

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Gideon Zarraga Alegado for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education presented on August 20, 1997. Title: A Study of Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction of Selected Student Services by Foreign (International) and Domestic Students at Oregon State University

Abstract approved: *Redacted for Privacy* _____
Charles Carpenter

This study examined the utilization of selected student services by domestic and foreign students in their sophomore, junior, or senior year at Oregon State University during Winter 1994 to find out if differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction existed between them. It also examined if differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction existed between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status; marital status was included in the questionnaire for demographic profile purposes only. Thirty-one services provided by the six departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs were selected for the study. A comparison of quality ratings was made between Student Affairs Departments that used a formal process of evaluation and those that did not.

The Student Services Awareness and Usage Questionnaire was developed and used. A sample of 150 domestic students and 150 foreign students were randomly selected, with equal representation by gender and academic status. A total of 193 questionnaires (64%) were returned, 116 from domestic students and 77 from foreign students. The five null hypotheses were tested using either the chi-square test, *t*-test, or Fisher's exact test.

The study found that a majority of domestic respondents (97%) were aware of more services than a majority of foreign respondents (77%). A majority of each group used only

about one-third of the services, with the domestic respondents using one service more than the foreign respondents. Seventeen percent of the domestic respondents and 20% of the foreign respondents were satisfied, while 83% of the domestic respondents and 80% of the foreign respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Neither group indicated being very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, or very satisfied with any of the services. The findings from the other variables yielded varying results. The use of a formal process of evaluation by some service departments did not result in their obtaining higher quality ratings than the rest.

Recommendations for administration and further research were included to address the issues involving student services and how they can be delivered more efficiently and effectively to benefit the university's diverse student population.

©Copyright by Gideon Zarraga Alegado
August 20, 1997
All Rights Reserved

**A Study of Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction of Selected Student
Services by Foreign (International) and Domestic Students at
Oregon State University**

by

Gideon Zarraga Alegado

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

**in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of**

Doctor of Education

**Completed August 20, 1997
Commencement June 1998**

Doctor of Education thesis of Gideon Zarraga Alegado presented on August 20, 1997

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy _____

Major Professor, representing ~~Education~~

Redacted for Privacy

Director of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Redacted for Privacy _____

~~Gideon~~ Zarraga Alegado, Author

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the many individuals who have contributed in many different ways to the development and completion of this study, I offer my deepest sense of gratitude and appreciation.

To all the domestic and international students who shared their time, effort, and experience in responding to the questionnaire, I convey my most heartfelt thanks.

I wholeheartedly thank all the members of my graduate committee for their commitment, patience, and support: My major professor, Dr. Charles Carpenter, deserves a very special appreciation, recognition, and thanks for all his input, keen attention, and observation, as well as professional guidance; Dr. Donald R. Sanderson, first minor advisor, for continually providing me with optimism, encouragement, and motivation; Dr. Joanne Engel, second minor advisor, for being so generously accommodating despite her hectic and overloaded schedule; Dr. Daniel B. Dunham, who, in spite of overwhelming commitments, graciously and willingly accepted this added responsibility, representing the School of Education; and Dr. Dale W. Weber, Graduate Council representative, for always showing genuine interest, with positive and gentle attitude.

I am extremely thankful to Dr. William Smart of the Office of International Education for all his encouragements, understanding, and assistance on both personal and research concerns. Likewise, I am deeply thankful to Mike Henthorne, Director of the Memorial Union, and the whole MU family for all their moral and professional support through these years.

I shall forever be grateful to my late brother-in-law, Dr. Merton D. Munn, and my sister-in-law, Mrs. Femme Tobias Munn, who have been very supportive of my family and

me in every way. The motivation and inspiration they provided will always be remembered and appreciated.

I especially convey my immeasurable gratitude, great appreciation, and deep affection to my caring and loving wife Rachel, our beloved son Gideon Mer (G-Mer), and our precious daughter Garnet Spring. Without their unconditional love, understanding, and unwavering support, the completion of this work would not have been possible.

The people above and countless others who have, in one way or another, contributed to the attainment of my pursuits, are truly an embodiment of One who has been my constant Source of inspiration, sustenance, and guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Importance of the Study	6
Statement of the Problem	8
Definition of Terms	10
II LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Importance of Student Services to Higher Education	13
Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction with Student Services	18
Comparison of Foreign and American Students	23
Foreign Students	26
American Students	30
Summary	33
III METHODOLOGY	35
Population	35
Sample Selection	36
Instrumentation	37
Testing of Hypotheses	40
Data Treatment	41
Descriptive Statistics	41
Inferential Statistics	41
IV DATA ANALYSIS	43
Demographic Data	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Major Research Problem	46
Data Analysis by Hypothesis	47
Awareness of Selected Student Services	47
Usage of Selected Student Services	51
Satisfaction with Selected Student Services	55
Comparison of Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction Between Groups	
Within the Variables of Gender, Age, and Academic Status	58
Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender	59
Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age	62
Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status	65
Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender	70
Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age	73
Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status	77
Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender ..	81
Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age	85
Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status	88
Quality Ratings for Student Services Departments With or Without a Formal Process of Evaluation	94
Overall Quality Ratings	95
Ranking of Quality Ratings	98
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	101
Summary of Study	101
Research Findings Overview	104
Key Findings and Conclusions	108
Hypothesis 1	109
Hypothesis 2	109
Hypothesis 3	110
Hypothesis 4	110
Hypothesis 5	114

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Recommendations	115
Recommendations for Administration	115
Recommendations for Further Research	117
REFERENCES	119
APPENDIXES	126
A Questionnaire	127
B Cover Letters	131
C Tables of Statistical Analysis	134

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Respondent Distribution Showing Resident Status, Academic Status, and Gender	37
2	Demographic Distribution of Domestic and Foreign Respondents	44
3	Rank Order of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Respondents, and Percentage Reporting Awareness	48
4	Rank Order of Usage of Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Respondents, and Percentage Reporting Usage	52
5	Mean Level of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Respondents	56
6	Rank Order of Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender, and Percentage Reporting Awareness	60
7	Rank Order of Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age, and Percentage Reporting Awareness	63
8	Rank Order of Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status, and Percentage Reporting Awareness	66
9	Rank Order of Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender, and Percentage Reporting Usage	71
10	Rank Order of Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age, and Percentage Reporting Usage	74
11	Rank Order of Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status, and Percentage Reporting Usage	78
12	Rank Order of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender, and Percentage Reporting Satisfaction	82
13	Rank Order of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age, and Percentage Reporting Satisfaction	86
14	Rank Order of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status, and Percentage Reporting Satisfaction	89

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
15	Quality Rating for the Dean of Students Office	95
16	Quality Rating for the Financial Aid Office	96
17	Quality Rating for the Counseling and Testing Services	96
18	Quality Rating for the Memorial Union and Educational Activities	97
19	Quality Rating for the Student Housing and Residence Programs	97
20	Quality Rating for the Student Health Services	97
21	Rank Order of Good Rating for the Six Student Services Departments Indicating Those With or Without a Formal Process of Evaluation	98
22	2 x 2 Contingency Table Using 50% as Breakpoint	100

LIST OF TABLES IN APPENDIX C

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
C-1	Awareness of Student Services/Programs by Domestic and Foreign Students	135
C-2	Usage of Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Students	136
C-3	Comparison of Mean Level of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Respondents	137
C-4	Comparison of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Gender	138
C-5	Comparison of Awareness of selected student services by age	139
C-6	Comparison of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Academic Status	140
C-7	Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Gender	141
C-8	Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Age	142
C-9	Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Academic Status	143
C-10	Comparison of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services By Gender	144
C-11	Comparison of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services by Age	145
C-12	Comparison of Satisfaction with Selected Student Services by Academic Status	146

This work is dedicated

in loving memory

to

DR. MERTON DEMING MUNN, Ed.D.
Outstanding educator, administrator, missionary,
and this writer's mentor and model.

REV. GRACIANO TIMTIM ALEGADO, B.Th.
Noted Philippine evangelist, minister, missionary,
church builder and school founder, and committed educator.

REV. FLORENTINA ZARRAGA ALEGADO, B.Th., B.C.Ed.
One of The Philippine's first ordained women ministers,
dedicated music and Bible teacher, and faithful
partner in Christian ministry and evangelism.

DON JULIO D. TOBIAS
Venerable patriarch whose supply of
wit and wisdom seemed inexhaustible.

MR. and MRS. CAYETANO E. TOBIAS
Sacrificed comfort and convenience in order to provide
better and brighter future for all their twelve children.

ATTY. ROLANDO MONDRAGON DIAO, L.I.B., A.B.
Champion and promoter of human relations and family
values, and this writer's bosom friend.

A STUDY OF AWARENESS, USAGE, AND SATISFACTION OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES BY FOREIGN (INTERNATIONAL) AND DOMESTIC STUDENTS AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Just as many American young people are obtaining their training and academic credentials from educational institutions in various parts of the world (Council on International Educational Exchange, 1988), thousands of their counterparts from nations around the world are coming to America to pursue higher education. And, even if the main goal and concern of these foreign students is scholarly in nature, their academic success or failure is largely influenced by the environment and experiences they encounter while attending American universities and colleges.

In her book, *Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States*, Cora Du Bois (1956) offered a succinct observation on the universality of education and some presumptions and misconceptions concerning foreign students:

The pursuit of learning beyond the boundaries of one's own community, nation, or culture is as old as learning itself. It stems from the human capacity for curiosity and adventure. It reflects the ability of human beings to communicate with each other at varying levels and with varying sophistication across the barriers of social particularities.

To put into perspective the widespread concern . . . expressed . . . about "the problem of the foreign student," it is necessary to know something of the long history of educational exchange. Actually, perhaps 95 percent of the students from abroad do not encounter "problems" in any serious sense of the word. On the contrary, their experience is richly educational in formal as well as informal aspects. But in the minds of many people one disappointed and embittered student overbalances the influences of the many students who are well adjusted while in the United States and after their return home. For every student guest to be a balanced individual capable of extracting maximum advantages from a study tour abroad or for

every student guest to encounter only constructive situations and insightful Americans would be a perfection unattainable.

Nevertheless, it behooves those concerned with exchange of persons to do all within their power to provide a flexible and constructive environment for student guests. This requires an understanding of complex factors that operate on many levels and in many contexts. (pp. 1-2)

The integration of foreign students with the mainstream student populations in institutions of higher education naturally requires certain responsibilities and constraints on the part of such institutions (Education and World Affairs, 1964). Questions are often raised whether the student services programs at American colleges and universities are carefully thought out and planned, taking into consideration the student clientele for whom, in essence, such programs exist to serve. Kauffman (1984) observed that:

Institutions often make program and mission decisions about the student clientele they will serve without giving adequate forethought to the student services that will be expected and needed.

In this regard, one . . . must be concerned about the admission of large numbers of foreign students to institutions of higher education in the United States. . . . Institutions intending to accept foreign students [must] understand why they want to do so and what resources they will need to make available to help achieve institutional and student goals. (p. 28)

The student population in American colleges and universities has changed significantly during the past half century (Kuh & Stage, 1992). In the mid 1960s, the typical college student in the United States was male, white, and between 18 and 22 years old. In the 1990s, it is difficult to arrive at a description of a typical college student. Fewer than one-half of the undergraduate students are between 18 and 22 years old. Of all college students, more than half are female, almost 20% represent ethnic minorities, and about 40% are over 25 years old. Ethnic and racial diversities characterize student constituencies on many campuses. Some students enroll for one or two classes per term, whereas others take a *full-time load* (at least four 3-credit hour classes or equivalent). Some students work full-time while taking classes; others alternate between work and study. A majority of the

students take five or more years to earn an undergraduate degree. Kuh and Stage (1992) pointed out that most of the student development theory and research in American institutions is based on white, traditional-age students, and may not be applicable to those with different backgrounds and cultures.

Foreign students are an integral part of student populations at many colleges and universities, and the number of foreign students attending American institutions of higher education is steadily increasing (Anderson & Myer, 1985; Dillard & Chisolm, 1983), notwithstanding the fluctuating trends between the 1960s and the 1980s (Cummings, 1991; Eddy, 1972). The proliferation of foreign students has been encouraged, to some extent, by the consequent reciprocal benefits that the institutions and students derive from each other.

Although many studies on racial and ethnic groups have been conducted, comparative studies on foreign and domestic college students, especially on how they perceive the university experience and environment, are few. Hamilton (1979) conducted such a study, using a random selection of 30 foreign students and 28 domestic students. Using the College Characteristics Index (CCI) it was found that the perceptions of the two groups differed significantly on 5 of 11 factors measured. His study revealed that, compared to domestic students, the foreign students:

1. Perceived the administration as being more receptive to change.
2. Felt that the competition for grades was more intense and the professors were more demanding.
3. Viewed themselves as having greater opportunities to develop leadership potential and assurance.
4. Felt a warmer and friendlier atmosphere in their group activities.
5. Internalized to a fuller degree the push for a vocational orientation.

Most American colleges and universities offer student services as an enhancer of, not simply a supplement to, their academic programs. Some institutions provide no more than the basic services to help their students, whereas others offer sophisticated and more complex services and programs.

Despite the important role student services plays, it has not been supported wholeheartedly by those in academia. In this regard, Delworth, Hanson, and Associates (1980) provided the following historical overview:

During one rather brief period early in this century, [student services] came fairly close to entering the mainstream of the academic program. In general, however, student services as a distinct professional role had never become thoroughly integrated into any of higher education's three principal functions of teaching, research, and service. By assuming, over the years, a multitude of student-related roles and activities yet by remaining estranged from the vital functions of the academic enterprise, student services finds itself in the peculiar situation of being indispensable but peripheral. (p. 3)

That student services should be central to the mission of higher education was pointed out by Katz (1973):

Any enlarged vision of the function of colleges and universities must include the development of people and not just the transmission of information and vocational preparation. In implementing this conception, the student services have often been the only agencies of the college or university aimed directly at the emotional, social, ethical, and esthetic development of the student beyond what can be achieved in the classroom. (p. vii)

Despite arguments over whether or not student services are indispensable in the total educational process, the fact remains that the partnership between academia and student services cannot easily be dissolved. Student services is a necessary ingredient in the achievement of educational goals by both institutions and students alike (Tilley, 1973). For any institution of higher education to maintain its leadership role in social and cultural development, it must support an efficient and effective system of delivery of student services. Tilley (1973) stressed that "those individuals concerned for the welfare of the

teaching, learning, and growing process . . . must focus on action . . . on practical measures to enhance learning; to improve student, faculty, and staff satisfactions; and to promote better educational cost effectiveness" (p. 113).

To ensure that all students, domestic and foreign, benefit fully from the student services offered by an institution of higher education, those responsible for delivering such services must continually review and evaluate their programs. Careful evaluation is the key to effective implementation of student services programs. According to Lewicki and Thompson (1982), a cyclical process of planning, implementation, and evaluation provides for effective delivery of student services. Carney and Barak (1976) found that yearly surveys of students' needs, usage, and satisfaction with student services were appropriate because they allowed for assessment of changes in student perceptions overtime.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) to investigate if there were any differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services between the foreign and domestic students at Oregon State University (OSU), and (b) to find out if differences in quality rating exist between student services departments that have a formal process of evaluation and those that do not. The differences were determined by an instrument developed to measure the degree of awareness, usage, and satisfaction, as well as quality ratings. The main objectives were to: (a) identify important differences between the domestic and foreign students; (b) identify important differences between groups within certain variables; and (c) find out if having a formal procedure for evaluating their services determined the departments' obtainment of higher quality ratings. The findings of this study provided a basis for assessing the functionality and effectiveness of the student services

selected for this study, and the need, if any, for more promotion of such services to foreign and/or domestic students.

Importance of the Study

Oregon State University offers a broad array of student services. Like many colleges and universities, it administers most of these services through departments under the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. In regard to student services, OSU is exceptional in two respects. It is one of only a few institutions in the United States that offers professional training in student services. It offers graduate degrees in College Student Services Administration, a program that has been identified as "one of the top ten in the nation" (Oregon State University Division of Student Affairs, 1992). Foreign student advising and related services are rendered through the Office of International Education, which is administered under the Vice Provost for Research, Graduate Studies, and International Programs. In most colleges and universities, this area is under the umbrella of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs (or a similar position). The OSU Office of International Education owes the increase of international student enrollment to 10% of the total student population to its goal and the quality of its programs (Oregon State University Office of International Education, 1992):

OSU has established a goal of being a premier international University. As the University's vanguard in meeting this goal, the Office of International Education (OIE) provides the leadership for involvement in a wide range of international activities. (p. 1)

Oregon State University has been undergoing major changes in its overall structure in response to budgetary constraints brought about by the passage, in 1990, of Measure 5, which set limitations on property taxes in Oregon. Student Affairs is among the divisions that have experienced significant restructuring and modifications. It reduced its service areas

from 10 to 6, through merging and transfer. The units remaining directly responsible to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs are: Dean of Students, Financial Aid, Counseling and Testing Services, Memorial Union and Educational Activities, Student Housing and Residence Programs, and Student Health Services. The following are descriptions of the role and functions of each unit (Byrne, 1993):

1. *Dean of Students.* The Office of the Dean of Students oversees the coordination of co-curricular activities and programs which include student assistance, student rights and responsibilities, career planning and placement, child care center management, and national student exchange program.
2. *Financial Aid.* The Financial Aid Office is responsible for administering financial assistance to students in the form of grants, loans, college work study, work opportunities, and various forms of scholarships.
3. *Counseling and Testing Services.* Various types of counseling are provided by the Counseling and Testing Services, including academic/educational, personal, and career counseling. Services also include testing.
4. *Memorial Union and Educational Activities.* The Memorial Union and Educational Activities is responsible for various educational, social, cultural, and recreational programs, as well as the provision and maintenance of various facilities, including food services, the I.D. Center, Craft Center, Experimental College, etc.
5. *Student Housing and Residence Programs.* The Department of Student Housing and Residence Programs is responsible for providing and overseeing programs and facilities within the residence hall system, as well as other types of student housing on and off campus. Included are dining centers and food services, conference housing, and the College Inn.

6. *Student Health Services.* The Student Health Services program provides medical and mental health services and health promotion. It maintains an infirmary for students and, when necessary, makes referrals to off-campus agencies and facilities.

Each of these services plays an important role in enhancing and enriching the students' total educational experience. Presumably, each of the six student services departments at OSU has its own method of measuring the success or failure of its particular services. This study adds another dimension to such assessment by providing survey respondents with an opportunity to view each service in relation to the others. The results of this study may help student services personnel and administrators identify the successful elements of these programs, as well as those needing improvement. The findings may also assist foreign student advisors and administrators in orienting and educating foreign students, and facilitating their full utilization of available services, facilities, and resources at OSU.

Statement of the Problem

OSU offers many types of student services through the departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Although a few are specifically offered to only U.S. citizens, the majority of the services offered are intended for the general student population.

Interest in this study came about when, in response to budgetary constraints and the university's commitment to more efficient operation and administration, the Division of Student Affairs at OSU, as well as other divisions, was subjected to close scrutiny and critical assessment. Each division has been trying its utmost to justify its role, functions, and importance in carrying out the educational process. Never before have the student services providers at OSU faced greater crises and challenges than they are facing at this time.

In addressing the inevitability of multiculturalism and diversity expansion at OSU, coupled with the administration's push for expanding its international commitment, interests, and involvements, the Office of the President (Oregon State University Office of Budgets and Planning, 1992) issued the following statement:

Oregon State University will increasingly be a multicultural and international university with faculty, staff, and administrators, and students from around the world and from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds. The University will be committed to achieving tangible improvement in opportunities for groups that are under-represented, thereby providing students with an environment conducive to critical thought and reflective of the cultural complexity of our collective histories and societies. Oregon State University will be distinguished as an international university bringing the world to Oregon and Oregon to the world. (p. 2)

Responding to inquiries and concerns about OSU's international programs in the light of structural adjustments at the university level, OSU President Byrne (Bruce, 1993) assured that "Oregon State places great importance on its international activities and programs. And we need to assure that those efforts are of the highest quality and receive proper direction at an appropriate level within our organization" (p. 1). The new emphasis by OSU on being an *international* university is likely to attract more foreign students in the future, thereby increasing the foreign student population at the university.

A study on foreign and domestic students' level of awareness, usage of, and satisfaction with certain student services can help determine if both groups are appropriately served by those services. This study was based on the premise that cultural background and orientation are an important factor in influencing the students' perception and use of student services. It addressed the following questions:

1. Of the two sample groups selected for this study, how many domestic respondents and how many foreign respondents were aware of the selected student services administered under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Oregon State University?

2. Among the respondents who reported awareness of a particular service, how many in each group actually used it?

3. Of those who used a particular service, how satisfied with the service were the users in each group?

4. Were there important relationships in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected services between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status?

5. Did the Student Services departments having a formal process of evaluation receive higher quality ratings than those without a formal process of evaluation?

The following research hypotheses were developed based on the questions above:

H₁: The domestic students are aware of more selected student services than are the foreign students.

H₂: The domestic students use more of the selected student services than do the foreign students.

H₃: Compared to foreign students, the domestic students are satisfied with more of the selected student services.

H₄: Differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services exist between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status.

H₅: Student services departments with a formal process of evaluation receive higher quality ratings than those without a formal process of evaluation.

Definition of Terms

Awareness: "Knowledge or understanding of a particular subject or situation"

(*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, 1995). Good (1959) defined awareness as

"the state of being aware; consciousness of a situation or object, without direct attention to it or definite knowledge of its nature" (p. 52).

Usage: "An act of using or employing" (*Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 1993); "the act, manner, or amount of using" (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 1992). This study will look at the usage of each student service as self-reported by the domestic and foreign students participating in the survey.

Satisfaction: "The state of being satisfied; contentment; confident acceptance of something as satisfactory, dependable, true; the state of being satisfied" (*Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 1993); "the fulfillment or gratification of a desire, a need, or an appetite" (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 1992). Hallenbeck (1978) defined satisfaction as "contentment" or "happiness."

Domestic students: United States citizens, including those with permanent resident status, who are enrolled at Oregon State University. Hamilton (1979) used this term in his study in which he compared them with international students in their perceptions of the university environment. Leong and Sedlacek (1986) used the term *U.S. students* in their study comparing them with international students on preferences for help sources.

Foreign students: Students enrolled at Oregon State University who are neither citizens nor immigrants (permanent residents) of the United States. This category includes persons with refugee status (Boyan, 1983; Zikopoulos, 1993) and also those with nonimmigrant student status, as determined by the visa issued under government regulations, who are expected to return to their home country upon completion of their study (Hull, 1978, p. 16). Hopke (1968) referred to foreign students as those admitted to the United States and enrolled in an educational institution.

Pedersen (1991) pointed out that there is controversy about whether *foreign student* or *international student* is the appropriate term, noting that the word foreign has a negative connotation and international does not. For this study the more widely used term foreign student(s) is used; although the synonymous term international student(s) may appear where and when used by cited sources.

Student Services: The college or university program which assists students, individually and collectively, to take full advantage of the opportunities offered in the academic community. Emphasis is placed upon the students (i.e., their needs and aspirations, their intellectual, personal, psychological, social, and physical growth) so that they may achieve their own goals and the goals of society as reflected by the particular institution they attend (Hopke, 1968, p. 352). This study examined those student services that are directly administered by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Oregon State University and commonly serve both domestic and foreign students.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Utilization of a program or service depends, to a large extent, on the intended clientele's awareness, usage, and satisfaction with that program or service. Consequently, a program's success or failure is better measured by the degree of its use and, eventually, by the level of satisfaction that the users experience. Because of the growing population of foreign students at Oregon State University (OSU), it is important for student services personnel and administration to review their programs and services to determine whether foreign students' needs are appropriately addressed, and whether the services provided are utilized with satisfaction by both domestic and foreign students. This study was an attempt to identify whether differences exist between domestic students or foreign students in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with student services that are administered by the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at OSU, and commonly available to, and used by, both groups.

A review of relevant literature is presented in the following sections: (a) Importance of Student Services to Higher Education; (b) Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction with Student Services; and (c) Comparison of Foreign and American students.

Importance of Student Services to Higher Education

During the early developmental stage of American higher education, educators and administrators relegated certain concerns and responsibilities to non-academic personnel. Since then, the concept, role, and functions of student services have become an indispensable and vital part of the total educational enterprise. Student Services, as an

organization, has been recognized as an important factor in achieving the goals and philosophy of education. The main function of student services was conceived to be that of helping to realize the academic purposes of the institution. Student services facilitated student life activities while the students pursued academic goals. As Zaccaria (1974) observed:

Personnel work in the broad context of the term becomes an important but secondary consideration in the operation of the school. It remains supplementary to the mainstream of the educative process. Personnel workers provide help to students in the form of eliminating problems (e.g., underachievement, vocational indecision, and problems related to discipline), offering services (e.g., vocational guidance, testing, group work), and providing remedial help (e.g., individual counseling). The intent of these programs has been to offer some type of help to students to complement or supplement the primary organization-centeredness of the administration and the subject-matter-centeredness of the teachers. (p. 35)

To better understand the nature and scope of student services as it relates to higher education, it is helpful to consider its historical background. As an organizational entity, student services (also referred to as student personnel or student affairs) is considered to be "a relatively new phenomenon in American higher education" (Barr, 1988, p. 7). Many of the student affairs functions have long been a part of higher education. However, it was not until late in the 1800s that the specialty area of student affairs gained recognition (Barr, 1988; Fenske, 1980). The role and functions of student services in higher education raised its level of recognition and definition at the appointment of the first dean of men and dean of women, the forebears of today's student affairs administrators (Allen & Elliott, 1993).

The increased complexity of higher education, as well as the changing and varying needs of the students, has necessitated the expansion of the functional areas of student services. According to Zaccaria (1974), institutional concern for the students' psychosocial or emotional development has effected major changes in student services:

Up to the 1920s or 1930s, i.e., the traditional period, there was a virtual neglect of the psychosocial and human relations aspect of the curriculum except for occasional, accidental or incidental help given to students by concerned staff members in the school. Then, largely due to the growing influence of the mental health movement, a parallel concern occurred in education between traditional academic learning and learning in the psychosocial-human relations sphere, i.e., a neo-traditional period. From the 1960s to the present there has been a growing concern over the psychosocial-human relations aspect of education. (p. 32)

Kauffman (1984) observed that since the first American college/university opened its doors, someone has always been expected to take charge of student life, student housing, and discipline. Thus, student personnel functions can be traced back to the time of early colonial colleges, when the college presidents carried the burdens for all such matters. The developments in intelligence and aptitude testing (Kauffman, 1984; Young, 1993) and the subsequent vocational guidance movement (Kauffman, 1984) helped to reinforce the expectation that institutions of higher education provide other services besides classroom instruction. Such expectation led to the emergence of the student personnel movement. Shaffer (1968) described the circumstances under which student personnel (i.e., student services) has evolved:

Response to individual and institutional needs has been the historical reason for the existence of student personnel services. When all students were essentially the same in background, motivation, and goals, regular institutional channels could deal with them effectively. Growth in number of students, complexity in organization, and heterogeneity in purposes and problems forced colleges to designate special officers and agencies to meet the problems that traditional officials could not handle. Thus, student personnel became that aspect of the college that was charged with being flexible, adaptive, and broad. (pp. 162-163)

In trying to predict the direction in which student personnel was headed, Shaffer (1968) said that it "will continue to be a feature of higher education as long as it fulfills its primary purposes" (p. 163). In 1958, the Committee on the Administration of Student Personnel Work, a branch of the American Council on Education, produced the following

list of functional differentiation of student services (Delworth et al., 1980; Feder & others, 1958):

1. Selection for admission.
2. Registration and records.
3. Counseling.
4. Health services.
5. Housing and food service.
6. Student activities.
7. Financial aid.
8. Placement.
9. Discipline.
10. Special clinics: Remedial reading, study habits, speech and hearing.
11. Special services: Student orientation, veterans advisory services, foreign

student program, marriage counseling, religious activities, counseling.

Kauffman (1984) created a list of ten basic student services, based on the assumptions that (a) the goals of student services are not separate from institutional goals; (b) the appropriateness or effectiveness of such services can only be judged by their reference to institution-wide objectives; and (c) the services should be provided if institutions are to better serve the undergraduates. The ten basic services were:

1. Adequate information to high school students, counselors, and parents to enable an understanding of admission requirements, educational program availability, and student life.
2. An admissions process that is rational and efficient, serving the needs of faculty as well as student clientele. Data on the characteristics of students applying and on those admitted or enrolled should make possible an analysis of the effectiveness of a purposeful admissions program.
3. Registrar and records functions that facilitate efficient student registration, desirable schedules, effective classroom and laboratory

utilization, and a student database, for use in analyzing faculty and physical plant resource utilization.

4. An orientation program that effectively inducts new students into programs, opportunities, regulations, and facilities of the institution.

5. A student financial aid service that brings together in one place all information concerning eligibility for financial aid, including scholarships, grants, loans, and part-time student employment.

6. Housing and food services appropriate to the mission and location of the institution. If residence halls are provided, staff and program should reinforce the educational purposes and goals of the institution. If necessary, a service providing information on off-campus housing deemed suitable for student rental also should be provided.

7. Health services that provide for the care or referral of students with illness and that provide educational programs aimed at preventing illness.

8. Counseling and advising services that relate to student needs for academic, vocational, and career information, as well as limited personal counseling.

9. Career placement services that aid students in becoming aware of requirements for specific jobs and that provide opportunities for qualified students to interview with employer representatives.

10. Services for encouraging and enabling a healthy student life and extracurricular environment through student organizations, student activities, recreation, and the like. The staff for such a function should see itself in an educational and developmental context, encouraging student responsibility, participation, and leadership. (pp. 25-26)

The importance of student services to higher education has not been viewed positively by some members and sectors of the academic community (Delworth et al., 1980). It may be reflective of its very beginning, having "emerged and evolved by default . . . taking over necessary and sometimes unpopular tasks abandoned by trustees, administrators, and faculty. It has grown into a ubiquitous but somewhat invisible empire in virtually every institution of higher education" (p. 3). As far back as the early 1970s, Tilley (1973) expressed some concern about the uncertain and vulnerable role that student services has played:

The strength of student services during expansion was its convenience as a mechanism to absorb the diverse pressures of growth. In the era of insufficiency, however, student services are vulnerable to attack. Few of the new functions taken on by student services are considered by more powerful elements of the institution as central to the purposes of the institution since

in some instances these new programs institutionalized educational concepts alien to traditional ideas of scholarship and higher education. The student services staff, despite their expanded role, still lack sufficient power within the institution to compete equally with the faculty for a fair share of resources. They often suffer an inferiority complex; they regard themselves as an oppressed campus minority required to perform tasks not wanted by others; they have little power over their professional environment and feel they are readily expendable. (pp. 114-115)

One of the challenges that confronts educational institutions in the 1990s is dwindling resources amidst high expectations and demands. Many institutions of higher education, private and public, are bearing the brunt of severe budget cuts. Services that are high in demand by students may increasingly have to be provided on a fee-for-service basis. Campuses will have to make hard choices as to which services are essential and which are supplementary (Cage, 1992). Administrators and student services providers will have to justify the existence and importance of programs and services. As Alan D. Berkowitz, Counseling Center director at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, and chairman of the mental health section of the American College Health Association, said: "There is a need for institutions of higher education to more clearly define their missions and to decide to what extent providing services outside the normal curriculum is important" (cited in Cage, 1992, p. A26). Student services, more than ever before, can certainly benefit from an objective evaluation of their functions and services, thereby effecting necessary changes or modifications of their objectives, philosophies, strategies, and operations.

Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction with Student Services

College students are entitled and expected to avail themselves of the services that their institutions provide. Colleges and universities allot a significant portion of their resources to establish and maintain services designed to help the students overcome the

rigors and constraints inherent in the process of pursuing higher education. Moses (1974)

likened the campus situation to that of society-at-large:

The complexity of modern society has contributed to feelings of loneliness and alienation of its citizens and students are no exception. The large modern schools make it easy for one to feel lost and insignificant, a number instead of a person. Students feel "caught up" in the system with no recourse, a feeling that nobody cares and that their lives are other-directed instead of self-directed. (p.353)

Hendershott, Wright, and Hendersen (1992) suggested that the quality of university life and the quality of community life can be assessed in the same way. The students' needs for housing, support services, and opportunities for recreation are no different from those of residents of any community. In either case, satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with how needs are met will likely affect the quality of life (Hendershott et al., 1992).

A student services program is an investment that deserves careful consideration, planning, implementation, and administration. Miller and Prince (1976) believed that it is the student affairs professionals' responsibility to collaborate with students and faculty in improving the quality of college life. Researchers have suggested that evaluation from the student-users' perspective can help administrators decide on program type and quality (Carney & Barak, 1976; Carranza, 1978; Hurst & Ivey, 1971; Morrill & Hurst, 1971; Passons, 1971). Educators and administrators tend to agree that evaluation of services by users should be an integral part of the process, especially when faced with rapidly changing trends. According to Carranza (1978):

Timely evaluation procedures can generate information which will assist educational planners to determine whether goals, policies, strategies, or programs should be changed, and, perhaps, why they should be changed. In a rapidly changing society, the needs of our student/client constituencies are subject to constant alteration, as is our ability to meet those needs. (p. 27)

Carranza (1978) observed that the student service providers' preoccupation with change is a result of their being held accountable to funding agencies as well as the

taxpayers who exercise their right to know whether or not the amount of money expended for educational services is effectively meeting specific needs.

Brown (1981) suggested 13 reasons for performing program evaluation, as follows:

1. Clarify program goals and objectives.
2. Relate program objectives to the broader educational goals of the institution.
3. Justify the existence and continuation of student affairs programs.
4. Identify unmet needs of both students and staff.
5. Improve program quality and delivery.
6. Provide stimulus for basic research regarding student personnel programs.
7. Test student development theory.
8. Resolve issues.
9. Gain new perspectives and stimulate new directions.
10. Lay the groundwork for future planning.
11. Provide data for decisions on resource allocation.
12. Lay the foundation for on going information-gathering procedures.
13. Establish legitimacy and promote visibility and recognition of student affairs

program among internal and external publics.

Young (1993) pointed out that those who pioneered the student personnel profession cared about its future.

They tried to improve themselves and others through professional education. Their consistent goal was professional improvement; only the means and motives for achieving that goal have changed. . . . By shaping and reshaping ourselves to improve professional practice today, we honor those who came before us as well as those who will come tomorrow. (p. 250)

When institutions of higher learning are confronted with problems such as dwindling enrollment and its corresponding financial effects, lowered public image, and declining

progress, all entities within the institution should be called upon for input and support (Passons, 1971). Those involved with student services are expected to play major roles, especially in dealing with issues and concerns directly affecting the students. Student services personnel and administrators are perceived to have direct influence on matters vital to the developmental process. As Hallenbeck (1978) put it:

As institutions continue grappling with student consumerism, public skepticism, stabilizing enrollments, and "retooling" for the future, it is incumbent on student affairs staffs to assist student needs and concerns. Through information gained from such assessments student affairs staff can become the "cutting edge" in fostering institutional vitality. Measures of student satisfaction are then effective on monitoring our progress toward this goal. (p. 24)

A few studies examining awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with student services have been conducted. Studies in the 1950s showed that students considered student personnel services as important and valuable parts of a total college or university program, and that they were generally satisfied with some services, dissatisfied with others, and, to some extent, aware of the existence of other services (Pinsky & Marks, 1980). The same studies also showed that faculty members tended to perceive student personnel services as important, but were less familiar with the services than the students.

In a study of awareness and utilization of professional and paraprofessional services, Lynch and Sinnott (1976) interviewed 133 students from six Kansas State University residence halls. Of the 12 professional and paraprofessional services included in the study, the Residence Hall Staff headed the list of those resources that the respondents were aware of; Academic Advisors and Student Health Center tied for second. The Learning Skills Center received the lowest awareness rating. The Lynch and Sinnott (1976) study made an impact on the way student services were administered and conducted at Kansas State University. Through proper dissemination of information concerning the findings and

implications of the study, changes were effected at Kansas State University: Direct programming efforts were applied; the Learning Skills Center was reorganized, resulting in 600% increase in the number of students served. The staff of the Drug Education Center used the findings in an attempt to obtain continued support from student activity fees.

A study by Lewicki and Thompson (1982) examined the degree of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with student services among lower division undergraduates at a 4-year public university, a 4-year state college, and a 2-year community college. They found that more than 80% of the students were aware of 14 of the 22 services listed. In terms of usage, the percentage was considerably lower, with fewer than 50% of the students using 14 of the 22 services. Satisfaction with the services was found to be "moderately high" (Lewicki & Thompson, 1982, p. 479).

The services that ranked low in usage in both the Lynch and Sinnott (1976) study and the one by Lewicki and Thompson (1982) were: Guidance and Counseling, Study/Learning Skills, and Career Planning and Placement Center. Pinsky and Marks (1980) examined the perceptions of students, faculty members, and academic administrators regarding 10 student services areas, including minority and international services. Their findings showed that all respondents agreed on the importance of six services: admission and records, counseling, health, housing and food, student activities, and financial aid. Administrators perceived disciplinary services and minority and international services as more important than did the students, whereas the students rated placement services and special services significantly higher than did the faculty and administrators. Special services included special remedial services, provisions for handicapped persons, programs for women, and counseling service to non-college persons. The researchers concluded that the administrators perceived the minority and international services as being particularly

important because of their multicultural aspect and the federal funding that such programs generate. The students did not perceive such services as important presumably because minority and international students constituted a small percentage of the total student population. The findings indicated no difference in response due to student classification (i.e., sophomore, junior, and senior). There was a strong indication that major efforts were needed to acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with the diverse services available on the campus.

In a survey of foreign undergraduate and graduate students at Ohio University, Lomak (1984) found that their level of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student personnel services and programs was low overall. A study involving full-time domestic graduate students at the same university (Haynes, 1991) revealed that the nine offices selected for evaluation had not been used by a number of the respondents and only one had been utilized by a majority of the respondents. The study also revealed that a number of the respondents were not satisfied with many of the offices and services. Only four of the offices evaluated were ranked as adequate or above; only 18 out of 45 services evaluated were rated as adequate or above.

Comparison of Foreign and American Students

International study is not a modern-day phenomenon. Its history dates to the early Islamic University (Dodge, 1961; Parr, Bradley, & Bingi, 1991; Parsons, 1952). It was, in fact, the Islamic libraries in Spain and Egypt that provided invaluable resources to post-Dark Ages and Renaissance scholars (Parsons, 1952). The European universities, after which present-day colleges and universities are patterned, were practically international in nature (Cobban, 1975; Haskins, 1966). Altbach, Kelly, and Lulat (1985) observed:

International study has a very long historical tradition going back to the very beginning of universities as institutions of higher learning. . . . Indeed, universities throughout much of history have been truly international institutions, enrolling students from many nations as integral part of their policies and practices. (p.3)

Foreign students came to study in American colleges much earlier than generally believed. Right after the 1784 Revolution, for example, a student from South America was said to have enrolled at Yale University (Cieslak, 1955).

Kerr (1990) has predicted that more students and faculty will be exchanged among nations and that "more attention will be paid to world history and to cultures around the globe" (p. 14). In his opinion, "academia is becoming 'one world.' . . . The 1990s will be a great decade for global perspectives in education" (p. 14).

A broader view of international education is provided by Gutek (1993):

With the twenty-first century less than a decade away, the sense that we are part of an interdependent and interconnected global system is becoming increasingly apparent. . . . Certainly, then, to be educated means to know more than our immediate locality; we must know our relationships to a global reality and to an international society. (p. 19)

Astin (1993) has observed that diversity is one of the most controversial issues in American higher education today. The move towards diversification is apparent among many, if not most colleges and universities: representation of historically underrepresented racial groups in their faculties, staffs, and students has increased, and curricular content has expanded to include more material from women, ethnic minorities, and non-western cultures. No other than the student services professional can virtually experience both the direct and indirect effects of the rapidly growing student diversity on campus. As Ramirez (1993) put it:

There is a need to understand the many ways in which students are unique — and yet the same. The diversity that we confront grows exponentially as we learn to see each new element. It is as if we are looking at our campus communities through a kaleidoscope and every movement to improve the

whole picture changes the design. But it is the student affairs professional who has the most accurate lens on the campus community and on the individual students within it. It is student affairs that has the responsibility to lead the campus community on an understanding of the implications of diversity. And it is our profession that must assess the institution's capacity to fulfill its mission and lead, cajole, and assist the institution in developing the ability to meet its emerging challenges. In short, the student affairs professional must be prepared to assume leadership at the institutional programmatic, and individual level. (p. 435)

In a study comparing counselor contacts and *no shows* between international and American students, Anderson and Myer (1985) observed that international and American students enter counseling with similar problems or concerns. The two groups did not differ significantly in the length of time they received counseling or in their commitment to appointments. The international student often does not return to the counseling center after the initial intake session, and 33% of the international students compared to 12% of the American students failed to keep a second appointment.

In examining 96,804 diagnoses at the University of Southern California Student Health Center over a period of 3 years, Ebbin and Blankenship (1986) found that international students used it more frequently than domestic students. Some possible reasons were suggested, such as that most of the domestic students were not in residence at the university; the domestic students had well-established health care systems; and the possible need of international students for interaction because of loneliness, depression, and stress. Mu (1983) portrayed a more positive picture of the foreign students in her study. She observed that while both American and foreign students felt that they have achieved large gains out of their academic efforts, the foreign students were further aware that they received cultural and social enrichment as a result of studying in a different country. Furthermore, many foreign students estimated large gains in three areas, namely, understanding other people and the ability to get along with them; gaining a broad general

education on various fields; and widening of acquaintance and enjoying different philosophies and ways of life.

According to Schieffer (1983), pursuing an academic education and getting into the job market can be traumatic and demoralizing for any student, American or foreign. The students and the professionals live in different worlds, with differing sets of rules, values and, behavioral patterns. Institutions respond sensitively by providing domestic students with career guidance and counseling that they may be prepared to cope with challenges and requirements of the economic environment and the professional world. One of the reasons foreign students in the United States have been viewed with mixed feelings, according to Beardsley (1988), is the overlying fear that foreign-born students, though providing definitely needed supplements to the labor force, are also posing a keen competition for U.S. citizens.

Foreign Students

It was in the 1800s that the dramatic flow of student migration from America to Europe became obvious (Veysey, 1965). King (1925) pointed out that the beginnings of foreign student presence in U.S. schools were of an earlier period than is generally realized. The student flow across international borders has continued, with a few notable changes. Altbach et al. (1985) observed that (a) the number of students involved is considerably greater today than in the past, (b) the students of the past were mostly scholars, and (c) the staff of the institutions were very heterogeneous in terms of national origin. The most distinct difference that can be observed, according to Altbach, is that the general pattern of international student flow is mostly unilinear, that is, largely, a movement from the less industrialized to the more industrialized countries.

The number of foreign students attending American colleges and universities has steadily increased since the 1960s. The number rose from 53,100 in 1960-61 to an estimated 250,000 in 1977-78 (Burn, 1980). In 1981-82 the Institute of International Education reported 326,000 foreign students in the United States (Ebbin & Blankenship, 1986; Schieffer, 1983). In 1992, there were reportedly 407,530 foreign graduate and undergraduate students attending 3,500 institutions across the United States (Smolowe, 1992). Wobbekind and Graves (1989) observed that the steady growth in foreign students in American colleges and universities helped to offset a period of decline in domestic demand for education during the 1980s as an effect of the Vietnam war, the changing age structure of the population, and the rising costs of higher education.

Burn (1980) observed that although the United States enrolled more foreign students than any other developed country in 1980, it ranked 21st in terms of the percentage of foreign students in the total student population and, therefore, was not considered a leader among the nations offering higher education opportunities to foreign students. That situation, however, could change dramatically for the 1990s. Parr, et al. (1991) observed that, with English established as the international language, "the United States plays a significant role worldwide as a premier provider of higher education for international students" (p. 370). According to estimates by Altbach et al. (1985), the United States spends more than \$2.5 billion annually on the education of foreign students, who comprise more than 3% of the total enrollment in higher education and account for about 15% of the graduate student enrollment.

There have been mixed concerns over the growing population of foreign students in the United States. Deutch (1991) made the following observation:

The large number of foreign graduate students and postdoctoral fellows on U.S. campuses presents the most difficult problem. Although both U.S.

universities and industry have become dependent on this source of talent, there is growing criticism about this proportion, both from those who believe that the U.S. is exploiting the intellectual capital of other nations and from those who believe that the U.S. is being exploited by other nations that send their scientists here to learn about basic technology for use at home. It would be comfortable to reject these two contradictory criticisms and argue that academic freedom demands the admission to U.S. research universities of the best minds without regard to national origin or future employment location. (p. 492)

Susan Lee (1991) referred to foreign students as a resource as valuable as gold, oil, or water, without whose steady stream "the United States would quickly lose its place on the cutting edge of technology and kiss goodbye the productivity that generates economic growth" (p. 10).

Foreign students come to study in the United States for different reasons (Smolowe, 1992). Some come to escape narrow and restrictive systems at home; others come in search of academic excellence, freedom, diversity, and integrity that is associated with American education. Spaulding and Flack (1976), in examining studies that focused on attitudes and achievements of foreign students while in the United States, concluded that the major reasons foreign students come to the United States are (a) to get advanced education or training that is not available at home, (b) to acquire prestige through a degree from a U.S. institution, (c) to take advantage of available scholarship funds, (d) to escape unsettled political or economic conditions, and (e) to learn more about the United States. Heikinheimo and Shute (1986) observed that the main objective of foreign students is to succeed in achieving their academic goals which are "likely if the emotional and social atmosphere is pleasant and the environment congenial" (p. 400). In comparing academic experiences between American and foreign graduate students at OSU, Mu (1983) observed that American students study at OSU to fulfill their individual and vocational goals while the foreign students do so not only to fulfill vocational goals, but also to meet family and social

expectations. Stromquist (1991) wrote that study abroad is an effective investment, noting that students who come to study in the United States constitute "a pool from which potential leaders will emerge" (p. xii).

Burn (1980) found it was important to future relations between the United States and other countries for foreign students to "come and understand us — to learn what goals are important to Americans and what we expect from our relationship with other countries" (p. xvii). According to her, many of the foreign students in the United States come from the ablest sectors of their own societies and will eventually return to positions of leadership and influence in their own countries, where they can be accurate interpreters of U.S. policies to their own people. She strongly recommended that:

While they are here, foreign students should be given ample opportunities to participate fully in the life of our college and university campuses and in the communities that surround them. They may need, and should be given, special assistance in maneuvering through the regulations and procedures encountered on campus, in acquiring competence in the English language (to the extent they may have deficiencies), and in other matters. Every effort should be made to determine as precisely as possible what they expect from their American educational experiences and, to the extent that it is appropriate and feasible, to help them to get it. Such assistance is nothing more than part of our colleges' responsibilities as hosts to foreign visitors. (p. xxvii)

The problems that foreign students face are enormous, and the experiences they undergo in pursuing an American education do not usually come easy. Combined with the personal, emotional, familial, and social problems that come in their way, they face graver problems associated with what is called double culture shock, which refers to the difficulties in adapting to the foreign culture, as well as the equally difficult process of transition upon their return home (Chandler, 1989; Raschio, 1987). Some view such problems as more traumatic than the adjustments one has to make to a foreign culture (Adler, 1974; Rogers, 1983). Uehara (1983, cited in Raschio, 1987) refers to it as "reverse culture shock" which is

characterized by temporary psychological difficulties that a returning student initially encounters at home after returning from scholarly sojourn in another country.

Some colleges and universities that enroll foreign students develop and conduct their services based solely on the assumptions by faculty and staff as to the adjustment needs of such students (Riesman, 1980; Stafford, Marion, & Salter, 1980). And because of the many common concerns that foreign students share, institutional services are usually designed based on presumptions that all foreign students are the same. In a crusading effort for international education programs and international students, Krasno (1985) challenged universities and host agencies to deal with the total experience of U.S. study beyond what happens in the classroom, with emphasis in reducing isolation of foreign students on both campus and communities, providing more opportunities for them to know the country better, and to present a more realistic picture of America and the American people that they can convey to their home countries.

American Students

In the *Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, students in the 1990s are described as being dramatically different "from those students in the twelfth century who entered the 'universities' in Bologna, Salerno, and Paris" (Clark & Neave, 1992, p.1526). While there is a link between the two sets of students, namely, similar motivation and aspirations, the students of today are very diverse in socioeconomic backgrounds, gender, ethnicity, age, academic abilities, and interests in fields of study.

More than half of all high school graduates proceed to postsecondary schools at some point (Altbach, 1991). About 37% of American students aged 19 to 24 years old are enrolled in higher education, a rate considered as the highest in the world. Today's students are no longer confined to the immediate postsecondary age group. About 45% of all

students are now over 25 (Jones, 1990). Men are slightly outnumbered by women in the student population, 47% to 53%. Out of the approximately 12.5 million persons enrolled, only about 2 million are traditional students, full-time students aged 18 to 25. More than 5 million of those enrolled are part-time students. A significant number of students (18%) are members of racial and ethnic minority groups (Altbach, 1991).

Green (1989) noted that a common pastime in the academic community is to compare today's students to those of the past and, in general, to charge them with sins of omission and commission. Today's students are viewed as being greedy and materialistic; their preoccupation is to make money and make it fast. They are considered intellectually docile, demonstrating more concern about their grades than about challenging intellectual issues. They are also accused of being apathetic about pressing issues and commonweal concerns, devoting much of their time to making life better for themselves with little regard to what might benefit others. The world view of today's students is more like that of their grandparents, who experienced the depression of the 1930s, than that of their parents, who grew up during the economically prosperous 1950s and 1960s. Green's (1989) description of today's students is that they are "scared, averse to risk, and insecure" (p. 480).

In his observation of today's students Astin (1991) described them as markedly more materialistic and more concerned with obtaining power and status. Undergraduate education is, to them, more of a means to make more money than a way to get a general education. They have become less and less concerned about the well-being of other people, the environment, and the community, and have very little interest, if any, in developing a more meaningful philosophy of life. A recent study by the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press was echoed by Singal (1991) which described young Americans between the ages of 19 and 29 as:

Remarkably uninformed. They do read, the survey found, but primarily lightweight publications . . . rather than serious newspapers and periodicals . . . they often first become aware of political candidates from TV commercials. This response cuts across all educational levels: college graduates and high school dropouts alike displayed a troubling ignorance. (p. 74)

Singal (1991) described these youth as “typically good-spirited, and refreshingly uncowed by teachers’ authority, and very willing to work” (p. 65), and felt convinced that they have not received the quality education that they deserve. Full of high ambitions, they enter college, only to be disillusioned because they are not equipped with adequate skills and knowledge to cope with even the normal activities required for a bachelor’s degree.

De Coster and Mable (1981) described the students of the early 1980s as seeking a college education for various reasons and as having different expectations. Although general expectations pose certain pressure for many students to pursue a college education, a large majority of them are driven by the desire to benefit themselves and thereby contribute to the prosperity of their society. Parents, institutions, and educational traditions contribute significantly in providing students with a vision on how their expectations could be met. Generally, students share a common belief that education provides the only way to realize personal goals and the promise of better jobs.

Educators and student services personnel agree on the importance of student involvement, convinced that students who are involved show that they are in control of events in their lives, have respect for themselves, and strive towards successful accomplishments (Madden, Woods, Dares-Hobbs, & Collins, 1987). Providing opportunities for student involvements, therefore, promotes feelings of control and self-esteem, and even uninvolved students may eventually be encouraged to become active when they see the effectiveness of others. Chambers and Phelps (1993) see today’s educational environment as providing opportunities for students’ involvement in their own

learning. Aside from a growing cultural diversity on campus, students can find varying degrees of commitment to social and political causes and issues, and those who act on any of those concerns are as much a part of the educative process as those who do otherwise.

Summary

The body of literature dealing with the areas of student services is slowly but steadily expanding. A few authors provide perspectives and insights on history, developments, and current issues.

Attempts at defining the roles and functions of student services as well as its relation to higher education have helped answer questions, clarify some doubts, and provide avenues towards more practical explanations and definitions. The fact that student services has been looked upon as a vital and indispensable part, if not partner, of the total educative process, affirms its integrity and stature in the delivery of quality education, especially as it pertains to the psychological, emotional, and social aspects of personal development.

The scope and complexities of student services developed as the students' needs dictated, and as institutions expanded. Despite its many challenges, its future, many predict, lies in its ability to fulfill its primary purposes.

Evaluation determines success or needs for improvement in the delivery of various forms of student services. The degree of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with these services among the students can serve as a measure of accomplishment for departments providing various student services.

The growing population of international students in American colleges and universities poses new challenges for student services providers. Although domestic and

foreign students have many things in common, some studies suggest that foreign students have certain unique expectations and needs that need to be specifically addressed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the use of selected student services by domestic and foreign students at Oregon State University (OSU) to determine whether there are similarities or differences in awareness, usage, or satisfaction between the two groups. The following sections describe the population, sample selection, instrumentation, testing of hypotheses, and data treatment.

Population

The population for this study consisted of sophomore, junior, and senior domestic and foreign students who were enrolled at Oregon State University during the 1994 Winter term. Based on the enrollment summary of Fall term 1993, OSU had a total enrollment of 14,264 (Oregon State University Office of Budgets and Planning, Information Resources, 1993; Fall Enrollment Levels, 1993). This figure included 1,387 (9.7%) foreign students representing 85 countries (Oregon State University Office of Budgets and Planning, Information Resources, 1993).

In determining the population for this study, the researcher consulted with the OSU Survey Research Center. The Center recommended that the survey be directed towards sophomore, junior, and senior students whose length of stay in the university would provide optimum opportunity to become aware of, and most likely use, the various student services. It was presumed that inclusion of freshman and graduate students would likely yield skewed results.

Despite the amount of orientation that freshman students undergo, they may not have adequate experience with, and exposure to, those services to warrant sufficient observation and evaluation. In their study on students' perceptions of student personnel services, Pinsky and Marks (1980) assumed that freshman students lacked sufficient familiarity with the services being investigated and, therefore, did not include them. On the other hand, graduate students, in general, have significantly different needs and concerns than undergraduate students. According to Helen Berg of the OSU Survey and Research Center (personal communication, March 29, 1994), graduate students may possess perceptions and experience with such services far different from those of the undergraduate students.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study comprised 300 domestic and foreign undergraduate students who were in their sophomore, junior, and senior years, and who were enrolled at OSU on a full-time basis during the 1994 Winter term. Full-time undergraduate students refer to those who carry a minimum academic load of 12 credit hours per term.

The prospective respondents were randomly selected from a master list obtained from the OSU Registrar's Office. A supplementary list was secured from the Office of International Education for the purposes of establishing up-to-date and accurate addresses of the foreign students.

The nonproportional stratified random sampling, as McMillan and Schumacher (1989) explained, was used in this study:

In this procedure, the population is divided into subgroups or strata, on the basis of a variable chosen by the researcher, such as gender, age, or level of education. Once the population has been divided, samples are drawn randomly from each subgroup. The number of subjects drawn is either

proportional or nonproportional. . . . In nonproportional (or disproportionate) sampling the researcher selects the same number of subjects to be in each stratum of the sample. Whether proportional or nonproportional, stratified random sampling is often more efficient than simple random sampling because a smaller number of subjects will need to be used. Dividing the population into subgroups also allows the researcher to compare subgroup results. (pp. 163-164)

According to Fink and Kosecoff (1985), "this method of sampling can be more precise than simple random sampling because it homogenizes the groups, but only if you choose the strata properly" (p. 56). Table 1 shows a breakdown of the different categories of respondents for this study.

TABLE 1
RESPONDENT DISTRIBUTION SHOWING RESIDENT STATUS,
ACADEMIC STATUS, AND GENDER

Academic Status	Domestic			Foreign			TOTAL
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Sophomore	25	25	50	25	25	50	100
Junior	25	25	50	25	25	50	100
Senior	25	25	50	25	25	50	100
TOTAL	75	75	150	75	75	150	300

Instrumentation

The data-gathering instrument developed for this study was the Student Services Awareness and Usage Questionnaire (SSAUQ) (see Appendix A). It contained questions that determined the level of awareness, the level of use, and the level of satisfaction on the part of both domestic and foreign students in connection with 31 selected student services offered

by the six departments under the administration of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Oregon State University.

The SSAUQ has been developed based on a similar instrument used by Paul Lomak (1984) at Ohio University. Lomak's instrument was largely influenced by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire produced by Starr, Betz, and Menne (1971) at Iowa State University. The format and style propounded and popularized by Dillman (1978) was adopted and used in formulating the questionnaire. The SSAUQ, like Lomak's instrument, although field-tested, was not further tested for validity and reliability.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I contained questions pertaining to certain services provided by each of the six departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs (i.e., Dean of Students Office, Financial Aid Office, Counseling and Testing Services, Memorial Union and Educational Activities, Student Housing and Residence Programs, and Student Health Services). The services rendered by each department were selected and included on the basis of their common usability by both foreign and domestic students.

Each question in Part I contained two sections for the respondent to answer. The first section asked whether the respondent (a) was not aware of a particular service, (b) was aware of the service but did not use it, or (c) have used the service at least once. The second section was answered only if the respondent selected response (c), indicating use of the service at least once. The second section provided five Likert-type responses that the respondent could choose (i.e., 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied). A summary question was included at the end of Part I asking the respondent to evaluate each of the six departments using the following rating: 1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = fair, 4 = poor, 5 = don't know. The

responses to this question served as a basis for determining if there was a relationship in quality rating between the departments that have a formal process of evaluation and those that do not have a formal process of evaluation.

Part II of the questionnaire was aimed at collecting pertinent personal data for demographic analysis, as well as serving as a basis for comparisons of groups within certain variables.

In order to enhance its content validity, a copy of the SSAUQ was sent to each of the six student services department directors and to an international student adviser in the International Education Office for their review, criticism, and input. It is important to have a panel of competent colleagues or experts examine the items in the questionnaire to determine if they are "adequate for measuring what they are supposed to measure and whether they are a representative sample of the behavior domain under investigation" (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985, p. 357). Aside from critiquing the questionnaire, each director was asked to furnish the researcher with information pertaining to a formal method and process of evaluation, if any, of their respective department.

The questionnaire was pilot tested, using selected foreign and domestic students. The researcher distributed copies of the questionnaire to the officers of the International Students of OSU (ISOSU) for their response and critique. The same procedure was conducted to selected domestic students. In all, 10 international students and 10 domestic students answered the questionnaire. Their responses and feedback effected some modifications of the questionnaire. Once tested, a total of 300 sets of the questionnaire were sent out to randomly selected sophomore, junior, and senior domestic and foreign students (based on the distribution in Table 1). Enclosed with the questionnaire was a cover letter (Appendix B) which contained information and instruction.

Testing of Hypotheses

A hypothesis is an educated guess about possible relationships, differences, or causes (Borg, 1987). It is a statement that describes the researcher's expected outcome, that is, what differences or relationships the researcher expects or predicts to find in the study (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989).

The hypothesis is considered by scientists as a powerful tool in scientific inquiry (Ary et al., 1985). It enables them to see the relationship between theory and observation. Just as the ancient inductive or deductive philosophers used it to emphasize their observation or reason, present-day researchers find it useful for uniting experience and reason in their pursuit of truth. The hypothesis, according to Ary et al. (1985) must be viewed as a "tentative proposition suggested as a solution to a problem or as an explanation of some phenomenon" (p. 75). It presents in simple form a statement of the researcher's expectations relative to a relationship between variables within the problem.

The following null hypotheses were tested to determine if the findings derived from the sample could be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn:

H₀1: There is no significant difference in the number of selected student services that the domestic students and the foreign students are aware of.

H₀2: There is no significant difference in the number of selected student services that the domestic respondents and the foreign students use.

H₀3: There is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction with selected student services between domestic and foreign students.

H₀4: There are no significant differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status of the respondents.

H₀₅: There is no significant difference in the overall quality ratings between student services departments with a formal process of evaluation and those without a formal process of evaluation.

Data Treatment

Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were employed to treat the data derived from the survey.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were utilized initially in treating the data derived from the research instrument. Descriptive statistics organize, summarize, and describe observations, and serve as a springboard for inferential statistics (Ary et al., 1985; McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). The descriptive characteristics of a random sample can be tested for generalizability to the entire population, with a known margin of error, using the techniques of inferential statistics.

Inferential Statistics

Since the questionnaire was administered to a random sample of the population, inferential statistics were employed to test the generalizability of the findings. Inferential statistics are used to infer or predict the similarity of a sample to the population from which the sample is drawn (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989).

The chi-square test was used to analyze H₀₁, H₀₂, and H₀₄, where the data were displayed in a two dimensionable table. The notion being tested was that the dimensions were independent, which means that there was no significant relationship between the

dimensions (aware/not aware, foreign/domestic). This does not involve treating the data as if they were continuous; it simply involves putting the data into *bins*.

The *t*-test was used to analyze H_03 . There are two *t*-tests: one for situations where the variances of the population are equal and one for situations where the variances are unequal. The notion is to test the variances for equality and then use the appropriate *t*-test.

H_05 was analyzed using Fisher's exact test (Miller, 1986) after the data were ordered and placed in a 2 x 2 contingency table using 50% as the breakpoint. The test result was then compared with the CRC tables (Beyer, 1991) for conformity.

The .05 level of significance was used to determine if the null hypothesis was retained or rejected. Retention of the null hypothesis indicates that the findings in the sample should not be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn; rejection of the null hypothesis, on the other hand, means that the findings in the sample may be generalizable to the population from which the sample was drawn.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will present the information obtained from the responses to the Student Services Awareness and Usage Questionnaire (SSAUQ) in order to analyze the data, test the hypotheses, and determine the relationships of certain variables in connection with the utilization of selected student services by sophomore, junior, and senior domestic and foreign students at Oregon State University (OSU).

Demographic Data

Using descriptive statistics, responses from the survey instrument were analyzed. Of the 300 questionnaires sent out, 201 were returned. However, eight of those were not answered sufficiently to warrant consideration and inclusion, thus bringing to 193 (64%) the total number of responses that were analyzed.

Among the total respondents, 116 (60%) were domestic students, while 77 (40%) were foreign students. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the respondents on the basis of the following variables: gender, age range, marital status, and academic status.

The domestic female respondents had the highest response rate of 60 (31.1%), followed by the domestic male respondents with 56 (28.9%), and the foreign male respondents with 41 (21.3%). The female foreign respondents showed the lowest response rate of 36 (19%). Overall, the number of respondents in the gender category was almost identical, with 97 male and 96 female. Among the domestic respondents, the female sophomores showed the highest response rate while the male juniors had the highest response rate among the foreign respondents.

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF DOMESTIC AND
FOREIGN RESPONDENTS ($N = 193$)

Variables	Domestic		Foreign		Row Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
GENDER: FEMALE						
•Sophomore	23	11.9	14	7.3	37	19.2
•Junior	21	10.9	12	6.2	33	17.1
•Senior	16	8.3	10	5.2	26	13.5
Total Female	60	31.1	36	18.7	96	49.8
GENDER: MALE						
•Sophomore	19	9.8	10	5.2	29	15.0
•Junior	18	9.3	17	8.8	35	18.1
•Senior	19	9.8	14	7.3	35	17.1
Total Male	56	28.9	41	21.3	97	50.2
Total Both Sexes	116	60.0	77	40.0	193	100.0
AGE RANGE						
•Under 18	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.5
•18-24	98	51.0	59	30.7	157	81.7
•25-29	13	6.8	17	30	30	15.7
•30 or older	4	2.1	0	4	4	2.1
Total All Ages	116	60.4	76	39.6	192	100.0
MARITAL STATUS*						
•Single	108	56.3	68	35.4	176	91.7
•Married, spouse in Corvallis	5	2.6	2	1.0	7	3.6
•Married, spouse not in Corvallis	2	1.1	6	3.1	8	4.2
•Other (divorced)	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.5
Total Marital Status	116	60.5	76	39.5	192	100.0
ACADEMIC STATUS						
•Sophomore	42	21.8	24	12.4	66	34.2
•Junior	39	20.2	29	15.0	68	35.2
•Senior	35	18.2	24	12.4	59	30.6
Total Academic Status	116	60.2	77	39.8	193	100.0

*One missing response.

The 18 to 24-year-old group of both domestic and foreign respondents dominated the distribution with 157 (98 domestic and 59 foreign) or 81.7% of the total respondents. There were more foreign respondents (17) than domestic respondents (13) in the 25 to 29-year-old category. None of the foreign respondents were under 18 nor over 30 years old. One domestic respondent was below the age of 18, and 4 were 30 years old or older.

One hundred eight (56.3%) of the domestic respondents and 66 (34%) of the foreign respondents were single. Of those who were married, 5 domestic respondents and 2 foreign respondents had their spouses living with them in Corvallis; conversely, 6 of the married foreign respondents and 2 of the married domestic respondents did not have their spouse living with them in Corvallis. One domestic respondent and none of the foreign respondents was divorced.

In academic status, the domestic respondents at all levels had a higher questionnaire return rate than did their counterparts. Among the domestic respondents, the sophomore group led with 42, followed by the junior group with 39, and the senior group with 35. Among the foreign respondents, the junior group had the highest response rate of 29 while both the sophomore and senior groups had 24.

The questionnaire included an item asking the respondents how they became aware of the student services at OSU. One hundred fifty of the respondents (97 domestic, 53 foreign) learned about the services from posters, brochures, and other printed media. There were 114 (73 domestic, 41 foreign) who got their information from friends or other students. Seventy-nine (54 domestic, 25 foreign) had faculty and staff as sources. All in all, 27 countries were represented by the foreign students that responded to the survey.

Major Research Problem

The problem of the study was to examine the use of selected student services by domestic and foreign students who were in their sophomore, junior, and senior years at OSU, to determine if there were any differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction between the two groups, as embodied in the first three research hypotheses:

H₁: The domestic students are aware of more selected student services than are the foreign students.

H₂: The domestic students use more of the selected student services than do the foreign students.

H₃: Compared to foreign students, the domestic students are satisfied with more of the selected student services.

The research also examined whether or not differences existed in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services between groups within certain variables:

H₄: Differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services exist between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status.

Lastly, the study examined the overall quality ratings of the six Student Services departments to find out if a relationship existed between those with a formal process of evaluation and those without a formal process of evaluation:

H₅: Student services departments with a formal process of evaluation receive higher quality ratings than those without a formal process of evaluation.

The 31 services offered by the six departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs that were selected for the study were broken down as follows: six services under the Dean of Students Office, three services under the Financial Aid Office, four services under the Counseling and Testing Services, six services under the Memorial Union and

Educational Services, four services under the Student Housing and Residence Programs, and eight services under the Student Health Services. The selection of these services was based on the commonality of usage of such services by both the domestic and the foreign students as determined by each respective department.

Data Analysis by Hypotheses

Presentation of the data was arranged by first describing what the sample said in response to the research hypotheses, with the use of descriptive statistics. At the end of each section, the results of inferential testing were presented, using the null hypothesis, to find out if the data from the sample could be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn. Tables generated directly from the statistical analysis are found in Appendix C. Included at the extreme right column of each table are the results of the statistical tests that determine whether or not the differences were significant at the .05 level. Explanatory tables corresponding to those in Appendix C are presented and interspersed in the text to interpret or elucidate the findings in the survey.

Awareness of Selected Student Services

H₁: The domestic students are aware of more selected student services than are foreign students.

Appendix C-1 shows the level of awareness by both domestic and foreign respondents of selected student services under each of the six departments. The results of the chi-square test are presented at the extreme right column of the table. Table 3 shows both groups and the rank order of their respective awareness of the selected student services.

TABLE 3

**RANK ORDER OF AWARENESS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES BY
DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN RESPONDENTS, AND PERCENTAGE
REPORTING AWARENESS (N = 193)**

Domestic Respondents (n = 116)	%	Foreign Respondents (n = 77)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Oversees fraternities and sororities	68.7	1. Student advising/academic support	66.2
2. Student advising/academic support	67.8	2. Coordinates student life programs	64.5
3. Student conduct and judicial matters	62.3	3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	59.7
4. Coordinates student life programs	61.7	4. Reviews student records policy	58.4
5. Reviews student records policy	55.6	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	49.4
6. Provides help with emergencies	51.8	5. Provides help with emergencies	49.4
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	94.8	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	92.2
2. Provides financial counseling	68.7	2. Provides financial counseling	68.8
3. Helps find part-time employment	62.3	3. Helps find part-time employment	39.0
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	76.5	1. Academic/educational counseling	77.6
2. Provides personal counseling	72.2	2. Provides personal counseling	73.7
3. Provides vocational guidance	62.6	3. Provides vocational guidance	61.8
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	30.7	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	14.5
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides I.D. system and services	98.3	1. Provides I.D. system and services	98.7
2. Provides building and facilities	96.5	2. Provides building and facilities	97.4
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	88.7	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	82.9
4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	84.2	4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	81.8
5. Provides leadership development	79.1	5. Provides leadership development	66.2
6. Work/training thru stud. media	65.2	6. Work/training thru stud. media	42.1
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	95.6	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	97.4
1. Dining services and facilities	95.6	2. Dining services and facilities	96.1
2. Programming & leadership training	78.9	3. Programming & leadership training	63.2
3. Live-in resource and support staff	71.1	4. Live-in resource and support staff	47.4
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	99.1	1. Offers pharmacy services	98.7
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	99.1	1. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	98.7
2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	95.6	2. Provides insurance info/liaison	97.4
3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	93.0	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	93.5
4. Provides insurance info/liaison	91.3	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	89.6
5. Mental health programs & services	80.9	5. Mental health programs & services	64.9
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	76.3	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	57.1
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	73.7	7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	44.2

Dean of Students. Under the Dean of Students Office a majority ($\geq 50\%$) of the domestic respondents were aware of all the six services while a majority ($\geq 50\%$) of the foreign respondents were aware of only four. The two services that received the lowest awareness ratings from the foreign respondents were *helps with student conduct and judicial matters* and *provides help with emergencies*, both at 49.4%. *Provides help with emergencies* received the lowest rating from both groups.

Financial Aid Office. Under the Financial Aid Office a majority of the domestic respondents showed awareness of all the three services while a majority of the foreign respondents showed awareness of only two. A majority of foreign respondents were not aware of *Helps student find part-time employment on campus*.

Counseling and Testing Services. Under the Counseling and Testing Services both domestic and foreign respondents had identical ranking for all the four services. *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* received the lowest rating for both groups, with 30.7% among the domestic respondents and 14.5% among the foreign respondents.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, both groups ranked the six services similarly. All the services received more than 65% awareness rating among the domestic respondents. More than 66% of the foreign respondents were aware of all but one service, namely, *offers work and training with student publication and broadcast media* which had 42.1%.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. All the four services under the Student Housing and Residence Programs had identical ranking order. More than 71% of the domestic respondents were aware of the services. Two services, namely, *provides adequate*

accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing and provides adequate dining services and facilities received the highest ratings among the domestic respondents with 95.6%. More than 63% of the foreign respondents were aware of three services, but only 47.4% were aware of *provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*.

Student Health Services. Under the Student Health Services *offers pharmacy services* was ranked the highest by the domestic respondents followed by both *promote educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* and *provides laboratory and X-Ray services* with identical ratings. More than 73% of the domestic respondents were aware of all the eight services. Among the foreign respondents, two services were equally ranked the highest, namely, *offers pharmacy services* and *provides laboratory and x-ray services*. More than 57% of the foreign respondents were aware of seven services, but only 44% were aware of one service, namely, *provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis*. Three services were ranked the lowest by both groups. They were *offers mental health programs and services*, *provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy*, and *provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis*.

The following null hypothesis was tested to find out if the findings on the awareness of selected student services by domestic and foreign respondents could be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn:

H₀1: There is no significant difference in the number of selected student services that the domestic and foreign students are aware of.

Since only 9 of the 31 selected student services were significantly different at the .05 level (rightmost column of table in Appendix C-1), the null hypothesis was retained,

supporting the notion that what the survey found in the sample should not be generalized to the original population.

Usage of Selected Student Services

H₂: The domestic students use more of the selected student services than the foreign students.

After determining how many of the domestic and foreign respondents in the sample were aware of the selected student services, the next step in the study was to find out how many of those who were aware used the services one or more times. The data were analyzed using the chi-square test. The table of statistical analysis for usage of these services is found in Appendix C-2. Table 4 shows the rank order of usage of services under each department with their corresponding percentage.

Dean of Students. Only one service under the Dean of Students was used by more than one-half of both domestic and foreign respondents, namely, *Provides student advising and academic support*. This particular service, coupled with *Coordinates student life programs*, were uniformly ranked the two highest by both groups. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* and *Provides help with emergencies* were used by fewer than 20% of each group.

Financial Aid Office. Under the Financial Aid Office, both groups ranked *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* the highest, although there was a wide disparity between the two with the domestic respondents having more than 70% and the foreign respondents having 32.4%. The least used service among the domestic respondents was *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* while that of the foreign respondents was *Provides financial counseling*.

TABLE 4

**RANK ORDER OF USAGE OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES BY DOMESTIC
AND FOREIGN RESPONDENTS, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING USAGE
(N = 193)**

Domestic Respondents (n = 116)	%	Foreign Respondents (n = 77)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	56.4	1. Student advising/academic support	56.9
2. Coordinates student life programs	45.1	2. Coordinates student life programs	38.8
3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	41.8	3. Reviews student records policy	37.8
4. Reviews student records policy	39.1	4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	26.1
5. Student conduct and judicial matters	19.7	5. Provides help with emergencies	18.4
6. Provides help with emergencies	18.6	6. Student conduct and judicial matters	13.2
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	70.6	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	32.4
2. Provides financial counseling	29.1	2. Helps find part-time employment	30.0
3. Helps find part-time employment	19.7	3. Provides financial counseling	17.0
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	36.4	1. Liaison with local mental health serv	27.3
2. Provides vocational guidance	20.8	2. Academic/educational counseling	18.6
3. Provides personal counseling	13.2	3. Provides personal counseling	8.9
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	0.0	4. Provides vocational guidance	8.5
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides building and facilities	86.5	1. Provides I.D. system and services	85.5
2. Provides I.D. system and services	82.3	2. Provides building and facilities	81.3
3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	51.0	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	58.7
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	43.1	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	34.9
5. Provides leadership development	30.8	5. Provides leadership development	15.7
6. Work/training thru stud. media	17.3	6. Work/training thru stud. media	15.6
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Dining services and facilities	63.6	1. Dining services and facilities	59.5
2. Residence halls/coop/family housing	62.7	2. Residence halls/coop/family housing	56.0
3. Live-in resource and support staff	42.0	3. Live-in resource and support staff	50.0
4. Programming & leadership training	36.7	4. Programming & leadership training	35.4
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	65.2	1. Offers pharmacy services	60.5
2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	62.6	2. Provides insurance info/liasion	60.0
3. Provides insurance info/liasion	58.1	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	56.9
4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	56.0	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	39.1
5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	42.7	5. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	38.2
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	21.4	6. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	34.2
7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	17.2	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	9.1
8. Mental health programs & services	8.6	8. Mental health programs & services	4.0

Counseling and Testing Services. Under the Counseling and Testing Services, far fewer than 50% of each group utilized each of the four services. In fact, only one service, namely, *Provides academic and educational counseling*, was used by more than 30% of the domestic respondents. All the other services had very low usage rates by both groups. While none of the domestic respondents used *Serves as liaison with local mental health services*, it received the highest usage rating among the foreign respondents. *Provides personal counseling* ranked third for both groups; this service together with *Provides vocational guidance* had fewer than 10% users from the foreign respondents group.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Two services under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities showed the highest usage percentages among the 31 services for both groups. *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* received the highest rank among the domestic respondents while it ranked second among the foreign respondents. *Provides I.D. system and services* was ranked first by the foreign respondents and second by the domestic respondents. Both were the only services that were used by more than 80% of the users from both groups. The other four services received uniform ranking order from both groups: (3) *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*, (4) *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center*, (5) *Provides leadership development through organizations*, and (6) *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*. The last three services were utilized by fewer than 50% of both domestic and foreign respondents.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. The four services under the Student Housing and Residence Programs received uniform ranking by both groups. *Provides*

adequate dining services and facilities was ranked first, followed in descending order by *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing*, *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*, and *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations*. It is interesting to note that the ranking order did not correspond at all with the succession order in the questionnaire. The first two services were used by more than 60% of the domestic respondents while the other two were used by fewer than 50%. Three of the services were used by more than 50% of the foreign respondents.

Student Health Services. Under the Student Health Services, *Offers pharmacy services* ranked first for both domestic and foreign respondents. Two services receiving the lowest usage rates from both groups were *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* and *Offers mental health programs and services*. These two were used by fewer than 10% of the foreign respondents. *Offers mental health programs and services* was the only service used by fewer than 10% of the domestic respondents.

The following null hypothesis was tested to find out if the findings on the usage of selected student services by the domestic and foreign respondents could be generalized to the student population from which the sample was drawn:

H₀2: There is no significant difference in the number of selected student services used by the domestic students and the foreign students.

Since only 5 of the 31 selected student services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-2), the null hypothesis was retained, supporting the notion that what the survey found in the sample should not be generalized to the original population.

Satisfaction with Selected Student Services

One of the 31 selected student services (namely, *Liaison with local mental health services* under the Counseling and Testing Services) was not used by any of the domestic respondents and was used by only 3 of the foreign respondents. Therefore, it was not included in the satisfaction rating.

H₃: Compared to foreign students, the domestic students are satisfied with more of the selected student services.

Through the process of elimination, the ultimate number of subjects (*N*) in this study had dwindled, resulting in difficulty or impossibility of determining satisfaction measures on some service areas. The level of satisfaction was determined from among those that had actually used the service once or more. The survey asked the respondents who used the services whether they were 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = satisfied, or 5 = very satisfied. The *t*-test was used to analyze the responses.

The statistical analysis for the mean level of satisfaction with the selected student services is shown in Appendix C-3. Table 5 reflects the mean level of satisfaction with selected student services for both domestic and foreign respondents.

Dean of Students. Under the Dean of Students only *Provides student advising and academic support* exceeded the 4.00 (satisfied) mean level. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* was consistently ranked lowest between the domestic and foreign respondents. None of the services was rated lower than 3.00 (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied).

TABLE 5

MEAN LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES
BY DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN RESPONDENTS ($N = 193$)

Domestic Respondents ($n = 116$)	<i>M</i>	Foreign Respondents ($n = 77$)	<i>M</i>
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	4.04	1. Coordinates student life programs	3.94
2. Reviews student records policy	3.88	2. Student advising/academic support	3.72
3. Coordinates student life programs	3.87	3. Provides help with emergencies	3.71
4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	3.72	4. Reviews student records policy	3.70
5. Provides help with emergencies	3.72	5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	3.58
6. Student conduct and judicial matters	3.64	6. Student conduct and judicial matters	3.40
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Provides financial counseling	3.65	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrsph	3.65
2. Grants, loans, work study, schlrsph	3.62	2. Helps find part-time employment	3.33
3. Helps find part-time employment	3.57	3. Provides financial counseling	3.11
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	3.78	1. Provides personal counseling	3.80
2. Provides vocational guidance	3.73	2. Academic/educational counseling	3.63
3. Provides personal counseling	3.72	3. Provides vocational guidance	3.50
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	0.00	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	0.00
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides building and facilities	4.26	1. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	4.13
2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	4.14	2. Provides building and facilities	4.11
3. Provides leadership development	3.96	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	4.10
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	3.93	4. Work/training thru stud. media	4.00
5. Provides I.D. system and services	3.90	5. Provides I.D. system and services	3.92
6. Work/training thru stud. media	3.76	6. Provides leadership development	3.62
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Live-in resource and support staff	3.82	1. Live-in resource and support staff	3.94
2. Programming & leadership training	3.81	2. Programming & leadership training	3.82
3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	3.56	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	3.73
4. Dining services and facilities	3.08	4. Dining services and facilities	3.22
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	4.10	1. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	4.04
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	4.03	2. Mental health programs & services	4.00
3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	3.76	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	3.97
4. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	3.72	4. Offers pharmacy services	3.93
5. Provides insurance info/liaison	3.67	5. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	3.84
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	3.66	6. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	3.80
7. Mental health programs & services	3.62	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	3.75
8. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	3.27	8. Provides insurance info/liaison	3.64

Financial Aid Office. All the services under Financial Aid Office were rated within the 3.00 range (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). The only noteworthy difference between the two groups was with *Provides financial counseling* which was ranked the highest by the domestic respondents, but was ranked the lowest by the foreign respondents.

Counseling and Testing Services. Of the four services under the Counseling and Testing Services, all but one were rated as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied by both groups. No rating could be made for one service, namely, *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* due to the fact that none of the domestic respondents and only 8% of the foreign respondents used it.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, two services received a 4.00 (satisfied) mean level of satisfaction from the domestic respondents: *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* and *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*. On the other hand, four services received from the foreign respondents a 4.00 mean level of satisfaction: *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and the Craft Center*, *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy*, *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*, and *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. All the services under the Student Housing and Residence Programs were rated within the 3.00 (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) mean level of satisfaction. All received uniform ranking by both groups. Each service was rated higher by the foreign respondents than by the domestic respondents.

Student Health Services. Two services under the Student Health Services received a 4.00 (satisfied) mean level of satisfaction from the domestic respondents: *Offers pharmacy services* and *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and other health-related issues*. The foreign respondents, on the other hand, gave a 4.00 mean level of satisfaction to two services, namely, *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and other health-related issues* and *Offers mental health programs and services*.

Although only a few of the 31 services had a mean level equal or greater than the 4.00 mean level of satisfaction, many services received ratings that were far above the 3.00 mean level, which suggested some leanings towards being satisfied with those services.

The following null hypothesis was tested to find out if the findings on the satisfaction with selected student services by domestic and foreign respondents could be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn:

H₀3: There is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction with the selected student services between the domestic and foreign students.

Since only 1 out of 31 selected student services was significantly different at the .05 level (Appendix C-3, rightmost column), the null hypothesis was, therefore, retained, supporting the notion that what the survey found in the sample should not be generalized to the original population.

Comparison of Awareness, Usage, and Satisfaction Between Groups Within the Variables of Gender, Age, and Academic Status

An analysis of the returns indicated a need for re-categorizing of the variable of age. Although four age ranges (under 18 years old, 18 to 24 years old, 25 to 29 years old, and 30 years old or older) were included in the questionnaire, the survey yielded only 1 respondent under the age of 18 and 4 respondents 30 years old or older. One hundred fifty-

seven (81.7%) of the respondents were 18 to 24 years old, and 30 respondents (15.7%) were 25 to 29 years old. These results necessitated the data be collapsed for analysis.

The first part of this section will deal with the research hypothesis and find out if there are differences in *awareness*, *usage*, and *satisfaction* with the selected student services between groups within the variables of *gender*, *age*, and *academic status*. Inferential testing is presented at the end of this section to determine if the findings are generalizable to the original population.

H₄: Differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services exist between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status.

Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender

The table in Appendix C-4 shows the statistical analysis for awareness of selected student services on the basis of gender. Table 6 shows the comparative ranking order of those services between the female and male respondents.

Dean of Students. All the services under the Dean of Students had an awareness rating lower than 70% by the female respondents; in fact, fewer than 50% of them were aware of one service, namely, *Provides help with emergencies*. Two services had the same awareness rating among the female respondents, and both ranked third: *Reviews student records policy* and *Oversees fraternities and sororities*. Among the male respondents, the awareness ratings for all the six services ranged from 53% to 70%. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* had the highest awareness rating among the male respondents while *Reviews student records policy* received the lowest awareness rating.

Financial Aid Office. All the three services under the Financial Aid Office received the same ranking order from both the female and male respondents. Only one service,

TABLE 6

**RANK ORDER OF AWARENESS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE
BASIS OF GENDER, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING AWARENESS
(N = 193)**

Female Respondents (n = 96)	%	Male Respondents (n = 97)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	69.1	1. Oversees fraternities and sororities	70.2
2. Coordinates student life programs	63.9	2. Student advising/academic support	64.9
3. Reviews student records policy	59.8	3. Coordinates student life programs	61.7
3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	59.8	4. Student conduct and judicial matters	58.5
4. Student conduct and judicial matters	55.7	5. Provides help with emergencies	56.4
5. Provides help with emergencies	45.4	6. Reviews student records policy	53.2
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	95.9	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	91.5
2. Provides financial counseling	73.2	2. Provides financial counseling	63.8
3. Helps find part-time employment	56.7	3. Helps find part-time employment	48.9
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	75.3	1. Academic/educational counseling	78.7
2. Provides personal counseling	73.2	2. Provides personal counseling	72.3
3. Provides vocational guidance	63.9	3. Provides vocational guidance	60.6
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	27.1	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	21.3
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides I.D. system and services	99.0	1. Provides I.D. system and services	97.9
2. Provides building and facilities	97.9	2. Provides building and facilities	95.7
3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	89.7	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	85.1
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	87.6	4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	76.6
5. Provides leadership development	78.3	5. Provides leadership development	69.2
6. Work/training thru stud. media	54.6	6. Work/training thru stud. media	57.5
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	97.9	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	94.7
2. Dining services and facilities	96.9	1. Dining services and facilities	94.7
3. Programming & leadership training	71.9	2. Programming & leadership training	73.4
4. Live-in resource and support staff	66.7	3. Live-in resource and support staff	56.4
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	100.0	1. Offers pharmacy services	97.9
2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	97.9	2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	95.7
3. Provides insurance info/liaison	95.9	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	95.7
4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	94.9	3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	95.7
4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	94.9	3. Provides insurance info/liaison	91.5
5. Mental health programs & services	80.4	4. Mental health programs & services	68.1
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	73.2	5. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	63.8
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	68.0	6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	55.3

namely, *Helps student find part-time employment* showed an awareness rating fewer than one-half (<50%) which came from the male respondents.

Counseling and Testing Services. All the four services under the Counseling and Testing Services showed the same ranking order for both groups of respondents. One service, namely, *Serves as liaison with local mental health services*, showed an awareness rating way below 50% for both groups. The difference in rating for each service between the two groups was almost minimal.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Both groups of respondents were concurrent in rating their top two services under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, namely, *Provides I.D. system and services* and *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy*. Likewise, they were concurrent in rating the lowest two services, namely, *Provides leadership development through organizations* and *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*, respectively.

Both groups differed in their rating for two services — *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports* and *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and the Craft Center* — where the female respondents rated the former higher than the latter, and the male respondents rated them the other way around. Minimum awareness rating of all the six services by the female respondents was 55%, while that of the male respondents was 58%.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. Under the Student Housing and Residence Programs, both groups of respondents showed an almost identical ranking order of the services. However, where the female respondents ranked *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* higher than

Provides adequate dining services and facilities, the male respondents ranked the two services equally. All the four services were rated considerably high by both groups with *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* as the only service showing fewer than 70% awareness.

Student Health Services. *Offers pharmacy services* showed the highest awareness rank among the services under the Student Health Services for both groups of respondents. It was, in fact, the only service with 100% awareness rating among the 31 services, as reflected by the female respondents. Two services — *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* and *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* — were rated equally by the female respondents (94.9%), while three services — *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine*, *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues*, and *Provides insurance information and liaison services* — had the same awareness rating (91.5%) by the male respondents.

Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age

Appendix C-5 shows the statistical analysis for awareness of selected student services on the basis of age. Table 7 shows the comparative ranking order of those services by the 18 to 24-year-old respondents and the 25 to 29-year-old respondents.

Dean of Students. The survey showed that more than one-half (> 50%) of the 18 to 24-year-old respondents were aware of all six services under the Dean of Students. The two services with the highest awareness percentage were *Provides student advising and academic support* and *Oversees fraternities and sororities*, both with 66.2%. The service

TABLE 7

RANK ORDER OF AWARENESS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE
BASIS OF AGE, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING AWARENESS
(N = 187)

18 to 24-Year-Old Group (n = 157)	%	25 to 29-Year-Old Group (n = 30)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	66.2	1. Student advising/academic support	70.6
1. Oversees fraternities and sororities	66.2	2. Reviews student records policy	70.6
2. Coordinates student life programs	64.3	2. Oversees fraternities and sororities	58.8
3. Student conduct and judicial matters	59.2	3. Coordinates student life programs	55.9
4. Reviews student records policy	56.1	4. Provides help with emergencies	50.0
5. Provides help with emergencies	51.0	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	47.1
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	94.3	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	91.2
2. Provides financial counseling	68.8	2. Provides financial counseling	67.6
3. Helps find part-time employment	54.1	3. Helps find part-time employment	47.1
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	77.1	1. Academic/educational counseling	76.5
2. Provides personal counseling	72.0	1. Provides personal counseling	76.5
3. Provides vocational guidance	62.4	2. Provides vocational guidance	61.8
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	23.6	3. Liaison with local mental health serv	27.3
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides I.D. system and services	98.1	1. Provides building and facilities	100.0
2. Provides building and facilities	96.2	2. Provides I.D. system and services	100.0
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	86.6	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	85.3
4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	83.4	4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	82.4
5. Provides leadership development	73.2	5. Provides leadership development	76.5
6. Work/training thru stud. media	57.3	6. Work/training thru stud. media	50.0
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	95.5	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	100.0
2. Dining services and facilities	95.5	2. Dining services and facilities	97.1
3. Programming & leadership training	71.3	3. Programming & leadership training	76.5
4. Live-in resource and support staff	61.1	4. Live-in resource and support staff	61.8
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	99.4	1. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	100.0
2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	96.2	2. Provides insurance info/liaison	97.1
3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	94.9	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	97.1
4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	94.9	3. Offers pharmacy services	94.1
4. Provides insurance info/liaison	93.0	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	85.3
5. Mental health programs & services	77.1	5. Mental health programs & services	61.8
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	71.3	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	61.8
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	63.1	6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	55.9

with the lowest percentage (51%) was *Provides help with emergencies*. Among the 25 to 29-year-old respondents, *Student advising and academic support* received the highest awareness rating at 70.6%, followed by *Reviews student records policy* and *Oversees fraternities and sororities*, both at 58.8%. Fewer than one-half (47.1%) of those in the 25 to 29-year-old group were aware of *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters*.

Financial Aid Office. The three services had the same awareness rank order for both age groups, the highest being *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships*, followed by *Provides financial counseling*. The lowest ranked service was *Helps student find part-time employment on campus*. Fewer than one-half (<50%) of the 25 to 29-year-old group were aware of such service.

Counseling and Testing Services. *Provides academic and educational counseling* received the highest awareness rank from both groups. *Provides personal counseling* also shared the highest-rank category among the 25 to 29-year-old group, while it ranked second among the 18 to 24-year-old group. *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* received the lowest awareness rank from both groups.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Among the 18 to 24-year-olds, *Provides I.D. system and services* ranked first in awareness while *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* ranked second. Both services, however, were ranked first by the 25 to 29-year-olds. All the other services followed in uniform order, with *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media* receiving the lowest rank. All services received awareness ratings 50% and above, with *Provides I.D. system and services* receiving 100% awareness rating from the 25 to 29-year-old group.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* received the highest rank from the 25 to 29-year-old group, with 100% awareness rating. The same service received the highest rank from the 18 to 24-year-olds, together with *Provides adequate dining services and facilities*. The lowest in rank order for both groups was *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*. Both age groups showed very high awareness ratings, which ranged from 61% to 100%.

Student Health Services. *Offers pharmacy services* was ranked first in awareness by the 18 to 24-year-olds, and third by the 25 to 29-year-olds together with *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine*. This latter service was ranked fourth by the 18 to 24-year-old group together with *Provides insurance information and liaison*, a service ranked second by the 25 to 29-year-old group. The highest ranked service among the 25 to 29-year-old group was *Provides laboratory and x-ray services*, which the 18 to 24-year-old group ranked second. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and other health-related issues* was ranked third by the 18 to 24-year-olds and fourth by the 25 to 29-year-olds. The three lowest ranked services by both groups were *Offers mental health programs and services*, *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy*, and *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis*.

Awareness of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status

Appendix C-6 shows the statistical analysis for awareness of selected student services on the basis of academic status. Table 8, shows the comparative ranking order of those services by the sophomore, junior, and senior respondents.

TABLE 8

RANK ORDER OF AWARENESS OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS OF
ACADEMIC STATUS, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING AWARENESS (N = 193)

Sophomores (n = 66)	%	Juniors (n = 68)	%	Seniors (n = 59)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	65.5	1. Oversees fraternities and sororities	65.4	1. Student advising/academic support	79.3
2. Oversees fraternities and sororities	63.6	2. Student advising/academic support	59.0	2. Student conduct and judicial matters	72.4
3. Coordinates student life programs	61.8	3. Coordinates student life programs	57.7	3. Coordinates student life programs	70.7
4. Reviews student records policy	56.4	4. Provides help with emergencies	51.3	4. Reviews student records policy	67.2
4. Student conduct and judicial matters	56.4	5. Reviews student records policy	48.7	5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	65.5
5. Provides help with emergencies	40.0	6. Student conduct and judicial matters	46.2	6. Provides help with emergencies	60.3
FINANCIAL AID SERVICES					
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	94.5	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	91.0	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	96.5
2. Provides financial counseling	70.9	2. Provides financial counseling	64.1	2. Provides financial counseling	72.4
3. Helps find part-time employment	52.7	3. Helps find part-time employment	52.6	3. Helps find part-time employment	53.5
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES					
1. Provides personal counseling	69.1	1. Academic/educational counseling	80.8	1. Academic/educational counseling	81.0
2. Academic/educational counseling	67.3	2. Provides personal counseling	71.8	2. Provides personal counseling	71.8
3. Provides vocational guidance	56.4	3. Provides vocational guidance	60.3	3. Provides vocational guidance	70.7
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	21.8	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	21.8	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	29.8
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides I.D. system and services	96.4	1. Provides I.D. system and services	98.7	1. Provides I.D. system and services	100.0
2. Provides building and facilities	94.5	2. Provides building and facilities	97.4	2. Provides building and facilities	98.3
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	87.3	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	83.3	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	89.7
4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	85.5	4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	79.5	4. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	86.2
5. Provides leadership development	67.3	5. Provides leadership development	70.5	5. Provides leadership development	84.5
6. Work/training thru stud. media	52.7	6. Work/training thru stud. media	47.4	6. Work/training thru stud. media	70.3

TABLE 8 - CONTINUED

Sophomores (<i>n</i> = 66)	%	Juniors (<i>n</i> = 68)	%	Seniors (<i>n</i> = 59)	%
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	98.2	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	93.6	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	98.3
1. Dining services and facilities	98.2	2. Dining services and facilities	92.3	1. Dining services and facilities	98.3
2. Programming & leadership training	74.6	3. Programming & leadership training	70.5	2. Programming & leadership training	73.7
3. Live-in resource and support staff	63.6	4. Live-in resource and support staff	56.4	3. Live-in resource and support staff	66.7
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Offers pharmacy services	98.2	1. Offers pharmacy services	100.0	1. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	100.0
2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	94.6	2. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	98.2	2. Offers pharmacy services	98.2
3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	94.5	3. Provides insurance info/liaison	93.6	3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	94.8
3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	94.5	4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	93.1	3. Provides insurance info/liaison	94.8
4. Provides insurance info/liaison	92.7	5. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	91.0	4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	93.1
5. Mental health programs & services	80.0	6. Mental health programs & services	68.0	5. Mental health programs & services	77.6
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	72.7	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	64.1	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	70.7
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	65.5	8. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	57.7	7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	63.8

Dean of Students. *Provides student advising and academic support* received the highest rank in awareness from both sophomores and seniors while it was ranked second by the juniors. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* was ranked first by the juniors, second by the sophomores, and fifth by the seniors. *Coordinates student life programs* ranked third in all groups. *Reviews student records policy* ranked fourth among the sophomores and seniors, and fifth among the juniors. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* ranked fourth among the sophomores, second among the seniors, and last among the juniors. *Provides help with emergencies* ranked fourth among the juniors, and last among the sophomores and seniors.

Financial Aid Office. The three services were ranked identically by the three groups, as follows: *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships*, followed by *Provides financial counseling*, and in the third position, *Helps student find part-time employment on campus*. More than one-half (> 50%) of the respondents in all academic status groups were aware of the three services.

Counseling and Testing Services. Both juniors and seniors showed the highest rank in awareness for *Provides academic and educational counseling* followed by *Provides personal counseling*. The reverse was true for the sophomores who ranked *Provides personal counseling* first followed by *Provides academic and educational counseling*. All three groups ranked *Provides vocational guidance* third and *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* fourth. This last service indicated an awareness rating of 22% among the sophomores and juniors, and 30% among the seniors. The highest awareness rank among the sophomores was 69%, while that of the juniors and seniors was 81%.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. All the three groups ranked the six services in similar order. While *Provides I.D. system and services* received the highest rank, it also indicated 100% awareness rating among the seniors. The lowest ranked service was *Provides work and training with student publications and broadcast media*. This also was the only service receiving fewer than one-half (<50%) awareness rating (47% by the juniors).

Student Housing and Residence Programs. *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* and *Provides adequate dining services* were both ranked first by the sophomores and seniors. Both services, however, were ranked first and second, respectively, by the juniors. *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations* was ranked second by the sophomores and seniors, and third by the juniors. *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* received the lowest awareness rank from the three groups.

Student Health Services. *Offers pharmacy services* was ranked first by the sophomore respondents as well as the junior respondents, who showed 100% awareness rating. The seniors ranked it second. *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* was ranked first by the seniors who reflected 100% awareness rating; the sophomores and the juniors ranked it second. The lowest ranked services that were uniformly rated by the three groups were: *Offers mental health programs and services*, *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy*, and *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis*.

Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender

Appendix C-7 shows the statistical analysis for usage of selected student services on the basis of gender. The corresponding table here (Table 9) shows the comparative ranking order of those services between the female and male respondents.

Dean of Students. Both groups ranked *Provides student advising and academic support* the highest in usage. *Reviews student records policy* ranked second among the female respondents and fourth among the male respondents. *Coordinates student life programs* was ranked second by the male respondents and third by the female respondents. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* ranked third among the male respondents and fourth among the female respondents. The two services ranked lowest by both groups were *Provides help with emergencies* and *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters*, respectively. Only three of the six services were used by more than one-half of the respondents.

Financial Aid Office. The three services showed identical ranking from the two groups. Only one of the services — *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* was used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the respondents from both groups. *Provides financial counseling* and *Helps students find part-time employment on campus* were used by fewer than one-fourth (< 25%) of both groups of respondents.

Counseling and Testing Services. Usage of services under the Counseling and Testing Services was substantially low, showing 36% as the highest usage rating. *Provides academic and educational counseling* and *Provides vocational guidance* were the two highest ranked services by both groups. The lowest ranked service among the female

TABLE 9

**RANK ORDER OF USAGE OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS
OF GENDER, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING USAGE (N = 193)**

Female (n = 96)	%	Male (n = 97)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	57.9	1. Student advising/academic support	55.6
2. Reviews student records policy	45.6	2. Coordinates student life programs	50.8
3. Coordinates student life programs	33.3	3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	39.7
4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	31.6	4. Reviews student records policy	30.8
5. Provides help with emergencies	16.0	5. Provides help with emergencies	21.3
6. Student conduct and judicial matters	7.3	6. Student conduct and judicial matters	21.1
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	58.7	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	52.3
2. Provides financial counseling	24.6	2. Helps find part-time employment	24.0
3. Helps find part-time employment	24.1	3. Provides financial counseling	21.3
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	21.2	1. Academic/educational counseling	35.8
2. Provides vocational guidance	15.8	2. Provides vocational guidance	16.1
3. Liaison with local mental health serv	14.3	3. Provides personal counseling	13.6
4. Provides personal counseling	8.6	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	5.1
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides I.D. system and services	84.2	1. Provides building and facilities	88.0
2. Provides building and facilities	80.9	2. Provides I.D. system and services	83.0
3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	47.4	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	60.5
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	41.7	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	38.3
5. Provides leadership development	21.3	5. Provides leadership development	28.4
6. Work/training thru stud. media	17.5	6. Work/training thru stud. media	16.0
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	67.0	1. Dining services and facilities	56.7
2. Dining services and facilities	66.0	2. Residence halls/coop/family housing	53.9
3. Live-in resource and support staff	49.1	3. Live-in resource and support staff	40.0
4. Programming & leadership training	35.1	4. Programming & leadership training	37.0
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	70.2	1. Provides insurance info/liaison	62.5
2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	63.7	2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	56.8
3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	55.6	3. Offers pharmacy services	56.4
4. Provides insurance info/liaison	55.4	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	43.2
5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	40.4	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	38.0
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	26.3	6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	26.2
7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	15.8	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	13.5
8. Mental health programs & services	6.5	8. Mental health programs & services	7.4

respondents was *Provides personal counseling*, while the lowest among the male respondents was *Serves as liaison with local mental health services*.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. *Provides I.D. system and services* ranked first among the female respondents, followed by *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy*. Among the male respondents, the reverse was true. The other four services were uniformly ranked by both groups: ranked third was *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*, fourth was *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center*; fifth was *Provides leadership development through organizations*, and ranked sixth was *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*. Four of the services were used by fewer than one-half (< 50%) of the female respondents, while three were used by fewer than one-half (< 50%) of the male respondents.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. The female respondents ranked *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* first, followed by *Provides adequate dining services and facilities*. The reverse was true among the male respondents. The two other services received uniform ranking from both groups, thus third was *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* and fourth was *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations*. The first two services were used by more than one-half of the respondents from both groups.

Student Health Services. The first four services were differently ranked in usage by both groups. *Offers pharmacy services* ranked first among the female respondents and third among the male respondents. *Provides insurance information and liaison services* was

ranked first by the male respondents and fourth by the female respondents. *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* ranked second in both groups. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* ranked third among the female respondents and fourth among the male respondents. The remaining four services were ranked uniformly by both groups: ranked fifth was *Provides laboratory and x-ray services*, sixth was *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis*, seventh was *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy*, and eighth was *Offers mental health programs and services*. Four services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the female respondents while three services were used by more than one-half of the male respondents.

Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age

Appendix C-8 shows the statistical analysis for usage of selected student services on the basis of age. The corresponding table here (Table 10) shows the comparative ranking order of those services between the 18 to 24-year-old group and the 25 to 29-year-old group.

Dean of Students. *Student advising and academic support* received the highest rank in usage from both groups. It was the only service that one-half of the 25 to 29-year-old group and more than one-half of the 18 to 24-year-old group used. Fewer than one-half of the respondents from either group used the other five services. *Coordinates student life programs* ranked second among the younger group and fifth among the 25 to 29-year-old group. *Reviews student records policy* ranked second among the 25 to 29-year-olds and third among the 18 to 24-year-olds. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* was ranked third by the

TABLE 10

**RANK ORDER OF USAGE OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS
OF AGE, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING USAGE (N = 187)**

18 to 24-Year-Old Group (n = 157)	%	25 to 29-Year-Old Group (n = 30)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Student advising/academic support	57.8	1. Student advising/academic support	50.0
2. Coordinates student life programs	46.2	2. Reviews student records policy	26.7
3. Reviews student records policy	40.4	3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	21.1
4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	38.3	4. Student conduct and judicial matters	20.0
5. Provides help with emergencies	18.6	5. Coordinates student life programs	18.8
6. Student conduct and judicial matters	17.0	6. Provides help with emergencies	18.2
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	54.4	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	63.3
2. Provides financial counseling	22.7	2. Helps find part-time employment	31.8
2. Helps find part-time employment	22.7	3. Provides financial counseling	23.1
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Academic/educational counseling	28.5	1. Academic/educational counseling	33.3
2. Provides vocational guidance	15.5	2. Provides vocational guidance	18.8
3. Provides personal counseling	12.2	3. Provides personal counseling	8.3
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	7.0	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	0.0
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides I.D. system and services	84.7	1. Provides building and facilities	84.3
2. Provides building and facilities	84.4	2. Provides I.D. system and services	78.1
3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	54.5	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	52.0
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	39.1	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	44.4
5. Provides leadership development	24.6	5. Provides leadership development	29.2
6. Work/training thru stud. media	18.5	6. Work/training thru stud. media	6.0
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	60.1	1. Dining services and facilities	71.9
2. Dining services and facilities	59.9	2. Residence halls/coop/family housing	59.4
3. Live-in resource and support staff	44.6	3. Live-in resource and support staff	43.8
4. Programming & leadership training	36.0	4. Programming & leadership training	37.5
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	65.2	1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	61.3
2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	60.1	1. Provides insurance info/liaison	61.3
3. Provides insurance info/liaison	58.4	2. Offers pharmacy services	56.3
4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	49.0	3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	51.6
5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	40.3	4. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	43.8
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	23.5	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	34.4
7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	14.5	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	14.3
8. Mental health programs & services	6.6	6. Mental health programs & services	14.3

25 to 29-year-olds and fourth by the 18 to 24-year-olds. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* ranked fourth among the 25 to 29-year-olds and sixth among the 18 to 24-year-olds. *Provides help with emergencies* was ranked fifth in usage by the 18 to 24-year-old group and sixth by the 25 to 29-year-old group.

Financial Aid Office. Among the three services, *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* was the only service with a usage rating more than 50%. It was ranked first by both age groups. *Provides financial counseling* and *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* were ranked second and third, respectively, by the 25 to 29 year-olds. Both were ranked second by the 18 to 24-year olds.

Counseling and Testing Services. Survey results reflected low usage ratings of the four services. None of the services was used by more than one-third (> 33.3%) of the respondents. All the services were uniformly rated by both age groups. First in rank was *Provides academic and educational counseling*, second was *Provides vocational guidance*, and third was *Provides personal counseling*. *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* was ranked fourth and was used by only 7% of the 18 to 24-year-olds and none of the 25 to 29-year-olds.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. *Provides I.D. system and services* was ranked first in usage by the 18 to 24-year-old group, followed by *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy*. The opposite was true for the 25 to 29-year-old group. The other four services were uniformly ranked in descending order by both age groups as follows: *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*, *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft*

Center, Provides leadership development through organizations, and Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media. The first three services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the respondents from each group.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* received the highest rank from the 18 to 24-year-olds, followed by *Provides adequate dining services and facilities.* The opposite was true among the 25 to 29-year-old group. Both age groups ranked the other two services similarly with *Provides live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* as third, and *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations* as fourth. The first two services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the respondents from both groups.

Student Health Services. *Offers pharmacy services* received the highest rank from the 18 to 24-year-old group, while the 25 to 29-year-old group ranked it second. Two services were ranked first by the 25 to 29-year-old group: *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* and *Provides insurance information and liaison services.* These two services were ranked second and third, respectively, by the 18 to 24-year-old group. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* was ranked third by the 25 to 29-year-olds and fourth by the 18 to 24-year-olds. *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis* was ranked fourth by the 25 to 29-year-old group and sixth by the younger group. *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* was ranked fifth by both age groups. Both *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* and *Offers mental health programs and services* were ranked sixth by the 25 to 29-year-olds, while they

were ranked seventh and eighth, respectively, by the 18 to 24-year-olds. Three services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the 18 to 24 year-old group, and four services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the 25 to 29-year-old group.

Usage of Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status

Appendix C-9 shows the statistical analysis for usage of selected student services on the basis of academic status. The corresponding table here (Table 11) shows the comparative ranking order of those services between the sophomore, junior, and senior respondents.

Dean of Students. *Provides student advising and academic support* received the highest usage rank from both the juniors and seniors. It also received the highest rank from the sophomores, together with *Oversees fraternities and sororities*, which was ranked fourth by the juniors and fifth by the seniors. *Coordinates student life programs* was ranked second by the sophomores and the seniors, and third by the juniors. *Reviews student records policy* was ranked second by the juniors, and third by the sophomores and the seniors. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* was ranked fourth by the seniors and fifth by the sophomores. It was also ranked fifth by the juniors, together with *Provides help with emergencies*, which was ranked fourth by the sophomores and sixth by the seniors. Two services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the sophomores and juniors, while one service was used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the seniors.

Financial Aid Office. *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* received the highest rank from all three groups. *Provides financial counseling* and *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* were ranked second and third, respectively, by the juniors and seniors. For the sophomores, the opposite was true. All

TABLE 11

RANK ORDER OF USAGE OF SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS OF
ACADEMIC STATUS, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING USAGE (N = 193)

Sophomores (n = 66)	%	Juniors (n = 68)	%	Seniors (n = 59)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	51.4	1. Student advising/academic support	59.7	1. Student advising/academic support	57.1
1. Oversees fraternities and sororities	51.4	2. Reviews student records policy	53.3	2. Coordinates student life programs	38.7
2. Coordinates student life programs	43.2	3. Coordinates student life programs	44.2	3. Reviews student records policy	25.8
3. Reviews student records policy	30.3	4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	35.1	4. Student conduct and judicial matters	22.6
4. Provides help with emergencies	24.1	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	17.8	5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	19.4
5. Student conduct and judicial matters	12.1	5. Provides help with emergencies	17.8	6. Provides help with emergencies	13.0
FINANCIAL AID SERVICES					
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	42.6	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	59.7	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	57.1
2. Helps find part-time employment	24.1	2. Provides financial counseling	26.3	2. Provides financial counseling	23.7
3. Provides financial counseling	21.6	3. Helps find part-time employment	24.4	3. Helps find part-time employment	18.5
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/educational counseling	21.7	1. Academic/educational counseling	59.7	1. Academic/educational counseling	39.5
2. Provides vocational guidance	13.5	2. Provides personal counseling	15.5	2. Provides vocational guidance	29.0
3. Provides personal counseling	7.9	3. Liaison with local mental healt serv	13.6	3. Provides personal counseling	9.3
4. Liaison with local mental healt serv	0.0	4. Provides vocational guidance	9.8	4. Liaison with local mental healt serv	0.0
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides I.D. system and services	80.0	1. Provides I.D. system and services	88.3	1. Provides building and facilities	89.3
2. Provides building and facilities	77.8	2. Provides building and facilities	85.5	2. Provides I.D. system and services	80.7
3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	54.0	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	41.5	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	72.7
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	42.0	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	40.6	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	37.0
5. Provides leadership development	24.4	5. Provides leadership development	25.9	5. Provides leadership development	25.6
6. Work/training thru stud. media	16.1	6. Work/training thru stud. media	13.3	6. Work/training thru stud. media	22.6

TABLE 11- CONTINUED

Sophomores (n = 66)	%	Juniors (n = 68)	%	Seniors (n = 59)	%
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	66.7	1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	57.3	1. Dining services and facilities	64.3
1. Dining services and facilities	66.7	2. Dining services and facilities	56.8	2. Live-in resource and support staff	58.1
2. Programming & leadership training	46.0	3. Live-in resource and support staff	42.9	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	57.1
3. Live-in resource and support staff	35.1	4. Programming & leadership training	31.0	4. Programming & leadership training	34.9
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	62.3	1. Offers pharmacy services	63.6	1. Offers pharmacy services	66.7
2. Offers pharmacy services	59.3	2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	62.5	2. Provides insurance info/liaison	64.8
3. Provides insurance info/liaison	51.9	3. Provides insurance info/liaison	59.7	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	55.6
4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	50.0	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	51.4	4. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	46.3
5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	40.7	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	36.8	5. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	41.9
6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	21.6	6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	24.0	6. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	41.1
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	16.2	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	14.0	7. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	8.1
8. Mental health programs & services	11.9	8. Mental health programs & services	3.5	8. Mental health programs & services	7.0

three services were used by fewer than one-half (<50%) of the sophomores. Only one service was used by more than one-half (>50%) of the juniors and seniors.

Counseling and Testing Services. *Provides academic and educational counseling* received the highest rank from all groups. *Provides vocational guidance* ranked second among the sophomores and seniors, and fourth among the juniors. *Provides personal counseling* was ranked second by the juniors, and third by the sophomores and seniors. *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* ranked third among the juniors and last among the sophomores and seniors. All but one service was used by fewer than one-half (<50%) of the respondents in each group.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. *Provides I.D. system and services* and *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* were ranked first and second, respectively, by the sophomores and juniors, while the seniors ranked them in reverse order. The other four services were rank-ordered uniformly by the three groups: third was *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*, fourth was *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center*, fifth was *Provides leadership development through organizations*, and ranked sixth was *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*. Three services were used by more than one-half (>50%) of the sophomore and senior respondents, while two services were used by more than one-half (>50%) of the junior respondents.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* and *Provides adequate dining services and facilities* were ranked number one equally by the sophomores while the juniors ranked them first and second, respectively. The seniors ranked *Provides adequate dining*

services and facilities first, followed by *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*; this latter service was ranked third by the sophomores and juniors. *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations* was ranked second by the sophomores, and fourth by the juniors and seniors.

Student Health Services. *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* was ranked first by the sophomores, second by the juniors, and third by the seniors. *Offers pharmacy services* was ranked first by the juniors and seniors, and second by the sophomores. *Provides insurance information and liaison services* was ranked second by the seniors, and third by the sophomores and juniors. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* was ranked fourth by all the groups. *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* was ranked fifth by the sophomores and juniors, and sixth by the seniors. *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis* was ranked fifth by the seniors, sixth by the juniors, and seventh by the sophomores. *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* was ranked sixth by the sophomores and seventh by both juniors and seniors. *Offers mental health programs and services* received the lowest rank from all the groups. Four services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the sophomores and juniors, while three services were used by more than one-half (> 50%) of the seniors.

Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Gender

Appendix C-10 shows the statistical analysis for satisfaction with selected student services on the basis of gender. The corresponding table here (Table 12) shows the comparative rank order of those services between the female and male respondents.

TABLE 12

**RANK ORDER OF SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS
OF GENDER, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING SATISFACTION (N = 193)**

Female (n = 96)	%	Male (n = 97)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Coordinates student life programs	80.0	1. Reviews student records policy	93.3
2. Student advising/academic support	78.9	2. Student advising/academic support	77.8
3. Oversees fraternities and sororities	77.3	3. Coordinates student life programs	76.6
4. Reviews student records policy	76.2	4. Provides help with emergencies	75.0
5. Provides help with emergencies	73.3	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	73.3
6. Student conduct and judicial matters	70.0	6. Oversees fraternities and sororities	72.0
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	74.6	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	70.8
2. Helps find part-time employment	72.7	2. Provides financial counseling	69.5
3. Provides financial counseling	70.8	3. Helps find part-time employment	66.7
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Provides personal counseling	76.0	1. Provides vocational guidance	76.5
2. Academic/educational counseling	75.8	2. Academic/educational counseling	73.7
3. Provides vocational guidance	74.5	3. Provides personal counseling	73.3
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides building and facilities	83.8	1. Provides building and facilities	84.3
2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	83.1	2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	82.0
3. Provides leadership development	80.9	3. Work/training thru stud. media	80.0
4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	80.6	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	79.3
5. Provides I.D. system and services	77.4	5. Provides leadership development	72.9
6. Work/training thru stud. media	74.0	6. Provides I.D. system and services	22.3
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Live-in resource and support staff	78.2	1. Programming & leadership training	75.8
2. Programming & leadership training	76.8	2. Live-in resource and support staff	75.6
3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	72.1	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	73.3
4. Dining services and facilities	63.8	4. Dining services and facilities	61.6
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Offers pharmacy services	82.5	1. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	80.0
1. Mental health programs & services	82.5	2. Offers pharmacy services	78.4
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	81.4	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	76.3
3. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	78.5	4. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	76.3
4. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	77.7	4. Provides insurance info/liaison	72.6
5. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	77.3	5. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	70.0
6. Provides insurance info/liaison	73.8	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	63.3
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	70.6	7. Mental health programs & services	40.0

Dean of Students. Except for *Provides student advising and academic support* that both female and male respondents ranked second in satisfaction, all services were differently ranked by both groups. *Coordinates student life programs* was ranked first in satisfaction by the female respondents and third by the male respondents. *Reviews student records policy* was ranked first in satisfaction by the male respondents while it ranked fourth among the female respondents. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* ranked third among the female respondents and sixth among the male respondents. *Provides help with emergencies* was ranked fourth by the male respondents and fifth by the female respondents. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* was ranked fifth by the male respondents and sixth by the female respondents. This service also received the lowest satisfaction rating at 70%.

Financial Aid Office. *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* was ranked first in satisfaction by both the female and male respondents. *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* ranked second among the female respondents and third among the male respondents. *Provides financial counseling* was ranked second by the male respondents and third by the female respondents.

Counseling and Testing Services. *Provides personal counseling* ranked first among the female respondents and third among the male respondents. *Provides vocational guidance* was ranked first by the male respondents and third by the female respondents. Both groups ranked *Provides academic and educational counseling* second.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Both female and male respondents ranked *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* and *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports* first and second, respectively. *Provides leadership development through organizations* ranked third among the female respondents

and fifth among the male respondents. *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media* was ranked third by the male respondents and sixth by the female respondents. Both female and male respondents ranked *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center* fourth. *Provides I.D. system and services* ranked fifth among the female respondents and sixth among the male respondents. This was also the only service showing fewer than 50% satisfaction rate.

Student Housing and Residence Program. *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* was ranked first by the female respondents and second by the male respondents. On the other hand, *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations* ranked first among the male respondents and second among the female respondents. Both groups ranked *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperative, and family housing* third, and *Provides adequate dining services and facilities* fourth.

Student Health Services. Two services were ranked first by the female respondents: *Offers pharmacy services* which the male respondents ranked second, and *Offers mental health programs and services* which the male respondents ranked seventh. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues* was ranked first by the male respondents and second by the female respondents. *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* was ranked third by the male respondents and fifth by the female respondents. *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* ranked third among the female respondents and sixth among the male respondents. *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* was ranked fourth by the female respondents. It was also ranked fourth by the male respondents together with *Provides*

insurance information and liaison services, a service that ranked sixth among the female respondents. *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis* ranked fifth among the male respondents, and seventh among the female respondents.

Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Age

Appendix C-11 shows the statistical analysis for satisfaction with selected student services on the basis of age. The corresponding table here (Table 13) shows the comparative ranking order of those services between the 18 to 24-year-old group and the 25 to 29-year-old group.

Dean of Students. *Coordinates student life programs* was ranked first by the 18 to 24-year-old group and fourth by the 25 to 29-year-old group. *Provides student advising and academic support* ranked first among the 25 to 29-year-olds and second among the 18 to 24-year-olds. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* ranked second among the 25 to 29-year-old group and fifth among the younger group. *Provides help with emergencies* also ranked second among the 25 to 29-year-old group while it was ranked fourth by the 18 to 24-year-old group. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* earned the lowest rank from both age groups.

Financial Aid Office. *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* ranked first among the 18 to 24-year-olds and last among the 25 to 29-year-olds. *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* was ranked first by the 25 to 29-year-old group and second by the younger group. *Provides financial counseling* ranked second among the 25 to 29-year-olds and last among the 18 to 24-year-olds.

TABLE 13

RANK ORDER OF SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS OF AGE, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING SATISFACTION ($N = 187$)

18 to 24-Year-Old Group ($n = 157$)	%	25 to 29-Year-Old Group ($n = 30$)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS			
1. Coordinates student life programs	78.1	1. Student advising/academic support	81.4
2. Student advising/academic support	77.6	2. Oversees fraternities and sororities	81.4
3. Reviews student records policy	75.9	2. Provides help with emergencies	80.0
4. Provides help with emergencies	74.1	3. Reviews student records policy	77.5
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	73.0	4. Coordinates student life programs	77.2
6. Student conduct and judicial matters	72.5	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	66.6
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE			
1. Helps find part-time employment	73.8	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	71.6
2. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	72.7	2. Provides financial counseling	63.3
3. Provides financial counseling	71.5	3. Helps find part-time employment	60.0
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES			
1. Provides personal counseling	73.8	1. Academic/educational counseling	80.0
2. Academic/educational counseling	73.3	2. Provides vocational guidance	80.0
3. Provides vocational guidance	72.5	3. Provides personal counseling	80.0
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
1. Provides building and facilities	84.3	1. Provides building and facilities	81.9
2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	83.5	2. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	80.0
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	80.0	2. Provides leadership development	80.0
4. Provides I.D. system and services	78.1	3. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	78.9
5. Provides leadership development	77.0	4. Provides I.D. system and services	78.7
6. Work/training thru stud. media	76.9	5. Work/training thru stud. media	76.0
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS			
1. Live-in resource and support staff	77.9	1. Live-in resource and support staff	75.0
2. Programming & leadership training	77.3	2. Programming & leadership training	73.8
3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	72.5	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	73.0
4. Dining services and facilities	62.3	4. Dining services and facilities	65.0
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES			
1. Mental health programs & services	95.0	1. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	76.7
2. Offers pharmacy services	82.7	2. Offers pharmacy services	74.2
3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	81.8	3. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	73.9
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	78.8	3. Provides insurance info/liaison	73.9
5. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	77.6	4. Mental health programs & services	70.0
6. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	75.6	5. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	64.3
7. Provides insurance info/liaison	72.9	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	64.3
8. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	72.7	6. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	46.7

Counseling and Testing Services. The 18 to 24-year-old group ranked the services in descending order as follows: *Provides personal counseling*, *Provides academic and educational counseling*, and *Provides vocational guidance*. These three services were identically ranked by the 25 to 29-year-old group. Satisfaction rating of the fourth service, *Serves as liaison with local mental health services*, did not warrant analysis and comparison due to insufficient data.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. Two services were ranked the same in satisfaction by both age groups: *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* was ranked first, and *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media* was ranked last. *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports* was ranked second by the 18 to 24-year-olds and third by the 25 to 29-year-olds. *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center*, which was ranked third by the 18 to 24-year-olds, was ranked second by the 25 to 29-year-olds, together with *Provides leadership development through organizations*. This latter service ranked fifth among the 18 to 24-year-old group. *Provides I.D. system and services* was ranked fourth by both groups.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. Satisfaction rankings of the four services under this department by the two age groups were identical in the following order: *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*, *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations*, *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing*; and *Provides adequate dining services and facilities*.

Student Health Services. *Offers mental health programs and services* led in satisfaction ranking by the 18 to 24-year-old group, while the 25 to 29-year-old group ranked it fourth. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and other health-related issues* ranked first among the 25 to 29-year-old group and third among the younger group. Both age groups ranked *Offers pharmacy services* second. Both *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization and travel medicine* and *Provides insurance information and liaison* were ranked third by the 25 to 29-year-old group. The former was ranked fifth and the latter was ranked seventh by the 18 to 24-year-old group. *Provides recreational medicine and physical therapy* was ranked fourth by the 18 to 24-year-olds and sixth (last) by the 25 to 29-year-olds. Both *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis* and *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* were ranked fifth by the 25 to 29-year-olds. The former was ranked eighth and the latter was ranked sixth by the 18 to 24-year-old group. One service — *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* — was the only service showing usage by fewer than one-half (<50%) of the respondents.

Satisfaction with Selected Student Services on the Basis of Academic Status

Appendix C-12 shows the statistical analysis for satisfaction with selected student services on the basis of academic status. The corresponding table here (Table 14) shows the comparative ranking order of those services by the sophomore, junior, and senior respondents.

Dean of Students. *Coordinates student life programs* was ranked first by the sophomores, second by the seniors, and third by the juniors. *Provides help with emergencies* was ranked first by the juniors and sixth (last) by both sophomores and seniors. *Provides*

TABLE 14

RANK ORDER OF SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED STUDENT SERVICES ON THE BASIS OF ACADEMIC STATUS, AND PERCENTAGE REPORTING SATISFACTION (N = 193)

Sophomores (n = 66)	%	Juniors (n = 68)	%	Seniors (n = 59)	%
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Coordinates student life programs	78.5	1. Provides help with emergencies	77.8	1. Student advising/academic support	82.0
2. Reviews student records policy	76.4	2. Student advising/academic support	76.2	2. Coordinates student life programs	81.1
3. Student advising/academic support	76.3	3. Coordinates student life programs	74.1	3. Reviews student records policy	80.0
4. Student conduct and judicial matters	76.0	4. Student conduct and judicial matters	72.0	4. Oversees fraternities and sororities	76.0
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	75.0	5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	71.1	5. Student conduct and judicial matters	67.5
6. Provides help with emergencies	68.0	6. Reviews student records policy	70.9	6. Provides help with emergencies	60.0
FINANCIAL AID SERVICES					
1. Provides financial counseling	72.0	1. Helps find part-time employment	77.1	1. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	72.4
2. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	70.4	2. Grants, loans, work study, schlrshp	74.0	2. Provides financial counseling	66.1
2. Helps find part-time employment	70.0	3. Provides financial counseling	72.9	3. Helps find part-time employment	65.7
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES					
1. Provides personal counseling	73.3	1. Academic/educational counseling	76.7	1. Provides personal counseling	80.0
2. Provides vocational guidance	70.0	2. Provides vocational guidance	75.0	2. Academic/educational counseling	76.5
3. Academic/educational counseling	67.5	3. Provides personal counseling	70.0	3. Provides vocational guidance	74.5
4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—	4. Liaison with local mental health serv	—
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	84.8	1. Provides building and facilities	82.9	1. Provides building and facilities	85.2
2. Provides building and facilities	84.3	2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	81.2	2. Provides for varied recreat'nal sport	82.7
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	81.1	3. Provides leadership development	80.0	3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	80.0
4. Provides leadership development	78.0	3. Work/training thru stud. media	80.0	4. Provides I.D. system and services	79.1
5. Provides I.D. system and services	76.7	4. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	79.2	5. Work/training thru stud. media	77.5
6. Work/training thru stud. media	70.0	5. Provides I.D. system and services	78.5	6. Provides leadership development	76.0

TABLE 14 - CONTINUED

Sophomores (<i>n</i> = 66)	%	Juniors (<i>n</i> = 68)	%	Seniors (<i>n</i> = 59)	%
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Live-in resource and support staff	80.0	1. Programming & leadership training	77.3	1. Live-in resource and support staff	78.8
2. Residence halls/coop/family housing	74.1	2. Live-in resource and support staff	75.2	2. Programming & leadership training	76.8
3. Programming & leadership training	73.3	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	70.8	3. Residence halls/coop/family housing	73.2
4. Dining services and facilities	62.9	4. Dining services and facilities	60.5	4. Dining services and facilities	65.4
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Offers pharmacy services	81.4	1. Offers pharmacy services	82.7	1. Mental health programs & services	86.7
2. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	78.5	2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	81.2	2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	82.1
3. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	78.4	3. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	80.0	3. Offers pharmacy services	78.5
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	76.7	4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	77.0	4. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	75.6
5. Provides insurance info/liaison	76.2	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	75.2	5. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	75.0
6. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	75.8	6. Provides insurance info/liaison	74.6	6. Provides insurance info/liaison	69.7
7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	70.0	7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	73.8	7. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	66.7
8. Mental health programs & services	60.0	8. Mental health programs & services	70.0	8. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	65.7

student advising and academic support was ranked first by the seniors, second by the juniors, and third by the sophomores. *Reviews student records policy* ranked second among the sophomores, third among the seniors, and sixth (last) among the juniors. *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* ranked fourth among the sophomores and juniors, and fifth among the seniors. *Oversees fraternities and sororities* was ranked fourth by the seniors, and fifth by the sophomores and the juniors.

Financial Aid Office. *Provides financial counseling* was ranked first by the sophomores, second by the seniors, and third by the juniors. *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* was ranked first by the juniors and third by both sophomores and seniors. *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarchips* was ranked first by the seniors and second by both sophomores and juniors.

Counseling and Testing Services. Both sophomores and seniors ranked *Provides personal counseling* first, while the juniors ranked it third. *Provides academic and educational counseling* was ranked first by the juniors, second by the seniors, and third by the sophomores. *Provides vocational guidance* ranked second among the sophomores and juniors, and third among the seniors. Due to insignificant data or non-usage, *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* could not be considered for analysis.

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports* was ranked first by the sophomores and second by the juniors and seniors. Both juniors and seniors ranked *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy* first, while the sophomores ranked it second. *Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center* ranked third among the sophomores and seniors, and fourth among the juniors. *Provides leadership*

development through organizations. which ranked fourth among the sophomores and sixth among the seniors, was ranked third by the juniors, together with *Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media*, which ranked fifth among the seniors and sixth among the sophomores. *Provides I.D. system and services* was ranked fourth by the seniors, and fifth by the sophomores and juniors.

Student Housing and Residence Programs. The sophomores and seniors ranked *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person* first, while the juniors ranked it second. *Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations* was ranked first by the juniors, second by the seniors, and third by the sophomores. *Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing* was ranked second by the sophomores, and third by both juniors and seniors. *Provides adequate dining services and facilities* was ranked fourth by all the three groups.

Student Health Services. *Offers pharmacy services* was ranked first by both sophomores and juniors, and third by the seniors. *Offers mental health programs and services* was ranked first by the seniors and eighth (last) by the sophomores and juniors. *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological and sexual health, immunization, and travel medicine* was ranked second by the sophomores and fourth by both juniors and seniors. *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and other health-related issues* was ranked second by the juniors and seniors, and third by the sophomores. *Provides recreational sports medicine and physical therapy* was ranked third by the juniors, fourth by the sophomores, and eighth by the seniors. *Provides insurance information and liaison services* was ranked fifth by the sophomores, and sixth by the juniors and seniors. *Provides laboratory and x-ray services* ranked fifth among the juniors and seniors, and sixth among

the sophomores. *Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis* received the seventh rank from all three academic groups.

The following null hypothesis was tested to determine if the findings on the awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status of the respondents could be generalized to the original population:

H₀4: There are no significant differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status of the respondents.

In terms of awareness on the basis of: (a) gender, the test results showed that only 2 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column of Appendix C-4), thus retaining the null hypothesis; (b) age, the test results showed that none of the services was significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-5), therefore the null hypothesis was retained; and (c) academic status, the test results showed that only 3 of the 31 services had significant differences at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-6), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

In terms of usage on the basis of: (a) gender, the test results showed that only 3 of the 31 services had significant differences at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-7), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained; (b) age, the test results showed that only 3 of the 31 services had significant differences at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-8), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained; and (c) academic status, the test results showed that only 5 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-9), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

In terms of satisfaction on the basis of: (a) gender, the test results showed that only 2 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-10), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained; (b) age, the test results showed that only 3 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-11), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained; and (c) academic status, the test results showed that only 1 out of 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level (last column, Appendix C-12), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

On the basis of the statistical test results enumerated above, to determine if any significant differences existed in connection with awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the 31 selected student services between groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status, it can be generally stated that H_0 was retained in favor of the notion that the findings in the study should not be generalized to the original population.

Quality Ratings for Student Services Departments With or Without a Formal Process of Evaluation

H_3 : Student services departments with a formal process of evaluation receive higher quality ratings than those without a formal process of evaluation.

As mentioned earlier in this study, a survey among the six departments was conducted to find out which among them had a formal process of evaluation. The purpose was to find out whether those departments that have a formal process of evaluation would receive higher quality ratings from both domestic and foreign respondents than those that do not have a formal process of evaluation. Two of the six departments — Student Housing and Residence Programs, and the Student Health Services — have a formal process of evaluation.

Overall Quality Ratings

The survey questionnaire included an item asking both the domestic and foreign respondents to give an overall quality rating for each of the six departments. The quality ratings were: 1 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Poor, 5 = Don't Know. The fifth item was included as a response option for those that may not have known the department enough to evaluate it.

The combined questionnaire responses from both groups generated wide discrepancies among the cells causing some cells to have fewer than five observations. It was, therefore, necessary to collapse the number of cells from four to two. First, the *don't knows* (those that did not know enough to evaluate the department/s) were identified and eliminated from the rating, although the data were included in the table for information and comparison purposes. Then the four-category rating was converted into two, combining *excellent* and *good* into a new category of *good*, and combining *fair* and *poor* into a new category of *poor*. Following is a presentation of the data based on questionnaire returns to determine the quality ratings for the six departments.

Dean of Students. About 41% of all the respondents (Table 15) did not know about the Dean of Students Office enough to evaluate it. Of the 113 respondents that evaluated the department, more than two-thirds rated it as *good*.

TABLE 15

QUALITY RATING FOR THE DEAN OF STUDENTS OFFICE ($N = 191$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	78	40.8	Good	83	73.5
Total Evaluators	113	59.2	Poor	30	26.5

Financial Aid Office. Roughly one-third of the total respondents did not know about the Financial Aid Office (Table 16) enough to evaluate it. Of the 122 total evaluators, fewer than one-half (48%) rated the department as *good*.

TABLE 16

QUALITY RATING FOR THE FINANCIAL AID OFFICE ($N = 190$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	68	35.8	Good	59	48.4
Total Evaluators	122	64.2	Poor	63	51.6

Counseling and Testing Services. More than one-half of the total respondents (58%) did not know the Counseling and Testing Services (Table 17) enough to evaluate it. The 81 evaluators were almost evenly divided between *good* (49%) and *poor* (51%).

TABLE 17

QUALITY RATING FOR THE COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES ($N = 191$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	110	57.6	Good	40	49.4
Total Evaluators	81	42.4	Poor	41	50.6

Memorial Union and Educational Activities. The Memorial Union and Educational Activities was evaluated by 95% of the respondents (Table 18), and 81% of the evaluators rated that department as *good*.

TABLE 18

QUALITY RATING FOR THE MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL
ACTIVITIES ($N = 191$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	10	05.2	Good	146	80.7
Total Evaluators	181	94.8	Poor	35	19.3

Student Housing and Residence Programs. Almost one-fourth of the total respondents did not know about the Student Housing and Residence Programs (Table 19). Sixty-one percent of the evaluators rated the department as *good*.

TABLE 19

QUALITY RATING FOR THE STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE
PROGRAMS ($N = 191$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	46	24.1	Good	88	60.7
Total Evaluators	145	75.9	Poor	57	39.3

Student Health Services. Table 20 shows that 93% of the total respondents evaluated the Student Health Services. Eighty percent of the evaluators rated the department as *good*.

TABLE 20

QUALITY RATING FOR THE STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES ($N = 191$)

	Number	Percent	Rating	Number	Percent
Don't Know	13	06.8	Good	143	80.3
Total Evaluators	178	93.2	Poor	35	19.7

Ranking of Quality Ratings

After determining what percentage of each of the six departments was rated *good*, the next step was to arrange the departments in rank order, from the department receiving the highest percentage down to the department receiving the lowest percentage. Table 21 shows the ranking order of the six departments based on the percentage rating given by both domestic and foreign respondents. It also shows the departments that have or do not have a formal process of evaluation (indicated by *yes* or *no*).

TABLE 21

RANK ORDER OF GOOD RATING FOR THE SIX STUDENT SERVICES
DEPARTMENTS INDICATING THOSE WITH OR WITHOUT
A FORMAL PROCESS OF EVALUATION

Department	Formal Evaluation	Good Rating Percentage	Rank Order
Memorial Union and Educational Activities	No	80.7%	1
Student Health Service	Yes	80.3%	2
Dean of Students Office	No	73.5%	3
Student Housing and Residence Programs	Yes	60.7%	4
Counseling and Testing Services	No	49.4%*	5
Financial Aid Office	No	48.4%*	6

*Below the 50% breakpoint.

Using 50% as the breakpoint, the results showed that four of the departments (Memorial Union and Educational Activities, Student Health Services, Dean of Students Office, and Student Housing and Residence Programs) scored above 50%, while the other two departments (Counseling and Testing Services, and Financial Aid Office) scored below

50%. The results also showed that the two departments that have a formal process of evaluation (Student Health Services, and Student Housing and Residence Programs) scored above the 50% breakpoint.

The statistical data indicated that although the two departments that use a formal process of evaluation scored above the 50% breakpoint, two other departments that do not have a formal process of evaluation also scored above the 50% breakpoint. As a matter of fact, the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, which does not have a formal process of evaluation, obtained the highest score, surpassing that of the Student Health Services which has a formal process of evaluation. In the same manner also, the Dean of Students Office, which does not have a formal process of evaluation, scored higher than the Student Housing and Residence Programs, which does have a formal process of evaluation.

It can, therefore, be concluded that, although it is a good tool for assessment, the formal process of evaluation is not a determinant of a service department's *good* or *poor* rating as perceived by the domestic and foreign respondents.

H₀5: There is no significant difference in quality ratings between student services departments with a formal process of evaluation and those without a formal process of evaluation.

The procedure to test the null hypothesis involved placing the ordered data in a 2 x 2 contingency table (Table 22) with 50% as the breakpoint. Fisher's exact test (Miller, 1986) was then used to determine the probability of obtaining results more extreme than those actually obtained. The result of the analysis was then referred to the CRC tables (Beyer, 1991) to determine the level of significance. However, no entries in the CRC tables were found that conformed to the result that had been obtained from the analysis, indicating that the *P*-value was greater than .05. Since the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the

.05 level, the results observed in the sample, should not be generalized to the original population.

TABLE 22

2 X 2 CONTINGENCY TABLE USING 50% AS BREAKPOINT

Formal Evaluation	X < 50%	X > 50%	Total
Yes	0	2	2
No	2	2	4
Total	2	4	6

X = Department 50% = 50% breakpoint

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The central purpose of this study was to examine certain student services offered by the six departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Oregon State University to determine whether or not a difference existed in the level of awareness, usage, and satisfaction between the domestic and foreign students who were in their sophomore, junior, or senior year at Oregon State University. The study also examined the relationships in the level of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services between two or more groups within the variables of gender, age, and academic status. Finally, the study examined the overall quality ratings of the six departments by the domestic and foreign students to find out if those departments with formal procedures of evaluation were rated better than those without formal procedures of evaluation.

Summary of the Study

The dearth of literature dealing with awareness, usage, and satisfaction with student services by domestic and foreign students reflects the need for more studies and research on these aspects of student services.

In spite of some arguments directed towards the roles and functions of student services, as well as its relation to higher education, the literature points to the fact that student services has always been, and will always be, an inherent part of higher education in particular, and the academic enterprise in general. It behooves, therefore, those in the

student services profession to seek ways and means to improve the quality of services to students in order to fulfill the total educational mission of developing the total person.

The true measure of effective and successful rendering of the various student services is reflected in the level of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with those services by the student clientele. Awareness serves as the key factor in determining the subsequent usage and the eventual satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a service by the student users. Constant evaluation of each department and its services is helpful and healthful in the fulfillment of the mission of Student Services.

The population of foreign students in American colleges and universities continues to rise steadily. Such increase calls for programs and services that address the nature and needs of that segment of the student population. Domestic and foreign students have many things in common, but their differences cannot be taken for granted. Cultural orientations and educational backgrounds, among other things, dictate many of such differences. It is, therefore, important for student services administrators to review and evaluate their respective services to ensure that both domestic and foreign students are equally served.

A total of 300 copies of the Student Services Awareness and Usage Questionnaire were mailed out to randomly selected domestic and foreign undergraduate students who were in their sophomore, junior, or senior year. The sample which was randomly selected from a list provided by the Registrar's Office as well as the Office of International Education consisted of 150 domestic students and 150 foreign students. Each of the domestic and foreign student groups consisted of 25 sophomore males, 25 sophomore females, 25 junior males, 25 junior females, 25 senior males, and 25 senior females.

Frequencies, percentages, the chi-square test, the *t*-test, and Fisher's Exact Test were used to analyze the data. The .05 level of significance was used, wherever

appropriate, to determine if the findings in the sample could be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn.

Of the 193 (64%) returned questionnaires, 116 were from the domestic respondents and 77 were from the foreign respondents. The domestic respondents consisted of 60 females and 56 males. Among the foreign respondents, 41 were male and 36 were female. There were 96 female and 97 male respondents altogether. Twenty-seven countries were represented by the 77 foreign respondents.

One domestic respondent and none of the foreign respondents were under 18 years old. In the 18 to 24-year-old age group, there were 98 domestic and 59 foreign respondents. In the 25 to 29-year-old age group, there were 13 domestic and 17 foreign respondents. Four domestic respondents were 30 years old or older, while none of the foreign respondents were in that category. One respondent did not indicate an age category.

Questionnaire respondents were predominantly single, with 108 among the 116 domestic respondents (93%) and 68 among the 77 foreign respondents (88%). There were 5 domestic and 2 foreign respondents who were married and whose spouses were living with them in Corvallis, while there were 2 domestic and 6 foreign respondents who were married and whose spouses did not live with them in Corvallis. One domestic respondent and none of the foreign respondents were divorced. One respondent did not indicate a marital status. The variable of marital status was included in the questionnaire for demographic purposes only.

The domestic respondents outnumbered the foreign respondents in questionnaire return rate among the three academic categories, with the domestic sophomores having the highest, and both the foreign sophomores and foreign seniors having the lowest.

The leading source of awareness of student services for both groups of respondents was the printed media (e.g., posters, brochures, and catalogues), followed by friends and other students, and then the faculty and staff.

When asked if they had something they would like to share concerning ways and/or means by which student services at Oregon State University may be improved, a total of 38 responses were generated. Twenty-four of the responses were directed at the student services in general, four of which expressed satisfaction while the rest called for more improvements; one referred to the Dean of Students, calling for more information about the services; three responses were directed to the Financial Aid Office expressing a need for budget and/or financial counseling as well as financial aid or scholarships for international students; three were directed to the Counseling and Testing Services expressing a need for more information about the services; three to the Memorial Union and Educational Activities conveying satisfaction as well as suggesting home delivery of the *OSU Barometer* (the students' newspaper); none to the Student Housing and Residence Programs; and four of the responses were directed to the Student Health Services, which asked for more information dissemination about some special services, and for improvements on patient/customer services as well as attitudes of the staff.

Research Findings Overview

This study found that the domestic respondents showed a very high awareness rating (97%) while the foreign respondents showed a moderately high awareness rating (77%) of the selected student services. The six services of which the majority of the foreign respondents were not aware imply either that many of them have not found any need or opportunity to find out about such services, or that departments need to further promote

these services. The service *Serves as liaison with local mental health* under the Counseling and Testing Services showed the lowest awareness rating by the foreign respondents, and was the only service of which the majority of the domestic respondents were not aware. One of the reasons that can be surmised is the apparent duplication of such service between the Counseling and Testing Center and the Student Health Services which also offers *Mental health programs and services*.

Of interest is the amount of usage that the 31 services received. The domestic respondents used only 11 services (35%) while the foreign respondents used only 10 (32%). Among the six services under the Dean of Students, only *Provides student advising and academic support* was used by more than 50% of both domestic and foreign respondents. Of the three services under the Financial Aid Office, only *Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships* was used by a majority of the domestic respondents and none was used by a majority of the foreign respondents. None of the four services under the Counseling and Testing Services was used by a majority of both groups. While none of the domestic respondents used *Serves as liaison with local mental health services*, this service was ranked the highest by the foreign respondents at 27%. This needs to be treated with careful consideration, though, due to the limited size of the sample.

Three of the six services under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities were commonly used by a majority of both groups. These services were (a) *Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy*; (b) *Provides I.D. system and services*; and (c) *Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports*. Two services under the Student Housing and Residence Programs were used by the majority of the domestic respondents: *Provides adequate accommodations through residents halls, cooperatives, and family housing* and *Provides adequate dining services and facilities*. Aside from these two

services, the majority of the foreign respondents also used *Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person*. Four of the eight services under the Student Health Services were used by a majority of the domestic respondents compared to three used by a majority of the foreign respondents. The three services that both groups commonly used were: (a) *Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological, and sexual health, immunization, and travel medicine*; (b) *Offers pharmacy services*; and (c) *Provides insurance information and liaison services*. The fourth service used by the domestic respondents was *Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues*.

In terms of satisfaction with the selected student services, the results of the study showed an overwhelming number of both domestic and foreign respondents who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with such services. A majority of the domestic respondents were satisfied with 5 of the services and were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the other 25 services. On the other hand, a majority of the foreign respondents were satisfied with 6 of the services and were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the other 24 services. In examining the responses on the basis of gender, the majority of both female and male respondents showed that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with about two-thirds of the services. When examined on the basis of age, the majority of the 18 to 24-year-olds respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with more than two-thirds of the services, while the majority of the 25 to 29-year-old respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with almost one-half of the services. The 25 to 29-year-old respondents were dissatisfied with five services more than the 18 to 24-year-old respondents, and were satisfied with four services more than that group. Finally, when the comparison was examined on the basis of academic status the findings showed that the majority of the sophomore and junior respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with more than two-thirds of the services

while the seniors were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with almost one-half of the services. None of the three groups was very dissatisfied or very satisfied with any of the services. All the academic groups had more services with which they were satisfied than those with which they were dissatisfied.

While the domestic respondents showed a higher level of awareness in more services than did the foreign respondents, both groups showed almost similar levels of usage and satisfaction with the selected services, which were rather low.

The gender variable yielded similar awareness levels (93%) for both the female and male respondents. The age variable showed a slight difference in awareness levels with the 18 to 24-year-old respondents showing awareness of two services (97%) more than the 25 to 29-year-old respondents (90%). The academic status variable showed the seniors with the highest awareness level (97%), followed closely by the sophomores (93%); the juniors showed a slightly lower awareness level (87%).

The low usage levels found in all the other variables were reflective of, and consistent with, the findings comparing the domestic respondents to the foreign respondents. In the gender variable, the usage levels between the female respondents and the male respondents were rather low (32% female, 35% male). Low usage levels were also evident in the two age groups (32% for 18 to 24-year-olds, 29% for 25 to 29-year-olds), as well as the three academic groups (35% sophomores, 38% juniors, and 35% seniors).

The satisfaction level in the variable of gender showed a predominance of neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (21 out of 30 services or 70% female, 19 out of 30 services or 63% male); the female respondents were satisfied with eight services (26%) while the male respondents were satisfied with four (13%). The satisfaction level in the variable of age also showed a predominance of neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (77% for 18 to 24-year-olds,

47% for 25 to 29-year-olds); the 25 to 29-year-olds were satisfied with nine services (30%) while the 18 to 24-year-olds were satisfied with five (16%).

In the variable of academic status, the neither satisfied nor dissatisfied category was also predominant, with 21 services (70%) among the sophomores, 22 services (73%) among the juniors, and 13 services (43%) among the seniors. The sophomores were dissatisfied with four services and satisfied with five services; the juniors were dissatisfied with one service and satisfied with seven services; the seniors were dissatisfied with eight services and satisfied with nine services.

Finally, while the domestic respondents seemed to be well aware of the various student services at Oregon State University, there was an apparent need for improvement or intensification of information dissemination of the student services to the foreign students. Although the domestic respondents showed high awareness of the student services, their usage of the services was not very much higher than that of the foreign respondents. The large percentage rate of student services in the category of neither satisfied nor dissatisfied implied a dire need for assessment and evaluation of the departments' respective services in order to deliver those services in efficient, effective, and satisfactory fashion.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Research hypotheses 1 through 3 stated that domestic students, compared to foreign students, have a higher level of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services. Null hypotheses 1 through 3 stated that there were no significant differences in the levels of awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected student services between the domestic and the foreign students.

This study found some similarities and differences between the two groups in awareness, usage, and satisfaction. Testing the null hypotheses determined whether or not the differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with the selected services were statistically different at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 1

Finding: A majority of the domestic respondents were aware of 30 services and unaware of 1 service. On the other hand, a majority of the foreign respondents were aware of 24 services, and unaware of 7.

Conclusion: The domestic students were aware of more services than were the foreign students. Furthermore, since only 9 out of 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level, the null hypothesis (H_01) was retained.

Hypothesis 2

Finding: Eleven of the services were used by a majority of the domestic respondents, which included one service under the Dean of Students, one under the Financial Aid Office, three under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, two under the Student Housing and Residence Programs, and four under the Student Health Services. On the other hand, 10 of the services were used by a majority of the foreign respondents. These included one under the Dean of Students, three under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, three under the Student Housing and Residence Programs, and three under the Student Health Services.

Conclusion: A majority of the domestic students used one service more than a majority of the foreign students. Moreover, since only 5 out of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level, the null hypothesis (H_02) was retained.

Hypothesis 3

Finding: The domestic respondents showed satisfaction with five services. Twenty-five services showed the domestic respondents as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The services with which they were satisfied included one under the Dean of Students, two under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, and two under the Student Health Services. None of the services was rated very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, or very satisfied. On the other hand, the foreign respondents were satisfied with 6 services, and were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with 24 of the services. The services with which they were satisfied included four under the Memorial Union and Educational Activities, and two under the Student Health Services. None of them was very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, or very satisfied with any of the services.

Conclusion: The foreign students were satisfied with one service more than were the domestic students. Moreover, since only 1 of the 30 services was significantly different at the .05 level, the null hypothesis (H_03) was retained.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis four stated that there are important relationships in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services between classifications within the variables of gender, age, and academic status. H_04 stated that there are no significant differences in awareness, usage, and satisfaction with selected student services between classifications within the variables of gender, age, and academic status.

Awareness by gender.

Finding: A majority of the female respondents were aware of 29 services and unaware of 2, namely, *Provides help with emergencies* under the Dean of Students, and

Serves as liaison with local mental health services under the Counseling and Testing Services. Similarly, a majority of the male respondents were aware of 29 services and unaware of 2, namely, *Helps student find part-time employment on campus* under the Financial Aid Office, and *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* under the Counseling and Testing Services.

Conclusion: Both the female and male students were equal in the number of those who were aware as well as those who were not aware of the services. Furthermore, since only 2 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level according to awareness and the respondent variable of gender, the null hypothesis (H_04) was retained.

Awareness by age.

Finding: A majority of the 18 to 24-year-old respondents were aware of all but one service, namely, *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* under the Counseling and Testing Services. A majority of the 25 to 29-year-old respondents were aware of 28 services, and unaware of 3, namely, *Helps with student conduct and judicial matters* under the Dean of Students, *Helps student find part-time employment* under the Financial Aid Office, and *Serves as liaison with local mental health services* under the Counseling and Testing Services.

Conclusion: Those in the 18 to 24-year-old group were aware of more services than were those in the 25 to 29-year-old group, although the difference (two services) was not substantial. Furthermore, since none of the selected services was significantly different at the .05 level according to awareness and the respondent variable of age, the null hypothesis (H_04) was retained.

Awareness by academic status.

Finding: Out of the 31 selected services, a majority of the sophomores were aware of 29 services, a majority of the juniors were aware of 27 services, and a majority of the seniors were aware of 30 services.

Conclusion: The seniors were aware of more services, followed by the sophomores, and the juniors having the least, albeit the differences were not substantial. Moreover, since only 3 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level according to awareness and the respondent variable of academic status, the null hypothesis (H_04) was retained.

Usage by gender.

Finding: A majority of the female respondents utilized 10 services while a majority of the male respondents utilized 11 services.

Conclusion: While a majority of both gender groups utilized about one-third of the 31 selected services, the male respondent usage exceeded only by one service over that of the female respondents. Furthermore, since only 3 of the 31 services were significantly different at the .05 level according to usage and the respondent variable of gender, the null hypothesis (H_04) was retained.

Usage by age.

Finding: A majority of the 18 to 24-year-old respondents utilized 10 services while majority of the 25 to 29-year-old respondents utilized 11 services.

Conclusion: A majority of both groups utilized about one-third of the 31 selected services, with the 25 to 29-year-old group exceeding only by one service over the 18 to 24-year-old group. Furthermore, since only three of the services were significantly different at

the .05 level according to usage and the respondent variable of age, the null hypothesis (H_0) was retained.

Usage by academic status.

Finding: A majority of the sophomores used 11 services, a majority of the juniors used 12 services, and a majority of the seniors used 11 services.

Conclusion: Among the three academic groups using the 31 selected services, the juniors exceeded by only one service over the sophomores and one service over the seniors. Furthermore, since only five of the services were significantly different at the .05 level according to usage and the respondent variable of academic status, the null hypothesis (H_0) was retained.

Satisfaction by gender.

Finding: A majority of the female respondents were satisfied with 30 services, while a majority of the male respondents were satisfied with 28 services.

Conclusion: The female respondents were satisfied with more services than the male respondents, albeit the difference was not substantial. Furthermore, since only two of the services were significantly different at the .05 level according to satisfaction and the respondent variable of gender, the null hypothesis (H_0) was retained.

Satisfaction by age.

Finding: A while a majority of the 18 to 24-year-old respondents were satisfied with 30 services, while a majority of the 25 to 29-year-old respondents were satisfied with 29 services.

Conclusion: The 18 to 24-year-old respondents were only slightly higher than the 25 to 29-year-old respondents in satisfaction rate with the selected services. Furthermore, since

only three of the services were significant at the .05 level according to satisfaction and the respondent variable of age, the null hypothesis (H_04) was retained.

Satisfaction by academic status.

Finding: A majority of all three academic groups were satisfied with all 30 services that they used.

Conclusion: All the three academic groups were equally satisfied with the selected services. Furthermore, since none of the services was significant at the .05 level according to satisfaction and the respondent variable of academic status, the null hypothesis (H_04) was thus retained.

Hypothesis 5

Finding: No differences were found between those departments that have a formal process of evaluation and those that do not have a formal process of evaluation. The Memorial Union and Educational Activities which does not have a formal process of evaluation received a rating of *good* by the highest percentage of the respondents, followed by the Student Health Services which is one of two that have a formal process of evaluation. Two of the services that do not have a formal process of evaluation (Counseling and Testing Services, and the Financial Aid Office) were both below the 50% breakpoint in the number of respondents rating the services as *good*. The Dean of Students Office with no formal process of evaluation ranked much higher than the Department of Student Housing and Residence Programs.

Conclusion: While an important tool for appraisal, the formal process of evaluation did not prove to be a factor in obtaining high quality ratings from the users. Moreover, since there was no significant difference in the overall rating between student services

departments with a formal process of evaluation and those without a formal process of evaluation, the null hypothesis (H_0) was retained.

Recommendations

Based on the findings obtained and the observations generated from this study, certain recommendations are necessary and in order. Two categories of recommendations are offered resulting from the writer's experience, readings, conversations and interviews, and scholarly enlightenment throughout the course of this study: (a) recommendations for administration and (b) recommendations for further research.

Recommendations for Administration

Based on data-supported findings and conclusions:

1. Throughout the early stages of this study, some concerns were expressed orally and/or in writing about the use of the word *foreign* in reference to international students (Pedersen, 1991), most of which refers to negative and somewhat hostile connotations and implications such as *alien*, *stranger*, or *outsider*. The most preferred term was *international student*, which was deemed friendly, courteous, nonthreatening, and nonexclusive. It is, therefore, recommended that those who are in positions of responsibility and authority abandon the use of, and reference to, foreign student and use the descriptor international student instead. It is encouraging to note that the Office of International Education at Oregon State University has long recognized and addressed this concern.
2. Some student services departments should spend extra time and effort in disseminating information and promoting their respective services. This may be done in the form of an open house or a student services fair.

3. A *portfolio of services* should be distributed to both the new domestic and international students. This could be a joint undertaking by both the Student Affairs Division and the Office of International Education.

4. A periodic evaluation and review of each service should be conducted to determine which service is truly functional, useable, and up-to-date.

5. Student services departments need to check and consult with one another regarding their services in order to avoid duplication of services.

6. A stronger and closer partnership between the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of International Education should be established and maintained to address the problems, provide for the needs, and deal with issues involving the international students.

7. More cultural, social, and educational activities should be planned and organized for the purpose of getting together both the domestic as well as the international students in order to promote intercultural awareness and to recognize, respect, and celebrate their similarities as well as their differences.

8. University administrators should mobilize and utilize more of the upperclass international students who have had adequate experience on campus in order to help in planning, developing, and administering orientation programs for new international students.

9. Both the Academic Affairs Division and the Student Affairs Division should explore and pursue possibilities of creating or providing classes for freshman and new students that would integrate domestic and international students in as much a proportional ratio as possible.

Based on professional experience and observations;

1. The university should provide opportunities for international students to engage in activities and experiences beyond the academic community such as home stays and *short-term adoption* of these students by American families.

2. The Office of International Education and the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs should work hand-in-hand in disseminating important orientation resources to both prospective as well as incoming domestic and international students, using especially the Internet and other telecommunication systems, network, etc.

3. Many international students feel that there are underlying presumptions on the part of department administrators and staff that the international students know all there is to know about their facilities, programs, and services. It is, therefore, recommended that the various student services departments coordinate or collaborate with the Office of International Education in maintaining an ongoing program of orientation, promotion, and education.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. This study was limited in scope to the comparison between domestic and international students in their sophomore, junior, and senior years. A similar study may be conducted to include other undergraduate classifications.

2. Inasmuch as the findings in this study could not be generalized to its population, this study should be repeated using the same format, but with the population and sample derived from a different institution, to see if the findings are generalizable.

3. A similar study may be made comparing graduate domestic and international students in their awareness, usage, and satisfaction with student services.

4. The dearth of literature and the need for more research on the international student, international education, and domestic-international student issues should serve as a challenge not only to students and scholars, but more especially to officers, administrators, and staff of student affairs and international education organizations in order to document or put in writing their experiences and observations. Better yet, they should be challenged and encouraged to conduct research on these subject(s).

5. If and when feasible, future researchers may resort to using the electronic mail system to send out their survey instruments or questionnaires. This certainly would save time, effort, and costs both in initial mailing, and the needed follow-ups thereafter.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. (1974). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15, 13-23.
- Allen, K. E., & Elliott, L. G. (1993). Reinventing student affairs: Something old and something new. *NASPA Journal*, 30, 93-100.
- Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1991). *International higher education: An encyclopedia* (Vol. 2). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Altbach, P. G., Kelly, D. H., & Lulat, Y. (1985). *Research on foreign students and international study*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- The American heritage dictionary of the English language* (1992). New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Anderson, T. R., & Myer, T. E. (1985). Presenting problems, counselor contacts, and "no-shows": International and American college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 500-503.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavieh, A. (1985). *Introduction to research in education*. New York: CBS College Publishing.
- Astin, A. (1991). *Assessment for excellence*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters college?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barr, M. J. (1988). Managing the enterprise. In M. J. Barr & M. Lee (Eds.), *Managing student affairs effectively* (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Beardsley, T. M. (1988). Embarrassment of riches. *Scientific American*, 258, 22.
- Beyer, W. H. (Ed.). (1991). *Table: CRC standard probability and statistics, tables and formulae*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Borg, W. (1987). *Applying educational research*. New York: Longman.
- Boyan, D. R. (Ed.). (1983) *Profiles: The foreign student in the United States*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Brown, S. (1981). An evaluation process for student affairs agencies. *NASPA Journal*, 18(4), 2-13.
- Bruce, B. (1993). President Byrne announces new structure. *OSU This Week: Staff Newsletter of Oregon State University (Special Edition)*, 32(17), 1.

Burn, B. B. (1980). *Expanding the international dimension of higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Byrne, J. V. (1993). The organization and structure of Oregon State University. *OSU This Week: Staff Newsletter of Oregon State University*, 33(2), 7-8.

Cage, M. C. (1992, November 18). Students face pressures as never before, but counseling help has withered. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A26.

Carney, C. G., & Barak, A. (1976). A survey of student needs and student personnel services. *Journal of Student Personnel*, 7, 280-284.

Carranza, E. (1978). Guidelines for client evaluation of student services programs. *NASPA Journal*, 15(3), 27-30.

Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1993). Student activism as a form of leadership and student development. *NASPA Journal*, 31(1), 19-29.

Chandler, A. (1989). *Obligation or opportunity*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Cieslak, E. C. (1955). *The foreign student in American colleges*. Detroit, MI: Wayne University Press.

Clark, B., & Neave, G. (1992). Introduction: Faculty and students: teaching, learning, and research. In *Encyclopedia of higher education*, (Vol. 3, pp. 1515-1535). New York: Pergamon Press.

Cobban, A. B. (1975). *The Medieval universities: Their developments and organization*. London: Methuen.

Council on International Educational Exchange. (1988). *Educating for global competence*. New York: Author.

Cummings, W. K. (1991). Foreign students. In *International higher education: an encyclopedia* (Vol. 1, pp. 107-124). New York: Garland Publishing.

De Coster, D. A., & Mable, P. (1981). Academic experiences and career orientations. In D. A. De Coster & P. Mable (Eds.), *Understanding today's students*. (pp. 7-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delworth, U., Hanson, G., & Associates. (1980). *Student Services: A handbook for the profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deutch, J. (1991). The foreign policy of U.S. universities. *Science*, 253, 492.

Dillard, J. M., & Chisolm, G. B. (1983). Counseling the international student in a multicultural context. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24, 101-105.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley.

Dodge, B. (1961). *Al-Azhar: A millennium of Muslim education*. Washington, DC: Middle East Institute.

Du Bois, C. (1956). *Foreign students and higher education in the United States*. New York: American Council on Education.

Ebbin, A. J., & Blankenship, E. S. (1986). A longitudinal health care study: International versus domestic. *Journal of American College Health*, 34, 177-182.

Eddy, J. (1972). Factors and guidelines in foreign student guidance. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13(3), 252-254.

Education and World Affairs. (1964). *The foreign student: Whom shall we welcome?* The report of the Education and World Affairs Study Committee on Foreign Student Affairs. New York: Author.

Fall enrollment levels drop slightly. (1993). *OSU This Week: Staff Newsletter of Oregon State University*, 33(8), 1.

Feder, D., & others. (1958). *The administration of personnel programs in American colleges*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Fenske, R. (1980). Historical foundations. In U. Delworth, G. Hanson, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 3-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1985). *How to conduct surveys*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Good, C. V. (1959). *Dictionary of education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Green, K. C. (1989). A profile of undergraduates in the sciences. *American Scientist*, 77, 475-481.

Guterk, G. L. (1993). *American education in a global society*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

Hallenbeck, T. R. (1978). College student satisfaction: An indication of institutional vitality. *NASPA Journal*, 16(2), 19-25.

Hamilton, J. T. (1979). A comparison of domestic and international students' perceptions of the university environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 20, 443-446.

- Haskins, C. H. (1966). *The rise of universities*. New York: Cornell.
- Haynes, B. L. (1991). American full-time graduate students' use and level of satisfaction with selected student personnel offices and services at Ohio University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.
- Heikinheimo, P. S., & Shute, J. C. (1986). The adaptation of foreign students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 27, 399-406.
- Hendershott, A. B., Wright, S. P., & Henderson, D. (1992). Quality of life correlates for university students. *NASPA Journal*, 30, 11-19.
- Hopke, W. E. (1968). *Dictionary of personnel guidance terms*. Chicago: J. G. Ferguson Publishing Co.
- Hull, W. F. (1978). *Foreign students in the United States of America*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Hurst, J. C., & Ivey, A. E. (1971). Toward a radicalization of student personnel. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 12, 165-168.
- Jones, C. H. (1990). Age related differences in college students' values. *College Student Journal*, 24, 292-295.
- Katz, J. (1973). *Services for students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kauffman, J. F. (1984). Assessing the quality of student services. In R. A. Scott (Ed.), *Determining the effectiveness of campus services* (pp. 24-26). Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass.
- Kerr, C. (1990). Higher education cannot escape history: The 1990s. In L. W. Jones & F. A. Nowotny (Eds.), *An agenda for the new decade*, (p.14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, H. H. (1925). Outline history of student migrations. In W. R. Wheeler, H. H. King, & A. B. Davidson (Eds.), *The foreign student in America*. (Pp. 3-32). New York: Association Press.
- Krasno, R. M. (1985). President's message. *Institute of International Education Annual Report 1985*, p. 7.
- Kuh, G. D., & Stage, F. K. (1992). Student development. In B. Clark & G. Neave (Eds), *The encyclopedia of higher education* (p.1719). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Lee, S. (1991). Train 'em here, keep 'em here. *Forbes*, 147, 110.
- Leong, F., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1986). A comparison of international and U.S. students' preferences for help sources. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 27, 426-430.

Lewicki, G. J., & Thompson, D. L. (1982). Awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with student services among freshmen and sophomores: A consumer evaluation. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23, 477-481.

Lomak, P. P. (1984). *An investigation of foreign students' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with selected student personnel services and programs at Ohio university, Athens 1983-84*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.

Longman dictionary of contemporary English (3rd ed.). (1995). Great Britain. Longman Group Limited.

Lynch, M. L., & Sinnott, R. (1976). Student awareness and utilization of professional and paraprofessional services. *NASPA Journal*, 14(2), 22-28.

Madden, M.E., Woods, S., Dares-Hobbs, S., & Collins, J. (1987). Perceived control and student involvement and campus activities, *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28, 371.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1989). *Research in education*. USA: Harper Collins Publishers.

Miller, R. G. (1986). *Beyond ANOVA, basics of applied statistics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, T., & Prince, J. (1976). *The future of student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morril, W. H., & Hurst, J. C. (1971). A preventative and developmental role for the college counselor. *Counseling Psychologist*, 2(4), 90-95.

Moses, H. A. (1974). Trends and issues in education. In H. A. Moses (Ed.), *Student personnel work in general education* (pp. 344-354). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publishers.

Mu, M. (1983). *A comparative study of academic experiences of American and foreign graduate students at Oregon State University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

Oregon State University Division of Student Affairs. (1992). *Student Affairs Update*. Corvallis: Author.

Oregon State University Office of Budgets and Planning. (1992). *Oregon State University: Facts 1992*. Corvallis: Author.

Oregon State University Office of Budgets and Planning, Information Resources (1993). *Oregon State University Enrollment Summary, Fall Term 1993*. Corvallis: Author.

Oregon State University Office of International Education. (1992, Spring). *OSU International*. Corvallis: Author.

Parr, G., Bradley, L., & Bingi, R. (1991). Directors' perceptions of the concerns and feelings of international students. *College Student Journal*, 25, 370-376.

Parsons, E. A. (1952). *The Alexandrian library: Glory of the Hellenic world*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Passons, W. R. (1971). Student satisfaction as perceived by three groups of university personnel. *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, 12(2), 126-129.

Pedersen, P. B. (1991). Counseling international students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 19, 10-58.

Pinsky, S., & Marks, D. (1980). Perceptions of student personnel services at a major land grant university. *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, 21, 99-105.

Ramirez, B. C. (1993). Adapting to new student needs and characteristics. In M. Barr & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (pp. 427-438). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Random House unabridged dictionary (2nd ed.) (1993). New York: Random House, Inc.

Raschio, R. A. (1987). College students' perceptions of reverse culture shock and reentry adjustments. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(2), 156-162.

Riesman, D. (1980). *On higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rogers, K. A. (1983). Alumni networking. In M. G. Hood & K. J. Schieffer (Eds.), *Professional integration: A guide for students from the developing world* (pp. 5-24). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Schieffer, K. (1983). Introduction. In M. G. Hood & K. J. Schieffer (Eds.), *Professional integration: A guide for students from the developing world* (p. 1). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Shaffer, R. H. (1968). Whither student personnel work from 1968 to 2018? *NASPA Journal* 6:9-14.

Singal, D. J. (1991). The other crisis in American education, *The Atlantic Monthly*, 268(6), 65-74.

Smolowe, J. (1992, April 13). The pursuit of excellence. *Time*, p. 59.

Spaulding, S., & Flack, M. J. (1976). *The world's students in the United States*. New York: Praeger.

Stafford, T. J., Jr., Marion, P. B., & Salter, M. L. (1980). Adjustments of international students. *NASPA Journal*, 18, 41-45.

Starr, A. M., Betz, E. L., & Menne, J. W. (1971). *Manual: The college student satisfaction questionnaire*. Ames, IA: Central Iowa Associates.

Stromquist, N. P. (1991). *Daring to be different*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Tilley, D. C. (1973). Student Services and politics of survival. In J. Katz (Ed.), *Services for students* (pp. 114-115). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Veysey, L. (1965). *The emergence of American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wobbekind, R. L., & Graves, P. E. (1989). International student demand for higher education in the United States. *Research in higher education*, 30, 273-298.

Young, R. B. (1993). Examining the history of student affairs through the lens of professional education. *NASPA Journal*, 30(4), 243-251.

Zaccaria, J. S. (1974). The organization of personnel work in the school. In H. A. Moses (Ed.), *Student personnel work in general education* (pp. 31-55). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publishers.

Zikopoulos, M. (Ed.) (1993). *Open doors 1992/93: Report on international education exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

**STUDENT SERVICES AWARENESS AND USAGE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

STUDENT SERVICES AWARENESS AND USAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your help with this survey is greatly appreciated.

The information you provide will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

PART I: STUDENT AFFAIRS DEPARTMENTS AND THEIR SERVICES

Instructions: Listed below are the departments under the Division of Student Affairs at Oregon State University, and their respective services.

Please read each item and circle in the Left Section whether you are, for each particular service:

- 1 = NOT AWARE
- 2 = AWARE, BUT HAVE NOT USED
- 3 = USED ONCE OR MORE

If you answer (1) or (2) in the Left Section, proceed down to the next item. If you, however, answer (3) in the Left Section (that is, you have used the service once or more), please indicate your level of satisfaction in the Right Section:

- 1 = VERY DISSATISFIED
- 2 = DISSATISFIED
- 3 = NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
- 4 = SATISFIED
- 5 = VERY SATISFIED

	Left Section			Right Section				
DEAN OF STUDENTS								
Provides student advising and academic support	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Reviews student records policy	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Coordinates student life programs	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Helps with student conduct and judicial matters	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Oversees fraternities and sororities	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides help with emergencies	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
FINANCIAL AID								
Facilitates procurement of grants, loans, work study, and scholarships	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides financial counseling	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Helps student find part-time employment on campus	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES								
Provides academic/educational counseling	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides vocational guidance	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Left Section			Right Section				
Provides personal counseling	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Serves as liaison with local mental health services	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES								
Provides building and facilities for students to use and enjoy	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides I.D. system and services	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Offers non-curricular knowledge and skill development through the Experimental College and Craft Center	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides facilities and opportunities for varied recreational sports	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides leadership development through organizations	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Offers work and training with student publications and broadcast media	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENT PROGRAMS								
Provides adequate accommodations through residence halls, cooperatives, and family housing	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides adequate dining services and facilities	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Offers programming and leadership training through living group organizations	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides trained live-in staff to serve as resource and support person	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES								
Provides clinics for allergy, gynecological, and sexual health, immunization, and travel medicine	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Promotes educational awareness on drugs, alcohol, and various health-related issues	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Offers mental health programs and services	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides ambulatory medicine and clinical care on both an appointment and urgent-care basis	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides laboratory and x-ray services	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Provides insurance information and liaison services	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

OVERALL RATING					
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
Dean of Students	1	2	3	4	5
Financial Aid	1	2	3	4	5
Counseling and Testing Services	1	2	3	4	5
Memorial Union and Educational Activities	1	2	3	4	5
Student Housing and Residence Programs	1	2	3	4	5
Student Health Services	1	2	3	4	5

PART II: PERTINENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

- Are you: Female Male
- Which age range below applies to you:
 - Under 18 years old 25 - 29 years old
 - 18 - 24 years old 30 years old or older
- What is your marital status?
 - Single
 - Married, living with spouse in Corvallis
 - Married, spouse not in Corvallis
 - Other (Please specify): _____
- What is your academic status at OSU?
 - Sophomore Junior Senior
- Are you a: Domestic Student?
 - Foreign Student? Please indicate your home country: _____
- How did you become aware about the student services at OSU? (Check all that apply)
 - Through posters, brochures, catalogues, and/or other literature.
 - Through a friend or other students.
 - Through a faculty or staff member.
 - Other (Please specify): _____
 - I have not been aware about student services at OSU.
- Is there anything else you would like to share concerning ways and/or means by which student services at OSU may be improved to better serve all the students?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS

February 25, 1994

Dear OSU Student:

You have been chosen to participate in a survey to find out if you and other fellow students at Oregon State University are aware, and have used, the various student services provided by the six departments under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Results of this study will be shared with student services administrators, and recommendations for improving the quality and delivery of such services will also be endorsed. Your feedback and input in this study are very valuable and important.

All information derived from the questionnaire will be treated with utmost confidentiality, and will be accessible only to the researcher. The number on each questionnaire serves no other purpose than to facilitate follow-up procedures, if and when necessary.

I would appreciate it very much if you can answer the questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. A stamped return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. You may also send it via campus mail, or drop it at the MU Business Office. If you have any questions and/or concerns, please feel free to give me a call at 737-4674 (work) or 757-7728 (home).

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation, and best wishes in all your undertakings.

Very Sincerely,

Gideon Zarraga Alegado
MU Night Manager and Doctoral Candidate

May 1, 1994

Dear Fellow OSU Student:

A copy of the **STUDENT SERVICES AWARENESS AND USAGE QUESTIONNAIRE** was mailed to you earlier. A high response rate is needed for surveys such as this to be helpful and useful, particularly in evaluating and improving the quality of student services at Oregon State University.

If you have already returned your copy, please accept my profound thanks and appreciation. If, however, you have not done so yet, could you possibly share some moments to answer and mail it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that came with it, as soon as possible? If your copy has been misplaced, or if you have any questions, please call me at 737-4674.

Thank you very much for your valuable cooperation, and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Gideon Zarraga Alegado
MU Night Manager and Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX C

TABLES OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Appendix C-1

Awareness of Student Services/Programs by Domestic and Foreign Students ($N = 192$)

Service/Programs	Domestic Students ($n = 115$)				Foreign Students ($n = 77$)				X ² Value Level of Signifi- cance
	Unaware		Aware		Unaware		Aware		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS									
1. Student advising/academic support	37	32.2	78	67.8	26	33.8	51	66.2	0.818
2. Reviews student records policy	51	44.4	64	55.6	32	41.6	45	58.4	0.702
3. Coordinates student life programs	44	38.3	71	61.7	27	35.5	49	64.5	0.702
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	43	37.7	71	62.3	39	50.6	38	49.4	0.077
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	36	31.3	79	68.7	31	40.3	46	59.7	0.202
6. Provides help with emergencies	55	48.2	59	51.8	39	50.6	38	49.4	0.744
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE									
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	6	5.2	109	94.8	6	7.8	71	92.2	0.470
2. Provides financial counseling	36	31.3	79	68.7	24	31.2	53	68.8	0.984
3. Helps find part-time employment	43	37.7	71	62.3	47	61.0	30	39.0	0.002*
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES									
1. Academic/education counseling	27	23.5	88	76.5	17	22.4	59	77.6	0.858
2. Provides vocational guidance	43	37.4	72	62.6	29	38.2	47	61.8	0.915
3. Provides personal counseling	32	27.8	83	72.2	20	26.3	56	73.7	0.818
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	79	69.3	35	30.7	65	85.5	11	14.5	0.011*
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES									
1. Provides building and facilities	4	3.5	111	96.5	2	2.6	75	97.4	0.731
2. Provides I.D. system and services	2	1.7	113	98.3	1	1.3	76	98.7	0.809
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	13	11.3	102	88.7	13	17.1	63	82.9	0.252
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	18	15.8	96	84.2	14	18.2	63	81.8	0.664
5. Provides leadership development	24	20.9	91	79.1	26	33.7	51	66.2	0.046*
6. Work/training thru stud. media	40	34.8	75	65.2	44	57.9	32	42.1	0.002*
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS									
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	5	4.4	110	95.6	2	2.6	75	97.4	0.526
2. Dining services and facilities	5	4.4	110	95.6	3	3.9	74	96.1	0.878
3. Programming and leadership training	24	21.1	90	78.9	28	36.8	48	63.2	0.017*
4. Live-in resource and support staff	33	28.9	81	71.1	40	52.6	36	47.4	0.001*
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES									
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	8	7.0	107	93.0	5	6.5	72	93.5	0.900
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	5	4.4	109	95.6	8	10.4	69	89.6	0.106
3. Offers pharmacy services	1	0.9	112	99.1	1	1.3	76	98.7	0.784
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	27	23.7	87	76.3	33	42.9	44	57.1	0.005*
5. Mental health programs & services	22	19.1	93	80.9	27	35.1	50	64.9	0.013*
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	30	26.3	84	73.7	43	55.8	34	44.2	0.000*
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	5	4.4	110	95.6	1	1.3	76	98.7	0.234
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	10	8.7	105	91.3	2	2.6	75	97.4	0.087

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-2

Usage of Selected Student Services by Domestic and Foreign Students ($N = 192$)

Service/Programs	Domestic Students ($n = 115$)				Foreign Students ($n = 77$)				X ² Value Level of Signifi- cance
	Not Used		Used 1+		Not Used		Used 1+		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS									
1. Student advising/academic support	34	43.6	44	56.4	22	43.1	29	56.9	0.960
2. Reviews student records policy	39	60.9	253	39.1	28	62.2	17	37.8	0.892
3. Coordinates student life programs	39	54.9	2	45.1	30	61.2	19	38.8	0.493
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	57	80.3	14	19.7	33	86.8	5	13.2	0.390
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	46	58.2	33	41.8	34	73.9	12	26.1	0.078
6. Provides help with emergencies	48	81.4	11	18.6	31	81.6	7	18.4	0.978
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE									
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	32	29.4	77	70.6	48	67.6	23	32.4	0.000*
2. Provides financial counseling	56	70.9	23	29.1	44	83.0	9	17.0	0.111
3. Helps find part-time employment	57	80.3	14	19.7	21	70.0	9	30.0	0.260
COUNSELING AND TESTING SERVICES									
1. Academic/education counseling	56	63.6	32	36.4	48	81.4	11	18.6	0.021*
2. Provides vocational guidance	57	79.2	15	20.8	43	91.5	4	8.5	0.073
3. Provides personal counseling	72	86.8	11	13.2	51	91.1	5	8.9	0.433
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	35	100.0	0	0.0	8	72.7	3	27.3	0.001*
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES									
1. Provides building and facilities	15	13.5	96	86.5	14	18.7	61	81.3	0.342
2. Provides I.D. system and services	20	17.7	93	82.3	11	14.5	65	85.5	0.557
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	58	56.9	44	43.1	41	65.1	22	34.9	0.295
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	47	49.0	49	51.0	26	41.3	37	58.7	0.341
5. Provides leadership development	63	69.2	28	30.8	43	84.3	8	15.7	0.047*
6. Work/training thru stud. media	62	82.7	13	17.3	27	84.4	5	15.6	0.829
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS									
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	41	37.3	69	62.7	33	44.0	42	56.0	0.359
2. Dining services and facilities	40	36.4	70	63.6	30	40.5	44	59.5	0.567
3. Programming and leadership training	57	63.3	33	36.7	31	64.6	17	35.4	0.884
4. Live-in resource and support staff	47	58.0	34	42.0	18	50.0	18	50.0	0.420
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES									
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	40	37.4	67	62.6	31	43.1	41	56.9	0.447
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	48	44.0	61	56.0	42	60.9	27	39.1	0.029*
3. Offers pharmacy services	39	34.8	73	65.2	30	39.5	46	60.5	0.516
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	72	82.8	15	17.2	40	90.9	4	9.1	0.211
5. Mental health programs & services	85	91.4	8	8.6	48	96.0	2	4.0	0.303
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	66	78.6	18	21.4	21	61.8	13	38.2	0.060
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	63	57.3	47	42.7	50	65.8	26	34.2	0.242
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	44	41.9	61	58.1	30	40.0	45	60.0	0.798

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-3

Comparison of Mean Level of Satisfaction with Selected Student
Services by Domestic and Foreign Respondents

	Domestic		Foreign		P Value
	n	M**	n	M**	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	44	4.04	29	3.72	0.023*
2. Reviews student records policy	25	3.88	17	3.70	0.279
3. Coordinates student life programs	32	3.87	19	3.94	0.591
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	14	3.64	5	3.40	0.458
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	33	3.72	12	3.58	0.641
6. Provides help with emergencies	11	3.72	7	3.71	0.964
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	77	3.62	23	3.65	0.880
2. Provides financial counseling	23	3.65	9	3.11	0.135
3. Helps find part-time employment	14	3.57	9	3.33	0.587
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	32	3.78	11	3.63	0.632
2. Provides vocational guidance	15	3.73	4	3.50	0.401
3. Provides personal counseling	11	3.72	5	3.80	0.891
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	-	-	-	-	-
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	96	4.26	61	4.11	0.146
2. Provides I.D. system and services	93	3.90	65	3.92	0.842
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	43	3.93	22	4.13	0.093
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	49	4.14	37	4.10	0.773
5. Provides leadership development	28	3.96	8	3.62	0.492
6. Work/training thru stud. media	13	3.76	5	4.00	0.410
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	69	3.56	42	3.73	0.227
2. Dining services and facilities	70	3.08	44	3.22	0.449
3. Programming and leadership training	33	3.81	17	3.82	0.979
4. Live-in resource and support staff	34	3.82	17	3.94	0.614
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	67	3.76	41	3.97	0.125
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	59	4.03	27	4.04	0.985
3. Offers pharmacy services	70	4.10	45	3.93	0.185
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	15	3.66	4	3.75	0.893
5. Mental health programs & services	8	3.62	2	4.00	0.707
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	18	3.27	13	3.84	0.156
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	47	3.72	26	3.80	0.617
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	61	3.67	45	3.64	0.850

* $p < .05$.

- Indicates insufficient data.

**Mean Equivalence:

1.00 = Very Dissatisfied; 2.00 = Dissatisfied; 3.00 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4.00 = Satisfied; 5.00 = Very satisfied

Appendix C-4

Comparison of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Gender

	Female		Male		X ² Value
	n	%	n	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	67	69.1	61	64.9	0.539
2. Reviews student records policy	58	59.8	50	53.2	0.357
3. Coordinates student life programs	62	63.9	58	61.7	0.751
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	54	55.7	55	58.5	0.692
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	58	59.8	66	70.2	0.131
6. Provides help with emergencies	44	45.4	53	56.4	0.128
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	93	95.9	86	91.5	0.212
2. Provides financial counseling	71	73.2	60	63.8	0.163
3. Helps find part-time employment	55	56.7	46	48.9	0.282
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	73	75.3	74	78.7	0.570
2. Provides vocational guidance	62	63.9	57	60.6	0.640
3. Provides personal counseling	71	73.2	68	72.3	0.894
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	26	27.1	20	21.3	0.350
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	95	97.9	90	95.7	0.385
2. Provides I.D. system and services	96	99.0	92	97.9	0.542
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	85	87.6	80	85.1	0.611
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	87	89.7	72	76.6	0.015*
5. Provides leadership development	76	78.3	65	69.2	0.148
6. Work/training thru stud. media	53	54.6	54	57.5	0.696
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	95	97.9	89	94.7	0.231
2. Dining services and facilities	94	96.9	89	94.7	0.443
3. Programming and leadership training	69	71.9	69	73.4	0.813
4. Live-in resource and support staff	64	66.7	53	56.4	0.145
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	92	94.9	86	91.5	0.357
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	92	94.9	86	91.5	0.357
3. Offers pharmacy services	96	100.0	92	97.9	0.151
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	71	73.2	60	63.8	0.163
5. Mental health programs & services	78	80.4	64	68.1	0.051*
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	66	68.0	52	55.3	0.070
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	95	97.9	90	95.7	0.385
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	93	95.9	86	91.5	0.212

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-5

Comparison of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Age

	18-24 Years		25-29 Years		P Value
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	104	66.2	24	72.6	0.517
2. Reviews student records policy	88	56.1	20	58.8	0.212
3. Coordinates student life programs	101	64.3	19	55.9	0.550
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	93	59.2	16	47.0	0.351
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	104	66.2	20	58.8	0.637
6. Provides help with emergencies	80	51.0	17	50.0	0.534
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	148	94.2	31	91.2	0.775
2. Provides financial counseling	108	68.8	23	67.6	0.505
3. Helps find part-time employment	85	54.1	16	47.1	0.418
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	121	77.1	26	76.5	0.633
2. Provides vocational guidance	98	62.4	21	61.8	0.570
3. Provides personal counseling	113	72.0	26	58.8	0.242
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	37	23.6	9	27.3	0.617
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	151	96.2	34	100.0	0.708
2. Provides I.D. system and services	154	98.1	34	100.0	0.877
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	136	86.6	29	85.3	0.794
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	131	83.4	28	82.4	0.745
5. Provides leadership development	115	73.2	26	76.5	0.610
6. Work/training thru stud. media	90	57.3	17	50.0	0.717
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	150	95.5	34	100.0	0.653
2. Dining services and facilities	150	95.5	33	97.1	0.959
3. Programming and leadership training	112	71.3	26	78.8	0.530
4. Live-in resource and support staff	96	61.1	21	63.6	0.591
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	146	93.0	32	94.1	0.433
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	149	94.9	29	85.3	0.130
3. Offers pharmacy services	156	99.4	32	97.0	0.592
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	112	71.3	19	55.9	0.139
5. Mental health programs & services	121	77.1	21	61.8	0.248
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	99	63.1	19	55.9	0.391
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	151	96.2	34	100.0	0.708
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	146	93.0	33	97.1	0.817

**p* < .05.

Appendix C-6

Comparison of Awareness of Selected Student Services by Academic Status

	Sophomore		Junior		Senior		X ² Value
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS							
1. Student advising/academic support	36	65.5	46	59.0	46	79.3	0.043*
2. Reviews student records policy	31	56.4	38	48.7	39	67.2	0.098
3. Coordinates student life programs	34	61.8	45	57.8	41	70.7	0.295
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	31	56.4	36	46.2	42	72.4	0.009*
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	35	63.6	51	65.4	38	65.5	0.972
6. Provides help with emergencies	22	40.0	40	51.3	35	60.3	0.096
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE							
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	52	94.5	71	91.0	56	96.5	0.403
2. Provides financial counseling	39	70.9	50	64.1	42	72.4	0.533
3. Helps find part-time employment	29	52.7	41	52.6	31	53.5	0.994
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES							
1. Academic/education counseling	37	67.3	63	80.8	47	81.0	0.129
2. Provides vocational guidance	31	56.4	47	60.3	41	70.7	0.259
3. Provides personal counseling	38	69.1	56	71.8	45	77.6	0.579
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	12	21.8	17	21.8	17	29.8	0.497
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES							
1. Provides building and facilities	52	94.5	76	97.4	57	98.3	0.488
2. Provides I.D. system and services	53	96.4	77	98.7	58	100.0	0.289
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	48	87.3	65	83.3	52	89.7	0.554
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	47	85.5	62	79.5	50	86.2	0.510
5. Provides leadership development	37	67.3	55	70.5	49	84.5	0.079
6. Work/training thru stud. media	29	52.7	37	47.4	41	70.3	0.022*
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS							
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	54	98.2	73	93.6	57	98.3	0.245
2. Dining services and facilities	54	98.2	72	92.3	57	98.3	0.133
3. Programming and leadership training	41	74.6	55	70.5	42	73.7	0.857
4. Live-in resource and support staff	35	63.6	44	56.4	38	66.7	0.449
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES							
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	52	94.5	72	92.3	54	93.1	0.880
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	52	94.5	71	91.0	55	94.8	0.612
3. Offers pharmacy services	54	98.2	78	100.0	6	98.2	0.494
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	40	72.7	50	64.1	41	70.7	0.526
5. Mental health programs & services	44	80.0	53	68.0	45	77.6	0.233
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	36	65.5	45	57.7	37	63.8	0.617
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	52	94.6	75	96.1	58	100.0	0.226
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	51	92.7	73	93.6	55	94.8	0.898

**p* < .05.

Appendix C-7

Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Gender

	Female		Male		X ² Value
	n	%	n	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	33	57.9	40	55.6	0.790
2. Reviews student records policy	26	45.6	16	30.8	0.112
3. Coordinates student life programs	19	33.3	32	50.8	0.053*
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	8	7.3	11	21.1	0.328
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	18	31.6	27	39.7	0.346
6. Provides help with emergencies	8	16.0	10	21.3	0.504
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	54	58.7	46	52.3	0.386
2. Provides financial counseling	14	24.6	18	24.0	0.941
3. Helps find part-time employment	13	24.1	10	21.3	0.738
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	14	21.2	29	35.8	0.053*
2. Provides vocational guidance	9	15.8	10	16.1	0.960
3. Provides personal counseling	5	8.6	11	13.6	0.366
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	1	14.3	2	5.1	0.366
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	76	80.9	81	88.0	0.176
2. Provides I.D. system and services	80	84.2	78	83.0	0.819
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	35	41.7	31	38.3	0.656
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	37	47.4	49	60.5	0.099
5. Provides leadership development	13	21.3	23	28.4	0.337
6. Work/training thru stud. media	10	17.5	8	16.0	0.831
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	62	66.0	49	53.9	0.093
2. Dining services and facilities	63	67.0	51	56.7	0.148
3. Programming and leadership training	20	35.1	30	37.0	0.815
4. Live-in resource and support staff	28	49.1	24	40.0	0.321
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	58	63.7	50	56.8	0.344
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	50	55.6	38	43.2	0.099
3. Offers pharmacy services	66	70.2	53	56.4	0.409*
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	9	15.8	10	13.5	0.714
5. Mental health programs & services	4	6.5	6	7.4	0.824
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	15	26.3	16	26.2	0.992
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	38	40.4	35	38.0	0.739
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	51	55.4	55	62.5	0.336

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-8

Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Age

	18-24 Years		25-29 Years		X ² Value
	n	%	n	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	63	57.8	10	50.0	0.076
2. Reviews student records policy	38	40.4	4	26.7	0.394
3. Coordinates student life programs	48	46.2	3	18.8	0.101
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	16	17.0	3	20.0	0.092
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	41	38.3	4	21.1	0.332
6. Provides help with emergencies	16	18.6	2	18.2	0.084
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	81	54.4	19	63.3	0.637
2. Provides financial counseling	25	22.7	7	31.8	0.173
3. Helps find part-time employment	20	22.7	3	23.1	0.027*
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	35	28.5	8	33.3	0.338
2. Provides vocational guidance	16	15.5	3	18.8	0.931
3. Provides personal counseling	14	12.2	2	08.3	0.627
4. Liaison w/local mental healt serv	3	07.0	0	00.0	0.858
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	130	84.4	27	84.3	0.793
2. Provides I.D. system and services	133	84.7	25	78.1	0.105
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	54	39.1	12	44.4	0.049*
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	73	54.5	13	52.0	0.448
5. Provides leadership development	29	24.6	7	29.2	0.649
6. Work/training thru stud. media	17	18.5	1	06.0	0.416
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	92	60.1	19	59.4	0.575
2. Dining services and facilities	91	59.9	23	71.9	0.367
3. Programming and leadership training	41	36.0	9	37.5	0.192
4. Live-in resource and support staff	45	44.6	7	43.8	0.718
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	89	60.1	19	61.3	0.791
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	72	49.0	16	51.6	0.149
3. Offers pharmacy services	101	65.2	18	56.3	0.093
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	16	14.5	3	14.3	0.889
5. Mental health programs & services	9	06.6	1	14.3	0.882
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	24	23.5	7	43.8	0.037*
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	62	40.3	11	34.4	0.343
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	87	58.4	19	61.3	0.346

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-9

Comparison of Usage of Selected Student Services by Academic Status

	Sophomore		Junior		Senior		X ² Value
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS							
1. Student advising/academic support	19	51.4	34	59.7	20	57.1	0.728
2. Reviews student records policy	10	30.3	24	53.3	8	25.8	0.027*
3. Coordinates student life programs	16	43.2	23	44.2	12	38.7	0.881
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	4	12.1	8	17.8	8	22.6	0.543
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	19	51.4	20	35.1	6	19.4	0.023*
6. Provides help with emergencies	7	24.1	8	17.8	3	13.0	0.583
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE							
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	23	42.6	43	59.7	34	63.0	0.068
2. Provides financial counseling	8	21.6	15	26.3	9	23.7	0.870
3. Helps find part-time employment	7	24.1	11	24.4	5	18.5	0.827
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES							
1. Academic/education counseling	10	21.7	16	27.6	17	39.5	0.171
2. Provides vocational guidance	5	13.5	5	9.8	9	29.0	0.062
3. Provides personal counseling	3	7.9	9	15.5	4	9.3	0.448
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	0	0.0	3	13.6	0	0.0	0.174
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES							
1. Provides building and facilities	42	77.8	65	85.5	50	89.3	0.236
2. Provides I.D. system and services	44	80.0	68	88.3	46	80.7	0.347
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	21	42.0	28	40.6	17	37.0	0.873
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	27	54.0	27	41.5	32	72.7	0.006*
5. Provides leadership development	10	24.4	15	25.9	11	25.6	0.986
6. Work/training thru stud. media	5	16.1	6	13.3	7	22.6	0.566
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS							
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	36	66.7	43	57.3	32	57.1	0.493
2. Dining services and facilities	36	66.7	42	56.8	36	64.3	0.476
3. Programming and leadership training	17	46.0	18	31.0	15	34.9	0.329
4. Live-in resource and support staff	13	35.1	21	32.9	18	58.1	0.159
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES							
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	33	62.3	45	62.5	30	55.6	0.691
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	26	50.0	37	51.4	25	46.3	0.848
3. Offers pharmacy services	32	59.3	49	63.6	38	66.7	0.718
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	8	21.6	8	14.0	3	8.1	0.254
5. Mental health programs & services	5	11.9	2	3.5	3	7.0	0.262
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	6	16.2	12	14.0	13	41.9	0.050*
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	22	40.7	28	36.8	23	41.1	0.855
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	28	51.9	43	59.7	35	64.8	0.385

**p* < .05.

Appendix C-10

Comparison of Satisfaction With Selected Student Services by Gender

	Female		Male		X ² Value
	n	%	n	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	36	78.9	37	77.8	0.730
2. Reviews student records policy	21	76.2	21	93.3	0.537
3. Coordinates student life programs	22	80.0	29	76.6	0.121
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	10	70.0	9	73.3	0.138
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	15	77.3	30	72.0	0.142
6. Provides help with emergencies	6	73.3	12	75.0	0.343
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	48	74.6	52	70.8	0.547
2. Provides financial counseling	13	70.8	19	69.5	0.344
3. Helps find part-time employment	11	71.7	12	66.7	0.419
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	24	75.8	19	73.7	0.195
2. Provides vocational guidance	11	74.5	8	76.5	0.636
3. Provides personal counseling	10	76.0	6	73.3	0.405
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	-	-	-	-	-
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	78	83.8	79	84.3	0.733
2. Provides I.D. system and services	78	77.4	80	22.3	0.049*
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	36	80.6	29	79.3	0.124
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	45	83.1	41	82.0	0.351
5. Provides leadership development	22	80.9	14	72.9	0.150
6. Work/training thru stud. media	10	74.0	8	80.0	0.063
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	66	72.1	45	73.3	0.348
2. Dining services and facilities	64	63.8	50	61.6	0.713
3. Programming and leadership training	31	76.8	19	75.8	0.716
4. Live-in resource and support staff	33	78.2	18	75.6	0.162
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	59	77.3	49	76.3	0.697
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	44	81.4	42	80.0	0.404
3. Offers pharmacy services	65	82.5	50	78.4	0.441
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	13	78.5	6	63.3	0.299
5. Mental health programs & services	8	82.5	2	40.0	0.019*
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	17	70.6	14	70.0	0.290
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	35	77.7	38	72.6	0.181
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	52	73.8	54	72.6	0.660

-Indicates insufficient data

* $p < .05$.

Percentage Equivalence: <60.0 = Very dissatisfied; 60.0+ = Dissatisfied; 70.0+ = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 80.0+ = Satisfied; 90.0+ = Very satisfied

Appendix C-11

Comparison of Satisfaction With Selected Student Services by Age

	18-24 Years		25-29 Years		P Value
	n	M	n	M	
DEAN OF STUDENTS					
1. Student advising/academic support	59	77.6	14	81.4	0.099
2. Reviews student records policy	34	75.9	18	77.5	0.992
3. Coordinates student life programs	43	78.1	7	77.2	0.946
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	16	72.5	3	66.6	0.354
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	40	73.0	5	80.0	0.683
6. Provides help with emergencies	17	74.1	1	80.0	0.860
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE					
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	78	72.7	22	71.6	0.008*
2. Provides financial counseling	26	71.5	6	63.3	0.778
3. Helps find part-time employment	16	73.8	7	60.0	0.472
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES					
1. Academic/education counseling	33	73.3	10	80.0	0.531
2. Provides vocational guidance	16	72.5	3	80.0	0.200
3. Provides personal counseling	13	73.8	3	80.0	0.487
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	-	-	-	-	-
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
1. Provides building and facilities	125	84.3	31	81.9	0.051*
2. Provides I.D. system and services	127	78.1	30	78.7	0.992
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	51	80.0	14	80.0	0.425
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	68	83.5	18	78.9	0.105
5. Provides leadership development	27	77.0	9	80.0	0.717
6. Work/training thru stud. media	13	76.9	5	76.0	0.271
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS					
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	91	71.5	20	73.0	0.705
2. Dining services and facilities	94	62.3	20	65.0	0.983
3. Programming and leadership training	37	77.3	13	73.8	0.666
4. Live-in resource and support staff	39	77.9	12	75.0	0.535
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES					
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	85	77.6	23	73.9	0.015*
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	68	81.8	18	76.7	0.300
3. Offers pharmacy services	90	82.7	24	74.2	0.068
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	16	78.8	3	46.7	0.088
5. Mental health programs & services	9	95.0	2	70.0	0.333
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	22	72.7	9	64.3	0.495
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	59	75.6	14	64.3	0.265
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	82	72.9	23	73.9	0.566

- Indicates insufficient data

* $p < .05$.

Appendix C-12

Comparison of Satisfaction With Selected Student Services by Academic Status

	Sophomore		Junior		Senior		X ² Value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
DEAN OF STUDENTS							
1. Student advising/academic support	16	76.3	26	76.2	30	82.0	0.315
2. Reviews student records policy	11	76.4	11	70.9	19	80.0	0.330
3. Coordinates student life programs	13	78.5	18	74.1	19	81.1	0.298
4. Student conduct & judicial matters	5	76.0	5	72.0	8	67.5	0.721
5. Oversees fraternities and sororities	12	75.0	18	71.1	15	76.0	0.740
6. Provides help with emergencies	5	68.0	9	77.8	4	60.0	0.506
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE							
1. Grants, loans, wrk stdy, schlrshp	23	70.4	40	74.0	37	72.4	0.572
2. Provides financial counseling	5	72.0	14	72.9	13	66.1	0.764
3. Helps find part-time employment	2	70.0	7	77.1	14	65.7	0.819
COUNSELING/TESTING SERVICES							
1. Academic/education counseling	8	67.5	12	76.7	23	76.5	0.715
2. Provides vocational guidance	4	70.0	4	75.0	11	74.5	0.669
3. Provides personal counseling	3	73.3	6	70.0	7	80.0	0.831
4. Liaison w/local mental health serv	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEMORIAL UNION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES							
1. Provides building and facilities	42	84.3	63	82.9	50	85.2	0.616
2. Provides I.D. system and services	42	76.7	67	78.5	47	79.1	0.042*
3. Experimental College & Craft Cntr	18	81.1	25	79.2	22	80.0	0.834
4. Provides varied recreat'nal sport	21	84.8	34	81.2	30	82.7	0.875
5. Provides leadership development	10	78.0	11	80.0	15	76.0	0.931
6. Work/training thru stud. media	4	70.0	6	80.0	8	77.5	0.358
STUDENT HOUSING AND RESIDENCE PROGRAMS							
1. Residence halls/coop/family housing	33	74.1	39	70.8	38	73.2	0.573
2. Dining services and facilities	35	62.9	41	60.5	37	65.4	0.727
3. Programming and leadership training	9	73.3	22	77.3	19	76.8	0.327
4. Live-in resource and support staff	10	80.0	25	75.2	16	78.8	0.519
STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES							
1. Clinics/immunization/travel meds	27	78.5	40	77.0	41	75.6	0.217
2. Educ. awareness on drugs/alcohol	25	78.4	33	81.2	28	82.1	0.559
3. Offers pharmacy services	29	81.4	45	82.7	40	78.5	0.303
4. Rec. Sports medicine/phys therapy	6	76.7	6	80.0	7	65.7	0.300
5. Mental health programs & services	1	60.0	6	70.0	3	86.7	0.277
6. Ambulatory medicine/clinical care	6	70.0	13	73.8	12	66.7	0.868
7. Provides laboratory & x-ray service	19	75.8	29	75.2	24	75.0	0.372
8. Provides insurance info/liaison	26	76.2	41	74.6	37	69.7	0.616

-Indicates insufficient data

* $p < .05$.

Percentage Equivalence: <.60 = Very dissatisfied; 60.0+ = Dissatisfied; 70.0+ = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 80.0+ = Satisfied; 90.0+ = Very satisfied