questionnaire indicated no one, faculty member, close friend, and the Counseling Center as the most frequently chosen.

The pattern for both formats stressed the strong tendency for students to turn to no one, a trend found in the earlier studies of Koile and Bird (1956), Suinn (1967), the Stanford survey (1970), and Donk and

Hinkle (1971). It appears that students prefer to be independent in solving many of their problems. The faculty also looms large as a source of help for a variety of problems. The reliance on peers might be interpreted as support for a paraprofessional approach where trained students provide assistance for their peers.

Many of the results significant by sex or year in school seem explainable in terms of developmental changes, however, a few seem worth mentioning. Females indicated they wanted job information more than males, and females, more so than males, indicated their coursework seemed irrelevant to their goals. Upperclassmen seemed most dissatisfied with their instructors. Sophomores, more than any other class, indicated they felt restricted by college policies and considered dropping out of school. Lowerclassmen wanted more information about a number of issues and were more concerned with relationships with the opposite sex than upperclassmen. A separate analysis was not performed for graduate students, although it might be interesting to see if this group experiences a special set of problems.

Few results for the sources of help categories were significant by sex or year in school. It did appear that the category, no one, was used more by males than females for a number of items.

As to implications for change, the analysis of open-ended responses indicated that only 17% would choose the same source again if they were free to select an ideal source of assistance. Fifty-six percent said they wanted a new or improved source of help. More work is needed in the elaboration of perceived helpers that students would find desirable. As lack of information about student services appeared as a top problem, it seems this issue will require continuing effort.

A revised student survey could be administered again in later years or at different times during the school year in order to monitor changes in student concerns and perceptions of sources of assistance. A similar survey could be pursued with faculty and student personnel staff members to see if their perspectives on student problems and ways of handling problems differ markedly from that of the students.

References

Clark, B.R. & Trow, M. The organizational context. In T.M. Newcomb and E.K. Wilson (eds.) College peer groups. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 17-70.

Donk, L.U. & Hinkle, J.E. Pre-college orientation and longitudinal changes in student attitudes. NASPA Journal, 1971, 9, 264-269.

Hartman, B.J. Survey of college students' problems identified by the Mooney Problem Checklist. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 715-716.

Harvey, O.J., Hunt, D.E., & Schroder, H.M. Conceptual systems and personality organization. New York: Wiley, 1961.

Kinnane, M. From whom would college women seek assistance? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 80-84.

Koile, E.A. & Bird, D.J. Preferences for counselor help on freshman problems. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1956, 3, 97-106.

Rust, R.E. & Davie, J.S. The personal problems of college students. Mental Hygiene, New York, 1961, 45, 247-257.

School and Society. Undergraduate anxieties. 1970, 98, 204.

Snyder, J.F., Hill, C.E., & Derksen, T.P. Why some students do not use university counseling facilities. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 263-268.

Suinn, R.M. Types of student problems as a function of year in college for males and females. College and University, 1967, 42, 221-230.

Table 1

Mean number of problems tabulated by sex and school class

	Males	Females
Feshmen	12.5	15.1
Sophomores	14.6	15.0
Juniors	14.8	13.4
Seniors	10.7	13.7

Table 2

Percentages* of Subjects Selecting Sources of Help Categories for Eight Overall Most Importa

Item and Mean	No response	Campus Police 1	Clergy 2	Peer 3	Counseling Center 4	Faculty 5	Family 6	Financial Aid Office 7	Health Cent. 8	Housing Off. 9	No One 10	Acad.Adv.Off. 11	Stu.Rel.Off. 12	Women's Rel.Off. 13	Placement Off. 14	Private Prof. 15	Res.Hall Staff 16	"RoadHouse" Hotline 17	Stud.Empl.Off. 18
1. Jobs (3.12)	11				6	34	1					5			29	5			7
2. Practical involvement major	11				3	63					4	12			1	2			1
3. Jobs (2.62)	11				4	24	1				2	4			39	1			13
4. Lifegoal (2.60)	11		8	9	16	9	11				26	2				2		10	
5. Knowledge Student Services (2.60)	11			7	12	6				1	4	1	23	1	1		7	4	1
6. Involvement social problems (2.53)	11			7	4	7					8		10			2	3	4	
7. More friends (2.41)	11		4	31	8						25		3	1		2	4	4	
8. Philosophy of life (2.34)	11		14	20	7	3	6				26					4		4	

Table 2

Subjects Selecting Sources of Help Categories for Eight Overall Most Important Problems

Clergy 2	Peer 3	Counseling Center 4	Faculty 5	Family 6	Financial Aid Office 7	Health Cent. 8	Housing Off. 9	No One 10	Acad.Adv.Off. 11	Stu.Rel.Off. 12	Women's Rel.Off. 13	Placement Off. 14	Private Prof. 15	Res.Hall Staff 16	"RoadHouse" Hotline 17	Stud.Empl.Off. 18	Stud.Center 19	Stud. Govt. 20	Other 21
		6	34	1					5			29	5			7			1
		3	63					4	12			1	2			1		1	2
		4	24	1				2	4			39	1			13			
8	9	16	9	11				26	2				2		10				5
	7	12	6				1	4	1	23	1	1		7	4	1	13	4	6
	7	4	7					8		10			2	3	4		10	16	17
4	31	8						25		3	1		2	4	4		1		6
14	20	7	3	6				26					4		4				4

*rounded to nearest whole percent.

Table 3

Summary of Significant ANOVAS:

Importance of Problem for Sex x Year in School

Item		Level of Significance		
		Sex	Year	Inter-action
1.	I am confused about what to major in.		.01	.05
3.	I want students to have more impact on how things are run at CSU.			.05
6.	I am confused about what student services are actually available at CSU.			.05
7.	I feel so inadequate with members of the opposite sex.			.05
10.	I miss not being at home.	.01	.001	
11.	I need some information on how to look for a job when nearing graduation.	.001		
12.	My instructors won't allow thinking; it's memorize and regurgitate in scheduled cycles.		.01	
13.	It's getting harder to resist pressures to go along with the crowd in activities I don't believe in.			.05
14.	I would like some information on sororities or fraternities.		.001	
19.	I feel so restricted by college rules and regulations.		.02	
20.	Many of my courses seem irrelevant in relation to my goals.	.01		
21.	I am considering dropping out of school.		.001	
23.	I am concerned about my relation-ship(s) with the opposite sex.		.01	
25.	I would like to find a campus acti-vity in which to get involved.		.05	

Table 3 (cont.)

Item	Level of Significance		
	Sex	Year	Inter-action
26. My instructor(s) seem vague, unorganized, and generally incompetent.		.001	
32. I feel I don't have enough information to select a major.		.001	
33. I would like to change a university policy affecting my academic program.		.001	
38. I am worried about my military service commitment. (Males only)	---	.01	

Note.-- Eighteen items out of the 38 total had significant findings.

Appendix A

Student Problems and Sources of Help Questionnaire

SOURCES OF HELP QUESTIONNAIRE
Student Form

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Please check one choice for each item or fill in the blank where appropriate.

1. Sex: Male_____ Female_____

2. Year in School: Freshman_____ Sophomore_____ Junior_____ Senior_____
   Graduate Student_____ Other_____

3. Marital status: single_____ married_____

4. Residence while attending school:

   CSU residence hall_____
   Off-campus room, apt., or house_____
   Fraternity or sorority_____
   Commute from another town_____

5. Ethnic group: Anglo_____ Black_____ Chicano_____ Indian_____ Other_____

6. Current major_____
   (fill in the blank)

7. Please circle the number best expressing how certain you feel about the choice of your major at this point:

-2	-1	+1	+2
Very Uncertain	Moderately Uncertain	Moderately Certain	Very Certain

8. How many quarters have you attended CSU (including this quarter)?
   1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____ 6_____ 7_____ 8_____ 9_____
   10_____ 11_____ 12_____ 13 or more_____

9. Are you a transfer student? Yes_____ No_____

10. Current grade point (leave blank if freshman)

    _____3.5 or better (A- average or higher)
    _____3.0-3.49 (B to B-plus average)
    _____2.5-2.99 (C-plus to B-)
    _____2.0-2.49 (C average or slightly higher)
    _____1.5-1.99 (C-average
    _____1.0-1.49 (D to D-plus average)
    _____below 1.0 (below a D average)

11. Listed below are descriptions of students with different orientations or philosophies. Select the description that is most like you and put a "1" in front of it, select the one that is second best and put a "2" in front of it, select the description that is third best in describing you, and write a "3", and select the one that is least like you and put a "4."

_____ I am in college to attain occupational skills for my future. As I see it, education consists of a body of skills and information to be mastered. I like to lead an orderly life, and I'm not overly interested in politics or culture.

_____ I view education as a means to sharpen and express my desire to explore, explain, and understand for the sake of understanding. I would like to be described as independent, politically liberal, and culturally aware. I am skeptical of authority, but not hostile. I like to question things and to devise creative solutions to problems. I reserve the right to decide questions of value for myself.

_____ I see myself as a seeker, who rejects the phoney middle class way of life. Often I feel like a loner. I like artistic and creative endeavors, and feel pretty apathetic about "organized campus life." Authority figures or very straight people make me feel nervous or hostile.

_____ I see myself as a very friendly and warm person. I like people and my main rewards in life are from friendships and interaction with others. I especially like the extra-curricular aspects of college life. It is very important that my peers accept and like me. Most of the middle class values are okay, but I'm certainly not overly devoted to all of them.

PART I

INSTRUCTIONS: Most students experience some problems or difficulties during their college years. Think back over the problems you have faced here at CSU--whether they be vocational, personal, financial, health, social, academic, etc. Complete the information requested below for each problem--from your point of view. (Use descriptive names as friend, roommate, etc., rather than proper names.)

1. Description of problem	2. Time of problem		3. Degree of concern			4. Source of help actually used and outcome	5. Ideally, source of help to which you would have liked to turn
	Current	Past	Mild	Moderate	Extreme		

PART II

INSTRUCTIONS:

Listed below and on the following pages are problem situations that appear to be facing some college students today.

1. On the separate Part II Answer Sheet (on the left-hand side) note the scale to rate your personal involvement with each item based on your experiences as a student this year. For each item check the column choice that best expresses whether the statement applies to you this year.

2. Next (on the right side of the answer sheet), regardless of the rating you just made, try to react to the problem as though you are actually confronted with this problem. Decide which source of help provided on the list below you would probably first turn to and write the identification number for that source of help in the designated column. Please select only one source of help for each item.

If on certain items you select "#21 other" category, be very certain that you specify that source by writing a descriptive name, such as tutor, former high school teacher, etc., in the column provided to the far right.

List of sources of help:

1 Campus Police Dept.
2 Clergyman
3 Close friend (peer)
4 Counseling Center
5 Faculty member-or adviser
6 Family member
7 Financial Aids Office
8 Health Center
9 Housing Office
10 No one
11 Office of Academic Advising
12 Office of Student Relations
13 Office of Women's Relations
14 Placement Center
15 Private professional (attorney, physician, psychologist, etc.)
16 Residence Hall staff member
17 Roadhouse
18 Student Employment Office
19 Student Center staff member
20 Student government
21 Other (please specify by writing in descriptive name of a source not on list.)

PROBLEM SITUATIONS

1. I am confused about what to major in.

2. I don't feel well physically.

3. I want students to have more impact on how things are run at CSU.

4. I am concerned about student drug abuse.

5. I would like to know more about my potential job possibilities after graduation.

6. I am confused about what student services are actually available at CSU.

7. I feel so inadequate with members of the opposite sex.

8. I would like to establish more real friendships with others.

9. My lousy study habits are causing me to do poorly in my classes.

10. I miss not being at home.

11. I need some information on how to look for a job when nearing graduation.

12. My instructors won't allow thinking; it's memorize and regurgitate, in scheduled cycles.

13. It's getting harder to resist pressures to go along with the crowd in activities I don't believe in.

14. I would like some information on sororities or fraternities.

15. I am searching for a significant life goal for myself and for a way to achieve it.

16. My family and I are growing further apart in what we feel is important in life.

17. I am tempted to experiment with marijuana and probably will go ahead with it.

18. I am looking for something meaningful to do besides attending classes.

19. I feel so restricted by college rules and regulations.

20. Many of my courses seem irrelevant in relation to my goals.

21. I am considering dropping out of school.

22. I want more practical involvement in my major instead of traditional course work.

23. I am concerned about my relationship(s) with the opposite sex.

24. I am looking for my own philosophy of life, but seem only to uncover more unanswerable questions.

25. I would like to find a campus activity in which to get involved.

26. My instructor(s) seem vague, unorganized, and generally incompetent.

27. I would like to get involved in an effort to improve social conditions--such as ecological problems.

28. I am afraid I am flunking one or more of my courses.

29. My adviser is little help in planning my program.

30. I can't effectively distribute my time among studying, classes, leisure, and rest.

31. I am concerned about having enough money to stay in school.

32. I feel I don't have enough information to select a major.

33. I would like to change a university policy affecting my academic program.

34. I know that a person in one of my classes has been cheating on his exams.

35. I would like some birth control information.

36. I have trouble managing my money.

37. I have experienced difficulty in pursuing my education because I'm a woman. (females only)

38. I am worried about my military service commitment (males only).

PART II
ANSWER SHEET

	1. DEGREE STATEMENT APPLIES TO ME: (check one choice for each problem.)				2. IF FACED WITH THIS PR BLEM, I WOULD PROBABL FIRST TURN TO:	
	Definitely does not apply to me. -2	Somewhat does not apply to me. -1	Somewhat does apply to me. +1	Definitely does apply to me. +2	Choose one source of help.	If "#21 other"-- please specify.
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						
19.						
20.						
21.						
22.						
23.						

PART II ANSWER SHEET -2-

	1. DEGREE STATEMENT APPLIES TO ME: (check one choice for each problem.)					2. IF FACED WITH THIS PROBLEM, I WOULD PROBABLY FIRST TURN TO:	
	Definitely does not apply to me. -2	Somewhat does not apply to me. -1	Somewhat does apply to me. +1	Definitely does apply to me. +2		Choose one source of help.	If "#21 other--please specify.
24.							
25.							
26.							
27.							
28.							
29.							
30.							
31.							
32.							
33.							
34.							
35.							
36.							
37.							
38.							

CLIENT TRANSACTION WITH A UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER

Lois Huebner, Weston Morrill
and
John Hinkle

Student Development Report
Vol X, No. 3, 1972-73

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires developed to investigate the effects of transactions between students seeking service and the university counseling center. A variety of contact points (contextual variables and staff) were identified and data collected. The results indicate that for the sample identified, the majority of client-counseling center transactions are positive. Areas of potential concern included use of non-professional staff, taping of counseling sessions, perceptions of competency of center in areas of counseling center functioning, and lack of information about services. Several areas which were expected to be viewed negatively by clients were not a concern. These included confidentiality, the waiting room, seeing a counselor before testing, filling out forms, and the intake process.

Client Transaction With a University Counseling Center

This is an initial study of the transactional relationships that occur between students and the University Counseling Center at Colorado State University. These transactions are the exchanges that occur between students seeking service and University Counseling Center staff members and certain contextual variables. Several factors may facilitate or inhibit students using the services offered. Such factors as the waiting room, attitude of the receptionist, level of training and skill of the Counselors, forms used, etc., are all a part of the Counseling Center environment that may have positive or negative impact on students perceptions and behaviors. Knowledge of these factors can be used to render the services more attainable and more helpful to students requesting service.

The availability of services is not just a function of the number of helpers available to helpees. The relationship between the physical environment and the individual also has an impact. Several studies (such as those of population density, response of consumers to public housing and the effects of urban renewal upon styles of living) point to the importance of evaluating the effects of non-personal structures on behavior (Caplan, G. 1964, Fried, M. 1963, and Wilner, D. et. al., 1962).

Relationships between the individual and specific settings are the subject matter for several investigators (Raush, H. L. et. al., 1960, Sells, S. B., 1963). A survey of the field of ecological psychology as well as a taxonomy of behavioral zones describing several kinds of behavioral settings can be found in the book "Ecological Psychology," (Barker, R. G., 1968). The basic thrust in these studies is an attempt to identify non-personal variables that influence behavior that is functional or dysfunctional. Such knowledge allows for intervention to change those aspects of the behavioral

setting which impede or even destroy the opportunities for individuals to profit from interacting with positive sources of help. This investigation seeks to identify possible barriers and bridges in the counseling center-(behavioral setting)-student interaction. Such knowledge will enable the center staff to redesign the contextual variables in the environment of the center to encourage student development and anticipate problems so as to take action in a preventative manner (Kaiser, L., 1973).

Procedure

Counseling Center Staff Feedback:

The staff of the Counseling Center were consulted during the designing of this evaluation instrument in order to identify possible problem areas of client-Center interaction. Counselors were asked to act as environmental censors and to report student-environment transactions they had witnessed or inhibiting to the students. The main areas of perceived concern were:

Confidentiality - specifically, being seen in the waiting room, being audio or video taped, overhearing staff discussing clients, fear of parental notification, counselors leaving messages at student residences.

Procedures - specifically, lack of explanation of procedures, having to see a counselor before taking tests, use of automated tapes, too many forms to fill out, the intake process, and having to wait for a time before regular counseling could begin.

Staff - specifically, use of paraprofessionals, counselors not being there and being difficult to contact, attitude and helpfulness of receptionist.

Lack of Information - specifically, not knowing what services the Center offers, not knowing where the Center is located, now knowing how "sick" or "healthy" one must be to use the Center.

Test Construction:

This list of potentially relevant transactions was added to that compiled by the evaluation team, who originally saw a client's interaction

with the Center as falling within the following seven sequential categories: 1) Expectations (including referral), 2) Initial Contact, 3) Forms, 4) Wait Before Intake, 5) Intake, 6) Wait for Assignment to Counselor, and 7) Treatment. Questionnaire items dealing with these various transactions were written and edited and then subsequently divided into two sets. The first set of items dealt primarily with student (client) expectations, initial contact and forms (1-3), while the second set encompassed Wait Before Intake, Intake, Wait for Counselor Assignment, and Treatment (4-7). (In addition, several demographic items recording number of counseling interviews accomplished, existence of prior contacts with the Counseling Center, and primary presenting problem, were added to each set). These two sets of items were then administered to several Counseling Center clients who were asked both to answer the items and make suggestions for improving and clarifying the format and the content of the questionnaire. The improvements suggested were incorporated and resulted in two questionnaires, the first containing 25 items and the second 23 items. All items except those concerned with demographic data were in the form of a 5-point Likert scale (Disagree Very Much -- Agree Very Much), and were followed by the word "Comment" and a space for elaborative reply (See Appendix A).

Sample:

All questionnaire forms were handed out during a one week period from November 14 through November 20, 1972. Questionnaire Form I was distributed by the Center receptionist to all students making their first contact with the Center that week. Questionnaire Form II was given, by counselors, to clients engaged in their first, second or third regular counseling interviews during that week. A total of 25 copies of Form I were returned and a total of 31 copies of Form II were returned.

Based on information retrieved via the demographic items, of the students taking Form I, 68% had never seen any counselor in the Cenber before, 8% had had an intake interview only, and 16% had had 3 or more interviews. None of the clients in the sample had had either only 1 or 2 interviews. In addition, 20% of our sample clients had been to the Counseling Center prior to the quarter of questionnaire administration, although the reason for and nature of this previous encounter was not specified. When questioned about their most significant reason for coming to the Center at this time, 40% of the sample indicated a specific personal crisis as the main motivating factor. Following this in frequency were vocational concerns (28%) and educational concerns (20%). Those coming for non-crisis personal concerns comprised only 8% of the sample, while desensitization clients made up an even smaller part of this cross section, with only 4%.

The sample of students who completed questionnaire Form II was composed (as planned) largely of clients who had had 3 or more interviews. In fact, this category encompassed 64% of the sample. There were also, however, some students who had only been seen in 2 counseling interviews (19%), one counseling interview (10%), or intake only (6%). However, the group was by and large relatively experienced in receiving counseling. Of this total sample of students, 32% had been to the Counseling Center prior to the quarter of questionnaire administration, although as above, the nature of this previous contact was not specified.

This second sample of students may not be truly representative of the Counseling Center clientele as there were, at the time of administration, several Test Anxiety and General Anxiety Programs (desensitization) in their second or third week of therapy, and clients from these groups were used in

the sample. Since these groups do not run continuously, it is likely that we have a higher proportion of desensitization clients in this sample than is representative of University Counseling Center clientele. Specifically, 32% of our sample were desensitization clients, 29% had come for a specific personal crisis, and 26% had come to deal with vocational concerns. Non-crisis personal concerns and educational concerns were less well represented, at 6% and 3% respectively. The chief source of referral to the Counseling Center was "friend, relative" (36%), followed by "self" (21%).

Expected Scales:

The items for both questionnaire forms were analyzed and sorted into a priori scales on the basis of their face content. These scales were: A, Expectations (Form I); B, Initial Contact (Form I); C, Wait for Intake (Form I); D, Intake Interview (Form II); E, Wait for Counselor Assignment (Form IIO; F, Staff Perceptions (Form I, II); G, Demographic Data (Form I, II); H, Referral (Form II); I, Contextual Variables (Form II).

Results

Questionnaire Form I and Form II were subjected separately to a sequence of analyses, beginning with the previously discussed sorting into scales. In this analysis, items which appeared to be tapping the same general types of transaction were included under a single scale heading. When the data were collected, mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each scale, with an attempt at interpretation. Following this, each item's mean and standard deviation was listed. Clusters of items dealing with a concise topic area were interpreted via mean scores, and interpretations were made also on the content of each item individually. Finally, correlations between all items were calculated.

Each form was then subjected to a principal components factor analysis (Cooley and Lohnes, 1971), followed by a Varimax rotation of the (orthogonal) factors (Cooley and Lohnes, 1971). These resultant factors were compared with the scales previously established. The data obtained from each questionnaire will be presented separately.

Form I - Client Initial Contact

Interpretation of Scale Scores

The first results reported will be some rather general and gross indications of student reaction to the transaction categories listed under rational scales. Client responses to each of the items within a scale were summed and averaged to give a grand mean for that scale. The majority of items were worded so that a high score (on a continuum from 1 to 5) indicated a positive (good) response to that aspect of the Center. On items where this was not true, (for scoring purposes) the item content was reversed and the original mean subtracted from 6.0 to yield a "revised mean." Thus, as the results are now presented, responses can range from 1-5, with 3.0 being a neutral response, responses lower than 3 being increasingly negative, and responses greater than 3 being increasingly positive.

Scale A, which dealt with client expectations, consisted of fifteen items (Item nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26) and had a grand mean of 2.92 (σ=1.66), indicating the existence of a rather broad range of expectations, from rather negative ones (values of 1, 2) to rather positive (values of 4, 5). In general, however, the mean response was nearly neutral, indicating neither strongly positive nor negative expectations. Scale B, (Item nos. 11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23) dealing with clients' Initial Contact with the Center, elicited a rather positive

response, with μ=3.74 and σ=1.33. These students perceived the initial contact as helpful, pleasant and good.

Scale C (Item nos. 15, 18), Wait for Intake, had an even larger range of responses than A, with μ=2.16 and σ=1.82, but with a more definite tendency toward disapproval and dislike of the waiting period. Scale F (Item nos. 16, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31), dealing with the student's perceptions of staff is more difficult to interpret, with a mean of 3.10 and a standard deviation equal to .58. With both professional (M.S. and Ph.D.) and non-professional (undergraduate paraprofessional, graduate student) staff included, the result is that students are just slightly positive in their feelings about the staff, in terms of their being comfortable with them.

Iteam Means and Standard Deviations

With some general and rather global indications of student perceptions and pre-conceptions of the Counseling Center thus extracted, it seemed logical to next look at responses to smaller groups of items and to individual items. There are 3 rational clusters of items (items dealing with one concise topic), one dealing with the receptionist (2 items), one dealing with the use of paraprofessionals (4 items) and one dealing with forms (3 items). The mean of the 2 receptionist-related items is 4.32, indicating that she is perceived in a very positive way as friendly, reassuring, respectful and caring.

The mean of the paraprofessional items is 2.67, pointing to the fact that students are not quite comfortable with the idea of dealing with undergraduates as helpers. Although some students liked the prospect of talking with a peer and thought they would feel more at ease in that situation, the comments focused on liking a "more experienced person." ("If I had a

problem, a real terrible one, I would want a person with more experience under his belt"), and distrusting "someone so close to my age." The most adamant response came from a client in a personal crisis who rejected all but Ph.D.s as helpers, stating" "I don't relish the idea of being a learning experience for a trainee.....if he blows it I'm....." The mean on item 31 makes it clear that among the students surveyed, paraprofessionals are not preferred over professional counselors.

The three items dealing with the forms that are an early part of the Counseling Center's procedures combine to reveal that these forms do not make the majority of clients anxious, and in fact, are seen as appropriate to the helping process (the mean of this cluster was 3.71). Although a few students found the forms confusing because they were too vague, most felt they were reasonable. Samples of comments are: ".....seemed to be an appropriate initial direction locating a specific problem," "you have to start somewhere," "I feel this service is concerned with helping me as an individual."

Following is a list of individual item means and standard deviations and a description of the item content, in terms of the responses to the item. Starred (*) means indicate that the item was reverse scored.

Item	Mean	S.D.	Interpreted Content
4	2.52*	1.02	It is primarily true that around campus very few people know about counseling center services.
5	2.48	1.84	The Counseling Center is seen as somewhat less than competent in vocational counseling.
6	2.64	1.92	The Counseling Center is seen as a little less than competent in testing.
7	3.00	1.79	It is unclear as to whether Counseling Center is seen as competent in personal counseling.
8	2.40	1.88	The Counseling Center is perceived as less than competent in Academic counseling.
9	3.20	1.65	There is slight agreement that U.C.C. is a place where a student can talk to someone right away.
10	3.40	1.77	There is some agreement that the Counseling Center is a place where students can get help from competent counselors.
11	4.40	1.20	Students agree very much that at initial contact the receptionist was friendly and reassuring.
12	3.76*	1.39	It is primarily agreed that the Counseling Center is not only for really disturbed people.
13	3.88	1.11	The physical surroundings of the Counseling Center are seen as pleasant and welcoming.
14	4.28	1.11	Students agree quite strongly that the receptionist treated them with respect and caring.
15	2.80	1.88	There is slight disagreement that a person can see a counselor immediately if he needs to.
16	2.88	1.80	There is slight disagreement that undergraduates have a place in providing U.C.C. services.
17	3.64	1.57	Forms are generally seen as reasonable and appropriate.
18	4.88*	1.34	Students disagree very much that they've heard U.C.C. frequently forgets to call people back.
19	2.64	1.55	Students would feel a little uncomfortable talking to undergraduates to determine best services for them.

Item	Mean	S.D.	Interpreted Content
20	4.20*	.94	Clients feel quite strongly that the forms were a method for the U.C.C. to deal with them.
21	2.84	1.91	Clients disagree a slight amount that they came to U.C.C. because of the good things they had heard about it.
22	3.96*	1.22	Students don't feel too much on display in the waiting room.
23	3.28*	1.46	There is slight agreement that the initial form does not really make students anxious.
24	3.88	1.14	Students primarily agree that U.C.C. is the only place they can get the help they need.
25	4.16*	1.01	Students disagree quite strongly that it's a waste of time to have to see a counselor before taking a test.
26	4.40*	1.13	Students disagree strongly that U.C.C. is only for healthy people rather than those with serious problems.
27	2.84	1.59	Students would feel slightly uncomfortable talking about their problems with an undergraduate paraprofessional.
28	3.40	1.41	There is some agreement that students would feel comfortable talking about their problems with a graduate student.
29	3.72	1.34	Students primarily agree that they would feel comfortable talking about their problems with a Master's degree psychologist.
30	3.88	1.39	Students primarily agree that they would feel comfortable talking about their problems with a Ph.D. level psychologist.
31	2.32	1.32	Students primarily disagree that they would feel more relaxed and at ease talking with an undergraduate than with a professional counselor.

Comparisons and Correlations of Items

It is interesting to compare the responses to several items bearing similarities to one another. For example, among items 5, 6, 7, 8, all dealing with the competencies of the Counseling Center, in various areas, only one mean response value was even equal to 3.0, with the mean of #8<mean of #5<mean of #6<mean of #7 = 3.0. Thus, Academic Counseling is perceived as the weakest area, followed by Testing and Vocational Counseling, all of which are seen as deficient. Personal Counseling with a mean of 3.0 is still "questionable" or, alternatively, received a neutral response overall.

Items 27-30, dealing with the comfort students feel in talking with various level personnel, are monotonically related, falling in the following order: 30<29<28<27. Only undergraduate paraprofessionals fall in the "uncomfortable" domain (mean less than 3.0), with a full point difference occurring between them and Ph.D. Psychologists' rating. It is also interesting to note the difference between "Graduate Students" (at 3.40) and "Master's level Psychologists" (at 3.72), since in fact they are, in a number of instances in the Counseling Center, equivalent categories.

It was thought that the reason a person came to the Counseling Center (his presenting problem) might affect his responses to certain of the questionnaire items. A check of the correlations of item 3 with all other items yielded only one statistically significant correlation, that of items 3, and 10, with $p<.05$ ($r = -.436$). This correlation suggests that those with personal concerns and/or who were in crisis situations were more positive in their assessed perceptions of the Counseling Center as a place to get help from competent counselors, than were those who came for educational concerns or desensitization. This is fairly consistent with the observation

noted above, that academic counseling and vocational counseling were seen as areas of deficiency in the Counseling Center, while personal counseling was seen in a more neutral way.

Factor Analysis:

A factor analysis was performed on the questionnaire to determine whether we could extract out of the larger whole any significant and meaningful concepts (which we could then quantify and measure). It was thought that it would also help us to assess whether we had covered the areas of interest denoted in our scales.

Based on Varimax rotation of the principal components Factor Analysis, four interpretable factors were extracted from Form I, accounting for a total of 54.6 percent of the variance. Items loading at least +.5 on the factor were included. The composition of the four factors is described below.

FACTOR I: Acceptability of Non-Professional Staff (15.9%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
16	.732	Supervised undergraduates do have a place in providing counseling services to other students.
19	.890	I would feel comfortable having an undergraduate talk with me about my problem to determine the appropriateness of various counseling center services.
27	.965	I would feel comfortable talking about my problems to graduate students.
28	.774	I would feel comfortable talking about my problems to Masters level psychologists.
31	.826	Working with an undergraduate rather than a professional counselor would make me feel more relaxed and at ease.

FACTOR II: Competency of U.C.C. (16.2%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
5	.938	The Counseling Center is competent in offering the following service: Vocational counseling.
6	.870	The Counseling Center is competent in offering the following service: Testing.
7	.670	The Counseling Center is competent in offering the following service: Personal Counseling.
8	.926	The Counseling Center is competent in offering the following service: Academic counseling.
21	.654	I came to the Counseling Center because of the good things I had heard about the services offered.
26	-.582	The Counseling Center is only for healthy people, and not those who have serious problems.

FACTOR III: Initial Contact (11.9%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
11	.720	I found my initial contact with the Receptionist to be friendly and reassuring.
14	.637	The Counseling Center Receptionist treated me with respect and seemed to care that I got what I needed.
17	.763	The forms I was given to fill out seemed reasonable and appropriate to the process of choosing the best experience for me.
23	-.809	The form I filled out before I could talk to a counselor made me anxious.

FACTOR IV: Perceptions of the Counseling Center (10.6%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
9	.542	The Counseling Center is a place where a student can go and talk to someone about his problem right away.
13	.734	The physical surrounding of the Counseling Center is pleasant and makes me feel welcome.

FACTOR IV (continued)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
29	.843	I would feel comfortable talking about my problems to: Masters level Psychologists.
30	.804	I would feel comfortable talking about my problems to: Ph.D. level Psychologists.

Looking at mean scores on the items within the factors, several general conclusions can be drawn. From Factor I it appears once again that the students surveyed were not too comfortable with the idea of seeing a para-professional (undergraduate student) as part of the counseling process. Factor II mean scores seemed to indicate a slightly negative impression of U.C.C. competencies (including vocational counseling, testing, personal counseling and academic counseling) among the students sampled. From Factor III mean scores it appears that the initial contact with the Center was quite positive. Factor IV, while quite broad, has yielded scores indicating a generally positive view of the functioning of the Counseling Center on the part of the students surveyed.

Comparisons of Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis with a priori scales

Of the 5 expected (rational) scales, only two appeared largely unchanged in meaning in the statistical factor analysis results. The first of these was the Initial Contact factor. (The statistical analysis contained four of the six items in the rational scale). Secondly, the 7-item rational scale labeled "Staff Perceptions" was chiefly converted into a 5-item factor called "Use of Non-professional Staff," by the deletion of two items. This is interesting in that the two items dealing with professional staff members were separated from those dealing with non-professional staff. This seems to indicate a dichotomy in the reactions of the students surveyed to these

two groups of helpers. The statistical factor "Competency of the U.C.C." was created out of 6 items previously couched in scale 4, "Expectations." The remaining stastical factor, "Perceptions" did not correspond to any of the rationally derived scales.

FORM II - Assessment of Ongoing Clients Reactions

Interpretation of Rational Scales

Following the format described under Form I, four of the five rationally derived scales represented in Form II were analyzed via mean response scores. Scale D (items 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 20), dealing with Intake, had a mean response value of 3.66 (σ=1.19) indicating (contrary to our expectations) that the intake procedure was viewed in a generally positive way. Scale E (items 8, 13, 14, 18, 19), Wait Following Intake, was also viewed in a somewhat positive manner (μ=3.52, σ=1.15) indicating that the waiting period was not as noxious to these clients as staff members had anticipated. Scale F (items 10, 12, 21), Perceptions, had a mean of 3.75 and standard deviation of 1.18. Thus, the perceptions of clients in their early phases of therapy are primarily positive with regard to the functioning of the Counseling Center.

Item Means and Standard Deviations

Having once again obtained a rather global and general assessment of client responses to certain broad areas of counseling center, responses to cogent item groupings and to individual items were retreived for closer examination.

Before looking at individual items let us turn to what have been called rational clusters of items. There are 3 of these clusters in this form, one dealing with the Intake Counselor, one with the Intake process and one

dealing with the time delay before routine counseling was begun. The mean of the 3 intake counselor items was 3.94, suggesting that the counselors were seen as helpful, understanding and reassuring. One client expressed her appreciation of the intake counselor saying, "She had a box of Kleenex and a warm smile ready for me," while another was more ambivalent in feel-feelings: "My counselor made me see aspects of my life in a more realistic manner which made me feel more uneasy, yet at the same time I felt I was going somewhere with myself." The overall positive feelings about intake counselors were accompanied by clients' acknowledgements of their own inadequacies in expressing their concerns to the counselors: "I didn't really know what to say and I believe I wasn't really making sense myself."

The intake process did nearly as well as the counselors with the mean of the 2 items equalling 3.71. Because of the number of clients in this sample who apparently had the same counselor both for intake and routine counseling (either by request or chance), it is difficult to know the full impact of the switch from intake to routine counseling. Several who had the same counselor expressed feelings that they would have been uneasy with such a change. But within these limitations, the data support the intake process as primarily acceptable. The present procedure of not specifying which sex counselor would be preferred, apparently is not seen as detrimental overall, although several clients indicated that if their counselor had been of the opposite sex they would not have been as comfortable. For instance, one client noted, "My problems, I felt, could only be dealt with a female counselor," and another said, "I felt much more at ease talking with a woman."

The mean of the 3 items dealing with the time delay before routine counseling was 3.54. This suggests that the wait was not seen as excessive,

but rather was generally as expected (though the mean was not much above 3, the neutral point). The major exceptions to feeling the wait was reasonable came from clients who said they needed help immediately. An interesting comment by one irate client who interpreted this question somewhat differently than intended, serves to point out occurrences which anger clients. This person said the time delay in seeing her counselor was excessive, and noted, "My counselor was on the phone for a half hour and I was waiting to see her."

Returning now to the individual items, interpretations of client feelings about the various Center-student interactions presented will be made based on mean scores. Starred (*) means indicate that the item was reverse scored.

Item	Mean	SD	Interpreted Content (actual Items included in Appendix B)
5	3.52	1.66	Clients felt that their referral sources' perceptions of the Counseling Center were somewhat accurate.
6	4.00	.95	Clients agreed that their intake counselor was able to put them at ease.
7	4.16	1.02	Clients felt quite strongly that their intake counselor seemed to understand what they were saying.
8	3.13	1.24	There was only a tendency toward slight agreement that the time delay before routine counseling began was what was expected.
9	3.58*	1.31	Clients generally agreed that they did not have to wait "too long" before their first appointment.
10	4.32*	1.89	Clients felt quite strongly that they did not have reason to be concerned about the confidentiality of their disclosures.
11	4.19*	1.03	Clients were not bothered by being seen sitting in the waiting room.

Item	Mean	SD	Interpreted Content
11	4.19*	1.03	Clients were not bothered by being seen sitting in the waiting room.
12	3.35	1.21	There was some agreement that the receptionist put them at ease upon coming in for an appointment.
13	3.90*	1.17	Clients disagreed that it took "an awfully long" time before they got to work on their problem.
14	3.58*	1.16	There was general agreement among clients that their problem had not significantly intensified while they waited to be seen in routine counseling.
15	3.74	1.05	It was primarily agreed that the first interview with a counselor was about as expected.
16	4.61*	.70	There was strong disagreement that there is a lot of noise outside the office during counseling sessions.
17	3.65	1.43	It was generally agreed that clients felt confident they would receive the kind of help they needed based on their initial contact with a counselor.
18	2.90	1.28	There was a tendency toward slight disagreement that clients felt they were able to begin working constructively on their problems following intake and before seeing a counselor.
19	4.18*	1.00	Clients disagree that talking with the first counselor made it seem like getting help was a long time away.
20	3.71*	1.30	Clients were primarily not displeased with having to see an intake counselor and then having to start all over with someone else.
21	3.71*	1.42	The sex of the intake counselor was primarily not thought to be an important consideration.
22	2.65*	1.36	There was some agreement that clients would feel uncomfortable and anxious if their sessions were taped.
23	3.87*	1.36	Clients were in near agreement that it is not wrong for an intake counselor to call and leave a message at a student's home without first asking permission.

Item Correlations and Interpretations

A 23 x 23 correlation matrix was generated and revealed a number of significant inter-item correlations. Two of these correlations involved the demographic data. Items 1 and 20 correlated .416 ($p<.05$) suggesting that clients who are relatively farther along in their therapy (2, 3, or more interviews) tend to be more displeased with the intake process than those who have only had an intake or maybe one interview. Secondly, items 3 and 15 had a Spearman ρ of -.499 ($p<.05$), indicating that clients coming in for educational concerns or desensitization tended to find their first interview less like what they expected than those coming in for personal crises or concerns. Since the frequency of non-crisis personal concerns and educational concerns as the presenting problem was so low, this becomes more nearly a comparison between those coming in for desensitization and those coming for personal crises.

Since there were no further significant correlations involving number of interviews, presenting problem, previous involvement with U.C.C. or referral source, it can be assumed that these variables are not differentially related to, nor predictive of, client attitudes toward and perceptions of the Counseling Center.

There were, however, 12 other significant correlations, suggesting the following relationships. From items 5 and 12 (ρ = .489, $p<.01$), it appears that the more accurate the referral person's perceptions of the Counseling Center, the more able is the receptionist to put the client at ease. Thus, apparently, if the client knows and expects that he will have to go through a receptionist before seeing a counselor he finds the process less anxiety producing and can be more readily put at ease.

Items 6 and 17 correlated .500 ($p<.01$) suggesting that the more the intake counselor was able to put the client at ease, the more the client felt confident on the basis of that contact that he would receive the kind of help he needed. Another way to interpret this relationship is that the client's feeling of being at ease resulted from having confidence in his counselor. Item 6 also correlated .557 with item 18 ($p<.01$), so that the more the intake counselor was able to put the client at ease, the more the client felt able to work on his problem following the intake and before seeing a regular counselor. Thus, the intake counselor seems potent not only in affecting client expectations of the remainder of therapy, but also in effecting client changes before the start of regular counseling.

A significant correlation between items 6 and 7 ($\rho = .600$, $p<.01$) revealed that the more the intake counselor seemed to understand what the client was saying, the more at ease the client felt. Somewhat surprisingly in view of this, items 7 and 22 ($\rho = .902$, $p<.01$) indicated that the more the intake counselor seemed to understand what the client was saying, the more uncomfortable the client would feel being taped.

Items 8 and 9 correlated .608 ($p<.01$) suggesting that the more that the time delay before being seen in routine counseling was close to what the client expected, the less the client felt that he had to wait too long before his first appointment. Once again, then, realistic expectations of what Counseling Center processes are like seemed to facilitate adjustment to these processes.

The correlation between items 9 and 16 ($\rho = .417$, $p<.05$) indicated that the more the client felt he had to wait too long for his first appointment, the more he agreed that there is too much noise outside the office during counseling. From items 10 and 11 ($\rho = .423$, $p<.05$) we also find that

the more concerned the client was about the confidentiality of his disclosures due to the number of people talked to and forms filled out, the more he was bothered by being seen sitting in the waiting room every week. Item 10 also correlated significantly with item 22 (ρ = .413, $p<.05$) indicating that the more concerned the client was about the confidentiality of his disclosures due to the number of people talked to and forms filled out, the more uncomfortable and anxious he was about his sessions being taped. Presumably, then, concern about confidentiality in one area is related to concern about it in other areas. Or, again, for those already concerned about confidentiality, the ideas of being taped or being seen sitting in the waiting room are seen as still another threat to them. The last 3 conditions also point to the fact that negative reactions to one aspect of the Center's transactions with them are accompanied by negative reactions to other aspects of the Center.

The final 3 significant correlations all relate to the time delay between first coming to the Center and actually being seen in routine counseling. Items 13 and 14 (ρ = .469, $p<.01$) are related in that the more the client agreed that it took an awfully long time to get to work on his problem, the more he saw that his problem intensified while he was waiting to be seen in routine counseling. Then items 12 and 14, with a Pearson ρ of -.476 ($p<.01$) reveal that for this sample the more the client saw his problems as having intensified during the wait for routine counseling, the less was the receptionist perceived as putting the client at ease when he came in for an appointment. And finally, from items 19 and 13 (ρ = .809, $p<.001$) we find that the more the client felt that it took an awfully long time to get to work on his problem the more he felt that his talk with the first counselor made it seem like getting help was a long time away. Thus,

apparently, both the intake interview itself and the wait following the intake played a part in determining the clients' perceptions of how long it took (or will take) to get to work on his problem.

Factor Analysis

Based on Varimax rotation of the principal components factor analysis (Cooley and Lohnes, 1971), five interpretable factors were extracted from Form II, accounting for a total of 57.1 percent of the variance. Items loading at least ±.5 on a factor were included. The factors are discussed below.

FACTOR I: Intake (12.9%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
6	.842	My intake counselor was able to put me at ease.
7	.721	My intake counselor really seemed to understand what I was saying.
17	.557	On the basis of my initial contact with a counselor, I felt confident that I would receive the kind of help I thought I needed.
18	.774	I found myself able to begin working constructively on my problem following my intake interview and before I was assigned a counselor.
21	.574	The sex of the intake counselor is an important consideration.

FACTOR II: Wait Before Regular Counseling (12.1%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
13	.887	I felt that it took an awfully long time before I actually got to work on my problem.
14	.622	My problem had intensified significantly during the time I was waiting to be seen for routine counseling.
19	.918	My talk with the first counselor made it seem like getting help was a long time away.

FACTOR III: Procedures of the Counseling Center up Through Intake (11.9%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
5	-.805	To what extent was the referring person's perceptions of counseling center service accurate?
11	.721	It bothers me to be seen setting in the waiting room every week.
12	-.659	The receptionist puts me at ease when I come in for an appointment.
23	.537	It is wrong for an intake counselor to call a student and leave a message at his home without asking permission to do this.

FACTOR IV: U.C.C. Processes - Stress (10.6%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
8	.865	The time delay before I was seen in routine counseling was about what I expected.
9	.779	I feel I had to wait too long before me first appointment.
16	.673	When I talk to my counselor there is a lot of noise outside the office.

FACTOR V: Perceptions of U.C.C. (9.6%)

Item No.	Factor Loading	Item Content
10	.662	I have been concerned about the confidentiality of my disclosures due to the number of people I have had to talk to and the number of forms I have had to fill out.
15	.737	My first interview with a counselor was about what I expected it to be like.

Looking at mean scores for items within these factors, several general conclusions can be drawn. From Factor I it appears that the students sampled found the intake interview itself to be somewhat helpful and reassuring, and perceived the intake counselor to be understanding.

Factor II yielded surprising results in that the waiting period before routine counseling was begun did not seem excessively long and was not felt to be destructive. From Factor III it appears that such Counseling Center procedures as referral, contact with the receptionist before seeing a counselor, the waiting room and parts of intake are viewed rather positively with no real complaints being noted overall by this sample. This may be because there was relatively little wait during the time of year this sample was drawn.

Means of Factor IV items suggest that there is not as much interference or stress in the system as had been feared by the Counseling Center staff. Likewise the scores on the Perception Factor (V) indicated that clients view their transactions with the counseling aspects per se of the Center in a positive light.

Comparison of Varimax Rotated Factors with Rationally Derived Scales

Only two of the expected scales in Form II were extracted by the Principal Components Factor Analysis and Varimax Rotation. The first of these was the Intake factor. The statistical Intake factor was composed of 4 items from the 6-item rational scale plus 1 other item. The second similar factor was called "Wait Following Intake" as a rational scale (5 items) and "Wait Before Routine Counseling" in the statistical analysis. The statistical factor contained 3 items, all of which were part of the 5 item rational scale. The other statistical factors: Perception, Procedures Through Intake, and U.C.C. Processes-Stress were all created out of a mixture of items from the other rational scales and did not correspond in content to any of those scales.

Discussion

Results of this study indicate that for this sample the majority of client-Counseling Center transactions are positive in nature and that a number of interactions and policies to which the staff had anticipated negative reactions were in actuality not irritating to clients.

The areas of stress which were identified were taping of sessions, the use of undergraduate paraprofessionals in the counseling process, perceptions of a lack of competency in vocational and academic counseling and testing, the general lack of knowledge of counseling center services and the feeling of not being able to see a counselor immediately even if it is necessary.

The clients who responded to these questionnaires did not have much to say in the "comments" sections with regards to taping, but their numerical responses to the item indicated a general tendency to feel uncomfortable with the idea of having a session taped.

The issue of the use of supervised undergraduates for certain tasks in the counseling center, and students' responses to this, has already been discussed. To summarize the data, students in general felt uncomfortable with the idea of using undergraduates because of age and experience factors. Those most vocal about their opposition were clients who had come for personal crises. The issue of perceived lack of competency in several central areas of counseling center functioning (Testing, Academic and Vocational Counseling) is a critical one and needs further exploration. It is interesting to note that while 3 of the 4 areas presented were viewed as less than competently serviced (ratings from 2.40 to 2.64) and even the most highly rated (personal counseling) achieved a mean score of only 3.0, the counselors themselves were seen as competent (mean score of 3.40). The competence

factor was one of the few that did not elicit elaborated client responses and so without this additional data it is difficult to understand the discrepancy or the reason that students perceived such lack of competence to prevail. It is recommended that additional probing be done to identify the referents of the students' dissatisfaction with the level of competence of the Counseling Center. Questions dealing with the comparison of counselors and services also seem called for in order to explicate the discrimination these students have made.

Another area of identified stress results from the fact that even among students who find their way to the Counseling Center there is a lack of information concerning its services. In addition to this, clients report that it is their impression that few people around campus know about the Counseling Center. A number of clients added remarks to their responses on item 4, with typical comments being, "I'd never heard of the Counseling Center until yesterday," "I didn't even know where it was and what type of counseling you offer," etc. There were several comments in addition to the above general remarks that revealed important pieces of information. One student noted that psychology classes in general do not disseminate information about the Counseling Center and that even after seeing U.C.C. publicity he felt he did not know what services were offered. Another student reported that it is professors rather than students who spread what information there is about the Center. Desensitization also turned up as a service which is more widely publicized and known. These facts seem to demand an increase in the Counseling Center's efforts at making its services known to students and faculty.

The final area of client-environment irritation extracted by this study deals with the issue of whether a student would be seen immediately if he

were in a crisis situation. Apparently students are not sure this would happen (item mean = 2.80). A lack of written comments makes further understanding of the cause of their doubt difficult to achieve. Since the feeling that "help is available immediately if I really need it," is an essential aspect of feeling secure in an environment, it would seem expedient to explore in more detail students' perceptions of the availability of crisis counseling, and to intervene in terms of altering misperceptions if that is indicated.

While the above transactions were revealed to be sources of dissatisfaction to the clients in our sample, several other areas of staff concern were shown to be nonstressful to clients. Among these were confidentiality (clients do feel their confidentiality is maintained), having to sit in the waiting room (clients don't seem to feel awkward since the others there who see them must also have problems), having to see a counselor before being tested (comments indicated that clients felt this to be helpful), filling out forms (clients found these reasonable), the intake process and having to change counselors (clients reported not minding this), the sex of the intake counselor (overall it was not seen as important), having to wait for a period of time after the intake interview before routine counseling could begin (this time period was not seen as excessive or detrimental in general*), possible misperceptions about what kinds of people and problems are appropriate (the clients thought that the counseling center was certainly not only for healthy people, nor only for those who are very disturbed), and the noise level outside the office during counseling (it was not seen as high or disturbing).

*Different results might be expected if sample was drawn during a time when there was a waiting list.

Other process variables which hadn't been anticipated to be problem areas, but which were presented for response and comment revealed that:

1. The expectations clients have are in general not either strongly positive or negative, but vary a great deal.

2. The initial contact a client has with the counseling center is usually good, pleasant and helpful.

3. In particular, the receptionist is viewed positively. Respondents agreed that she is friendly, reassuring, respectful and caring.

4. Overall, Ph.D.s are the most preferred counselors, followed in order by Masters level psychologists and graduate students (the issue of paraprofessionals was discussed earlier).

5. Intake counselors were seen as helpful, understanding and reassuring.

6. Perceptions of the Counseling Center communicated by the referral person to clients were seen as somewhat accurate.

7. Treatment was thought to be as expected and as at least potentially helpful.

Form I

UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER FEEDBACK CHECKSHEET

The following questionnaire has been compiled by the University Counseling Center staff to enable us to evaluate the impact of our transactions with students, and thus to make changes which will render our services more attainable and more helpful to you. You are asked to answer all of the questions as honestly as you can. All of the questionnaires are of course anonymous.

Instructions:

Please evaluate the following statements in terms of your experience or perceptions of how things currently are at the Counseling Center.

Example: The Counseling Center staff is competent to deal with vocational concerns.

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/	/	/	/

If you think the Counseling Center is not at all able to deal competently with vocational concerns you would put an X in the space indicating "disagree very much."

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/ X /	/	/	/	/	/

If you think the Counseling Center is moderately able to deal with vocational concerns you might put an X in the center space (a neutral choice)

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/ X /	/	/	/

Or, in the next one to the right (a more positive choice).

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/	/ X /	/	/

You can also give us valuable feedback if you have comments about specific items. Space is provided for this purpose under each item.

PLEASE FILL THIS FORM OUT NOW BEFORE YOU LEAVE THE COUNSELING CENTER AND DROP IT IN THE BOX PROVIDED IN THE RECEPTION AREA.

1. How many counseling interviews have you had in this Counseling Center?

_____none, _____intake only,
_____one, _____two, _____3 or more.

2. Have you been to the Counseling Center prior to this quarter?

_____yes _____no

3. Please indicate which of the following identifies the most important reason for your coming to the Counseling Center.

_____specific personal crisis
_____non-crisis personal concerns
_____vocational concern
_____educational concern
_____desensitization

4. Around campus very few people know about the services that the Counseling Center offers.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

5. The Counseling Center is competent in offering the following services:

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Vocational counseling
Testing
Personal counseling
Academic counseling

Comment:

6. The Counseling Center is a place where a student can go and talk to someone about his problem right away.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

7. The Counseling Center is a place where I can receive help from competent professional counselors.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

8. I found my initial contact with the Receptionist to be friendly and reassuring.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

9. Most of the people I know think that only really disturbed people come to the Counseling Center.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

10. The physical surrounding of the Counseling Center is pleasant and makes me feel welcome.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

11. The Counseling Center Receptionist treated me with respect and seemed to care that I got what I needed.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

12. If a person really needs to see a counselor immediately he is able to do that.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

13. Supervised undergraduates do have a place in providing counseling services to other students.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

14. The forms I was given to fill out seemed reasonable and appropriate to the process of choosing the best experiences for me.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

15. From what I've heard, the Counseling Center frequently forgets to call back people after they have come in for their intake.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

16. I would feel comfortable having an undergraduate talk with me about my problem to determine the appropriateness of various Counseling Center services.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

17. The forms I was given to fill out seemed to be the Counseling Center's way of not really dealing with me.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

18. I came to the Counseling Center because of the good things I had heard about the services offered.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

19. While waiting in the reception area I felt I was too much on public display and was uncomfortable.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

20. The form I filled out before I could talk to a Counselor made me anxious.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

21. I came to the Counseling Center because I felt it was the only place that could provide the kind of help I need at this time.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

22. It seems to be a waste of time for a student to have to see a counselor when all he wants is to take a specific test.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

23. The Counseling Center is only for healthy people, and not those who have serious problems.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

24. I would feel comfortable talking about my problems to:

Disagree very much / Agree very much

Undergraduate paraprofessionals / / / / /
Graduate students / / / / /
Masters level psychologists / / / / /
Ph.D. level psychologists / / / / /

Comment:

25. Working with an undergraduate rather than a professional counselor would make me feel more relaxed and at ease.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

Form II

UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER FEEDBACK CHECKSHEET

The following questionnaire has been compiled by the University Counseling Center staff to enable us to evaluate the impact of our transactions with students, and thus to make changes which will render our services more attainable and more helpful to you. You are asked to answer all of the questions as honestly as you can. All of the questionnaires are of course anonymous.

Instructions:

Please evaluate the following statements in terms of your experience or perceptions of how things currently are at the Counseling Center.

Example: The Counseling Center staff is competent to deal with vocational concerns.

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/	/	/	/

If you think the Counseling Center is not at all able to deal competently with vocational concerns you would put an X in the space indicating "disagree very much."

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/ X /		/	/	/	/

If you think the Counseling Center is moderately able to deal with vocational concerns you might put an X in the center space (a neutral choice)

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/ X /		/	/

Or, in the next one to the right (a more positive choice).

Disagree very much					Agree very much
/	/	/	/ X /		/

You can also give us valuable feedback if you have comments about specific items. Space is provided for this purpose under each item.

PLEASE FILL THIS FORM OUT NOW BEFORE YOU LEAVE THE COUNSELING CENTER AND DROP IT IN THE BOX PROVIDED IN THE RECEPTION AREA.

Form II

1. How many counseling interviews have you had in this Counseling Center?
   _____none, _____intake only, _____one, _____two, _____3 or more.

2. Have you been to the Counseling Center prior to this quarter?
   _____yes _____no

3. Please indicate which of the following identifies the most important reason for your coming to the Counseling Center.
   _____specific personal crisis
   _____non-crisis personal concerns
   _____vocational concern
   _____educational concern
   _____desensitization

4. I was referred to the Counseling Center by:_____

5. To what extent was the referring person's perceptions of Counseling Center service accurate?
   Not at all accurate / / / / / / Very accurate

   Comment:

6. My intake counselor was able to put me at ease.
   Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

   Comment:

7. My intake counselor really seemed to understand what I was saying.
   Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

   Comment:

8. The time delay before I was seen in routine counseling was about what I expected.
   Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

   Comment:

9. I feel I had to wait too long before my first appointment.
   Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

Form II

10. I have been concerned about the confidentiality of my disclosures due to the number of people I have had to talk to and the number of forms I have had to fill out.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

11. It bothers me to be seen sitting in the waiting room every week.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

12. The receptionist puts me at ease when I come in for an appointment.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

13. I felt that it took an awfully long time before I actually got to work on my problem.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

14. My problem had intensified significantly during the time I was waiting to be seen for routine counseling.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

15. My first interview with a counselor was about what I expected it to be like.

Disagree very much / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

Form II

16. When I talk to my counselor there is a lot of noise outside the office.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

17. On the basis of my initial contact with a counselor I felt confident that I would receive the kind of help I thought I needed.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

18. I found myself able to begin working constructively on my problem following my intake interview and before I was assigned a counselor.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

19. My talk with the first counselor made it seem like getting help was a long time away.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

20. I was displeased with the process of seeing an "intake counselor" first and then having to start all over again with someone else.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

21. The sex of the intake counselor is an important consideration.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

22. I would feel rather uncomfortable and anxious if my conversation with the counselor was being taped.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

Comment:

23. It is wrong for intake counselors to call a student and leave a message at his home without asking permission to do this.

Disagree very much / / / / / / Agree very much

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF CHANGES IN SATISFACTION OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS

Dennis L. Madson, James M. Kuder
and
Tom T. Thompson

Student Development Report
Vol X, No. 4, 1972-73

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire on satisfaction level for students living in the residence hall system at Colorado State University was administered to 575 students living in residence halls in the spring of 1969 and to a similar group of 504 residence hall students in the spring of 1972. Comparative analysis indicated statistically significant increases in satisfaction in the areas of academic atmosphere, rules and regulations, organized programs and activities, room and board rates, intramural activities, room furnishings, treatment as an adult, maid and janitorial services, development of responsibility, and recreational facilities. Significant decreases in satisfaction were found in the area of quality of meals. Findings tend to indicate that modification of University and residence hall rules and regulations, changes in philosophy, methods, attitudes and program emphasis by the Office of Student Residence Education and Housing and changes in student body make-up all played a significant role in the increase in satisfaction of students living in the residence halls.

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF CHANGES IN SATISFACTION OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

During the past several years student housing at many institutions of higher learning has come under fire from a variety of sources. On one hand there are budget officers and bond holders who are concerned about the return on the investment dollar. At another level, there are students concerned with the quality of housing, the quality of food service, and the personal and educational experiences that may or may not be present in their living environment. At still another level, professional and student staff members are concerned about how effectively they are meeting student needs and contributing to the goals of the institution.

While many residence hall systems are seemingly in some rather serious trouble financially, one only needs to read various professional journals of the last several years to learn that there is an apparent lack of real interest in determining the causes for many of these problems. It is known that the growth of four year institutions has slowed down and that in some cases, students do not find institutionally provided housing to be to their liking and thus are leaving in increasing numbers.

Yet, with the clear knowledge that it is very important to attract, retain and satisfy students who live in a university or college operated residence hall system, there seems to be a lack of concern as to what actually pleases or displeases students. This shortage of concrete data concerning students' satisfactions and dissatisfactions with various segments of residence hall life would appear to be an enigma

when examined both in terms of finances and in terms of potential educational benefits to the student.

It would therefore seem most important that any residence hall system, no matter what its size, spend time and effort assessing student attitudes. Staff evaluation, student government opinion, and student input on a regular basis all have merit. Additionally, there is a strong case for longitudinal study of changes in student satisfaction, particularly if changes in policy and procedure have been made over a period of time.

The Colorado State University's residence hall system, like many others across the nation, has experienced tremendous growth and change during the last decade. With this growth have come several problems, not the least of which has been the attraction of students to residence hall living and retention of these students once they are in the system. In the Spring of 1969 an initial effort was made to objectively determine student attitudes concerning the various segments that went into making up the entire residence hall system. Results of this study were utilized in a variety of ways to attempt to change, improve, and add to existing services and programs. Following the initial study, major changes occurred in student involvement and responsibility in the area of social rules and regulations. These changes affected residence hall students directly.

Subsequently, a duplication of the 1969 study was undertaken in the Spring of 1972. Its primary purpose was to determine if policy, program and rule changes instituted since the time of the original study had created significant effects on the attitudes and satisfaction of the students within the residence hall system. What follows is a description

of the studies, of the changes that have taken place since the initial study and of the comparative results of the two studies.

METHOD

Subjects:

The sample for the study consisted of 575 students living in the Colorado State University residence halls during the spring quarter of 1969 and 504 students who lived in the residence halls during the spring quarter of 1972. Students were randomly selected for participation in the study. These numbers represent a sample of approximately ten percent of the total residence hall population at the time of each study.

Of the 575 students in the 1969 sample, 299 were women and 276 were men. The 1972 sample consisted of 241 men and 263 women.

Instrument:

The development of the instrument used to study both groups resulted from the efforts of many individuals. During the 1968-1969 academic year, residence hall staff members, student leaders, central office staff and a faculty consultant worked on the development of questions that would cover all aspects of student life in a residence hall. The instrument utilized a Likert scale for responses with poles of highly dissatisfied and highly satisfied. The goal in developing the instrument was to produce a measurement tool that could be responded to in only a few minutes and provide comprehensive coverage of student life in a residence hall situation. A copy of the instrument is found in Appendix 1.*

---

* James M. Edler, former Area Director, Student Residence Education and Housing, presently a doctoral student at the University of Massachusettes, is credited for leading the development of the instrument and the collection and tabulation of the 1969 data. Also noted is the contribution of measurement expert, Dr. Evan Vlachos, Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology Department, Colorado State University.

Procedures:

The instrument was administered to a randomly selected group of residence hall students during the spring quarter of 1969 and again during the 1972 spring quarter. The following comparisons were made for responses to each item on the instrument:

(1) Total group of 1969 compared with total group of 1972;

(2) Men in 1969 group compared with men in 1972 group; and

(3) Women in 1969 group compared with women in 1972 group.

For both samples, the instruments were distributed and collected by residence hall staff members. Raw data was tabulated and converted to percentages of the total groups responding to each of the five resource categories for each item. Statistical tests of significance were computed.

Descriptive Background

The following information contrasts residence hall life at Colorado State University during 1968-69 with 1971-72:

1968-69

All freshman women who did not live at home were required to live in a University residence hall. Sophomore women under twenty-one years of age were required to live in a University residence hall or with a recognized group supervised by the University. Junior women under twenty-one years of age, with parental permission, could live in housing of their choice. Freshman women hours were 12:00 midnight, Sunday through Thursday and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights. Upperclass women had self-limited hours with parental permission. There were no restrictions for men in terms of hours.

Visitation in residence halls was limited to a maximum of six hours per week, with no more than three hours per day for each hall. Visitation could only be scheduled between 7:00 pm and 12 midnight on Friday and Saturday or 12 noon to 7:00 pm on Sunday. The visitation policy insisted on extensive supervision by hall staff and student government leaders.

University regulations prohibited the possession or use of alcoholic beverages or intoxicants of any kind on University property. Furthermore, events officially sponsored by University organizations or agencies could not include the serving of beer or alcohol.

Social, cultural, recreational and educational programming was emphasized; however, the development of programming was not coordinated on a system-wide basis. Individual halls were responsible for the production of programs in their units. This procedure was cumbersome, led to overlapping and duplication of effort, and productivity was often low for individual halls.

Room and board rates for the academic year ranged from $966-$1050 for double occupancy.

Transition:

At the beginning of the 1969-70 academic year the Faculty Council of Colorado State University approved a revision of social rules for University organizations. This revision considerably increased the responsibility of individual student organizations and coordinating student governments..."for establishing guidelines and reviewing procedures...for the regulation of social activities (including visitation) and the use of alcoholic beverages and 3.2 beer." From this date forward,

individual residence hall student governments as well as the system-wide residence hall student government were granted more freedom and responsibility in the development of policies and procedures concerning hall activities. In addition to the social activities area, students were involved to a greater extent than ever before in the process of management and program development in the total system. It must be understood that this trend did not necessarily mean any reduction of staff influence. Staff continued to play a varied, active and at times dominant role. The trend, however, was toward a more balanced approach to decision making, with assurance of input of student reactions and suggestions and excellent cooperation between student governments and staff. This operational emphasis was fostered by a reorganization within the Student Affairs division that placed residence hall "program" staff together with "financial" and "management" staff in one department with one director.

1971-72

All single freshmen, men and women, who were under twenty-one years of age and did not live at home were required to live in a University residence hall. All residents had self-limited hours and could come and go as they desired. Visitation policies were established by the residents of an individual floor section. Most sections had open (24-hour) visitation policies. A program of grouping students by living environment preference concerning dimensions of visitation/privacy and study atmosphere/quiet hours was utilized.

Students were permitted to consume alcoholic beverages in their individual rooms in accordance with the law. Activities sponsored by student groups could include 3.2 beer as one refreshment, provided attendance was limited to group members and guests, appropriate behavior

was maintained and the law was not broken.

Social, cultural, recreational and educational programming within the residence halls reached a record-high level of productivity through the efforts of the Residence Hall Educational Programming Team. This team, composed of at least one residence hall staff member and student leader from each residence hall developed hundreds of programs during this year. The response to their work was so positive that during the spring quarter the Associated Students of C.S.U. and the Inter-residence Hall Association voted to provide seven thousand dollars to the team for their 1972-73 work.

Because of continuing commitment to improve the effectiveness of staff, staff training and supervision was greatly improved as contrasted to 1968-69. Staff received continuous feedback and were formally evaluated once each quarter by their immediate supervisor.

Since 1968-69, approximately three-fourths of a million dollars had been spent on improving hall facilities. New facilities included stereo rooms, weight lifting rooms, dark rooms, and kitchenettes. Remodeling included dining halls and kitchens, main lounges, floor lounges, and individual room wardrobes and carpeting. Although extensive improvements had been made, by no means did each hall receive all of the improvements noted above.

Double occupancy room and board rates (21 meals per week) ranged from $993-$1077 for the academic year.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The findings of this study can be divided into several distinct categories. For purposes of clarity however, comparative data for the years 1969 and 1972 will be reviewed for men, women and for the total groups. To statistically determine if there were significant differences

between the groups, the chi square test of independence was run between 1969 and 1972 groups on each of the twenty items of the questionnaire.

Findings Related to Differences Among 1969, 1972 Groups

Question #1 Availability of privacy in the residence hall.

Table 1 presents data for males, females and the combined groups relative to this question. No significant differences were found between any of the groups at the five per cent level of confidence and few observable differences can be noted in terms of increasing or decreasing percentages for any of the groups between 1969 and 1972.

Question #2 Rules and Regulations governing my presence and activities in the residence hall.

All of the groups experienced significant changes in their degree of satisfaction in this area from 1969 to 1972. Increases in satisfaction for men, women and for the combined groups were significant at the one per cent level of confidence. Analysis of the findings in this area are presented in Table 2.

Question #3 Organized residence hall programs and activities provided by staff and hall government.

Table 3 presents data relative to change in satisfaction for the three groups concerning programs and activities in the residence hall system. All of the groups experienced significant increases in satisfaction at the one per cent level of confidence on this item.

Table 1- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall degree of satisfaction with the availability of privacy in the residence hall.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory
Male	1969	2.78	31.35	25.40	28.97	11.51
	1972	4.15	38.17	26.97	23.24	7.47
Female	1969	4.64	33.44	23.84	23.84	14.24
	1972	3.80	29.66	27.00	28.14	11.41
Combined	1969	3.83	32.52	24.52	26.09	13.04
	1972	3.97	33.73	26.98	25.79	9.52

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and tisfaction with the availability of privacy in the residence hall.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
2.78	31.35	25.40	28.97	11.51	6.0925[a]
4.15	38.17	26.97	23.24	7.47	
4.64	33.44	23.84	23.84	14.24	3.4008[a]
3.80	29.66	27.00	28.14	11.41	
3.83	32.52	24.52	26.09	13.04	3.6951[a]
3.97	33.73	26.98	25.79	9.52	

Table 2 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in resid
degree of satisfaction with rules and regulations.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very D Satisfa
Male	1969	4.76	20.63	21.03	28.97	24.64
	1972	19.50	43.98	22.41	10.79	3.32
Female	1969	4.95	24.77	21.36	29.72	18.89
	1972	26.24	47.52	15.21	10.27	.76
Combined	1969	4.87	22.96	21.22	29.39	21.39
	1972	23.02	45.83	18.65	10.52	1.98

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

e chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ion with rules and regulations.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very sfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
4.76	20.63	21.03	28.97	24.64	103.0019[c]
19.50	43.98	22.41	10.79	3.32	
4.95	24.77	21.36	29.72	18.89	140.0881[c]
26.24	47.52	15.21	10.27	.76	
4.87	22.96	21.22	29.39	21.39	237.4892[c]
23.02	45.83	18.65	10.52	1.98	

Table 3 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with organized residence hall programs and activities pr and hall government.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Sa
Male	1969	1.98	22.62	44.05	22.22	
	1972	7.05	30.71	34.85	20.33	
Female	1969	3.10	26.01	46.44	18.89	
	1972	6.84	35.36	39.54	13.69	
Combined	1969	2.61	24.52	45.39	20.35	
	1972	7.14	33.13	37.30	16.86	

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and tisfaction with organized residence hall programs and activities provided by staff vernment.

	Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
)	1.98	22.62	44.05	22.22	7.94	13.4898[c]
2	7.05	30.71	34.85	20.33	6.22	
(	3.10	26.01	46.44	18.89	5.57	13.8513[c]
2	6.84	35.36	39.54	13.69	3.42	
(	2.61	24.52	45.39	20.35	6.61	26.2127[c]
2	7.14	33.13	37.30	16.86	4.76	

Question #4 The opportunity offered by the residence hall to meet people.

Although the data indicate greater satisfaction for all three groups in 1972, the differences were non-significant at the five per cent level of confidence. Comparative data is presented in Table 4.

Question #5 The relationship I have with my roommate.

While no significant differences were found on this item between the groups, percentage increases were noted in the neutral category for all three groups. (See Table 5)

Question #6 General atmosphere of the cafeteria.

Table 6 presents findings for this item. At the five per cent level of confidence, no significant differences were noted.

Question #7 Room and board rates relative to the current cost of living and the services provided in the halls.

Analysis of the data presented in Table 7 reveals significantly higher degree of satisfaction during 1972 for all three groups at the one per cent level of confidence.

Question #8 Effectiveness of residence hall government in initiating and providing meaningful activities.

While response to satisfaction categories dropped slightly for all groups, no significant differences at the five per cent level were evidenced on this item. Results are presented in Table 8.

Question #9 Opportunity to get involved in intramural activities.

Results in this area point to diversity of satisfaction. While all groups experienced an increase in the percentage of satisfaction, the male groups increase was non-significant at the five per cent level of confidence. The female group and the combined group results were

Table 4 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence degree of satisfaction with the opportunity offered by the residence halls to meet people

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory
Male	1969	25.00	43.25	21.43	7.94	2.38
	1972	26.14	43.15	19.50	10.37	.41
Female	1969	21.36	43.96	19.20	11.76	3.10
	1972	29.28	44.11	15.59	8.75	1.52
Combined	1969	22.96	43.65	20.17	10.09	2.78
	1972	27.78	43.65	17.46	9.52	.99

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

e chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ion with the opportunity offered by the residence halls to meet people.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very isfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
25.00	43.25	21.43	7.94	2.38	
26.14	43.15	19.50	10.37	.41	4.4559[a]
21.36	43.96	19.20	11.76	3.10	
29.28	44.11	15.59	8.75	1.52	7.5012[a]
22.96	43.65	20.17	10.09	2.78	
27.78	43.65	17.46	9.52	.99	8.0339[a]

Table 5 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with relationships with roommate.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Sa
Male	1969	40.48	38.89	11.90	4.37	
	1972	43.56	31.95	15.35	3.73	
Female	1969	55.42	24.15	9.29	7.74	
	1972	51.35	26.62	12.93	3.04	
Combined	1969	48.87	30.61	10.43	6.29	
	1972	47.61	29.17	14.09	3.37	

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non-significant at .05

or the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and sfaction with relationships with roommate.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
40.48	38.89	11.90	4.37	3.17	4.2288[a]
43.56	31.95	15.35	3.73	1.66	
55.42	24.15	9.29	7.74	2.79	8.2746[a]
51.35	26.62	12.93	3.04	2.28	
48.87	30.61	10.43	6.29	2.96	8.6236[a]
47.61	29.17	14.09	3.37	1.98	

Table 6 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with the general atmosphere of the cafeteria.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	S
Male	1969	5.16	45.24	25.40	17.46	
	1972	4.56	48.13	23.65	17.01	
Female	1969	9.29	39.32	27.55	15.17	
	1972	6.46	47.15	25.86	12.54	
Combined	1969	7.48	41.91	26.61	16.17	
	1972	5.56	47.61	24.80	14.68	

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ection with the general atmosphere of the cafeteria.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
5.16	45.24	25.40	17.46	5.56	.6987[a]
4.56	48.13	23.65	17.01	6.64	
9.29	39.32	27.55	15.17	6.81	4.4818[a]
6.46	47.15	25.86	12.54	7.60	
7.48	41.91	26.61	16.17	6.26	4.4464[a]
5.56	47.61	24.80	14.68	7.14	

Table 7 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with room and board rates.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	S
Male	1969	.79	13.30	25.79	35.71	
	1972	4.15	19.92	33.20	30.29	
Female	1969	2.79	10.84	20.43	37.46	
	1972	4.56	27.38	27.00	31.56	
Combined	1969	1.91	11.48	22.78	36.70	
	1972	4.37	23.81	29.96	30.95	

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

e chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and on with room and board rates.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
.79	13.30	25.79	35.71	25.00	23.4756[c]
4.15	19.92	33.20	30.29	12.03	
2.79	10.84	20.43	37.46	27.86	51.9424[c]
4.56	27.38	27.00	31.56	9.51	
1.91	11.48	22.78	36.70	26.61	72.2855[c]
4.37	23.81	29.96	30.95	10.71	

Table 8 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year i
degree of satisfaction with effectiveness of residence hall government.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)			
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory
Male	1969	4.37	17.86	36.11	32.14
	1972	2.49	19.92	34.02	31.95
Female	1969	3.10	23.84	42.72	22.29
	1972	3.04	20.53	43.72	26.24
Combined	1969	3.65	21.22	39.83	26.61
	1972	2.77	20.24	39.08	28.96

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

or the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and
sfaction with effectiveness of residence hall government.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
4.37	17.86	36.11	32.14	9.52	2.2086[a]
2.49	19.92	34.02	31.95	11.62	
3.10	23.84	42.72	22.29	7.12	2.4296[a]
3.04	20.53	43.72	26.24	5.32	
3.65	21.22	39.83	26.61	8.17	1.3481[a]
2.77	20.24	39.08	28.96	8.33	

Table 9 - Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year degree of satisfaction with opportunities to get involved in intramural act

Group	Year	Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages) Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory
Male	1969	13.89	50.79	29.76	4.37
	1972	21.99	49.37	22.82	3.32
Female	1969	5.88	32.51	45.82	11.76
	1972	10.64	49.43	35.36	4.18
Combined	1969	9.39	40.52	38.78	8.52
	1972	16.07	49.40	29.37	3.77

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05
x^2 (.01) = 13.28
[c] significant at .01

ne chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and tion with opportunities to get involved in intramural activities.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very tisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
13.89	50.79	29.76	4.37	.79	8.6056[a]
21.99	49.37	22.82	3.32	2.07	
5.88	32.51	45.82	11.76	3.41	34.7328[c]
10.64	49.43	35.36	4.18	.38	
9.39	40.52	38.78	8.52	2.26	32.5919[c]
16.07	49.40	29.37	3.77	1.19	

significant at the one per cent level of confidence. Analysis of data is presented in Table 9.

Question #10 The overall furnishings of my room.

As presented in Table 10, significant differences in increased satisfaction for the 1972 groups over the 1969 groups were found to exist in this area. Differences were significant at the five per cent level of confidence for the male group and at the one per cent level for the female and combined groups.

Question #11 The degree to which I am treated as an adult in the residence hall by the hall staff.

Table 11 presents data on this item. Significant differences in higher satisfaction at the one per cent level of confidence were present for the 1972 male, female, and the combined groups.

Question #12 The extent to which the residence hall staff provides me with help and guidance.

While small increases in the satisfaction response categories were noted for all three groups on this item, no significant differences were present when comparing 1969 and 1972 responses for any of the groups. Data is presented in Table 12.

Question #13 Experience and personal growth gained from living in a residence hall.

As presented in Table 13, analysis of responses on this item revealed significant differences at the five per cent level of confidence for the male group. While increased satisfaction was present in the female and combined groups, these increases were not statistically significant.

Table 10- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in re
degree of satisfaction with the overall furnishings of residence hall rooms.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Ver Sati
Male	1969	3.97	42.46	26.19	21.83	5
	1972	7.47	44.81	30.29	15.35	2
Female	1969	6.81	44.27	20.74	20.12	8
	1972	6.84	47.15	28.52	14.07	3
Combined	1969	5.57	43.48	23.13	20.87	6
	1972	7.14	46.03	29.37	14.68	2

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[b] significant at .05
x^2 (.01) = 13.28
[c] significant at .01

e chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ion with the overall furnishings of residence hall rooms.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very isfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
3.97	42.46	26.19	21.83	5.56	10.2119[b]
7.47	44.81	30.29	15.35	2.07	
6.81	44.27	20.74	20.12	8.05	12.1372[b]
6.84	47.15	28.52	14.07	3.42	
5.57	43.48	23.13	20.87	6.96	20.6060[c]
7.14	46.03	29.37	14.68	2.77	

Table 11- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with the degree of being treated as an adult by the resi

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	V Sa
Male	1969	9.92	42.06	19.05	14.29	
	1972	21.58	47.47	21.99	7.05	
Female	1969	13.93	43.03	15.17	18.27	
	1972	26.24	47.52	18.63	4.18	
Combined	1969	12.17	42.61	16.87	16.52	
	1972	24.01	47.02	20.24	5.56	

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and on with the degree of being treated as an adult by the residence hall staff.

egree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
ery factory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
9.92	42.06	19.05	14.29	13.89	37.0344[c]
21.58	47.47	21.99	7.05	2.49	
13.93	43.03	15.17	18.27	9.60	46.4579[c]
26.24	47.52	18.63	4.18	3.04	
12.17	42.61	16.87	16.52	11.48	79.8878[c]
24.01	47.02	20.24	5.56	2.77	

Table 12- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in re degree of satisfaction with extent of help and guidance from residence hall staff.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Ver Sati
Male	1969	9.52	27.38	46.03	11.90	5
	1972	8.30	37.34	41.49	7.05	5
Female	1969	11.76	34.98	41.18	8.36	3
	1972	14.45	34.60	38.40	9.51	1
Combined	1969	10.78	31.65	43.30	9.91	4
	1972	11.51	35.91	39.98	8.33	3

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and
on with extent of help and guidance from residence hall staff.

cree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very factory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
9.52	27.38	46.03	11.90	5.16	7.6263[a]
8.30	37.34	41.49	7.05	5.39	
11.76	34.98	41.18	8.36	3.41	2.5133[a]
14.45	34.60	38.40	9.51	1.90	
10.78	31.65	43.30	9.91	4.17	3.3018[a]
11.51	35.91	39.98	8.33	3.57	

Table 13- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with experience and personal growth gained from living i

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	V Sa
Male	1969	9.52	42.06	30.16	12.70	
	1972	15.35	43.98	30.71	5.39	
Female	1969	24.46	44.84	19.50	5.26	
	1972	27.76	41.44	20.53	7.98	
Combined	1969	17.91	43.65	24.17	8.52	
	1972	21.82	42.65	25.39	6.75	

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant
[b] significant at .05

the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and action with experience and personal growth gained from living in a residence hall.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
9.52	42.06	30.16	12.70	5.56	10.9583[b]
15.35	43.98	30.71	5.39	4.56	
24.46	44.84	19.50	5.26	5.88	8.3379[a]
27.76	41.44	20.53	7.98	1.90	
17.91	43.65	24.17	8.52	5.74	7.3056[a]
21.82	42.65	25.39	6.75	3.17	

Question #14 Maid and janitorial services in the residence hall.

In comparing the responses of 1969 with those of 1972, significant differences in increased satisfaction at the one per cent level of confidence were present for the male, female and combined groups. Data is presented in Table 14.

Question #15 The residence hall as an environment conducive to doing academic work.

While increases in the percentage of student satisfaction existed for all three groups on this item, no significant differences were present for the male and female groups. When males and females were combined, significant differences at the five per cent level were in evidence. Analysis of results are presented in Table 15.

Question #16 The extent to which life in a residence hall allows me to feel like a responsible individual.

As presented in Table 16, significant differences in increased satisfaction at the one per cent level of confidence between 1969 and 1972 were found for males, females and the combined groups on this item.

Question #17 The quality of food in the cafeteria.

Analysis of data on this item revealed a mixed response as to satisfaction by each of the groups. While non-significant data was present for the female group, significant differences at the one per cent level of confidence revealed less satisfaction on the part of the male and combined groups. Results are presented in Table 17.

Question #18 My personal relationships with the residence hall staff.

As presented in Table 18, analysis of data on this item revealed no significant differences for the male, female and combined groups from 1969 to 1972.

Table 14- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in re degree of satisfaction with maid and janitorial services in the residence hall.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Sati
Male	1969	19.05	43.65	20.24	11.11	5.
	1972	28.22	49.37	12.03	7.05	2.
Female	1969	21.67	45.20	14.55	14.24	4.
	1972	41.06	42.21	10.64	4.18	1.
Combined	1969	20.52	44.52	17.04	12.87	5.
	1972	34.92	45.63	11.31	5.56	2.

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

e chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ion with maid and janitorial services in the residence hall.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very sfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
19.05	43.65	20.24	11.11	5.95	15.1812[c]
28.22	49.37	12.03	7.05	2.90	
21.67	45.20	14.55	14.24	4.33	38.8011[c]
41.06	42.21	10.64	4.18	1.52	
20.52	44.52	17.04	12.87	5.04	47.7713[c]
34.92	45.63	11.31	5.56	2.18	

Table 15- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year degree of satisfaction with the residence hall as an environment conducive t

Group	Year	Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)			
		Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory
Male	1969	2.38	21.83	17.86	35.32
	1972	2.07	28.22	25.31	28.22
Female	1969	2.48	23.53	23.22	36.53
	1972	1.90	28.14	25.10	28.90
Combined	1969	2.43	22.78	20.87	36.00
	1972	1.98	28.17	25.20	28.57

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant
[b] significant at .05

the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and ction with the residence hall as an environment conducive to doing academic work.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very atisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
2.38	21.83	17.86	35.32	21.83	9.2518[a]
2.07	28.22	25.31	28.22	16.18	
2.48	23.53	23.22	36.53	14.24	4.4742[a]
1.90	28.14	25.10	28.90	15.97	
2.43	22.78	20.87	36.00	17.57	10.4399[b]
1.98	28.17	25.20	28.57	16.07	

Table 16- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in res
degree of satisfaction with the extent to which residence hall life allows the deve
responsibility.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisf	ry	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Satis
Male	1969	3.17	24.60		32.94	22.62	16.
	1972	7.88	40.25		33.61	12.86	5.
Female	1969	4.95	31.27		26.32	23.53	13.
	1972	12.17	44.11		27.38	11.03	4.
Combined	1969	4.17	28.35		29.22	23.13	14.
	1972	10.12	42.26		30.36	11.90	4.

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
c significant at .01

the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and faction with the extent to which residence hall life allows the development of

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
3.17	24.60	32.94	22.62	16.27	34.2511[c]
7.88	40.25	33.61	12.86	5.39	
4.95	31.27	26.32	23.53	13.62	40.8515[c]
12.17	44.11	27.38	11.03	4.56	
4.17	28.35	29.22	23.13	14.78	73.0638[c]
10.12	42.26	30.36	11.90	4.96	

Table 17- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in r
degree of satisfaction with the quality of food in the cafeteria.

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Ve Sat
Male	1969	3.57	26.19	22.22	21.03	2
	1972	4.15	14.94	26.56	34.44	1
Female	1969	3.41	24.46	19.20	24.46	2
	1972	3.80	28.14	25.48	24.33	1
Combined	1969	3.48	25.22	20.52	22.96	2
	1972	3.97	21.82	25.99	29.17	1

x^2 (.01) = 13.28
[c] significant
x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant

the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and action with the quality of food in the cafeteria.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very atisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
3.57	26.19	22.22	21.03	26.19	
4.15	14.94	26.56	34.44	19.50	19.0288[c]
3.41	24.46	19.20	24.46	26.63	
3.80	28.14	25.48	24.33	18.25	7.7985[a]
3.48	25.22	20.52	22.96	26.43	
3.97	21.82	25.99	29.17	18.85	15.6672[c]

Table 18- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in degree of satisfaction with personal relationship with the residence hall staff.

Group	Year	Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages) Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	V Sa
Male	1969	11.51	41.27	36.90	6.75	
	1972	9.54	45.64	37.75	4.15	
Female	1969	10.22	40.25	39.94	7.12	
	1972	14.45	38.02	40.68	4.94	
Combined	1969	10.78	40.70	38.61	6.96	
	1972	12.10	41.66	39.08	4.56	

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant at .05

for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and isfaction with personal relationship with the residence hall staff.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
11.51	41.27	36.90	6.75	3.57	2.7095[a]
9.54	45.64	37.75	4.15	2.90	
10.22	40.25	39.94	7.12	2.48	3.6852[a]
14.45	38.02	40.68	4.94	1.90	
10.78	40.70	38.61	6.96	2.96	3.4706[a]
12.10	41.66	39.08	4.56	2.38	

Question #19 The degree of acceptance and friendliness I feel on my floor.

In comparing 1969 and 1972 responses to this item, significant differences at the five per cent level of confidence in increased satisfaction were present for males. No significant differences for either the female or combined groups were found. Analysis of data is presented in Table 19.

Question #20 Recreation facilities offered in the residence hall.

As presented in Table 20 analysis of results on this item revealed significant differences at the one per cent level of confidence in increased satisfaction for the male, female and combined groups.

DISCUSSION

The results of this comparative study would seem to lend themselves to a more thorough scrutiny. It is interesting to note that over a relatively short period of time there were many statistically significant changes in the satisfaction level of students living in residence halls. In part, these changes may be accounted for by the significant changes in rules, regulations and staff attitudes that affect the residence hall student directly. Additionally, the often alluded to changes in the character of the student body in general -- i.e., that today's students are more serious, more conservative than those of three years ago--could well account for some of the changes in attitudes found in the results of this study. Finally, the changes in philosophy of the Office of Student Residence Education and Housing, resultant changes in attitudes and methods of staff within the residence halls themselves, programming such as the Educational Programming Team and special floor groupings have had some effect on students living in the halls.

Table 19- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in resid degree of satisfaction with the degree of acceptance and friendliness on the residenc

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very D Satisfa
Male	1969	26.19	51.19	18.25	3.57	.79
	1972	37.75	48.13	10.79	1.90	.83
Female	1969	27.86	47.37	16.10	5.26	3.10
	1972	28.14	41.44	18.25	9.12	3.04
Combined	1969	27.13	49.04	17.04	4.52	2.09
	1972	32.73	44.64	14.68	5.75	1.98

x^2 (.05) = 9.49
[a] non significant
[b] significant at .05

r the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and faction with the degree of acceptance and friendliness on the residence hall floor.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
26.19	51.19	18.25	3.57	.79	11.3442[a]
37.75	48.13	10.79	1.90	.83	
27.86	47.37	16.10	5.26	3.10	4.6248[b]
28.14	41.44	18.25	9.12	3.04	5.6905[b]
27.13	49.04	17.04	4.52	2.09	
32.73	44.64	14.68	5.75	1.98	

Table 20- Summary data for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in r
degree of satisfaction as to the recreational facilities offered in the residence

		Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)				
Group	Year	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Ve Sat
Male	1969	10.32	44.44	26.59	13.10	5
	1972	15.77	56.43	15.77	11.20	
Female	1969	10.84	35.91	30.96	16.10	6
	1972	17.87	52.09	23.57	6.08	
Combined	1969	10.61	39.65	29.04	14.78	5
	1972	16.87	54.17	19.84	8.53	

x^2 (.05) = 13.28
[b] significant at .05

for the chi square test of independence on the variables--year in residence hall and isfaction as to the recreational facilities offered in the residence hall.

Degree of Satisfaction (expressed in percentages)					
Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-Satisfactory	Very Dis-Satisfactory	x^2
10.32	44.44	26.59	13.10	5.56	21.9609[b]
15.77	56.43	15.77	11.20	.83	
10.84	35.91	30.96	16.10	6.19	42.9772[b]
17.87	52.09	23.57	6.08	.38	
10.61	39.65	29.04	14.78	5.91	60.0850[b]
15.87	54.17	19.84	8.53	.60	

While the nature of the methodology of this study makes it impractical to directly correlate the changes in students' satisfaction to any of the afore mentioned possible causes, it would seem important to discuss in further detail the findings in each of the areas studied.

Availability of privacy in the residence halls:

It is generally understood that in a mass housing arrangement such as is found in a residence hall setting, individual privacy to some degree is lost. Some room arrangements, for example pairs of rooms with connecting semi-private bath, can reduce the public nature of residence hall living. As no major changes in room arrangements were made between 1969 and 1972 it is not surprising to find a lack of significant differences between the groups on this issue. Percentage changes were present, particularly in increase in satisfaction with privacy for the male subjects (+8.19%) and a decrease in satisfaction for females (-5.62%). While no direct supportive data is available, it could be hypothesized that these changes have resulted from the more liberal visitation policies in effect in 1972. In practice, more men visit women's living quarters than vice versa.

Rules and regulations:

As noted earlier, highly significant differences were found between 1969 and 1972 groups in this area. It appears likely that the loosening and liberalizing of rules and regulations is directly responsible for the increase of more than 40 percentage points in the satisfaction categories. Additionally, changes in these policies have greatly reduced the number of disciplinary actions required by the residence hall staff and the hall government and have freed these individuals to do more in terms of educational programming.

Organized residence hall programs and activities:

During the intervening years of this study, the time, effort and money spent on programming increased annually. The residence hall Educational Programming Team was formed. This team was composed of student leaders and staff members and had responsibility for coordinating, encouraging and developing a wide variety of programs and activities. Based on the significantly higher degrees of satisfaction between the 1969 and 1972 groups, these efforts seem to have met with success.

Opportunity to meet people:

While slight (+5.82% for combined groups) increases in percentages of those satisfied were found in this area, the lack of significant differences noted are interesting. It might be predicted that with open visitation policies, increased activities and continued encouragement for participation, significant changes would result. While such has not been the case, it should be pointed out that over 65% of all the groups both in 1969 and 1972 were satisfied or highly satisfied with this area.

Relationships with roommate:

The lack of significant differences here is not surprising. Both in 1969 and in 1972 over 70% of the sample felt either satisfied or highly satisfied with their relationship with their roommate. With 10% or less of all the groups being dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied, it could be hypothesized that the results reflect a continued satisfactory situation.

General atmosphere of the cafeteria:

While no significant differences were found in this area, there was a slight over-all drop (less satisfaction) in percentages for all of the groups when 1969 and 1972 results were compared. This trend is reinforced further when the results on item 17 concerning the quality of food are examined. As no supportive data is available, a more detailed study of existing food service policies and procedures as they relate to students would be useful.

Room and board rates:

Since rates for room and board increased only an average of $27 during the insuing three years of this study, the significant increases in satisfaction on this item--15% in the satisfied categories in 1972--are perhaps not surprising. Students were apparently aware of this lack of increase in relation to the cost of living increases or had some understanding of the relatively high cost of living in privately owned housing in comparison. It will be interesting to see the effects on student satisfaction of an increase in room and board rates instituted after the responses to the 1972 study were gathered.

Effectiveness of residence hall government:

The results in this area would seem to support the generally held notion that student governments are considered to be ineffective by a majority of the students governed. While no significant increases or decreases in satisfaction were found in this area, less than 27% of the students in both the 1969 and the 1972 groups were satisfied or highly satisfied with their hall student government. Detailed examination of the purposes and practices of student government would seem to be warranted.

Opportunities to get involved in intramural activities:

Highly significant differences between the 1969 and 1972 female and combined groups were reported, representing an increase of more than 16 percentage points for the 1972 groups. These findings coincide with staff observations of a large increase in interest by both men and women in intramural sports, increased programming efforts and equipment purchases, and expansion of the University's general intramural program, particularly the women's programs. Programming efforts on the part of residence hall staff can be given at least partial credit.

Overall furnishings of residence hall rooms:

As noted earlier, approximately three quarters of a million dollars has been spent since 1969 to improve existing residence hall facilities. As a large percentage of this money was spent on improving student rooms, it is not surprising to find significantly greater satisfaction in this area.

Treated as adult by staff:

The number of students who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the degree to which they were treated as an adult by hall staff fell sharply, twenty percentage points, between 1969 and 1972. Likewise, the percentage of students responding "very satisfied" to this item doubled in 1972. The differences between the two combined samples as well as the male and female subgroups proved to be statistically significant. This fact may be due to increased opportunities to be involved in the governance of the housing system plus a shift in staff role from an enforcer of numerous rules to a resource, helping professional or paraprofessional.

Help and guidance from staff:

The results showed no significant differences for the two years under study. The fact that for each sample there was approximately a forty percent response in the neutral category, raises questions of visability and/or value of the staff for a large number of students.

Experience and personal growth in a residence hall:

In this age of measuring learning by credit hour production, it is impressive to see that over sixty percent of the students in both 1969 and 1972 responded "very satisfied" or "satisfied" to this item. The differences between the two years, however, were not significant.

Maid and janitorial services:

Students living in residence halls during 1972 responded more positively to their housekeeping services than did students in the 1969 sample. The 1972 sample showed an increase of sixteen percentage points, to 81 percent, in the very satisfied or satisfied categories combined. These differences may be the result of improved staff training and supervision and the emphasis over the three-year period to develop a team approach between all housing staff, maintenance, housekeeping, food service, programming and administrative.

Academic environment:

Residence hall students and staff were pleased to see that there were significant differences between the 1969 and 1972 study groups in the direction of improved conditions for doing academic work in the residence halls. Such improvement was consistent with stated goals of the residence hall system. Nevertheless, the 1972 sample showed that only thirty percent of the students were satisfied with the academic environment within the hall. Obviously, noise and privacy continue to be top issues within a residence hall. The area of study conditions requires thoughtful improvement through new programs and facilities in future years.

Feeling responsible through residence hall life:

The increase of almost twenty percentage points in the 1972 group in the "satisfactory" categories appears to be a clear indication that students had understood and accepted increased responsibility as mature, young adults. It is a fact that students living in a residence hall in 1972 had greater responsibility for developing and enforcing their own living regulations than was true in 1969. In addition, by 1972, students were represented in equal numbers to faculty and staff on the Housing Advisory Committee, a group which deals with policy, operation and program issues of the total University housing system.

Furthermore, individual responsibility was fostered through a staff approach that typically insisted on direct confrontation between individuals prior to staff intervention as well as program development involving students and not staff alone.

Quality of food:

The differences between the 1969 and 1972 male and combined groups were significant and in the direction of less satisfaction in 1972. These results are difficult to analyze in light of increased variety and flexibility of the 1972 food service program as contrasted with 1969. However, analysis of the data from individual food service units provided valuable feedback to the individual managers, cooks, and line workers of a unit concerning their execution of a basically standardized food service program.

Personal relationship with staff:

No significant differences were reported in the groups under study. During both 1969 and 1972, over fifty percent of the students in the study populations indicated they were satisfied with their personal relationship with staff. That fact that for both years almost forty percent responded in the neutral category again raises the question of staff visability and/or value to a considerable number of students.

Acceptance and friendliness felt on floor:

Although no significant differences were reported for the combined groups when contrasting the two years, the male group showed a significant increase in satisfaction in 1972 when compared with the 1969 male group. For both years the combined group reported an impressive 76 percent plus in terms of their satisfaction with the acceptance and the friendliness on their particular floor section of the residence hall. This finding is consistent with the over 70 percent satisfaction with roommate relationships.

Recreation facilities:

The highly significant results in favor of greater satisfaction during 1972 are a positive reaction to the increasing emphasis on programs and program facilities over the three-year period. Over seventy percent of the students in the 1972 group were very satisfied or satisfied with the recreation facilities offered in their residence hall. Between 1969 and 1972 numerous recreation facilities such as weight lifting rooms, kitchenettes, sewing rooms, photo dark rooms, arts and crafts rooms had been developed. In addition, new color T.V. equipment, pool tables, ping pong tables and coin operated amusement machines were installed in most halls. Many of these projects were jointly funded by the individual hall student governments and the central housing office thereby increasing the number of projects the central office could support while at the same time increasing participation and the sense of ownership on the part of the students.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant changes had occured in satisfaction level for students living in the residence hall system at Colorado State University in 1972 as compared to a similar group in 1969. A Likert type questionnaire consisting of twenty items covering

a broad range of topics relative to the residence halls was administered to a sample of 575 in the Spring of 1969 and to a sample of 504 in the Spring of 1972. Results were collated, divided into three groups, males, females and combined groups for each sample year and subjected to comparative statistical analysis. Results of this analysis indicated significant differences at the five per cent level of confidence in the area of academic atmosphere. Significant differences at the one per cent level of confidence were found in the area of rules and regulations, organized programs and activities, room and board rates, intramural activities, room furnishings, treatment as an adult, maid and janitorial services, development of responsibility, quality of meals, and recreation facilities. All changes were in the direction of greater satisfaction in 1972, with the exception of quality of meals.

While significant differences in results could not be directly attributed to any specific change, findings tend to indicate that modification of University and residence hall rules and regulations, changes in philosophy, methods, attitudes and program emphasis by the Office of Student Residence Education and Housing and changes in student body make-up all played a significant role in the increase in satisfaction of students living in residence halls.

In this age of reduced growth in University populations, stablizing freshman class sizes, increasing proportions of upperclass and graduate students, inadequate residence hall occupancy rates, high residence hall bonded indebtedness and reduction or elimination of University live-in requirements, it is crucial for University housing officials to know how satisfied students are concerning their residence hall living environments. The success of a residence hall program is dependent on having such data. This data can point to needs for modifications and adjustments in a wide

variety of interrelated areas including educational programming, maintenance and housekeeping, facilities, staff and student government functions, food quality and a sense of responsibility and community. Furthermore, this data can serve to measure the success of changes that have been made.

The instrument used in this study proved to be an efficient, productive tool. Containing twenty items covering a wide variety of areas affecting the residence hall environment, the instrument can be responded to in only a few minutes. This fact is critical in obtaining cooperation and a response from the typical person. The instrument clearly has value and potential for use on other campuses.

Obviously, evaluation is an on-going process. The approach utilized in this study should be repeated in future years. Such a continuing process allows for the identification of trends, the measurement of success of new program and operational modifications and the discovery of future needs.

In order for University residence hall programs to prosper both financially and as part of an educational institution, they must be flexible and responsive to new needs and trends. Currently some of these needs and trends appear to include: programming for older students as well as freshmen, special educational activities including academic major groupings, increased social and "life style" freedoms, high quality facilities and services at reasonable costs, greater student input in the governance of the residence hall system and improved study conditions.

The study here reported has provided basic data useful in assisting C.S.U. in the development of an ever-changing residence hall system that continues to be successful both financially and educationally.

APPENDIX I

OFFICE OF STUDENT RESIDENCE EDUCATION AND HOUSING

Colorado State University

April 21, 1972

Dear Student at C.S.U :

This is a questionnaire devised to assist us in accurately understanding your feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction about residence hall living. In order that this study be meaningful it is important that we have *your* response.

The responses that you provide will be kept in strict confidence but will be summarized and the results will be available to you after May, 1972.

Please tear off the sheet of paper with your name on it prior to returning the completed questionnaire to your student assistant.

Thank you for your cooperation in making this study as complete and accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

Dennis L. Madson
Director

RESIDENCE HALL QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

B. Total number of quarters in a residence hall at CSU (include present quarter): _____.

Were you living in a CSU residence hall during Spring Quarter, 1969? Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Total number of quarters enrolled at CSU (include present quarter): _____.

D. Present Residence Hall: (Please check)

Allison	☐	Green	☐
Braiden	☐	Ingersoll	☐
Corbett	☐	Newsom	☐
Durward	☐	Palmer House	☐
Ellis	☐	Parmelee	☐
Edwards	☐	Westfall	☐

E. Reason(s) for living in a residence hall (If more than one reason, please rank in priority where 1 is most important, 2 next most important reason, etc.).

Financial ☐ Parental Desire ☐

University Policy ☐ Personal Preference ☐

Other (please specify) _____

F. Are you planning to return to the residence hall system next year?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided ☐

Please respond to the following statements in terms of your personal feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the item covered. It is important that you respond as to how you feel and not how you think others might feel. All of these statements refer to the residence hall in which you live and not to your total University environment. Please check the box that corresponds more closely with your degree of satisfaction using the following guidelines: 1 very satisfied, 2 satisfied, 3 neutral, 4 dissatisfied, 5 very dissatisfied. Please do not leave any items unanswered and feel free to comment on any of the statements that follow. On the last page there is space provided for any reaction or recommendation to general areas of residence hall life.

Examples:	1	2	3	4	5
Amount of window space in my room	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Social activities on my floor	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

	very satisfied 1	satisfied 2	neutral 3	dissatisfied 4	very dissatisfied 5
Availability of privacy in the residence hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rules and regulations governing my presence and activities in the residence hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Organized residence hall programs and activities provided by staff and hall government	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The opportunity offered by the residence hall to meet people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The relationship I have with my roommate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
General atmosphere of the cafeteria	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Room and board rates relative to the current cost of living and the services provided in the hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Effectiveness of residence hall government in initiating and providing meaningful activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunity to get involved in intramural activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The overall furnishings of my room	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The degree to which I am treated as an adult in the residence hall by the hall staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The extent to which the residence hall staff provides me with help and guidance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Experience and personal growth gained from living in a residence hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Maid and janitorial services in the residence hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The residence hall as an environment conducive to doing academic work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The extent to which life in a residence hall allows me to feel like a responsible individual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Meals offered in the cafeteria, particularly the quality of food	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My personal relationship with the residence hall staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The degree of acceptance and friendliness I feel on my floor	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Recreational facilities offered in the residence hall, such as TV, games, ping pong, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	1	2	3	4	5

Please feel free to comment on any of these general areas:

I. Physical facilities in the residence hall (room, cafeteria, lounge, recreation facilities, etc.).

II. Aspects of policies, rules, and procedures in the residence hall.

III. The non-social aspects of life in the residence hall such as academic atmosphere, staff, etc.

IV. The social atmosphere in the residence hall such as relations with other students, opportunity for social contacts.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?
A STUDY OF STUDENT PERSONNEL TITLES

C. W. Hotchkiss and W. H. Morrill

Student Development Report

Vol X, No. 5, 1972-73

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to quantify the feelings or reactions elicited by five titles that could be utilized in the 70's to describe student personnel services--Student Relations, Student Development, Student Personnel Services, Student Affairs, and Student Life. Students, faculty members, administrators and student personnel staff members rated each title using a 7-point semantic differential format with 11 bipolar pairs of adjectives. Results of the survey indicated:

(a) A majority of the mean scores for each title tended toward the negative end of the continuum, suggesting negative meaning for the samples contacted. A change in title, therefore, may do little to change this negative perception.

(b) Any title selection has more or less meaning depending upon the group sampled. For example, students and student personnel staff members were most closely aligned in their ranking of the various titles under study, while in most cases, faculty members and administrators were separated by two or more ranks from every other group.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?
A STUDY OF STUDENT PERSONNEL TITLES

Introduction

The "60's" brought many changes to higher education in the United States. Not the least of these were dramatic changes in student's attitudes and activities. From the silent generation of the 50's emerged a verbal, concerned and action oriented student who, unlike his predecessors, was unwilling to blandly accept many of the traditional ways of higher education.

One traditional area with which students became concerned was that of the authoritative role model - the in loco parentis role - assumed by most institutions of higher education and vested in the Student Personnel Services area. As roles and regulations were examined and changed, and as students demanded and were given more freedom and responsibility, the traditional roles, the titles of Dean of Men, Dean of Women and even that of Dean of Students with which the Student Personnel area had become so secure, took on less meaning. Many divisions began to search for less threatening authoritative roles that connoted more support to students. At the same time, however, parents, faculty, the general public and many administrators still felt very comfortable with the title of "Dean." They were less comfortable with the newer titles that they may have interpreted as permissive, vague or misleading.

The field of Student Personnel or Student Services has found itself in the position of attempting to evaluate services it provides and also the title or titles which should be attached to these services. In an attempt to clarify this matter a study was constructed to quantify the feelings or reactions that were elicited by several titles, both new and old, that could be utilized in the "70's" to describe the student personnel area.

Method

Five different names were selected by Student Services department heads to be investigated in this study. The names that were chosen seemed to describe the student services area in somewhat different ways. The names were presented to samples of faculty and students using a semantic differential format. Each respondent placed an X along a continuum (seven possible spaces) between the adjectives. Thus on the adjectives dull-interesting, if the respondent saw the name being evaluated as interesting, he would place the X in the space nearest the interesting end of the continuum. The responses of each individual were scored by assigning numbers from 1 through 7 to the spaces between the concepts. Judgments were made concerning which end of the continuum would receive a 1 score and which a 7. A mean and standard deviation was computed for each set of bipolar adjectives for each name and sample group. In addition to the semantic differential format, each respondent was then asked to indicate which of the names they most preferred. The names were presented to the respondents in random order.

The questionnaire was administered to samples of students, faculty, administrators and student personnel staff members. Responses were obtained from 114 students who were enrolled as majors in 26 different undergraduate departments. The student sample included student government officers, student staff members in the residence halls and students enrolled in one section of Py 220, a survey course, that was felt to be representative of undergraduate students at CSU. If the sample was biased it would be a result of the inclusion of a much higher percentage of "student leaders" than would be true of a random student population.

The academic faculty and administrators sample were obtained by sending all of the faculty and administrators on the Faculty Council mailing list a copy of the questionnaire and asking them to complete and return it by mail. The faculty

council is composed of academic faculty members elected to represent departments and colleges as well as departmental, college and general university administrators. A total of 58 questionnaires out of 134 were returned in time to be included in the study. Since this represents only a 43% return, there may be some response bias. The academic faculty sample consisted of 32 faculty members representing 27 different academic departments. The administration sample consisted of 26 administrators including 12 departmental level administrators and 14 college and university level administrators.

The student personnel faculty included 27 individuals representing 5 departments. The questionnaires were delivered to departmental offices for distribution into mailboxes of individual staff members with instructions to return them by mail.

Results

A mean and standard deviation was computed for each of the sample groups for each of the 11 bipolar pairs of adjectives and for each of the 5 names. This allowed the comparison of the mean score for each sample for each name as well as a ranking of the names based on mean scores. The range of possible scores was from 1 through 7, with a 1 representing the more negative end of the continuum between the two adjectives. For example, on the dull-interesting dimension, a low mean reflected a dull rating for the name and a high mean reflected an interesting rating for that name. The names were then ranked on the basis of the mean scores. A rank of 1 indicates that this name received the highest mean on that dimension and a rank of 5 indicates the lowest mean for that dimension.

Table 1 presents the rank, mean, and standard deviation for each name for each of the sample groups based on the sum of the responses for each of bipolar adjectives. There was little agreement between the samples as to which name

received the highest relative rank. The magnitude of the mean indicates the relative rating between the two adjectives. Means below 4.0 would indicate a tendency towards the more negative adjective and means above 4.0 would indicate a tendency towards the more positive adjective. Value judgments were made with the first adjective listed representing the more negative.

A majority of the means for each of the names and sample groups tended toward the negative end of the continuum between the adjectives. Thus, the names tended to have negative meaning for the samples contacted.

Table 2 presents the rank order of the names based on the stated preference for one of the five names. While table 1 reflects the ranks based on the rating of each name on 11 bipolar adjectives, table 2 reflects the ranks based on the stated preference for the names. This preference was stated by the respondents after they had completed the rating tasks. Both the students and Student Personnel faculty indicated a preference for "Student Life" while the academic faculty indicated a preference for "Student Affairs" and the administrative sample most preferred "Student Personnel Services."

Greater understanding of the meaning ascribed to the names by each of the samples can be determined by looking at the pattern of responses to that name on the various adjectives. The mean score for each sample on each pair of adjectives was computed and the names were ranked according to the magnitude of these mean scores. The name with the highest mean (most positive) was ranked 1 and the name with the lowest mean (most negative) was ranked 5.* Since all of the means

*The mean, standard deviation and rank for each of the bipolar adjectives for each sample are presented in the appendix in Tables 7 through 17.

Table 1

The Rank, Mean, and Standard Deviations of Each

Name for Each of the Sample Groups

Based on the Sum of the Adjective Ratings

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT F FACUL
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	3.91	1.23	2	3.48	1.48	3	3.80	1.27	4
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	1	4.03	1.30	4	3.38	1.63	2	3.90	1.48	2
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	5	3.68	1.16	3	3.47	1.62	1	3.92	1.42	5
STUDENT AFFAIRS	4	3.87	1.19	1	4.17	1.51	4	3.54	1.47	3
STUDENT LIFE	2	4.01	1.47	5	3.35	1.68	5	3.31	1.40	1

A rank of 1 denotes the highest mean and a rank of 5 the lowest mean

Table 1

The Rank, Mean, and Standard Deviations of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups Based on the Sum of the Adjective Ratings

NTS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
ean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
91	1.23	2	3.48	1.48	3	3.80	1.27	4	4.00	1.38
03	1.30	4	3.38	1.63	2	3.90	1.48	2	4.69	1.45
68	1.16	3	3.47	1.62	1	3.92	1.42	5	3.82	1.45
87	1.19	1	4.17	1.51	4	3.54	1.47	3	4.39	1.40
01	1.47	5	3.35	1.68	5	3.31	1.40	1	4.70	1.15

otes the highest mean and a rank of 5 the lowest mean

Table 2

The Rank of Each Name as Preferred

by Each Sample Group

	STUDENTS	ACADEMIC FACULTY	ADMINISTRATION	STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	A
STUDENT RELATIONS	4	4.5	5	5	
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	3	3	2	2	
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	5	2	1	4	
STUDENT AFFAIRS	2	1	3.5	3	
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.5	3.5	1	

Table 2

The Rank of Each Name as Preferred

by Each Sample Group

TS	ACADEMIC FACULTY	ADMINISTRATION	STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	AVERAGE RANK
	4.5	5	5	4.6
	3	2	2	2.5
	2	1	4	3.0
	1	3.5	3	2.4
	4.5	3.5	1	2.5

ranged from low positive or neutral to negative scores, caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the data. Thus the results will be expressed in terms of the relative ranking of the means rather than absolute differences. There is no inference that any differences are statistically significant.

Table 3 presents the name that was ranked highest (ranked 1) and the name that was ranked lowest (ranked 5) on each of the paired adjectives by the student sample. For this sample group, the names "Division of Student Life" and "Division of Student Personnel Services" were ranked in the extreme positions a majority of times. From table 2 we note that "Student Life" was the name that was most preferred by the student sample and "Student Personnel Service" was the name that was least preferred. Table 3 indicates for the student sample that the name "Student Life" was relatively more interesting, exciting, broad scope, supportive, liked, personal and active. It was also seen as non-professional, low status and unscientific. On the other hand, "Student Personnel Services," the name that was least preferred by the student sample, was seen as relatively more professional, high status, dull, boring, narrow scope, non-supportive, disliked, impersonal and passive.

Table 4 presents the highest and lowest ranked names for the faculty sample. From table 2 we note that the name that was most preferred by this sample was "Division of Student Affairs" while "Student Relations" and "Student Life" were least preferred. The name "Student Affairs" was ranked highest on all of the adjectives except scientific. "Student Personnel Services" was seen as relatively more scientific than the other names. On the more negative side of the paired adjectives, "Student Personnel Services" was seen as relatively more dull, boring and impersonal by the faculty sample. "Student Life" was seen as relatively more non-professional, low status and non-scientific. The faculty viewed the name "Student Development" as relatively more narrow scope, non-supportive, non-descriptive and disliked.

Table 5

The Names Ranked Highest and Lowest by the Student Sample on Each of the Paired Adjectives

Highest Ranked Name	Adjectives	Lowest Ranked Name
Student Life	Interesting - Dull	Student Personnel Services
Student Personnel Services	Professional - Nonprofessional	Student Life
Student Personnel Services	High Status - Low Status	Student Life
Student Life	Exciting - Boring	Student Personnel Services
Student Development	Scientific - Unscientific	Student Life
Student Life	Broad Scope - Narrow Scope	Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Supportive - Nonsupportive	Student Personnel Services
Student Affairs	Descriptive - Nondescriptive	Student Relations
Student Life	Like - Dislike	Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Personal - Impersonal	Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Active - Passive	Student Personnel Services

The highest and lowest ranked names on each of the paired adjectives for the administrator sample are presented in table 5. For this sample, there is greater variety of names ranked high and low on the various adjectives. The meaning ascribed to the name "Student Personnel Services," which was the name administrators most preferred (Table 2), can be inferred from looking at which paired adjectives were ranked the highest and lowest. For this sample, "Student Personnel Services" was relatively more professional, scientific, descriptive and active. It was also seen as relatively more dull and narrow scope. "Student Development" was seen as relatively more high status, broad scope, supportive, liked and impersonal. "Student Relations" was seen as relatively more interesting, exciting and personal. The name "Student Life" was seen somewhat negatively as relatively more dull, non-professional, low status, non-scientific, non-supportive, disliked and passive.

The name that was most preferred by the student personnel faculty (Table 2) was "Student Life" and the name that was least preferred was "Student Personnel Services." Table 6 presents the highest and lowest ranked names on each of the paired adjectives for the student personnel faculty. "Student Life" was viewed as being relatively more interesting, exciting, personal and active. "Student Development" was viewed as being relatively more professional, scientific, broad scope, supportive and liked. On the other hand, "Student Personnel Services" was viewed as being relatively more dull, low status, boring, narrow scope, non-supportive, disliked, impersonal and passive. In order to choose which name would best represent the administrative area of the university, decisions would need to be made as to which sample group and which set of adjectives should be given greatest weight. In any case, the decision may reflect which name has the least negative connotation rather than which has the most positive.

Table 4

The Names Ranked Highest and Lowest by the Faculty Sample on Each of the Paired Adjectives

Highest Ranked Name	Adjectives	Lowest Ranked Name
Student Affairs	Interesting - Dull	Student Personnel Services
Student Affairs	Professional - Nonprofessional	Student Life
Student Affairs	High Status - Low Status	Student Life
Student Affairs	Exciting - Boring	Student Personnel Services
Student Personnel Services	Scientific - Unscientific	Student Life
Student Affairs	Broad Scope - Narrow Scope	Student Development
Student Affairs	Supportive - Nonsupportive	Student Development
Student Affairs	Descriptive - Nondescriptive	Student Development
Student Affairs	Like - Dislike	Student Development
Student Affairs	Personal - Impersonal	Student Personnel Services
Student Affairs	Active - Passive	Student Relations

Table 5

The Names Ranked Highest and Lowest by the Administrative Sample on Each of the Paired Adjectives

Highest Ranked Name	Adjectives	Lowest Ranked Name
Student Relations	Interesting - Dull	Student Life[1] Student Personnel Services
Student Personnel Services	Professional - Nonprofessional	Student Life
Student Development	High Status - Low Status	Student Life
Student Relations	Exciting - Boring	Student Affairs
Student Personnel Services	Scientific - Unscientific	Student Life
Student Development	Broad Scope - Narrow Scope	Student Personnel Services
Student Development	Supportive - Nonsupportive	Student Life
Student Personnel Services	Descriptive - Nondescriptive	Student Life
Student Development	Like - Dislike	Student Life
Student Relations	Personal - Impersonal	Student Development
Student Personnel Services	Active - Passive	Student Life

[1]Tied ranks.

Table 6

The Names Ranked Highest and Lowest by the Student Personnel Faculty on Each of the Paired Adjectives

Highest Ranked Name	Adjectives	Lowest Ranked Name
Student Life	Interesting - Dull	Student Personnel Services
Student Development	Professional - Nonprofessional	Student Relations
Student Affairs	High Status - Low Status	Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Exciting - Boring	Student Personnel Services
Student Development	Scientific - Unscientific	Student Relations
Student Development	Broad Scope - Narrow Scope	Student Personnel Services
Student Development	Supportive - Nonsupportive	Student Personnel Services
Student Affairs	Descriptive - Nondescriptive	Student Relations
Student Development	Like - Dislike	Student Relations[1] Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Personal - Impersonal	Student Personnel Services
Student Life	Active - Passive	Student Personnel Services

[1]Tied ranks.

Discussion

The results of this study lend themselves to several areas of discussion even though firm conclusions may be difficult to produce. In examining the data on the sum of the adjective ratings, students and student personnel faculty were most closely aligned in their ranking of the various names under study, with not more than one rank level separating any of the choices. Academic faculty and administration were separated by two or more ranks from every other group except on one item. It is obvious that more than one public is to be served and that any name selection will have more or less meaning depending upon which public is involved.

In addition to responding to the various public's expressed perceptions however, professionals in the field must come to some sort of concensus as to their overall purpose and objectives. If the primary objective is one of providing ancillary service to the University community, particularly the student, then the title of the Division should reflect this purpose. On the other hand, if the objective is one of education of the total student in areas outside of the classroom, laboratory and library, then the title would take another bent.

It seems relatively clear that professional opinion leans most directly towards the philosophy of service and education in all aspects of student life. More often than not, the actual service areas provide the vehicle from which an educational base can be extended.

The data do indicate that the name used to describe the student affairs division of the university is important. Various names have different patterns of meaning for different publics. Professional staff and administrators must carefully consider all aspects of those meanings in selecting a title for a particular division or office.

In conclusion, it appears that the implications for change will vary from institution to institution depending upon the target group with which the professional staff of the student personnel area wish to identify. Campus politics, as well as the specific environment, may dictate a need to relate more closely with students or the need to identify with the "establishment." However, the generally negative weight indicated by the samples to possible names also warrants comment. While no supportive data is available, this reaction could well be considered as indicative of a general negative feeling by the various publics sampled concerning the Student Personnel-Student Services area. If this is the case, a change in name will do little to correct the situation unless accompanied by improved communication and extensive evaluation as to philosophy, purpose and function.

APPENDIX

Table 7

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups on the Dull-Interesting Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDE
	N = 114			N = 32			N = 26			
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	3.77	1.77	2.5	3.50	1.44	1	4.12	1.58	4
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	2	4.04	1.79	4	3.35	1.84	2.5	3.65	2.02	2
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	5	3.35	1.60	5	3.00	1.67	4.5	3.58	1.98	5
STUDENT AFFAIRS	4	3.76	1.74	1	4.32	1.67	2.5	3.65	1.83	3
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.43	1.92	2.5	3.50	1.94	4.5	3.58	1.77	1

Table 7

Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups on the Dull-Interesting Dimension

STUDENTS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114		N = 32			N = 26			N = 27		
Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3.77	1.77	2.5	3.50	1.44	1	4.12	1.58	4	3.74	1.63
4.04	1.79	4	3.35	1.84	2.5	3.65	2.02	2	4.82	1.52
3.35	1.60	5	3.00	1.67	4.5	3.58	1.98	5	3.15	1.63
3.76	1.74	1	4.32	1.67	2.5	3.65	1.83	3	4.26	1.79
4.43	1.92	2.5	3.50	1.94	4.5	3.58	1.77	1	5.19	1.36

Table 8

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of t

Sample Groups of the Nonprofessional-Professional Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 26		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
STUDENT RELATIONS	2	4.40	1.55	4	3.35	1.65	4	3.61	1.70
Student Development	3	4.31	1.68	3	3.65	1.84	2	4.27	1.87
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	1	4.64	1.66	2	3.97	1.93	1	4.77	1.66
STUDENT AFFAIRS	4	4.15	1.59	1	4.00	1.72	3	3.81	1.81
STUDENT LIFE	5	3.29	1.82	5	3.09	1.78	5	3.23	1.51

Table 8

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Nonprofessional-Professional Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 31			N = 26			N = 27		
Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
2	4.40	1.55	4	3.35	1.65	4	3.61	1.70	5	4.26	1.53
3	4.31	1.68	3	3.65	1.84	2	4.27	1.87	1	4.70	1.64
1	4.64	1.66	2	3.97	1.93	1	4.77	1.66	3	4.56	1.70
4	4.15	1.59	1	4.00	1.72	3	3.81	1.81	2	4.67	1.73
5	3.29	1.82	5	3.09	1.78	5	3.23	1.51	4	4.52	1.50

Table 9

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Low Status-High Status Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			S
	N = 114			N = 31			N - 26			
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Ra
STUDENT RELATIONS	1.5	4.11	1.47	3	3.38	1.71	2	3.77	1.37	4
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	4	3.97	1.60	2	3.65	1.77	1	3.92	1.79	3
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	1.5	4.11	1.57	4	3.35	1.94	3	3.73	1.59	5
STUDENT AFFAIRS	3	4.02	1.40	1	4.09	1.71	4	3.39	1.47	1
STUDENT LIFE	5	3.71	1.71	5	3.03	1.64	5	3.19	1.42	2

Table 9

n, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the

ample Groups of the Low Status-High Status Dimension

UDENTS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
= 114		N = 31			N = 26			N = 27		
Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
4.11	1.47	3	3.38	1.71	2	3.77	1.37	4	3.96	1.58
3.97	1.60	2	3.65	1.77	1	3.92	1.79	3	4.30	1.44
4.11	1.57	4	3.35	1.94	3	3.73	1.59	5	3.63	1.74
4.02	1.40	1	4.09	1.71	4	3.39	1.47	1	4.41	1.74
3.71	1.71	5	3.03	1.64	5	3.19	1.42	2	4.33	1.24

Table 10

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Eacl

Sample Groups of the Boring-Exciting Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATI	
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 25	
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean
STUDENT RELATIONS	4	3.48	1.56	2	3.24	1.65	1	3.92
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	2	3.74	1.63	3	3.18	1.59	2	3.50
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	5	3.04	1.53	5	2.85	1.83	4	3.19
STUDENT AFFAIRS	3	3.53	1.58	1	3.77	1.63	5	3.15
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.09	1.86	4	3.15	1.83	3	3.23

Table 10

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Boring-Exciting Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 31			N = 25			N = 27		
Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
4	3.48	1.56	2	3.24	1.65	1	3.92	1.38	4	3.82	1.59
2	3.74	1.63	3	3.18	1.59	2	3.50	1.68	2	4.52	1.72
5	3.04	1.53	5	2.85	1.83	4	3.19	1.58	5	3.41	1.39
3	3.53	1.58	1	3.77	1.63	5	3.15	1.62	3	4.07	1.64
1	4.09	1.86	4	3.15	1.83	3	3.23	1.48	1	4.67	1.21

Table 11

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Unscientific-Scientific Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 26		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	3.47	1.47	4	3.15	1.73	3	3.46	1.77
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	1	4.06	1.67	3	3.18	1.96	2	3.65	1.70
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES	2	3.93	1.64	1	3.35	2.00	1	4.08	1.70
STUDENT AFFAIRS	4	3.10	1.46	2	3.21	1.72	4	2.96	1.69
STUDENT LIFE	5	2.96	1.59	5	2.68	1.70	5	2.46	1.30

Table 11

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Unscientific-Scientific Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 31			N = 26			N = 27		
ank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3	3.47	1.47	4	3.15	1.73	3	3.46	1.77	5	3.74	1.56
1	4.06	1.67	3	3.18	1.96	2	3.65	1.70	1	4.52	1.40
2	3.93	1.64	1	3.35	2.00	1	4.08	1.70	4	3.89	1.74
4	3.10	1.46	2	3.21	1.72	4	2.96	1.69	2	4.22	1.53
5	2.96	1.59	5	2.68	1.70	5	2.46	1.30	3	4.00	1.44

Table 12

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Narrow Scope-Broad Scope Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDE FA
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 25			N
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	4.75	1.70	3	4.44	2.16	3	4.35	1.94	4
ST ENT DEVELOPMENT	4	4.51	1.75	5	3.77	2.24	1	4.58	2.25	1
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	5	4.01	1.76	4	3.85	2.06	5	4.27	1.85	5
STUDENT AFFAIRS	2	4.94	1.64	1	5.06	1.97	2	4.39	2.08	2.5
STUDENT LIFE	1	5.04	1.77	2	4.56	2.30	4	4.31	2.06	2.5

Table 12

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Narrow Scope-Broad Scope Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 31			N = 25			N = 27		
Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3	4.75	1.70	3	4.44	2.16	3	4.35	1.94	4	4.67	1.69
4	4.51	1.75	5	3.77	2.24	1	4.58	2.25	1	5.37	1.52
5	4.01	1.76	4	3.85	2.06	5	4.27	1.85	5	4.37	1.80
2	4.94	1.64	1	5.06	1.97	2	4.39	2.08	2.5	5.22	1.74
1	5.04	1.77	2	4.56	2.30	4	4.31	2.06	2.5	5.22	1.48

Table 13

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Non-supportive-Supportive Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 25		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
STUDENT RELATIONS	4	4.08	1.63	4	3.53	1.94	3	4.08	1.70
DENT DEVELOPMENT	2	4.30	1.67	5	3.50	1.96	1	4.81	1.70
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	5	3.69	1.59	2	3.82	1.95	4	4.27	1.87
STUDENT AFFAIRS	3	4.12	1.50	1	4.29	1.72	2	3.89	1.73
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.29	1.77	3	3.68	1.72	5	3.85	2.05

Table 13

ean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Non-supportive-Supportive Dimension

TUDENTS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
= 114		N = 31			N = 25			N = 27		
Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
4.08	1.63	4	3.53	1.94	3	4.08	1.70	3	4.52	1.50
4.30	1.67	5	3.50	1.96	1	4.81	1.70	1	5.11	1.48
3.69	1.59	2	3.82	1.95	4	4.27	1.87	5	4.15	1.51
4.12	1.50	1	4.29	1.72	2	3.89	1.73	4	4.33	1.57
4.29	1.77	3	3.68	1.72	5	3.85	2.05	2	5.04	1.40

Table 14

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Nondescriptive-Descriptive Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STU
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 26			
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank
STUDENT RELATIONS	5	3.67	1.72	3	3.65	2.24	2	4.00	1.92	5
ST ENT DEVELOPMENT	3	3.87	1.86	5	2.74	2.05	3.5	3.65	1.94	2.5
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	4	3.82	1.79	2	3.85	2.20	1	4.19	1.90	4
STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	4.01	1.78	1	4.29	2.21	3.5	3.65	2.17	1
STUDENT LIFE	2	3.90	1.99	4.	3.03	2.17	5	3.08	1.52	2.5

Table 14

Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the

ple Groups of the Nondescriptive-Descriptive Dimension

TS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
		N = 31			N = 26			N = 27		
n	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
7	1.72	3	3.65	2.24	2	4.00	1.92	5	4.04	1.61
7	1.86	5	2.74	2.05	3.5	3.65	1.94	2.5	4.41	1.99
2	1.79	2	3.85	2.20	1	4.19	1.90	4	4.26	2.07
1	1.78	1	4.29	2.21	3.5	3.65	2.17	1	4.74	1.66
0	1.99	4.	3.03	2.17	5	3.08	1.52	2.5	4.41	1.85

Table 15

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each o

Sample Groups of the Dislike-Like Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	N = 114			N = 33			N = 25		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	S
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	3.84	1.62	3	3.27	1.73	3.5	3.12	1.7
JDENT DEVELOPMENT	4	3.77	1.98	5	2.88	1992	1	3.50	2.1
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	5	3.26	1.73	2	3.32	2.00	2	3.42	2.0
STUDENT AFFAIRS	2	3.89	1.67	1	4.50	1.85	3.5	3.12	1.9
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.15	2.00	4	3.12	2.10	5	2.73	1.8

Table 15

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Dislike-Like Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 33			N = 25			N = 27		
Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3	3.84	1.62	3	3.27	1.73	3.5	3.12	1.71	4.5	3.74	1.72
4	3.77	1.98	5	2.88	1992	1	3.50	2.13	1	4.63	1.96
5	3.26	1.73	2	3.32	2.00	2	3.42	2.00	4.5	3.41	1.95
2	3.89	1.67	1	4.50	1.85	3.5	3.12	1.90	3	4.30	1.90
1	4.15	2.00	4	3.12	2.10	5	2.73	1.87	2	4.59	1.69

Table 16

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each o

Sample Groups of the Impersonal-Personal Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 25		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	
STUDENT RELATIONS	3	3.75	1.81	3	3.38	1.65	1	3.92	1.
TUDENT DEVELOPMENT	2	3.81	1.88	4	3.35	1.82	5	3.58	1.
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	5	3.17	1.85	5	3.24	2.02	3	3.70	1.
STUDENT AFFAIRS	4	3.37	1.64	1	4.15	1.56	2	3.73	1.
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.19	1.99	2	3.62	2.08	4	3.62	1.

Table 16

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Impersonal-Personal Dimension

STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
N = 114			N = 31			N = 25			N = 27		
Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3	3.75	1.81	3	3.38	1.65	1	3.92	1.85	4	3.78	1.83
2	3.81	1.88	4	3.35	1.82	5	3.58	1.75	2	4.67	1.73
5	3.17	1.85	5	3.24	2.02	3	3.70	1.62	5	3.56	1.76
4	3.37	1.64	1	4.15	1.56	2	3.73	1.99	3	4.00	1.75
1	4.19	1.99	2	3.62	2.08	4	3.62	1.92	1	5.00	1.21

Table 17

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Passive-Active Dimension

	STUDENTS			ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			S
	N = 114			N = 31			N = 25			
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	R
STUDENT RELATIONS	4	3.64	1.58	5	3.38	1.74	3	3.54	1.66	
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	2	3.90	1.80	2	3.91	2.02	2	3.81	1.86	
STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY	5	3.40	1.61	3	3.59	2.00	1	3.89	1.71	
STUDENT AFFAIRS	3	3.70	1.57	1	4.24	1.83	4	3.19	1.74	
STUDENT LIFE	1	4.10	1.86	4	3.44	1.97	5	3.12	1.61	

Table 17

n, Standard Deviation and Rank of Each Name for Each of the Sample Groups of the Passive-Active Dimension

DENTS		ACADEMIC FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION			STUDENT PERSONNEL FACULTY		
114		N = 31			N = 25			N = 27		
Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
3.64	1.58	5	3.38	1.74	3	3.54	1.66	4	3.78	1.67
3.90	1.80	2	3.91	2.02	2	3.81	1.86	2	4.59	1.72
3.40	1.61	3	3.59	2.00	1	3.89	1.71	5	3.59	1.76
3.70	1.57	1	4.24	1.83	4	3.19	1.74	3	4.07	1.49
4.10	1.86	4	3.44	1.97	5	3.12	1.61	1	4.82	1.39

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT REPORTS

REVISED INDEX - November, 1969

Volume I, 1963-64

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. A Study of Student Reactions to Welcome Week, 1963-64, I, 1.

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. Freshman Class Profile, 1964, I, 2.

Ivey, A. E. The Colorado State University Student (A Comparative Study of High School Rank and CEEB-SAT Scores), 1964, I, 3.

Ivey, A. E. Student Perceptions of Colorado State University, 1964, I, 4.

Goldstein, A. D. & Miller, C. D. Educational and Vocational Background of Parents of Colorado State University Students, I, 5.

Volume II, 1964-65

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. Scholastic Ability Patterns of Colorado State University Freshmen Entering Fall 1963, 1964, II, 1.

Miller, C. D. Scholastic Ability Patterns of CSU Freshmen Entering Fall 1964. 1965, II, 2.

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. The Academic Performance of Student's Ranking in the Fourth Sixth of CSU's Freshmen Class. 1965, II, 3.

Volume III, 1965-66

Keist, R. T. A Study to Determine if Students Living in a Residence Hall With Community Bathrooms Participated in More Activities and Have More Interaction With Members of Their Living Units Than Students Who Live in a Residence Hall With Private Bathrooms. 1965, III, 1.

Miller, C. D. Scholastic Achievement Patterns of Colorado State University Freshmen. 1966, III, 2.

Miller, C. D., Ivey, A. E., & Goldstein, A. Colorado State University Student Economic Patterns: A Financial Survey. 1966, III, 3.

Rietsma, G. Areas of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction With Colorado State University as Perceived by Students. 1966, III, 4.

Keist, R. T. Validation Study: Student Interaction in Residence Halls With or Without Community Bathrooms. 1966, III, 5.

Schoemer, J. R. An Analysis of the 1966 Summer Orientation Program at CSU. 1966, III, 6.

Volume IV, 1966-67

Office of the Dean of Men. Summary of Transfer and Reference Evaluations. 1966, IV, 1.

Volume IV, 1966-67 (Con't.)

Cole, C. W. & Ivey, A. E. Differences Between Students Attending and Not Attending a Pre-College Orientation. 1966, IV, 2.

Crookston, B. B., Keist, R. T., Miller, C. D. & Ivey, A. E. A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students: Part I: A Summary Report of Five Populations. 1966, IV, 3.

Gabbert, K. H., Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. Counselor Assignment and Client Attitude. 1967, IV, 4.

Keist, R. T., Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students. 1967, IV, 5.

Keist, R. T. A Study of Enculturation Patterns of First Quarter Freshmen at CSU. 1967, IV, 6.

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. Student Response to Three Types of Orientation Programs. 1967, IV, 7.

Volume V, 1967-68

Early, E. J. F., Johnson, D. D., Morrill, W. H. & Oetting, E. R. A Comparison of the Meaning of Names Used to Describe a Modern College of Agriculture. 1968, V, 1.

Schoemer, J. R. Class of 1970 - This is Your Potrait. 1968, V. 2.

Volume VI, 1968-69

McConnell, W. A. & Schoemer, J. R. Is There a Case for the Freshmen Women Residence Hall? 1968, VI, 1.

Crookston, B. B. A Survey of Student Participation in Academic Departmental Affairs. 1968, VI, 2.

Hurst, J. C. & Schoemer, J. R. An Attitude Assessment of Students and Their Parents Who Did and Did Not Attend Preview CSU 1968. 1969, VI, 3.

Hurst, J. C., Hubbell, R. N., Munsey, W. L., Penn, J. R., & Harding, K. A Survey of Student and Parent Attitudes Concerning Colorado State University. 1969, VI, 4.

Hubbell, R. N., Munsey, W. L., Nutt, J. A., & Penn, J. R. An Annotated Bibliography of Research Done at Colorado State University Concerning Student Life. 1969, VI, 5.

Forrest, D., Moore, M., & Hinkle, J. Married Student Outreach Programs Completed During the 1968-69 Academic Year at Colorado State University.

Volume VII, 1969-70

Crookston, B. B. & Hubbell, R. N. A Follow-up Study of Student Participation in Departmental Academic Affairs at Colorado State University. 1969, VII, 1.

Volume VII, 1969-70 (Con't.)

Morrill, W. H., Miller, C. D. & Thomas, L. E. The Relationship of Educational and Vocational Interests of Women Students at Colorado State University. 1969, VII, 2.

Hurst, J. C., Munsey, W. L. & Penn, J. R. Student and Parent Attitudes Before and After One Quarter at Colorado State University. 1969-70, VII, 3.

Hubbell, R. N., Sjogren, D. D. & Boardman, T. The Generation Gap: Parent and Student Perceptions of the University. 1969-70, VII, 4.

Dildine, G., Hubbell, R. N., Keltz, R. & Smith, T. A Collegiate Experiment in Human Relations Training: The CSU Student Leadership Workshop of April 1969. 1969-70, VII, 5.

Hurst, J. C. & Smith, T. Student-Parent Perceptions of CSU Before and After Attendance at Preview CSU 1969. 1969-70, VII, 6.

Carlson, J. Bibliography on Drugs. 1969-70, VII, 7.

Hurst, J. C. & Morrill, W. H. Personal vs General Requests for Client Feedback in the Evaluation of Counseling Services. 1969-70, VII, 8.

Volume VIII, 1970-71

Morrill, W. H. & Hoyt, D. P. The Training of Counseling Psychologists for Outreach Activities. 1970-71, VIII, 1.

Birney, D., Thomas, L. E. & Hinkle, J. Life Planning Workshops: Discussion and Evaluation. 1970-71, VIII, 2.

Kuder, J. M. & Smith, T. The Leaving Student at Colorado State University, 1970-71, VIII, 3.

Weigel, R. G. & Smith, T. Effects of Pre-PREVIEW Information Mailings on Academic Choices and Performance, 1970-71, VIII, 4.

Layton, K. & Gardiner, J. C. Justifications for Calling in National Guard Troops During a Campus Demonstration: A Study of Student Attitudes. 1970-71, VIII, 5.

Volume IX, 1971-72

Hurst, J. C., Delworth, U. & Garriott, R. The Effects on Participant Self-Concept of a Pre-Recorded Audio Tape in Self-Directed Encounter Groups, 1971-72, IX, 1.

Morrill, W. H. & Hyne, S. What to Prevent and Promote, 1971-72, IX, 2.

Titley, R. W. & Vattano, F. J. Psychology as a "Major" Step, 1971-72, IX, 3.

Coates, Carolie J. Floor Social Climate Factors in Varying Residence Hall Living Arrangements, 1971-72, IX, 4.

Volume X, 1972-73

Coates, Carolie, J., and Hall, Raymond L. Comparison of Academic Predictors and Achievement for Project GO and Regularly Admitted Freshmen at Colorado State University, 1968-71. 1973, X, 1.

Coates, Carolie, J., Hurst, James, C., and Becker, Wayne. College Students' Perceptions of Problems and Sources of Help. 1973, X, 2.

Huebner, Lois, Morrill, Weston, and Hinkle, John. Client Transaction with a University Counseling Center. 1973, X, 3.

Hadson, Dennis, L., Kuder, James, M., and Thompson, Tom, T. A Longitudinal Study of Changes in Satisfaction of Residence Hall Students. 1973, X, 4.

Hotchkiss, C. W., and Morrill, W. H. What's in a Name? A Study of Student Personnel Titles. 1973, X, 5.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT DEVELOPMENT STAFF PAPERS

Volume I, 1969-70

Crookston, B. B. Implications of Drug Usage for Higher Education. 1969-70, I, 1.

Crookston, B. B. Coping with Campus Disruption. 1969-70, I, 2.

Carlson, J. M. The Elements of Conflict. 1969-70, I, 3.

Volume II, 1970-71

Carlson, J. M. & Hubbell, R. N. The Future of College Discipline. 1970-71, II, 1.

Crookston, B. B. A Developmental View of Academic Advising. 1970-71, II, 2.

Morrill, W. H. & Hurst, J. C. A Preventative and Developmental Role for the College Counselor. 1970-71, II, 3.

Crookston, B. B. & Carlson, J. M. Third Party Mediation on Campus. 1970-71, II, 4.

Hubbell, R. N. & Sherwood, G. P. A Model for Developing New Residence Hall Environments. 1970-71, II, 5.

Volume III, 1971-72

Ivey, A. E. & Hurst, J. C. Communication as Adaptation. 1971-72, III, 1.