

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

G. WILLIAM SNODGRASS for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in EDUCATION presented on Aug. 10, 1976

Title: COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTS AND OF
STUDENT SERVICES FUNCTIONS WITH INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY IN
PRIVATE COLLEGES

Approved: Redacted for Privacy
Dr. JoAnne Trow

The purpose of the study was to compare perceptions by faculty, students and administrators of the campus environments of eight small, independent liberal arts colleges in Oregon and to determine if similar or like perceptions of the environment lead to greater vitality in each of the colleges studied. In the context of the study, vitality refers to the ability of the institution to function effectively or optimally.

A random sample of 50 junior and senior resident students, 20 full-time teaching faculty and 7 administrators were selected for testing on each of the campuses using the Institutional Functioning Inventory to measure perceptions. Following are the eleven scales:

1. Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurricular
2. Freedom
3. Human Diversity
4. Concern for Improvement of Society
5. Concern for Undergraduate Learning
6. Democratic Governance
7. Meeting Local Needs
8. Self-study and Planning
9. Concern for Advanced Knowledge
10. Concern for Innovation
11. Institutional Esprit

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences between faculty, students, and administrators at each college in the study in their perception of the campus environment.
2. There are no significant differences in the nine colleges studied in the manner in which their environments are perceived by faculty, students and administrators on all scales totaled.
3. There is no demonstrable relationship between divergent perceptions of the campus environment by faculty, students and administrators and institutional vitality.
4. There is no demonstrable relationship between divergent perceptions in areas of the campus environment that are of concern to student personnel services and institutional vitality.

Statistical analysis of the data resulted in the rejection of null hypotheses one and two. Significant differences were found among the three groups, faculty, student, and administrators, in 28 out of 88 comparisons at the colleges studied. The groups differed most often on the scales that measured perceptions in the dimensions of personal and academic freedom, diversity in faculty and student backgrounds, concern for undergraduate education and campus decision-making. The data suggested that students as a group did not share the perceptions of their faculty and administrators at four of the eight colleges studied when responses to all eleven scales of the inventory were totaled for faculty and administrators and on six scales for students. Students tended to perceive the campus environment less positively than either faculty or administrators. The most positive

perceptions were noted among administrators.

A major conclusion of the study was that in the population samples, the presence of shared or congruent perceptions of the campus environment by faculty, students and administrators did not have a demonstrable relationship with the vitality of the college and its ability to function effectively. Null hypotheses three and four were retained.

Further results of the study indicated that, at the colleges studied, significant differences exist between students and administrators in their perceptions of the campus environments in areas of special concern to student services personnel. Differences, statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence (in five instances at the .01 level) were noted at seven of the eight colleges in areas including campus governance, personal freedom (life style, values) and diversity in student backgrounds.

Colleges in the study which described themselves as conservative and church-related had lower overall college mean scores, suggesting lower vitality, than did non-sectarian colleges. The church-related colleges, however, had fewer significantly different perceptions between faculty, students and administrators, scale-by-scale, than did the non-sectarian colleges suggesting a greater sense of community and singleness of purpose.

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS
ENVIRONMENTS AND OF STUDENT
SERVICES FUNCTIONS WITH
INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY
IN PRIVATE COLLEGES

by

G. William Snodgrass

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1977

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

Aug. 10, 1976

Typed by Mrs. Mary Syhlman for

G. William Snodgrass

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

With deep appreciation, the author expresses his gratitude to Dr. Jo Anne Trow for her encouragement and unfailing support. Her wise counsel throughout the development of this study was invaluable.

Special thanks is extended to the author's doctoral committee: Dr. Robert Chick, Dr. Kenneth Munford, Dr. Charles Warnath, and Dr. C. V. Bennett. This committment of time and effort is appreciated.

The author is grateful to Dr. Wayne Courtney and Mr. David Niese for their assistance in the statistical design and computer analysis of the research data.

Finally, my sincere thanks to my wife Ginny, and my three teenage children Julie, Dave and Dan without whose love, loyal support and encouragement, this graduate program would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	6
Concept of Vitality	7
Limitations of the Study	9
Research Hypotheses	10
Definition of Terms	10
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
The Private Liberal Arts College: Its Problems and Challenges	13
Perceptions of Student Personnel Services	16
Perceptions of College Environments and Institutional Vitality	19
Summary	24
Institutional Functioning Inventory	26
Validity and Reliability of the Institutional Functioning Inventory	34
III METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN	37
Description of Institutions	37
Selection of Subjects	39
Research Procedures	42
Analysis of Data	46
IV ANALYSIS OF DATA	48
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
Summary	69
Findings	73
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Sampling matrix showing sample size of faculty, student and administrators for each institution in the study.	38
2-9.	Comparison of mean scores of faculty, students and administrators on each of the eleven scales of the I.F.I. using the "t" test to indicate significance levels at Colleges 003-010.	
	2. College 003	49
	3. College 004	51
	4. College 005	52
	5. College 006	54
	6. College 007	56
	7. College 008	57
	8. College 009	59
	9. College 010	61
10.	Comparison of mean of faculty, students and administrator groups on an eleven scales (totaled) of the I.F.I., using the "t" test to indicate significance levels.	65
11.	Two-way interactions: Group/College ANOVA for each of 11 scales.	68

Appendix

Appendix A. Letter of Introduction: CASC	90
Appendix B. Letter of Invitation	92
Appendix C. Questionnaire: Institutional Functioning Inventory	94
Appendix D. Description of Colleges in the Study	103

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTS
AND OF STUDENT SERVICES FUNCTIONS WITH INSTITUTIONAL
VITALITY IN PRIVATE COLLEGES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The private college and its role in American higher education has received increased attention in the last decade. The proliferation of community colleges, the demands of a technological society for career/vocational education, and the trend towards free post-secondary education have sharpened the distinctions as well as the competition between the public and private sectors of the American educational system. The private college today faces an uncertain future, beset by financial and enrollment problems and, more basically, by questions concerning its identity in higher education. Recent studies have substantiated these problems.

Cheit, (1971) found 79 percent of 41 private colleges and universities surveyed in financial trouble. Astin (1972) characterized the small private college as the "invisible college" and found its chief problem to be one of obscurity and consequent lack of concern by the higher education community. Clark Kerr and others, writing in The Expanded Campus, (1972) called special attention to the plight of the independent college.

The problems facing the private sector are especially apparent on the campus of the church-related college. Changing social standards, issues of separation of church and state, and greatly increased costs of operation have all contributed to the crisis. Astin, (1972) cites these and other problems in what he characterizes as an "increasingly secular society". A number of the Carnegie Commission essays speak specifically to the challenges and problems facing the independent college, and call for strong measures to insure the continuance and viability of the American pluralistic educational system as stated by Bowen in The Finance of Higher Education (1968).

The many options open to its citizens is one of the strengths of the education system in the United States. The landmark Danforth Foundation study, 800 Colleges Face The Future (Pattillo, 1966), supports the importance of non-public education, citing among other benefits, the freedom the private college affords to experiment and to serve special purposes and interests, the opportunity for close faculty-student relationships and the espousal of human values. Critical analysis of the distinct role and contribution of the independent college as well as the identification of factors that encourage or inhibit the optimal functioning of each institution would seem to be essential. If we expect to continue to benefit from a truly diverse educational environment, reappraisal of some of the present trends in higher education is in order.

Certainly more data are needed to understand the forces that are acting upon the private college. Among the research methods

currently being used to help provide these data are studies which attempt to measure the campus environment by analysis of the perceptions of it by various campus groups. Pace and Stern (1958) and Astin (1961) developed this method. The College and University Environment Scales (Pace, 1967), The College Characteristics Index (Stern, 1963), and The Institutional Functioning Inventory (Peterson, 1969), are all instruments which measure environmental perceptions.

The use of perceptual measurement as a management tool has gained attention because of the evidence that relationships do exist between perceptions and the ability of the college to function effectively, i. e., "vitality". Wise (1969), and Peterson (1971), found correlations between lack of shared perceptions and extent of support of the college program. Wicke (1964), Jenny and Wynn (1964), Peterson (1971), and Mayhew (1962), found a singleness of purpose and community as essential to vitality and growth of the institution.

One of the areas on the college campus where perceptual studies have been used as a research tool is that of student services. Research has been conducted which endeavored to identify the perceptions students had of the student personnel staff and their function on the campus and to compare these perceptions with those of other campus groups. Pascarella (1974) sought to determine the accuracy of administrative descriptions of the college as it appeared to students. His findings suggested that administrators had an overly optimistic understanding of how students perceived their institution's environment. Other studies support these findings (Ivey, Miller, and Goldstein, 1967; Noeth and Dye, 1973). The data suggested a lack of agreement between

students and student services staff in their perceptions of the campus environment.

Purpose of the Study

One purpose of the study is to compare perceptions by faculty, students and administrators of the campus environments of nine small, independent, liberal arts colleges in Oregon. The study will seek to determine if the manner in which the environments and the student services of the colleges in the study as perceived by these groups will have an interaction effect upon the vitality of the college and its ability to function effectively.

Because the interest and experience of the researcher lies in the field of student services administration, special attention is given in the study to the identification and analysis of perceptions in the areas of the campus environments that are the responsibility or concern of the student services staff. A second purpose of the study will be to measure perceptions in these specific areas to assess the relationship that divergent or shared perceptions may have to the overall vitality of the college.

The present investigation will use as a survey instrument the Institutional Functioning Inventory, (IFI) developed by Educational Testing Service (1970). The instrument is discussed in detail in Chapter two (page 27).

The specific objectives of this study will be to determine:

1. if differences exist between students and faculty on each campus in their perception of the campus environment.

2. if differences exist between students and administrators on each campus in their perception of the campus environment.
3. if differences exist between faculty and administrators on each campus in their perception of the campus environment.
4. if there is a relationship between the mean I.F.I. score of each college and differences between the three group I.F.I. scores on that campus.
5. if there is a relationship between differences on scales significant to student services and mean I.F.I. scores of each college.

Significance of the Study

Mayhew (1962), and McGrath (1961) suggest that the liberal arts college has allowed its distinct and unique purpose to become obscured. It has given up its real self to be like the competition. Pace (1962) argues that if "press" (his term for the total environment of the campus), is perceived differently by the campus constituencies, major problems might be encountered in achieving institutional goals. Wise (1969) notes about his study of six private colleges that the perceptions of purposes of the colleges which were expressed by presidents, faculty, and students were sufficiently disjunctive as to sustain the view that these were "divided communities."

The data from this study could be useful in the context of the above concerns to administrators, faculty, and student services personnel at the institutions in the study. Ultimately the students themselves will profit from beneficial changes on the campus in the following ways:

1. An understanding of the existing perceptions of the campus environment of a given institution, and an awareness of the areas where they are divergent could result in constructive change including a heightened awareness of student and faculty concerns, better communication channels, and changes in curricular and extra-curricular programs. Data from this study would take on particular significance, for instance, where student and/or faculty perceptions differed from stated institutional and program goals. This would be especially true if these same institutions were experiencing enrollment, retention or financial difficulties.

2. Additionally, it is hoped that the data reported to the individual institutions within the study will stimulate college officials to make increased use of available measurement tools such as the IFI for institutional self-study and evaluation.

3. In regard to the role of the student services administrator, Hodgkinson, (1970) Rickard, (1972) McConnell (1970) and others found widely divergent perceptions among campus groups of the role of the student services and its staff. It would seem particularly significant in this area of direct student concern that college officials be appraised of the manner in which programs and policies were perceived.

Concept of Vitality

Basic to the significance of the study is an understanding of the concept of institutional vitality or optimal functioning. In order for differences of perception among campus groups to take on any real significance in relation to the vitality of the institution, a method of describing and measuring the vitality of that institution is needed. Several studies have been conducted which have resulted in the development of criteria intended to describe a vital, or by contrast, a less vital institution.

Cheit (1971) identified several variables which he suggests are "criteria for determining financial trouble." They include faculty salaries, expenditure for student aid, general fund expenditures, enrollment and attrition figures, faculty retention and the like. In a study of forty-eight private four-year colleges, Jenny

and Wynn (1972) identified five factors associated with the overall financial malaise: 1) a decline in public confidence, 2) a change in public and private priorities (including a shift towards vocational objectives), 3) demands from students and parents for accountability, 4) too much power without attendant responsibility among administration, and 5) poor management practices.

A "Survival Through Change" checklist developed by a private university in their plan to fight the budget squeeze suggests the following as indicators of lack of vitality: declining enrollment and indifferent recruitment practices; too few faculty teaching too few courses to too few students; no institutional research or long range planning. (Academy for Educational Development, 1971.)

The financial and logistical problems associated with the collection and analysis of the kind of data described above are numerous and complex. These factors together with the lack of accessibility of the bulk of the information pleads for another approach to the measure of vitality. While some data, such as enrollment figures, are available as a matter of public record, these figures, taken by themselves, might be more misleading than significant. Enrollment trends, for example, rather than reflecting institutional vitality might instead reflect an administrative decision to restrict growth to maintain a high degree of community and close faculty/student relationship. Conversely, an increase in enrollment instead of indicating increasing vitality could result from lowered admissions standards to attract students to a floundering institution. Isolated bits of information

take on significance only when they are taken as a whole. The large amount of this type of data available to the developers of the IFI and its use in the validation of the instrument will be discussed elsewhere in this paper (page 34). It should be noted that most of the variables identified in the above studies were exactly those used in the development and validation of the scales of the IFI.

For the reasons given above, the author has not attempted to gather outside supportive data, but is rather depending upon the instrument itself to measure the vitality of the institutions in the sample.

Limitations of the Study

The following factors should be considered when interpreting the results of the study:

1. The data are accurate insofar as the Institutional Functioning Inventory is a valid instrument in measuring the campus environment.
2. The data are accurate insofar as the scales of the IFI are a valid measure of institutional functioning of colleges within the study.
3. All institutions in the study are small, independent, liberal arts colleges in western Oregon.

Research Hypotheses

In order to facilitate the statistical treatment of the data, the following null hypotheses were selected for examination:

1. There are no significant differences between the mean scores on each of the scales for faculty, students and administrators at each college.
2. There are no significant differences between the mean scores on all scales (totaled for each group) of students, faculty, and administrators of each college.
3. There is no significant interaction effect between the mean scores of each college and the mean scores of groups of that college.
4. There is no significant interaction effect between the mean group scores of I.F.I. scales significant to student services concerns and the mean scores of that college.

Definition of Terms

A definition of terms which are used in this thesis are as follows:

Environment

Characteristics, events, practices, or sets of conditions existing on a campus that constitute an influence or potential influence on members of the campus community.

Full-Time Student

For purposes of this study a full-time student was one who was so designated by the institutions within the study. In most cases, full-time students were enrolled for twelve or more hours.

Independent/Private Institutions

The independent institutions in this study are those whose boards of control are non-public, who derive no significant financial support from taxes or other public funds. Independent and private are used interchangeably in this study.

Institutional Functioning Inventory

The Inventory, referred to in this study also as the IFI, is a perceptual measure consisting of 132 items yielding scores on eleven scales or dimensions each comprised of twelve items. The eleven scales are described elsewhere in this study. It measures student, faculty, and administrator perceptions of the campus environment. (Centra, Hartnett & Peterson, 1970).

Institutional Vitality

For purposes of this study, vitality shall be used interchangeably with "optimal functioning." Institutional vitality as measured by the IFI relates to the degree to which an institution may be said to be accomplishing its presumed goals and objectives, as well as objectives relevant to the well-being of any college, regardless of its mission (Peterson, et al., 1970).

Liberal Arts

The colleges in this study all share certain similarities which serve as a definition. All either require or encourage an academic program which includes a number of general education courses. Each strives to provide the student with a broad exposure to courses in the humanities, social sciences and the arts. The extra-curriculum is designed to expose the student to a variety of social, artistic, and in many cases, religious experiences. While many of the institutions within the study offered technical and preprofessional training, the majority of undergraduate students were in education, social service, or humanities related programs, thusly, the liberal arts college.

Optimal Functioning

A condition described by the eleven scales of the Institutional Functioning Inventory; used interchangeably with vitality.

Perception

Perception has been defined as the process of knowing objects, facts or truths by either sense, experience, or by thought; a form of thought as well as behavior, a conscious awareness (Bartley, 1958). For respondents to the IFI, perception is a discriminatory and evaluative process which allows them to make judgments regarding their environment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The material in this chapter will consist of a review of the literature relevant to the following areas:

1. The Private Liberal Arts College: It's Problems and Challenges
2. Perceptions of Student Personnel Services
3. Perceptions of College Environments and Institutional Vitality
4. Institutional Functioning Inventory

The Private Liberal Arts College: It's Problems and Challenges

The literature of education provides ample evidence of the problems facing the independent college. As late as 1951, private colleges were enrolling over 50 per cent of college students in the United States. Yet this figure had dropped to 25 per cent in 1970 and continues to decline (Froomkin, 1970). While education costs have sky-rocketed in both public and private sectors, governmental and tax support have aided the public institution. The private college, however, has had to continually raise tuitions and anxiously search for alternate sources of funds to remain viable or in some cases, merely stay in business.

Earl Cheit, in a comprehensive study, coordinated by and reported to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971),

investigated the manner in which forty-one public and private institutions in America were adapting to the rising costs of education. The study, conducted in the spring of 1970, found twenty-nine of the forty-one (79 percent) in financial difficulty. Private universities and liberal arts colleges were over represented in the problem group. This group, which made up 56 per cent of all institutions studied, constituted 82 per cent of the "In financial trouble" category. Cheit's standards for defining an institution Not in financial difficulty, Headed for financial difficulty, and In financial difficulty are more detailed than is necessary to describe here. The underlying principle was that an assessment of an institution's financial condition is a statement of the relationship between its objectives and its ability to carry them out. Some of the significant characteristics Cheit found common to the colleges in financial trouble were: deficit financing, reduction of faculty positions, increasing student/faculty ratios, program cuts, in peripheral programs as well as in those regarded as central to the mission of the institution.

Significant to the problems faced by the private institution and also important to its renewal are comments made by Professor Cheit in the summary of the report. He cited the need for colleges to have campuses that reveal themselves as being "reasonably governed," that demonstrate efficiency in their internal operations, and most significantly, evidence that the activities and programs of the college have a unified set of purposes and priorities.

Astin (1972), in a report of small private colleges, described them in terms of their "visibility." How visible a college was appeared to be a function of its enrollment size and selectivity. Thus, the largest and most selective colleges were highly "visible." Because the small invisible college is private, it receives only limited federal funds. Because it is unknown, it suffers in competition for students, for faculty, as well as federal grants. Because its financial resources are scant, it cannot make attractive offers to students needing financial aid, as can state colleges and local community colleges.

The invisible college is often church-related and, in a society that is increasingly secular, it must grapple with the question of retaining affiliation or severing ties with the parent church. Astin notes that the highly visible or "elite" colleges have severed their church affiliations while the small invisible college has generally maintained such affiliation. Of forty-four "elite" colleges studied, 43 per cent were non-sectarian to begin with and another 40 per cent had severed this affiliation. Conversely, only 2 per cent of the invisible colleges had broken away. Administrators of small colleges are thus faced with the dilemma of abandoning such ties in the hope of widening the financial and constituent base of the institution or to maintain the affiliation with its attendant distinctives, but face possible financial disaster.

Astin's study suggests that the small private college is in a constant state of flux and that the turmoil constitutes not merely minor adjustments in curriculum and internal governance, but funda-

mental change relating to institutional mission. These changes, further, seem to relate more to the need for survival than to any other factor.

A significant conclusion of Astin's study was the suggestion that there was no special "value added" by attendance at an elite college except the prestige factor, and in some cases, more luxurious facilities. Students at the larger institutions were reported as feeling more alienated and depersonalized while those at the invisible colleges cited greater opportunity for interaction with faculty and other students, a preservation of identity, personalized attention, and friendliness.

The existence of the small private college is justified according to Astin because of the diversity and multiplicity of goals represented by the education-seeking public. American higher education needs to resist the homogenizing effect of a monolithic, state-controlled system of higher education with no educational options.

The findings and conclusions of the above study are supported by a number of other studies and articles (Mayhew, 1962; McGrath, 1972; McGrath, 1961).

Perceptions of Student Personnel Services

Consistent with the experience of any emerging profession, student services administration has come into its share of criticism and introspection. Changes in education and society have been reflected in the field of student personnel. Much has been written by educators, practitioners, and others, commenting on, and calling for, reanalysis and redirection of the function (McConnell, 1970;

Hodgkinson, 1970; Richard, 1972; Lavender, 1972; Penney, 1972).

The perceptions of student personnel practitioners and student services functions by other campus groups has been the subject of much recent research. In a study which compared students and student personnel worker perceptions of the Purdue University environment, Noeth and Dye (1973) found one or more differing perceptions on twenty-five items of a forty-one item questionnaire. Using an instrument consisting of four scales, they sampled students and student personnel staff. General agreement was found between the two groups on the Academic scale (teaching methods, relevance of course work, innovation and student interest in courses); agreement on fewer than 50 percent of the items on the Community scale (living environment, friendliness, adjustment); and little agreement on the Awareness scale (degree of individual freedom, administrative controls on conduct, channels for communicating concerns). However, the greatest difference was found in the Personnel Services scale. This scale assessed the student's knowledge of the availability of Student Services and staff, the responsiveness of these to student concerns, and the degree to which students felt that personal and educational needs were being met by student services personnel. On the majority of items of this scale, student services workers perceived themselves as fulfilling necessary and developmental functions in a much greater degree than did students.

In a less recent study of a group of staff and students at Colorado State University, Ivey, Miller, and Goldstein (1967) found considerable disparity in perceptions of the campus environment

among the two groups. The authors concluded that the implications for student services is clear. Staff personnel need to review their perceptions of the campus environment and examine areas where these perceptions differ from those of students. They conclude that if student personnel staff are to function as agents of change on the college campus, clear perceptions of existing student attitudes are needed.

In a similar study, Pascarella (1974) found differing perceptions of the environment of two large private universities. The study compared the degree of congruence between student perceptions of the college environment and student personnel and academic administrators projections of how students perceive that environment. The purpose was to determine the accuracy of administrative descriptions of the institution as it appears to students. The sample included all academic affairs administrators, all student personnel administrators, and 483 freshman and 410 seniors. Perceptions were measured using a seven-point "semantic difference" scale. Findings suggest that administrators, as a group, have an inaccurate and overly optimistic understanding of the way in which students perceive their institution's environment along two significant dimensions: (1) Intellectual and Creative Dynamism and (2) Institutional Responsiveness versus Bureaucracy. Student personnel administrators also tended to share this overly idealized and inaccurate understanding.

The recommendations of the author bear noting. He suggests a redefinition of the student personnel function, one which would not

be limited to planning and management of non-academic student activities and services. The function should be broadened to include the planning and conducting of student-oriented institutional research, which, among other things, would provide faculty, administrators, and student personnel staff with more systematic and reliable information concerning the ways in which students perceive the institution's educational environment. Additionally, areas would be identified where programs, policies, and practices have been "inconsistent with institutional goals" (Pascarella, 1974).

The literature characterizes student services, variously, as being "involved in an identity crisis," (Rickard, 1972) as needing to "revise their own self perceptions and the perceptions that others have of them" (Brown, 1972) and demanding the "resolution of role conflicts and acceptance of campus power realities" (Penny, 1972). A recent article calls for increased participation with other faculty in institutional programs as well as a clarification of "traditional" student services roles (Penn, et al., 1975).

Perceptions of College Environments and Institutional Vitality

A large number of studies have been conducted in recent years to analyze the campus environment, to measure its impact on campus groups, and to determine how it is perceived by these groups. It is beyond the scope of this review to attempt a discussion of the mass of literature related to this topic. Major studies such as those of Feldman and Newcomb (1969), Astin (1968), and Freedman (1967), have shown that a separate campus environment or subculture does

exist, and that these environments do exert a definite "press" or impact on students, faculty, and others. Factors such as expectation, background, major field, living arrangements, and class standing are important to an understanding of environmental impact, but do not relate directly to this study.

The environment of the campus has been variously defined as "any characteristic of the college that constitutes a potential stimulus for the student," (Astin, 1968); and "characteristics, events, and practices of a campus which constitutes an educational press upon the awareness of students, faculty, and staff" (Pace, 1961). Implied in the term, Environment, is the notion, as Hartnett (1974) states, that there exists an environment, i.e., a common, mutually-perceived set of conditions that influence the members of the academic community. Hartnett notes, "The term environment is seldom qualified by the phrase 'as seen through the eyes of the student, faculty, administrator, etc'"

The preponderance of evidence in recent studies supports the notion that college environments are perceived differently by the various groups on campus. The degree to which these perceptions differ is a matter of disagreement among researchers. In a study on faculty views of the academic environment, Hartnett (1974) obtained responses to the Institutional Functioning Inventory from representative samples of faculty, students, and administrators at a diverse cross-section of American colleges. Two findings were apparent. Administrators had more positive perceptions of the campus environment than did faculty or students. Secondly, with some exceptions, the study suggests a good deal of consensus between the three groups in their responses to the scales of the I.F.I. which would indicate a

common environment. Faculty to administrator correlations were high on eight of the eleven scales. Faculty to student correlations were slightly less similar. Administrator to student correlations showed perceptions to be markedly dissimilar.

The most noteworthy exceptions to the presence of one generally-perceived environment were found (1) in the manner in which students differed from faculty and administrators in the concept of Democratic Governance where students perceived a lower degree of D.G. and (2) the way in which faculty and administrators perceived the institution's Concern for Innovation and overall staff morale where administrators held a more idealistic view.

In summary, Hartnett's study found that comparisons of faculty perceptions with student and administrator perceptions suggested the presence of a common environment on the campuses studied rather than different environments depending upon the group reporting. Group membership did, however, substantially influence the dimensions of Democratic Governance, Concern for Innovation, and Institutional Esprit.

A study of institutional vitality at the University of Northern Colorado (Worden, McCary, 1973) produced similar results. The Institutional Functioning Inventory was administered to faculty and administrators in an attempt to answer two study questions: (1) How do faculty and administrators at the University of Colorado view the institution when compared to normative IFI data, and (2) is there a difference in the perceptions of the University between these two groups? The study concluded that compared to the national normative data, UNC possessed less vitality in three dimensions (Concern

for Undergraduate Learning, Self-Study and Planning, and Concern for Innovation). However, the University scored higher on the dimension of Democratic Governance than national norms. No significant differences were found with national norms on the other seven scales.

More relevant to the present study were the significant differences found between faculty and administrators on the Freedom and Human Diversity scales which indicated the administrators perceiving the University as having greater vitality than faculty. As suggested by Hartnett's study above, a generally mutually-perceived environment existed on the UNC campus with no significant differences existing between the two groups on the other nine scales on the IFI.

A replication of this study conducted on the same campus (Harris, 1974) found higher vitality ratings in two dimensions, Human Diversity and Concern for Innovation than in 1971. Students (not sampled in earlier study) rated only one scale significantly higher and rated six scales lower than either faculty or administrators.

Results suggested that the University had made "limited progress toward institutional goals." Improvement was needed, however, in such areas as undergraduate education, academic advising, student involvement in governance, and communication between groups.

Further support for the existence of divergent perceptions among campus groups was found in a study of six private liberal arts colleges (Wise, 1969). Presidents and trustee-board members of the

colleges studied were found to have little sense of the attitudes and opinions held by faculty and students. As a result, their decisions "lacked authenticity for the college community" they represented. In the interviews conducted by the author on campuses in the study, perceptions of purposes and prospects for college expressed by presidents, faculty, and students were sufficiently different as to sustain the view that "these were divided communities." Few faculty and students shared the president's perceptions of restraints imposed on the colleges by financial limitations or other external pressures. Nor were most presidents aware of the frustrations of students and faculty with respect to the exercise of initiative and freedom. The author concludes that, until the various groups on these campuses achieve a higher degree of shared perceptions, there is small prospect that these colleges will function as communities. Significant to the present study is the author's observation that:

The disparity between the statements of presidents and trustees, and the firsthand knowledge of faculty and students about the condition of their college has made meaningful discussion difficult (on these campuses) and has thus blocked the development of internal support for the college.

(Wise, 1969)

The existence of differing perceptions between certain administrative personnel and other significant campus groups was shown by a study of students, faculty, and admissions officers of a two-year and a four-year college (Donato, 1969). The study was designed to determine if the admissions officers' perceptions of the campus environment accurately represented that environment. Subjects were tested by the College Characteristics Index (Pace and Stern, 1958)

on items of policy, impression, procedure, attitude, and activity. Results showed the representation of the colleges by the admissions officers differing greatly from perceptions by faculty and students, with the admissions officer tending to exaggerate the positive attributes of the college environments. The author suggests that admissions officers may be, in part, responsible for some unrealistic expectations of colleges held by incoming seniors.

Summary

While a review of the literature indicates some disagreement in the matter, the weight of evidence indicates that there exists on the college campus, not one generally mutually-perceived environment, but divergent perceptions of that environment differing according to membership in, at least, three significant campus groups; faculty, students, and administrators. Even in those studies which argue for a common environment (Hartlett, 1974; Worden & McCary, 1973), some significant differences of perception were found in isolated areas. More common are studies which report differences varying from occasional to substantial (Pascarella, 1974; Wise, 1969; Donato, 1969). While reporting the existence of divergent environmental perceptions, authors of reviewed studies did not test the influence these diverged perceptions had on the vitality or ability of the institution to function optimally though several advanced the notion that such may be the case (Donato, 1969; Wise, 1969; Cheit, 1971).

As much as anywhere on the American college campus, the crisis of identity and differing perceptions has been apparent

in the student services function. Opinions from observers and practitioners range from mild to strong concern over the lack of agreement and understanding of the function among campus groups (Hodgkinson, 1970; Penney, 1972; Noeth and Nye, 1973). Studies would seem to indicate a need for greater clarity of the role student services has in the overall mission of the institution as well as improved methods of communicating that role to all the campus constituencies.

The private liberal arts college, in a manner similar to student services, also faces an identity crisis. In a secular society that continues to be strongly career and vocationally oriented, the liberal arts college, especially the church-related institution, is under great tension to establish and maintain a clear identity. Major studies by Earl Cheit (1971), Astin (1972), and others note the pressures, created by financial and enrollment problems, to loosen denominational ties, broaden course offerings, and attempt to be "all things to all people." Yet evidence seems to indicate that this very blurring of identity and mission may be at the heart of the problem (Cheit, 1971; Mayhew, 1962; McGrath, 1972; MacKenzie & Pattillo, 1966).

It seems evident that, in each of the areas concerned, a real need for an awareness of campus perceptions exists. In addition, an understanding of the source and dynamics of these perceptions will aid in finding answers to many of the problems facing this facet of American higher education.

Institutional Functioning Inventory

The Institutional Functioning Inventory, (IFI) the perceptual measure used throughout this research, was developed by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

The IFI falls under the general category of survey instruments designed to assess the college and university environment. The method most frequently employed has been to ask members of the campus setting to report their impressions or perceptions of what their institution is like. Two well known examples of this technique are the College and University Environment Scales (Pace, 1963), and the College Characteristics Index (Stern, 1958). These instruments, however, measure the perceptions of students only. There are features of the college environment for which the student is not the best, or at least not the only, appropriate reporter. Other members of the campus constituency, e.g., faculty and administration, would hold views useful to assess. The IFI was developed specifically with this purpose in mind (Centra, Hartnett, Peterson, 1970).

While the IFI was developed primarily as an instrument for institutional self-study, it is also useful for intercollege comparisons. Peterson notes:

Students of higher education may find the IFI useful in multi-college studies that seek a better understanding of the varying roles of different colleges.... Inter-college comparisons...may serve to reveal differences otherwise not apparent (Peterson, et al., 1970).

The IFI has use not only for basic research, but also to identify

possible problem areas on the campus and provide the data for developing corrective measures.

The IFI contains 132 multi-choice items yielding scores of eleven dimensions or scales, each comprised of twelve items. The instrument measures perceptions by the faculty, students and administrators of how the actual functions of the college are carried out. It provides a means whereby a college can describe itself in terms of a number of characteristics (Peterson, et al., 1972). It is an institutional rather than an individual measure. Individual scores are not a major concern.

The project of which the IFI eventually became a part had its origin in the observations of two officers of the Kettering Foundation who noted that many very inventive ideas and practices spring up in some institutions but are seldom adopted elsewhere. While poor communication is often a factor, even where creative concepts are known, they are often ignored. Because of this lack of acceptance and productive use of new ideas for educational practice, the Kettering Foundation believed that a study should be made of the factors in the academic complex that makes some institutions creative, experimental and adaptive, while others cling to more traditional practice. Initially, the study consisted of conversations with many students of higher education to get their ideas about the factors in institutional life that seem to relate to continuing vitality. The initial study yielded a large volume of data which was then analyzed to find factors related to adaptiveness, experimentation, and creativity (Hefferlin, 1969).

It was found that a more precise and objective measure of institutional characteristics was needed. Officers of Educational Testing Service in Princeton were consulted and Roger Peterson of the ETS staff was named as director of a project to develop and test such an instrument. In 1967, a survey dealing with the concept of institutional vitality was conducted among presidents, deans of students, faculty and student leaders on 307 college and university campuses. Respondents were asked to suggest characteristics that describe a "vital institution." The responses resulted in the identification of ten areas where vitality could be measured.

1. Openness to innovation and experimentation.
2. Concern for sound undergraduate instruction.
3. Participatory campus government.
4. Staff loyalty to institutional objectives.
5. Communication among students, faculty and administration.
6. Intellectual orientation and growth in students.
7. Close student-faculty relationships.
8. Faculty scholarship and research.
9. The nature and quality of the faculty.
10. Institutional involvement in social problems.

Following the development of these measures, two conferences were held to discuss and refine the conceptual basis of the Inventory. The word "vitality" came under fire in both meetings as having emotional overtones which might render it unsuitable. A

relatively neutral phrase was adopted, that of "institutional functioning." It was felt by the conferees that a college might find it easier to accept the idea that it was not "functioning optimally" than that of not being a "vital" institution (Peterson & Loye, 1967).

Subsequent to these two conferences twelve, and then later, eleven scales for the IFI were developed. In 1968, a pretest involving 67 institutions was conducted. Small colleges as well as large were included in the sample. The purpose of the pretest was to provide data for subsequent validation of the scales. All colleges were asked to administer the test to their faculty, with students and administrators optional. An item analysis was conducted which resulted in the following eleven scales which comprise the present instrument (Peterson, 1970):

(IAE) Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum: the availability of activities and opportunities for intellectual and aesthetic stimulation outside the classroom. Colleges with high scores are characterized by their deliberate efforts to encourage intellectual and artistic interests. Low scores would mean a relative absence of such opportunities.

(F) Freedom: academic freedom for students and faculty as well as freedom in their personal lives for all individuals on the campus. High scores imply that respondents perceive themselves as essentially free to discuss topics and organize groups of their own

choosing, to invite controversial speakers, and to be relatively free of college restrictions on their personal conduct and activities. Low scores suggest an institution that places many restraints on the academic and personal lives of faculty and students.

(HD) Human Diversity: the degree to which the faculty and student body are heterogeneous in their backgrounds and present attitudes. A high score indicates that the college is viewed as having attracted students and faculty of diverse social, political and religious backgrounds. A low score suggests a campus community that is relatively homogeneous in faculty and student background and beliefs.

(SI) Concern for Improvement of Society: desire at the institution to apply knowledge and skill in solving social problems and prompting social change in America. A high score indicates that programs dealing with contemporary social problems exist on campus and that campus authorities are committed to the view that the institution should be actively engaged in working to improve social conditions. Low scores imply some combination of disinterest, parochialism, or conservatism in relation to the existing American social order.

(UL) Concern for Undergraduate Learning: the degree to which the college--in its structure, function, and professional commitment of faculty--emphasizes undergraduate teaching and learning. A high score suggests a faculty generally disposed toward personalized teaching of undergraduates, encouragement of active student involvement in the learning enterprise, and institutional rewards for good teaching. A low score indicates either that undergraduate instruction stands relatively low as an institutional priority, or else the perception that, for whatever reasons, the quality of teaching at the college is generally somewhat poor.

(DG) Democratic Governance: the extent to which individuals in the campus community who are directly affected by a decision have the opportunity to participate in the making of the decision. High scores indicate extensive and meaningful faculty and student involvement in institutional affairs, decentralized decision making, and shared rather than hierarchical organizational arrangements. Low scores suggest authoritarianism--authority and power tightly held, typically by an administrative clique in a "top-down" administrative framework.

(MLN) Meeting Local Needs: an institutional emphasis on providing educational and cultural opportunities for all adults in the surrounding area. High scores indicate availability of adult education, job related, curricula; job placement, and vocational counseling services and so forth. Low scores usually reflect traditional purposes and low priority given to meeting local needs.

(SP) Self-Study and Planning: the importance leaders attach to continuous long-range planning for the total institution, and to institutional research. High scores reflect the perception that long-range planning is a high-priority activity for campus officials: that long range plans for the institution either exist currently or are being developed; and that relevant institutional self-studies are being conducted. Low scores indicate a perceived lack of systematic long-range planning and pertinent self-study.

(AK) Concern for Advancing Knowledge: the degree to which the institution--in its function, structure, and professional commitment of faculty--emphasizes research and scholarship aimed at extending the scope of human knowledge. High scores indicate heavy faculty engagement in scientific research. Low scores indicate a low priority, usually reflecting traditional college purposes, given to research and scholarship.

(CI) Concern for Innovation: an institutional commitment to experimentation with new ideas for educational practice. A high score reflects the view that senior administrators are receptive to new ideas, that people are encouraged to innovate and experiment at all levels and that significant changes, in the curriculum, for example, have in fact, been made in recent years. Low scores could imply traditionalism, complacency, or opposition to change in the college community.

(IE) Institutional Esprit: a sense of shared purpose and high morale among faculty and administrators. High scores reflect a feeling of genuine community, loyalty to the institution and satisfaction with its work, open and honest communication among faculty and administrators and respect for the competency of administrative leaders. Low scores suggest antagonism among and between faculty and administrators, low faculty estimate of the worth of the college and poor morale in general within faculty and administrative ranks.

Validity and Reliability of the Institutional
Functioning Inventory

The question of validity concerns the extent to which the institutional dimensions defined by the IFI scales are, in fact, measured by the instrument (Best, 1970). Having earlier defined certain scales that purport to describe how an institution functions, evidence is necessary to show that colleges scoring high on a scale also exhibit other characteristics that are related in concept to the scales. In a study of 37 college faculties, John Centra, Rodney Hartnett, and Richard Peterson, of the research staff of Educational Testing Service obtained responses to the eleven scales of the IFI which were then correlated with three kinds of information:

1. published institutional data;
2. students perception of their college environment;
3. a national study of student protest.

The published institutional data included information such as the number of books in the library, college income per student, and average faculty compensation. Also included were two kinds of college selectivity; Astin's (1965) selectivity (A), which he described as the proportion of applications rejected, and Cass and Birnbaum's (1968) selectivity, which is based on information that measures the scholastic potential of the student body.

Student perceptions of the college environment were identified by the College and University Environment Scales (CUES). The CUES

(Pace, 1963) assesses the college environment along five dimensions: Practicality--emphasis on organization, bureaucracy, material benefits, and social activities; Community--a friendly cohesive campus; Awareness--an emphasis on self-understanding, aesthetics, and events around the world; Propriety--an environment that is polite and considerate; and Scholastic--an emphasis on academic achievement and intellectuality.

The protest data were obtained from a survey of student personnel deans at 859 four-year institutions during the 1967-68 academic year (Peterson, 1968). A questionnaire consisting of 27 items on which student discontent might focus was used. Protest items included such issues as class size, quality of instruction, alleged censorship, rules, food service, dress, discipline, and student-administrator communication.

The data from all three of these sources was correlated with the eleven scales of the IFI. In all but two of the eleven scales--Self-Study and Planning and Concern for Innovation--there was ample correlative support for the concepts which were intended to be measured (Centra, et al.). In addition, Peterson (1970) found that a multi-group analysis produced validity for the Self-Study and Planning scale as well.

In the published material relating to the IFI, Peterson (1970) notes that in the normal measurement situation, "reliability refers to the consistency of a person's scores on a series of measurements". A reliable test then would yield comparable scores upon

repeated administration, leading to a degree of confidence in the measure (Best, 1970). The researcher who uses the IFI is not, however, in the typical measurement situation. The IFI is a group measure rather than an individual measure. For this reason it is necessary to consider the concept of reliability in terms of the responses of the individuals taken together as a group (Peterson, 1970). The essential question in considering the reliability of the IFI is that of "scale homogeneity or internal consistency". In other words, are the items which comprise a given scale actually measuring the subject's perceptions of a single aspect of institutional functioning or are the perceptions the result of a number of different aspects? Such ambiguity would result in meaningless scores. Average scores, for example, might be a result of high concern or emphasis in a certain area of institutional functioning and very low concern in another in the same scale. Thus it was necessary for the developers of the measure to determine the consistency of responses to the individual items of each scale.

Technical data are presented in the manual (Peterson et al., 1970) to substantiate the internal consistency of the measure. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to present in detail the computation and results of the tests of reliability. Suffice it to say that coefficients of correlation (or reliability) were extracted which ranged from a low of .86 to a high of .96. Thus it can be said that consistency of response ranges from "substantial or marked" to "high" (Best, 1970).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology used in testing the hypotheses developed for the study. The chapter describes the institutions and the subjects of the study and the procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data.

Description of Institutions

Significant to the design of the study are the institutions selected to be included. Both from the standpoint of interest on the part of the researcher, as well as the relatively small amount of research available in the area, the small, independent, four-year liberal arts college was selected for study. The state of Oregon provides an interesting and comprehensive cross-selection of independent colleges. Institutions studied range from progressive, non-sectarian, unstructured colleges to the more traditional church-related college. Small colleges with enrollments of 500 and less were included as well as more complex institutions with enrollments of up to 2500.

Following is a list of the colleges included in the study. The schools are described in detail in Appendix D .

Willamette University - Salem
George Fox College - Newberg
Lewis and Clark College - Portland
Linfield College - McMinnville
Pacific University - Forest Grove
Reed College - Portland
University of Portland - Portland
Warner Pacific College - Salem
Western Baptist Bible College - Salem

TABLE I

SAMPLING MATRIX SHOWING SAMPLE SIZE (n)
OF FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS
FOR EACH INSTITUTION IN THE STUDY

	FACULTY	STUDENTS	ADMINISTRATORS	TOTALS
003	7	35	6	48
004	16	31	6	53
005	12	32	5	49
College 006	12	37	3	52
Code 007	25	50	7	82
008	20	36	6	62
009	19	42	8	69
010	7	49	8	64
011	Data Not Available (See Note)			
	118	312	49	479

NOTE: This institution (011) initially Agreed to participate in the study. Subsequently after being included in the design, college officials determined not to distribute study materials.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for the study consist of students, faculty, and administrators selected from each of the nine institutions listed above. Table one gives sample sizes for each group.

Student Sample

From current lists provided by the office of the dean of students or the registrar, full-time junior and senior resident students were identified. Upper-division students were used exclusively in the study. Thus, students had at least two year's exposure to the environment of the institution. Only students living in university-provided housing were included to insure the greatest possible familiarity with curricular and extra curricular programs. These students were numbered and a random sample of fifty was selected using a random number table. A random sample of fifty students was felt to be an adequate representation of the upper-division population of these small institutions (Peterson, et al., 1970). In no case did the sample include less than 15 percent of the eligible population and in the cases of the smaller schools, samples approached 50 per cent of the eligible population.

Although a number of interesting comparisons could be made between various student groups; e.g., sex, major field of study, socioeconomic background and others, no attempt was made for purpose of this study to control these variables. Because the IFI is designed to yield group scores, comparisons are being made between groups of faculty, students and administrators and not individuals.

Thus, variables within the groups are of less significance to this study. Complete and strict randomization of the samples minimized bias which might have occurred with, say, an already assembled group such as a residence hall or class.

Faculty Sample

From lists provided by the office of the dean of the faculty of each institution, full-time, teaching members were identified and numbered. In order to maintain as clear a distinction between the faculty and the administrative sample as possible, faculty members were selected who were designated by the institution as part of the instructional staff having few, if any, administrative duties. Full-time faculty who had been on campus for at least a year were selected to insure familiarity with the overall institutional program. Using a random number table, twenty subjects were randomly selected to participate in the study. In the case of the smaller colleges in the study, the sample approximated the total faculty. In the larger institutions, no fewer than 25 per cent of eligible subjects were included.

Administrator Sample

The developers of the IFI suggest that the administrators sample include those who have major responsibility in an administrative area (Peterson, et al., 1970). Consistent with that recommendation at least the following administrators were surveyed on each campus:

President

Dean of Students

Associate Dean of Students

Dean of Faculty

Director of Admissions

Director of Business Affairs

Director of Development

While actual titles in these areas varied between institutions in the sample, administrative responsibilities were essentially the same.

Research Procedures

Collection of the Data

The initial contact with each institution was with the office of the president. In all but two of the colleges, an appointment was made, the study described, and the cooperation of the institution obtained. In the other two cases, an immediate subordinate was authorized to discuss the study and commit the institution. In each case, a college official was designated to work with the researcher on the data collection. This person, usually the dean of faculty or dean of students, provided the student, faculty and administrator rosters used to select the sample. Two colleges in the study had the services of a computer with a random sample program available for use. This service greatly simplified the sampling procedures at the schools. On eight of the campuses, a specific location was identified where student respondents came to complete the questionnaire. On the ninth campus, after the initial appointment and inclusion in the design, college officials decided to withdraw from the study.

Approximately one week before the scheduled testing date, a memo (see appendix) was distributed through the campus mail to all of the students in the sample. Their cooperation was solicited and they were instructed to report on a specific date during specified hours to a central campus location. In most cases, the location was

the university center or student union or the library. Students came at their convenience and the researcher administered the questionnaire. Faculty and administrative subjects were provided test booklets and answer sheets at their offices with instructions to complete the questionnaire and return it by a certain date. This variation resulted from experience at the first institution tested. It was found that faculty and administrative personnel were not able to come to a central location to complete the questionnaire.

At each institution, it was found that responses on the initial visit were entirely inadequate, the usual response being approximately 15 percent for students and 50 percent for faculty and administrators. The techniques for follow-up varied with the institution as well as the group. In the case of students, a second date was set and another memo sent to the original sample asking for their help (see appendix). Faculty and administrators were followed up by telephone or in person by the researcher and the campus representative. A third follow up effort, also necessary on each campus, consisted of personally contacting each student and requesting that he/she come into a specific office, usually the dean of students', and complete the questionnaire. In most cases, these efforts resulted in a final response of from 62 percent to 100 percent for the student sample. Second follow-up efforts with faculty and administrators resulted in a final response of from 60 percent to 85 percent.

The IFI is essentially self-administered. It utilizes a reusable test booklet and a separate machine-scored answer sheet.

Student respondents complete only sections one and two (items 1 through 72). Faculty and administrative respondents complete all four sections of the Inventory (items 1 through 132) and use a different test booklet than students. The Inventory is taken anonymously with respondent's names optional. When student respondents arrived at the test location, they were given a test kit, asked to read the instructions on the first page and then proceed with the questionnaire. There was no time factor.

Scoring

As earlier noted, the IFI yields scores on eleven scales which describe the respondent's perceptions of the environment of his campus. Responses to seventy-two items are recorded for student subjects and 132 for faculty and administrators. Two types of item format are used. The first is the factual item to which the respondent answers either Yes, No, or Don't Know; an example would be: "Students publish a literary magazine." The second type of item calls for an opinion in the form of a Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree response; for example: "Power here tends to be widely dispersed rather than tightly held." Sections one and three of the booklet (items 1 through 25 and 73 through 95) contain factual items; Sections two and four (items 26 through 72 and 96 through 132) are opinion items.

To allow for the acquiescence response set--the tendency to agree with almost any proposition--about one-third of the items are

stated in such a manner so that a "No" or "Disagree" answer is keyed (counted in the scale score). Scoring is on a unit basis (0-1). If the keyed answer is "Yes" on a factual item, that response is scored 1, "No" is scored 0 and "Don't Know" is regarded as an omit. Likewise with opinion items, either a "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" response (or a "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree") is scored 1 or 0 depending on which is the keyed direction.

Each respondent's scale score, which may range from 0 to 12, is the number of items in the keyed direction. Scores are then averaged to give an institutional (mean) score. Means were calculated on each of the eleven scales for the three sample groups, i.e., faculty, students and administrators, at each institution. As recommended in the technical manual, scores were not computed for respondents who omitted more than four of the twelve items in the scale. They were also omitted in calculating means for that scale. Otherwise, omitted items were given a value equal to the sum of item scores divided by the number of responses (Peterson, et al., 1970).

Consideration was given in the design of the study to the inclusion of a sampling of local community reactions to the degree that the institution was meeting local needs (described by the MLN scale of the IFI). Such an analysis would add another dimension to the study.

Only four of the institutions in the population, however, have an identifiable community where opinion could be realistically

sampled. The remaining five institutions are located in heavily populated areas of Portland and Salem where a community which could be considered "local" to each school would be difficult to identify.

In addition, the dimensions of adult education and job preparation measured by the MLN scale are not a significant part of the programs of the liberal arts colleges in this study.

Analysis of Data

In order to test statistically the hypothesis, the following comparisons were made:

- A. Students with faculty at each college.
- B. Students with administration at each college.
- C. Faculty with administration at each college.
- D. College with college using the total mean scores of all three groups at each college.
- E. Students as a group from all colleges with faculty as a group and with administrators as a group from all colleges.

For each pair of groups, differences between means were tested using a least significant difference test (L.S.D.) and t values computed. Significance levels of .01 and .05 were accepted as indicating degrees of confidence that differences were real (Snedecor & Cockran, 1967).

The hypothesis that significant differences between means of groups on each campus will have a relationship to the functioning

of that institution was also tested. Mean scores of groups on each of the nine campuses were compared with grand institutional means using a two-way analysis of variance test (ANOVA) of values computed. Significance levels of .01 and .05 were accepted as indicating degrees of confidence that differences were real.

The hypothesis that significant differences between campus groups in their perceptions in areas of the campus environment that are of concern to student personnel services will have a relationship to institutional vitality is based upon two assumptions:

1. Scales 01, 02, 03, 04, and 06 measure perceptions in the areas of the campus environment of concern to the student personnel administrator.
2. Student personnel administrators at the colleges in the study have the opportunity to develop programs and policies that will change or influence these areas of the campus environment and thus have an impact upon student's perceptions.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, data from the study are tabulated and analyzed using the research hypotheses as headings to organize the material.

Hypothesis One: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scales for faculty, students and administrators at each college.

Table two is a comparison of mean scores of faculty, students and administrators on each of the eleven scales of the I.F.I. at College 003. The first line in each scale section compares mean scores of faculty to those of students. The second line compares mean scores of students to those of administrators, and the third line compares administrator scores to those of faculty. In interpreting the tables, it should be kept in mind that a mean score of 12.00 is the highest or most positive score possible.

Significant differences were found three times among the three groups at this college. Students scored significantly lower than administrators on the Freedom scale and significantly lower than both faculty and administrators on the Human Diversity scale. On eight of the eleven scales, administrators had the highest mean scores. On all six scales where student responses were collected, that group scored lower than did either faculty or administrators.

While no significant differences were found on scale 04, Concern for Improvement of Society, or scale 09, Concern for Advancement of Knowledge, mean scores for all three groups were lowest on these

TABLE 2

College 003

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	7.42	2.87	Fac/Sdt	.11	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.31	2.45	Std/Adm	1.30	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.66	1.36	Adm/Fac	.96	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	8.85	3.07	Fac/Sdt	1.43	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.05	3.03	Std/Adm	2.45	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	10.16	1.32	Adm/Fac	.96	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	9.42	1.81	Fac/Sdt	2.04	Rej	Acc
	Students	7.60	2.26	Sdt/Adm	2.58	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	10.00	.89	Adm/Fac	.70	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	4.71	3.09	Fac/Sdt	.61	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.11	2.24	Sdt/Adm	.23	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.33	1.21	Adm/Fac	.28	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	9.42	1.71	Fac/Sdt	.88	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.48	2.72	Sdt/Adm	.87	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.50	1.87	Adm/Fac	.07	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	8.85	4.29	Fac/Sdt	1.14	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.05	3.71	Sdt/Adm	1.75	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.83	2.63	Adm/Fac	.48	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	6.57	2.82	Fac/Adm	.20	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.83	1.60				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	7.42	2.99	Fac/Adm	1.00	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	5.50	3.93				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	3.00	2.23	Fac/Adm	.14	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	3.16	2.13				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	7.28	3.30	Fac/Adm	.65	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.50	3.39				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	9.00	1.39	Fac/Adm	.09	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.83	1.22				

two scales. Highest mean scores for this college were noted on scale two, Freedom, and scale three, Human Diversity.

Table three is a comparison of mean scores of faculty, student and administrators at College 004.

Significant differences were noted three times among the three groups at this college. Students scored significantly lower than administrators on the Freedom scale (02) and the Human Diversity scale (03). Differences on the Freedom scale were significant at the .01 level. Students scored significantly lower than did faculty on the Freedom scale.

Administrators at this college had higher mean scores than either faculty or students on nine of the eleven scales. In five of six comparisons involving student perceptions, students scored lower than faculty or administrators.

Lowest mean scores for all three groups were noted on the Meeting Local Needs (07) and Concern for Advancement of Knowledge (09) scale. Highest mean scores for the groups were noted on the Freedom (02) and Institutional Esprit (11) scales.

Table four compares mean scores of faculty, students and administrators at College 005. Significant differences were noted four times among the three groups at this college. Students scored significantly lower than faculty on the Human Diversity scale (03) and lower than administrators on the Concern for Undergraduate Learning scale (05).

Faculty scored significantly lower than did administrators on the Meeting Local Needs scale (07) and the Institutional Esprit

TABLE 3
College 004

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	8.25	2.23	Fac/Sdt	.19	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.35	1.51	Std/Adm	1.94	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.66	1.50	Adm/Fac	1.42	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	9.50	2.03	Fac/Sdt	2.24	Rej	Acc
	Students	8.90	2.03	Std/Adm	3.16	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	10.83	1.16	Adm/Fac	1.50	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	6.43	2.55	Fac/Sdt	1.61	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.38	1.85	Sdt/Adm	1.99	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	7.00	1.54	Adm/Fac	.50	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	5.75	2.06	Fac/Sdt	.32	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.32	2.44	Sdt/Adm	.39	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.33	3.07	Adm/Fac	.98	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	8.87	2.06	Fac/Sdt	.32	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.64	2.44	Sdt/Adm	.85	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.66	3.83	Adm/Fac	.63	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	5.75	3.82	Fac/Sdt	1.24	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.38	3.42	Sdt/Adm	.59	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.83	3.86	Adm/Fac	1.57	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	5.12	1.62	Fac/Adm	.80	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.50	1.64				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	6.31	2.41	Fac/Adm	1.16	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.66	4.22				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	4.12	1.70	Fac/Adm	.23	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.33	2.25				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	7.62	3.63	Fac/Adm	.39	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.33	4.36				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	9.06	4.02	Fac/Adm	.06	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.16	3.48				

TABLE 4
College 005

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	8.16	2.25	Fac/Sdt	.30	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.37	1.96	Std/Adm	1.67	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.00	2.44	Adm/Fac	1.49	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	9.66	1.96	Fac/Sdt	1.23	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.62	2.66	Std/Adm	1.96	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	11.00	.70	Adm/Fac	1.45	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	8.91	1.78	Fac/Sdt	2.25	Rej	Acc
	Students	7.03	2.68	Sdt/Adm	.37	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.60	.89	Adm/Fac	1.28	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	4.50	2.78	Fac/Sdt	.52	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.96	2.60	Sdt/Adm	1.21	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.00	1.87	Adm/Fac	.37	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	10.66	1.23	Fac/Sdt	1.86	Acc	Acc
	Students	9.25	2.51	Sdt/Adm	2.06	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	11.60	.54	Adm/Fac	1.61	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	8.91	3.23	Fac/Sdt	1.15	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.68	3.11	Sdt/Adm	1.62	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.00	1.41	Adm/Fac	.71	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	5.66	1.72	Fac/Adm	2.88	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	8.00	.70				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	4.08	2.64	Fac/Adm	1.30	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.00	3.08				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	3.25	1.65	Fac/Adm	1.12	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.40	2.51				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	6.66	2.64	Fac/Adm	1.50	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.60	1.67				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	8.00	.75	Fac/Adm	2.23	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	11.00	1.00				

scale (11). Low scores were noted for all three groups on the Concern for Improvement of Society (04) and Concern for Advancement of Knowledge (09) scales. Though significant differences were found on both the Freedom and Concern for Undergraduate Learning scales, the highest mean scores for all the groups were also found on these same scales.

Table five compares mean scores of faculty, students and administrators at College 006. Significant differences were noted three times among the three groups at this college. Students scored significantly higher than did faculty on the Concern for Improvement of Society and Concern for Undergraduate Learning scales. Furthermore, these mark the only instances among all the colleges sampled where students had significantly higher mean scores than either of the other two comparison groups. In every other instance among the eight colleges tested, where significant differences were noted between students on the one hand and faculty or administrators on the other, students had lower mean scores.

Faculty and administrators differed significantly in their perception on the Concern for Improvement of Society scale with faculty having the lower mean scores.

Administrators at this college had lower mean scores than either faculty or students on four of the eleven scales. In contrast, students had the lowest mean scores in only one of the six scales where student perceptions were measured.

Highest overall mean scores of the three groups were noted at this college on the Concern for Undergraduate Learning, Meeting

TABLE 5

College 006

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	5.16	1.46	Fac/Sdt	1.03	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.78	1.88	Std/Adm	.50	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.33	.57	Adm/Fac	1.32	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	5.16	2.08	Fac/Sdt	1.03	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.00	2.05	Std/Adm	.54	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.33	2.30	Adm/Fac	.61	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	5.08	2.06	Fac/Sdt	1.71	Acc	Acc
	Students	3.89	2.10	Sdt/Adm	1.42	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	5.66	1.52	Adm/Fac	.45	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	5.25	2.09	Fac/Sdt	2.47	Rej	Acc
	Students	7.00	2.14	Sdt/Adm	.78	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.00	1.73	Adm/Fac	.57	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	9.00	1.47	Fac/Sdt	2.37	Rej	Acc
	Students	10.00	1.20	Sdt/Adm	1.40	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	11.00	1.00	Adm/Fac	2.19	Rej	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	7.66	2.53	Fac/Sdt	.68	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.00	3.07	Sdt/Adm	.91	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	5.33	2.51	Adm/Fac	1.43	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	9.50	1.67	Fac/Adm	.50	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.00	1.00				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	8.58	1.50	Fac/Adm	.94	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	7.66	1.52				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	2.16	1.40	Fac/Adm	.57	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	1.66	1.15				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	9.66	.98	Fac/Adm	.43	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.00	2.00				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	11.00	.85	Fac/Adm	∅	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	11.00	1.00				

Local Needs, Concern for Innovation and Institutional Esprit (where identical high mean scores of 11.00 were found).

Lowest scores among the three groups were noted on the Freedom, Human Diversity and Concern for Advancement of Knowledge. (Very low scores were noted here.)

Table six is a comparison of mean scores of faculty, students, and administrators at College 007.

Significant differences were noted three times among the three groups at this college. Student perceptions differed significantly with faculty and administrator perception only one time, these differences being noted on the Freedom scale.

Faculty and administrators differed significantly in their perceptions of Self-Study and Planning on this campus. Furthermore, these differences were significant at the .01 level. However, mean scores of both these groups were high on this scale. High mean scores were also noted among faculty and administrators on the Institutional Esprit scale. Lowest overall scores of the three groups were noted on the Human Diversity scale.

Similar mean scores among the three groups were found on at least three scales, indicating shared perceptions. These were Intellectual/Aesthetic Extracurriculum, Concern for Improvement of Society, and Freedom.

Table seven compares mean scores of faculty, students and administrators at College 008.

TABLE 6

College 007

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	6.16	1.81	Fac/Sdt	1.03	Acc	Acc
	Students	6.56	1.45	Std/Adm	1.30	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.28	2.13	Adm/Fac	.16	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	6.36	2.09	Fac/Sdt	1.03	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.66	2.25	Std/Adm	.99	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.57	2.57	Adm/Fac	.22	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	5.20	2.14	Fac/Sdt	1.66	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.28		Sdt/Adm	1.41	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	5.57	1.90	Adm/Fac	.41	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	6.64	2.37	Fac/Sdt	.56	Acc	Acc
	Students	6.34	2.06	Sdt/Adm	.06	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.28	2.13	Adm/Fac	.36	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	9.68	1.34	Fac/Sdt	1.74	Acc	Acc
	Students	8.98	1.76	Sdt/Adm	1.86	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.28	1.49	Adm/Fac	1.03	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	6.92	2.78	Fac/Sdt	1.18	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.94	3.66	Sdt/Adm	2.32	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	9.28	2.69	Adm/Fac	2.00	Rej	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	7.92	1.93				
	Adminis.	7.85	1.06	Fac/Adm	.08	Acc	Acc
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	9.16					
	Adminis.	11.28		Fac/Adm	3.03	Rej	Rej
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	3.80					
	Adminis.	4.85		Fac/Adm	1.20	Acc	Acc
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	8.72					
	Adminis.	8.71		Fac/Adm	∅	Acc	Acc
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	10.64					
	Adminis.	11.71		Fac/Adm	1.92	Acc	Acc

TABLE 7

College 008

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	8.15	1.72	Fac/Sdt	.36	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.94	2.20	Std/Adm	1.42	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.33	2.33	Adm/Fac	1.36	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	8.05	2.52	Fac/Sdt	2.88	Rej	Rej
	Students	5.75	3.02	Std/Adm	2.91	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	9.50	2.07	Adm/Fac	1.28	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	7.30	2.40	Fac/Sdt	1.23	Acc	Acc
	Students	6.55	2.03	Sdt/Adm	1.06	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	7.50	1.87	Adm/Fac	.19	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	4.60	2.39	Fac/Sdt	.33	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.83	2.66	Sdt/Adm	1.16	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.16	2.13	Adm/Fac	1.44	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	10.15	1.75	Fac/Sdt	3.89	Rej	Rej
	Students	7.52	2.71	Sdt/Adm	2.46	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	10.33	1.50	Adm/Fac	.23	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	6.55	3.41	Fac/Sdt	1.65	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.97	3.43	Sdt/Adm	2.99	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	9.33	2.25	Adm/Fac	1.87	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	9.00	1.52	Fac/Adm	2.08	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	10.50	1.64				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	7.60	1.98	Fac/Adm	.60	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.16	2.13				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	2.90		Fac/Adm	2.77	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	5.00					
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	8.25	3.12	Fac/Adm	.56	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.00	1.78				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	9.20		Fac/Adm	1.41	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	11.16					

Significant differences were noted seven times among the three groups at this college. Students scored significantly lower than did both faculty and administrators on the Freedom, and the Concern for Undergraduate Learning scales. Furthermore, differences on the latter scale were significant at the .01 level. Very large differences, significant at .01 level, were noted between students and administrators on the Democratic Governance scale.

Faculty and administrators differed in their perceptions to a significant degree on the Meeting Local Needs and Concern for the Advancement of Knowledge scales. Significances at the .01 level were found on this scale as well as low mean scores for both faculty and administrators. High mean scores among the groups were noted on the Meeting Local Needs, and Institutional Esprit scales.

Significant differences occurred among the three groups more often at this college than any of the others in the study.

Table eight compares mean scores of faculty, students and administrators at College 009.

Significant differences were found five times among the three groups at this college. Significantly different perceptions on the Freedom scale were noted between faculty, students and administrators. Student mean scores were lower than either faculty or administrators and were significant at the .01 level. Students also scored significantly lower than did administrators on the Human Diversity and Democratic Governance scales.

TABLE 8

College 009

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	9.47	1.30	Fac/Sdt	.30	Acc	Acc
	Students	9.59	1.53	Std/Adm	.15	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.50	2.07	Adm/Fac	.04	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	9.15	1.64	Fac/Sdt	2.00	Rej	Acc
	Students	8.04	2.15	Std/Adm	3.57	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	10.87	1.35	Adm/Fac	2.60	Rej	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	6.15	2.29	Fac/Sdt	1.00	Acc	Acc
	Students	5.52	2.30	Sdt/Adm	2.72	Rej	Rej
	Adminis.	7.87	1.80	Adm/Fac	1.88	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	4.78	2.46	Fac/Sdt	.08	Acc	Acc
	Students	4.73	2.23	Sdt/Adm	1.30	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	5.87	2.41	Adm/Fac	1.05	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	9.47	1.54	Fac/Sdt	.17	Acc	Acc
	Students	9.38	2.18	Sdt/Adm	1.10	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.25	.88	Adm/Fac	1.33	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	9.10	3.10	Fac/Sdt	1.62	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.64	3.31	Sdt/Adm	2.21	Rej	Acc
	Adminis.	10.37	2.44	Adm/Fac	1.03	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	5.78	2.14	Fac/Adm	.52	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.25	1.90				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	7.63	2.72	Fac/Adm	.22	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	7.87	2.23				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	3.10	1.48	Fac/Adm	.37	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	2.87	1.45				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	8.73	2.07	Fac/Adm	1.77	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.12	1.12				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	9.42	2.83	Fac/Adm	.62	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	10.12	2.35				

High mean scores were noted for the group at this college on the Freedom, Concern for Undergraduate Learning, and Institutional Esprit scales. Low scores were noted on the Meeting Local Needs and Concern for Advancement of Knowledge scales.

Table nine compares mean scores of faculty, students and administrators at College 010.

No significant differences were found on any of the eleven scales of the I.F.I. at this college. Scores of the three groups as a whole ranged from very high on some scales (11.00-12.00) to very low on others (1.57-2.00). However, differences between the groups remained consistently small on each scale. High mean scores were noted on the Concern for Undergraduate Learning, Self Study and Planning and Institutional Esprit scales. Very low scores were noted among all three groups on the Freedom, Human Diversity, Concern for Improvement of Society, and Concern for Advancement of Knowledge scales.

Null hypothesis one was rejected. Significant differences were noted between faculty, students, and administrators on the I.F.I. scales at every college studied except College 010.

TABLE 9

College 010

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF FACULTY/STUDENTS/
ADMINISTRATORS ON EACH OF THE 11 SCALES OF THE I.F.I.
USING THE t TEST TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Scale	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	Faculty	5.71	2.04	Fac/Sdt	.64	Acc	Acc
	Students	6.12	1.59	Std/Adm	.03	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	6.12	1.95	Adm/Fac	.40	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	Faculty	4.71	1.49	Fac/Sdt	1.79	Acc	Acc
	Students	3.69	1.40	Std/Adm	1.09	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	4.25	.70	Adm/Fac	.79	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	Faculty	2.85	.90	Fac/Sdt	.12	Acc	Acc
	Students	2.79	1.27	Sdt/Adm	.42	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	3.00	1.30	Adm/Fac	.24	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	Faculty	2.14	1.46	Fac/Sdt	1.72	Acc	Acc
	Students	3.97	2.75	Sdt/Adm	1.34	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	2.62	1.68	Adm/Fac	.59	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	Faculty	9.85	.90	Fac/Sdt	.48	Acc	Acc
	Students	9.59	1.41	Sdt/Adm	.52	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.87	1.55	Adm/Fac	.03	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	Faculty	8.71	1.11	Fac/Sdt	.87	Acc	Acc
	Students	7.83	2.61	Sdt/Adm	.43	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.25	1.48	Adm/Fac	.68	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	Faculty	7.57	1.98	Fac/Adm	.42	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	7.12	2.10				
08 Self Study and Planning	Faculty	9.00	1.15	Fac/Adm	∅	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	9.00	1.41				
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	Faculty	1.57	1.39	Fac/Adm	.75	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	2.00	.75				
10 Concern for Innovation	Faculty	8.14	3.53	Fac/Adm	.16	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	8.37	2.20				
11 Institutional Esprit	Faculty	12.00	∅	Fac/Adm	.93	Acc	Acc
	Adminis.	11.87	.35				

The following briefly summarizes the data noted at the eight colleges for each of the eleven scales:

1. Significant differences were noted eight times between faculty and students, twelve times between students and administrators and seven times between faculty and administrators at the eight colleges.
2. Significant differences were recorded between faculty and students on the Freedom scale at colleges 004, 008, and 009. No other scale accounted for this many faculty/student differences. Furthermore, the Freedom scale accounted for the greatest number of student/administrator differences at the colleges as well. Colleges 003, 004, 008, and 009 recorded significant differences between students and administrators on the dimension of Freedom.
3. Lowest scores among faculty, students and administrators were noted at the eight colleges on the Concern for Advancement of Knowledge scale: Scores at each college were consistently below 5.00. Generally, higher scores were noted among the colleges on the Concern for Undergraduate Learning and Institutional Esprit scales with mean scores of 10.00 and above at colleges 006, 007, 009, and 010.

4. Scales 01 through 06 of the I.F.I. measure perceptions on dimensions of the campus environment that relate to student concerns. It should be noted that of 28 significant differences identified on the eleven scales at the eight colleges, 22 were found on these first six scales (see Table 2-9). In every case but College 006, students responded more negatively than did either faculty or administrators. In contrast, in all but three colleges (006, 007, 010) campus groups as a whole responded with high scores on the Intellectual/Aesthetic Extracurriculum scale indicating a positive perception of this dimension of student services activity. Seventy-five percent of the colleges studied revealed significant differences or low scores on the Freedom scale. This indicates a less positive, incongruent perception of the personal and academic freedom of the campuses by the three groups.
5. The Democratic Governance scale measures another student-related dimension of the campus environment. Significant differences in perception between students and administrators were noted on this scale in three of the eight colleges (Colleges 007, 008, 009). One of these three, College 008, reported large differences

significant at the .01 level. While differences of perception were present in the above dimension, mean scores as shown on Tables 2-9 nevertheless indicated a generally positive perception of the decision-making process on the campuses studied.

Hypothesis Two: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on all scales (totaled for each group) of students, faculty, and administrators of each college.

Table 10 compares the mean scores of each of the three groups (faculty, students, and administrators) sampled on each campus. For example: the faculty mean score of 7.52 at College 009 is the average of the combined scores on the eleven scales of the faculty sample at that college. Similarly, the "College Mean," is an average of the means of the three groups for each college. The college mean was used to rank the eight colleges in the study. The largest mean (7.79, College 009) was ranked highest and the smallest (6.27, College 010) the lowest. For the purpose of this analysis, the college mean score is a measure of the degree to which the college is functioning optimally (Peterson, 1970). Thus, a college ranked third, for example, would be viewed as functioning more optimally than a college ranked seventh.

Significant differences in perception among the groups were found 7 times among the eight schools (Table 10). However, Colleges 005, 008, and 007, ranked second, third and fifth in institutional functioning, accounted for 5 of the 7 differences with significances at the .01 level in three instances. An analysis of the mean scores of college groups for each scale (01-11) discussed earlier revealed the

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF MEANS OF FACULTY/STUDENT/ADMINISTRATOR GROUPS
ON ALL 11 SCALES (TOTALED) OF THE I.F.I. USING THE "t" TEST
TO INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

	Group	Mean	S.D.	Com- paring	"t"	.05	.01	College Mean	"Vit- ality" Rank
009	F	7.52	1.37	F/S	.11	Acc	Acc	7.79	1
	S	7.48	1.42	S/A	1.66	Acc	Acc		
	A	8.36	1.00	F/A	1.54	Acc	Acc		
005	F	7.13	1.28	F/S	.86	Acc	Acc	7.75	2
	S	7.65	1.92	S/A	.92	Acc	Acc		
	A	8.47	.94	F/A	2.09	Rej	Acc		
008	F	7.43	1.79	F/S	2.20	Rej	Acc	7.47	3
	S	6.26	1.95	S/A	2.92	Rej	Rej		
	A	8.72	1.56	F/A	1.59	Acc	Acc		
003	F	7.45	2.14	F/S	.67	Acc	Acc	7.38	4
	S	6.93	1.80	S/A	1.03	Acc	Acc		
	A	7.75	1.82	F/A	.27	Acc	Acc		
007	F	7.38	1.37	F/S	3.00	Rej	Rej	7.24	5
	S	6.29	1.52	S/A	2.96	Rej	Rej		
	A	8.06	1.04	F/A	1.21	Acc	Acc		
004	F	6.98	1.92	F/S	.56	Acc	Acc	7.02	6
	S	6.69	1.49	S/A	.95	Acc	Acc		
	A	7.39	2.34	F/A	.42	Acc	Acc		
006	F	7.11	.81	F/S	1.68	Acc	Acc	6.91	7
	S	6.44	1.29	S/A	.96	Acc	Acc		
	A	7.18	.86	F/A	.13	Acc	Acc		
010	F	6.57	.82	F/S	2.11	Rej	Acc	6.27	8
	S	5.67	1.08	S/A	2.29	Rej	Acc		
	A	6.59	.83	F/A	.05	Acc	Acc		
011	F	NO DATA AVAILABLE * (See Note Page 39)							
	S								
	A								

greater number of significant differences at Colleges 009, 005, and 008 (Tables 8, 4, and 7). Yet these three colleges ranked first, second, and third, respectively.

Several general observations can be made from data tabulated on Table 10. At every college, student means were the lowest and administrator means the highest. In only one case (College 005) were there significant differences in perception between faculty and administrators. Thus, in every case where large differences in perception were found, students were represented in the comparison group.

Null hypothesis two was rejected. Significant differences between mean scores of group of faculty, students, and administrators were found at Colleges 005, 007, 008, and 010 (Table 10).

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant interaction effect between the mean score of each college and the mean scores of groups of that college.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant interaction effect between group differences on scales significant to student services concerns and the mean scores of colleges.

The statistical design used to test hypotheses three and four is an application of analysis of variance which determines interaction effect. If the means of a group or cell are significantly different than the total mean, the "effect" of that group is said to be significant. The interaction SS (sum of squares) measures this effect quantitatively (Li 1957).

In the data tabulated in Table 11, the absence of interaction effect between the group/college sum of squares indicated the absence of any significant relationships between any of the group means and

the college means. Therefore, null hypothesis three is retained.

There is no significant interaction effect between mean scores of each college and the mean scores of groups of that college, and none between the grand mean scores of the colleges in the study. Since hypothesis four is an elaboration of three, the null is also retained.

There is no significant interaction effect between group differences on scales significant to student services concerns and the mean scores of colleges.

TABLE 11
TWO-WAY INTERACTIONS: GROUP/COLLEGE ANOVA
FOR EACH OF ELEVEN SCALES

Scale	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significant at	
					.05	.01
01 Intellectual Aesthetic Extracurriculum	21.65	12	1.805	.500	Acc	Acc
02 Freedom	80.81	12	6.735	1.352	Acc	Acc
03 Human Diversity	40.04	12	3.337	.794	Acc	Acc
04 Concern for Improvement of Society	78.51	12	6.543	1.102	Acc	Acc
05 Concern for Undergraduate Learning	101.19	12	8.433	2.001	Acc	Acc
06 Democratic Governance	93.43	12	7.787	.773	Acc	Acc
07 Meeting Local Needs	25.43	6	4.24	1.282	Acc	Acc
08 Self Study and Planning	39.77	6	6.629	1.082	Acc	Acc
09 Concern for Advancement of Knowledge	19.44	6	3.241	1.168	Acc	Acc
10 Concern for Innovation	7.98	6	1.330	.175	Acc	Acc
11 Institutional Esprit	33.23	6	5.539	.717	Acc	Acc

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the problem, the objectives and procedures of the study. Findings are stated based upon the data in Chapter IV. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are formulated.

Summary

The problem of the study was to determine if differences in perception of the campus environment existed between faculty, students, and administrators in colleges studied. Further, the study sought to ascertain if congruent perceptions would have a demonstrable effect upon the vitality of the colleges in the study. The perceptions of dimensions of the environment of special concern to the student personnel services administrators were also analyzed for their effect on vitality.

The instrument employed to sample perceptions and to provide a measure of institutional vitality was the Institutional Functioning Inventory (I.F.I.). This instrument is described in detail in Chapter II.

The specific objectives of the study were to determine:

1. if differences exist between students and faculty on each campus in their perceptions of the campus environment.

2. if differences exist between students and administrators on each campus in their perception of the campus environment.
3. if differences exist between faculty and administrators on each campus in their perceptions of the campus environment.
4. if differences exist between faculty, students, and administrators on the total I.F.I. score for each group in each of the eight institutions studied.
5. if there is a demonstrable relationship between divergent perceptions by faculty, students, and administrators and institutional vitality.
6. if there is a demonstrable relationship between divergent perceptions in areas of the campus environment that are of concern to student personnel services and institutional vitality.

The procedures followed to meet the objectives of the study

were:

1. Selection of the colleges to be included in the study. The college population consisted of all the four-year, independent liberal arts colleges in Oregon:

George Fox College, Newberg

Lewis & Clark College, Portland

Linfield College, McMinnville

Pacific University, Forest Grove
University of Portland, Portland
Reed College, Portland
Warner Pacific College, Portland
Western Baptist Bible College, Salem
Willamette University, Salem

(*See note below)

2. Selection of subjects to be surveyed on each campus.
50 junior and senior full-time resident students and
20 full-time teaching faculty were randomly selected
at each college. Additionally, seven administrators
were identified each representing a major responsibility
in an administrative area. Included were:

President

Vice President

Dean of Students

Associate Dean of Students

Dean of Faculty

Director of Financial Affairs

Director of Admissions

*One college initially agreed to participate in the study.
Subsequently, after being included in the design, college officials
determined not to distribute the questionnaire.

3. Administration of the questionnaire (I.F.I.).

Prior to the scheduled visit to each campus, a memo (see Appendix B) was distributed through the campus mail to all students in the sample advising them of the time and location of the survey. In order to secure an adequate response, this procedure was repeated for each college. Faculty and administrator questionnaires were distributed personally with a cover letter.

4. Statistical analysis of the data. The score sheets were scored by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. and the resulting data analyzed at the Oregon State University Computer Center. Between-group comparisons were made using the "Student's t" statistic. Interaction effect was tested using an Analysis of Variance Technique which provided a two-way analysis of variation between groups and colleges. All differences were tested at the .05 and .01 levels of significance.

FINDINGS

Relationship of Vitality to Shared Perceptions

A central issue of the study was to evaluate the notion that congruent or shared perceptions of the campus environment would enable the college to function more effectively as a community and thus more optimally. The findings of the study do not support the notion. When colleges were ranked, lowest to highest, by institutional grand mean scores (scores obtained by averaging the scores of the sampled groups on each campus), significantly different perceptions between the groups were distributed throughout the resulting vitality ranking (Table 10). It is notable, however, that when the colleges were ranked, not by mean scores, but by the number of significant differences for each scale (Tables 2-9), the ranking is essentially inverted. Stated another way, it was found that colleges with the highest mean scores (highest vitality scores) also reported the greatest number of significant differences on the individual scales of the I.F.I.

Differences on Each I.F.I. Scale Between Faculty, Students and Administrators at Individual Colleges

Null hypothesis one was rejected. Significant differences were noted between the groups on the I.F.I. scales at all but one of the colleges studied.

Further analysis of the data for each of the eight colleges studied, however, suggests the presence of a mutually-perceived environment on, at least, seven of the eight campuses. At colleges

003, 004, 006, and 007, significant differences were noted in only three instances between faculty, students and administrators. College 003, for example, reported differences between students and administrators on two of the eleven scales and between students and faculty on only one. This same general pattern was found at Colleges 004, 006, and 007 where significant differences were similarly noted in three instances. In every instance but one, the significant differences noted at the above colleges were found on the six student-related scales. The exception was found at College 007 (Table 6). Additionally, students were more often in comparisons where significant differences were found than were faculty or administrators.

Significant differences were found four times at College 005 and five times at College 009. These differences were, again, found to be on the first six scales of the I.F.I.

Significant differences were noted in seven instances between the three groups at College 008. Five of these were noted between students on the one hand and faculty or administrators on the other. In every case but one, significances were found at the .01 level. At College 008, as was true at the other colleges, significant differences were found more often on the first six scales of the I.F.I. than on the latter five which measure faculty/administrator perceptions only.

College 010 reported no significant differences on any of the eleven scales, the only college in the population to do so.

An analysis of the data at Colleges 003, 004, 007, and 008 show students and administrators differing significantly in their perceptions

more often than did the faculty/student group and the faculty/administrator group. This finding suggests that greater incongruence in perception is present between students and administrators at these colleges than is present between either students and faculty or faculty and administrators.

Differences in Overall Group Scores at the Colleges Studied.

Null hypothesis two was rejected. Comparisons were made between the three major groups on each campus, faculty, students and administrators, and the mean scores on all scales for each subject averaged and tested. Significant differences were found on four of the campuses (Table 10).

It was found at every college that students, on the average, scored lowest, faculty next and administrators the highest. This finding supports those of Hartnett (1974) and Pascarella (1974). In every case where significant differences were found, students were a part of the comparison. This finding could be of importance to student service workers. Evidence of incongruent perceptions between students and administrators should be of concern to those involved in the development of a campus community. This would be especially true where administrators held unrealistically high expectations of student personnel services compared to student expectations.

Relationship of Inter-group Perceptual Differences and Institutional Vitality.

Null hypotheses three and four were retained. They were written to study the interaction or relationship, if any, between inter-group

differences in perception at each college and the vitality or functioning of that college.

No significant interaction effect was found in any of the group/college comparisons (null hypothesis three). The f value tabulated for each scale indicates a non-significant value for each scale. This finding indicates that the variation of perception between the groups at each college did not significantly effect the mean score of the college and, thus, its vitality.

Null hypothesis four was written to test specifically for interaction on scales 01, 02, 03, 04 and 06 of the I.F.I. These scales measure perceptions of the campus environment of specific concern to student personnel services. There were no significant f values found on any of these scales. This finding indicates that no demonstrable relationship was shown in this study between these specific student-related dimensions of the campus environment and institutional vitality as measured by the I.F.I.

Issues Regarding the Church-Related College

Several findings of the study which are not directly related to the above hypotheses bear discussion. While the design of the study did not classify colleges as to their sectarian/non-sectarian or conservative/liberal (progressive) character, evidence from the catalogs of the colleges as well as observations and experience of the researcher make it possible to relate the findings of the study to the above suggested dimensions.

Reference to Table 10 shows Colleges 007, 004, 006 and 010 ranked in the lower half of the "vitality" scale. With the exception of college 004, these colleges would be considered generally conservative, church-related schools. The upper half of the rankings, with the possible exception of College 005, would be characterized as more liberal and non-sectarian.

These findings would tend to imply that the church-related colleges, based upon their institutional mean score, are less vital than the non-sectarian colleges. Consideration should be given, however, to the possibility that the construction of the I.F.I. questionnaire may, in addition to measuring vitality, also be measuring the degree of "church-relatedness". For example, an item from the questionnaire reading "Religious authority has meant some curtailment of academic freedom for students and faculty" is scored negatively. Yet, in a religious college, this condition would not necessarily be considered negative by those who attend and work there. Other questions that related to dress codes, types of off campus speakers, and extracurricular activities might also evoke an "invalid" negative response. While these types of questions represent a small minority of the 132 items, they could adversely influence the college mean score in relation to the stated goals of the institution.

Conclusions and Implications

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions and implications are drawn.

1. It can be concluded that in the population sampled the presence of shared or congruent perceptions of the campus environment does not have a demonstrable relationship with institutional vitality.
2. It can be concluded that in the college populations sampled, students, faculty and administrators have different perceptions of the environment of their respective colleges in a number of areas. This condition was especially found to be true in the dimensions of personal and academic freedom, diversity in faculty and student backgrounds, and campus decision-making. This conclusion is supported by the research of Hartnett (1974) and Donato (1969).
3. The results of this study support the conclusions of recent research in student services administration (Pascarella 1974, Ivey et al., 1967, Noeth and Dye 1972), which found considerable disparity of perception between students and student services workers as noted earlier (Pages 17-20).
4. The results of this study concur with those of Pascarella (1974), Warden and McCary (1973) and Donato (1969) in which administrators and faculty (to a lesser degree) perceived the campus in a more positive manner than did students. The data from the study suggests that students generally held less positive perceptions of the campus environ-

ment than faculty and administrators in the eight colleges studied.

5. Observations while on the campuses and a review of published information about the colleges in the study leave some doubt in the mind of the researcher that the data on institutional functioning in all regards accurately describe the institution. The possible bias in the questionnaire referred to earlier remains an issue. The lack of correlative outside criteria for institutional vitality leaves some question regarding the true "rank" of the colleges.
6. Colleges which describe themselves as conservative and church-related generally had fewer significantly different perceptions, scale by scale, than did the other colleges in the study. Thus, it would seem that these church-related schools, especially College 010 (Table 9), enjoyed a sense of community and singleness of purpose not found on other campuses in the study.

On the scales of the I.F.I. which specifically measure dimensions of the campus environment of concern to the student services worker, the findings suggest dissimilar perceptions between students and the other two groups, faculty and administrators. Of 28 significant differences identified on the eleven scales at the eight colleges, 22 were found on the first six scales, five of which directly relate

to student personnel. In the vast majority of cases (40 of 48 comparisons), students responded more negatively than did either faculty or administrators.

The implications of these findings should be of concern to the student services administrators at the colleges studied. Administrators may be holding idealistic or unrealistic perceptions which are not shared by students. Students in some cases may not feel a part of the campus community. Additional efforts in communication and student involvement seem advisable.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based upon the findings of the study:

1. Additional study is needed to investigate the possibility that the Institutional Functioning Inventory contains items that may cause the church-related college to score lower in relation to other more secular, liberal colleges.
2. Further investigation is needed into the reasons why there were many more significant differences between groups on certain scales of the I.F.I., notably the Democratic Governance and Freedom scales. Such a study could, for example, provide insight into methods to improve communication between campus groups, and increase involvement by all the campus constituency in the college

decision-making process.

3. A study designed to utilize the I.F.I. in sampling the perceptions of students and student personnel staff exclusively would provide data useful to the student personnel administrator. By excluding perceptions of other administrators and faculty, a clear picture could be obtained of the differences that exist between the perceptions of students and the staff that is responsible for providing student programs and services. The availability of such data would eliminate a good deal of the guesswork that often goes into the planning of such programs and services. Additional subgroupings could well be added to the student sample such as class standing, resident/non resident, and course of study.

Additional recommendations not specifically related to the findings of this study are as follows:

1. An in-depth study is suggested which would include two institutions which have been selected because of their opposing character in several major areas. These could include degree of church-relatedness, commitment to a student development "point of view", degree of career orientation and degree of centralized administrative authority. Such a study would be useful in determining the influence of these characteristics

on the perceptions of faculty, students and administrators.

2. Further study should be undertaken to determine the relationship between differing perceptions of the college environment and the vitality of the college using additional data obtained from the individual colleges. Such data should include such dimensions as student enrollment and attrition, financial stability and faculty salaries. The availability of this data for each college would provide the researcher with the opportunity to attempt correlations between these criteria of vitality and the ranking provided by the mean scores of the I.F.I.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, Alexander. 1968. *The College Environment*. American Council On Education.
- Astin, Alexander. 1961. Environmental Assessment Techniques. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 52:308-316.
- Astin, Alexander, and Calvin Lee. 1972. *The Invisible Colleges: A Profile of Small Private Colleges with Limited Resources*. Carnegie Commission Report. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Baird, Leonard L. 1971. The Functions of College Environmental Measures. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 8:83-86.
- Bartley, S. Howard. 1958. *Principles of Perception*. New York, Harper and Row.
- Berdie, Ralph. 1966. College Expectations, Experiences and Perceptions. *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, 7:336-344.
- Bowen, Howard R. 1968. *The Finance of Higher Education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Berkeley, California.
- Bowen, William G. 1968. *The Economics of the Major Private Universities*. Carnegie Commission of Higher Education. Berkeley, California.
- Boyer, E. L. and W. B. Michael. 1968. Faculty and Student Assessment of Environments of Several Small Religiously Oriented Colleges. *California Journal of Educational Research*, 19:59-66.
- Byrnes, James C. and A. Dale Tussing. 1971. *The Financial Crisis in Higher Education: Past, present, and Future*. Education Policy Research Center. Syracuse, Syracuse University Research Corporation.
- Centra, John and Donald Rock. 1970. *College Environments and Student Academic Achievement*. Educational Testing Service. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Centra, John and Robert L. Linn. 1970. On Interpreting Student Perceptions of Their College Environments. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 3:102-109.
- Centra, John and Rodney T. Hartnett and Richard E. Peterson. 1970. Faculty Views of Institutional Functioning: A New Measure of College Environments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30:405-416.

- Centra, John A. 1970. The College Environment Revisited: Current Descriptions and a Comparison of Three Methods of Assessment. College Entrance Exam Board Research and Development Bulletin. Educational Testing Service. Princeton, New Jersey. R870-44.
- Chambers, M. M. 1963. Financing Higher Education. Washington, D. C. Center for Applied Research in Education, Incorporated.
- Chambers, M. M. 1968. Higher Education: Who Pays, Who Gains. Danville, Illinois. Interstate Publishers and Printers.
- Cheit, Earl F. 1971. The New Depression in Higher Education. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Crookston, Burns B. 1972. An Organizational Model for Student Development. Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 10:3-13.
- Doescher, Waldemar. 1963. The Church College in Today's Culture. Minneapolis, Minnesota, Augsburg Publishing House.
- Donato, Donald J. 1969. A Comparison of Admission Officer, Faculty and Student Perceptions of Their College Environment. NDEA Institute Paper.
- Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb. 1969. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco, California, Jossey Bass, Incorporated.
- Freedman, Mervin B. 1960. Impact of College: New Dimensions in Higher Education. Washington Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Gelso, C. J. and D. M. Sims. 1966. Perceptions of a Junior College Environment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 9:40-43.
- Harcleroad, Fred. 1971, ed. 1971. Assessment of Colleges and Universities. Iowa City, Iowa. American College Testing Program.
- Hartnett, Rodney T. and John A. Centra. 1974. Faculty Views of the Academic Environment: Situational vs. Institutional Perspectives. Journal of Sociology in Education, 47:159-169.
- Harvey, Thomas R. 1974. Some Future Directions for Student Personnel Administration. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15:243-247.
- Heath, Raymond P. 1974. The Reality of Student Development Programs in the Private Liberal Arts College. Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administration, 12:16-21.

- Hecklinger, Fred. 1972. Let's Do Away With the Dean. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administration*, 9:317-320.
- Higher Education: Educational Directory 1973-1974. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.
- Hill, Alfred L. 1959. *The Small College Meets the Challenge: The Story of Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges*. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Hodgkinson, Harold. 1970. How Deans of Students are Seen by Others-- And Why. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 8:49-54.
- Huebner, Lois. 1974. *Students, The College Environment and Their Interaction*. Student Development Report. Fort Collins, Colorado. Colorado State University, 11:3.
- Iven, A. E., C. Dean Miller and Arnold D. Goldstein. 1968. Differential Perceptions of College Environments. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 46:17-21.
- Jacobs, Phillip E. 1957. *Changing Views in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching*. New York, Harper and Brothers Publisher.
- Jenny, Hans H. and G. Richard Wynn. 1972. *The Turning Point: A Study of Income and Expenditure Growth and Distribution of 48 Private, Four-year, Liberal Arts Colleges*. Wooster, Ohio, The College of Wooster.
- Karman, Thomas A. 1974. Student Expectations of College: Some Implications for Student Personnel Administrators. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 11:52-59.
- Keeton, Morris. 1971. *Models and Mavericks: A Profile of Private Liberal Arts Colleges*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Li, Jerome C. R. 1957. *Introduction to Statistical Inference*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Edwards Bros. Inc.
- Lindahl, Charles 1967. Impact of Living Arrangements on Student Environmental Perceptions. *Journal of College Student Personnel Administration*, 8:10-15.

- Livix, Harvey. 1971. Analysis of Student Attitude Toward Governance in Liberal Arts Colleges. Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Lynch, Robert C. and William E. Sedlacek. 1971. Differences Between Students and Student Affairs Staff Perceptions of a University. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 12:173-176.
- McConnell, J. R. 1970. Student Personnel Services: Central or Peripheral? *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 8:55-63.
- McFee, Anne. 1961. The Relation of Student's Need to Their Perceptions of a College Environment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52:25-29.
- McGrath, Earl J. 1961. The Future of the Protestant College. *Liberal Education*, 47:45-47.
- McGrath, Earl J. 1972. Survival Kit for the Liberal Arts College. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 6:
- McKenna, David L. 1964. Evangelical Colleges: The Race for Relevance. *Christianity Today*, 8:13-17.
- Maw, Ian E. L. 1974. Student Personnel. Reflections and Projections. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 11:33-36.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. 1962. Destiny of the Liberal Arts College. *Liberal Education*, 48:408-414.
- Michael, W. B. and E. L. Boyer. 1965. The College Environment. *Review of Educational Research*, 35:264-266.
- Netusil, Anton J. and Daniel A. Hallenbeck. 1975. Assessing Perceptions of College Student Satisfaction. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 12:263-268.
- Noeth, Richard J. and H. Allen Dye. 1965. Perceptions of a University Environment: Students and Student Personnel Workers. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 14:527-531.
- Pace, C. Robert. 1962. Methods of Describing College Cultures. *Teachers College Record*, 63:267-277.
- Pace, C. Robert. 1962. Implications for Differences in Campus Atmosphere for Evaluation and Planning of College Programs. Personality Factors on the College Campus. Review of a Symposium. Edited by Robert L. Sutherland. Austin, Texas, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, pp. 45-61.

- Pascarella, Ernest T. 1974. Student's Perception of the College Environment: How Well are they Understood by Administrators. *Journal of College Student Personnel*.
- Pattillo, Manning M. and Donald M. Mackenzie. 1966. Church-sponsored Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D. C. Report of the Danforth Commission. American Council on Education.
- Pealman, John. 1947. *Descriptive and Sampling Statistics*. New York, Harper and Row.
- Penn, J. Roger, Jewell Manspeaker and Brian J. Millette. 1975. The Model Merry-Go-Round. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrator*, 12:222-225.
- Penney, James F. 1969. Student Personnel Work: A Profession Stillborn. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 47:958-962.
- Peterson, Richard E. 1965. On a Topology of College Students. Princeton, New Jersey. College Entrance Exam Board Research Bulletin. RB 65-9. Educational Testing Service.
- Peterson, Richard E., John A. Centra, Rodney T. Hartnett, and Robert L. Linn. 1970. Institutional Functioning Inventory Technical Manual. Princeton, N.J. Educational Testing Service.
- Pode, Hazel C. 1974. Educational Directory-Higher Education. Washington, D. C. National Center for Educational Statistics Office of Education. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. United States Government Printing Office.
- Reeves, Floyd W. 1932. *The Liberal Arts College*. Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago Press.
- Richard, Scott T. 1972. The Role of the Chief Student Personnel Administrator Revisited. *Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 9:226.
- Riesman, David and Christopher Jencks. 1962. The Vitality of the American College. *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Education*. Nevitt Sanford ed. New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Rock, Donald, John A. Centra and Robert L. Linn. 1970. Relationships Between College Characteristics and Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 7:109-121.

- Sanderson, Donald. 1971. Perceptions of Residence Hall Leaders and Non-Leaders. Doctoral Dissertation. Oregon State University.
- Sanford, Nevitt. 1967. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Schoen, W. T. 1966. Campus Climate: Student Perception and Faculty Idealism. Journal of Educational Research, 60:3-7.
- Simmons, Harry E. Jr. 1968. Environmental Perceptions of Selected Groups of Reporters on a Campus Committed to a Peer Group Concept. Doctoral Dissertation. Los Angeles, University of California.
- Snedecor, George W. 1946. Statistical Methods. Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State College Press.
- Stephan, Fredrick, and Philip J. McCarthy. 1958. Sampling Opinions. An Analysis of Survey Procedure. New York, John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stern, George G. 1970. People In Context. Measuring Person-Environmental Congruence in Education and Industry. New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Stern, George G. 1963. Characteristics of the Intellectual Climates of College Environments. Howard Educational Review, 33:5-41.
- Stordahl, Kalmer. 1972. Student Perception of the Campus Environment. Institutional Research Office. Marquette, Michigan, Northern Michigan University.
- Terenzini, Patrick T. 1972. Comparative Study of Perceptions of Student Personnel Programs by Presidents and Deans of Students. Doctoral Dissertation. Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University.
- Trent, J. W. and L. L. Medsker. 1968. Beyond High School. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- Trivett, David A. 1973. Small College Management: Key to Survival. Eric Research Currents. March.
- Underwood, Arthur G. 1971. Changes in the Perception of the University Environment by Students who Participate in two Forms of University Governance. Doctoral Dissertation, Corvallis, Oregon, Oregon State University.
- Vermilye, Hyckman W. 1972. The Expanded Campus: Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

- Walsh, Bruce, and R. McKinnon. 1966. Impact of Experimental Programs on Student Environmental Perceptions. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 10:310-316.
- Warnath, C. F. 1971. *New Myths and Old Realities*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Wicke, Myron F. 1964. *The Church-Related College*. Washington, D. C. Center for Applied Research in Education Incorporated.
- Wise, W. Max. 1969. *The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry into the Process of Collegiate Government*. New Haven, Connecticut, Hazen Foundation.
- Worden, James and Patrick McCary. 1973. A Study of Institutional Vitality at the University of Northern Colorado. *Journal of Educational Research*, 12:8-14.
- Yamamoto, Karn. 1968. *The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A



The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges

ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 • (202) 659-3795

ROGER J. NOSKUYL, Executive Director

Dear Colleague:

The importance of institutional appraisal and self-study is an accepted fact to all of us who are involved in the challenging business of private higher education.

The small college administrator is daily faced with significant decisions regarding institutional goals and identity as well as the ever-present challenge of academic and financial stability. Studies such as the one in which Mr. Snodgrass is engaged will provide valuable data which can be of assistance in the decision-making process.

CASC is interested in all research efforts pertaining to the small college and we want to encourage them. I would like to elicit your cooperation in the successful completion of Mr. Snodgrass' study. Thank you.

Cordially yours
Redacted for Privacy

roger J. NOSKUYL

RJV/rdg

APPENDIX B

January 23, 1975

Dear Student:

I am a graduate student at Oregon State University. For my doctoral dissertation, I am conducting a study of student, faculty, and administration perceptions of the campus environments of nine private colleges in Oregon. In cooperation with college officials, I am surveying the George Fox College campus.

As a junior or senior resident student, you are eligible to participate in the study, and you are invited and encouraged to do so. If you are willing to help, it will require only that you come to the location indicated below during the hours shown and complete a questionnaire taking about twenty minutes.

If you have questions regarding the study, please contact Dr. William Green, Dean of the College.

Thank you.

Cordially,

William Snodgrass

Place: Reserve Reading Lounge - Shambaugh Library

Date: Monday, January 27, 1975

Time: 10 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

TO THE RESPONDENT:

This is a questionnaire for institutional self-study. In it you will be asked for your perceptions about what your institution is like--administrative policies, teaching practices, types of programs, characteristic attitudes of groups of people, and so forth. This inventory is not a test; the only "right" answers are those which reflect your own perceptions, judgments, and opinions.

Confidentiality of responses can be assured by not giving your name on the answer sheet. Comments and criticisms are invited regarding any aspect of the inventory; space is provided on the back of the answer sheet.

DIRECTIONS:

1. **PENCILS.** Use any soft lead pencil (preferably No. 2). Do not use an ink or ball-point pen.
2. **MARK ONLY ON THE SEPARATE ANSWER SHEET.** Please make no marks in the questionnaire booklet, which may be reused.
3. **INFORMATION ITEMS.** Fill in the name of your institution on the answer sheet. Then answer the questions that apply to you on the right-hand side of the answer sheet. Blacken only one answer box for each question. All respondents should answer Item I and each of the Items II - VI that apply.
4. **OPTIONAL QUESTIONS A-J.** A sheet of additional questions designed to provide information for local research purposes may be enclosed in the questionnaire booklet. If so, mark your answers to these questions in the boxes lettered A through J located in the bottom right-hand corner of the answer sheet.
5. **SUBGROUPS.** Instructions may be given for gridding the Subgroup item. If not, please leave blank.
6. **MARKING YOUR RESPONSES.** Sections 1 and 3 consist of statements about policies and programs that may or may not exist at your institution. Indicate whether you know a given situation exists or does not exist by gridding either YES, NO, or? (DON'T KNOW).
 In Sections 2 and 4, the statements are such that different individuals at the college will have different opinions or judgments. Indicate your opinion by gridding either STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
7. **STUDENTS.** Students should answer only the questions in Section 1 and Section 2 of the inventory (statements 1 through 72).
8. **RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION.** Please try to mark an answer for every statement in the inventory (or, for students, in Sections 1 and 2). Leave blank *only* those statements that clearly do not apply to your institution.
9. **MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH STATEMENT.**

The Institutional Functioning Inventory was developed in collaboration with the Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, under a grant from the Kettering Foundation.

SECTION 1

Respond to statements on this page by gridding either:

- | YES (Y)
If the statement
applies or is true
at your institution. | NO (N)
If the statement does
not apply or is not true
at your institution. | DON'T KNOW (?)
If you do not know
whether the statement
applies or is true. |
|--|---|--|
| 1. There is a campus art gallery in which traveling exhibits or collections on loan are regularly displayed. | | 13. When this institution is looking for new faculty, it goes primarily to a few nearby graduate schools. |
| 2. There are provisions by which some number of educationally disadvantaged students may be admitted to the institution without meeting the normal entrance requirements. | | 14. At least one modern dance program has been presented in the past year. |
| 3. There are programs and/or organizations at this institution which are directly concerned with solving pressing social problems, e.g., race relations, urban blight, rural poverty, etc. | | 15. Students publish a literary magazine. |
| 4. A number of professors have been involved in the past few years with economic planning at either the national, regional, or state level. | | 16. In the past two years, administrators or the governing board have countermanded one or more invitations from student groups to controversial speakers. |
| 5. Foreign films are shown regularly on or near campus. | | 17. Faculty promotion and tenure are based primarily on an estimate of teaching effectiveness. |
| 6. There are established procedures by which students may propose new courses. | | 18. This institution, through the efforts of individuals and/or specially created institutes or centers, is actively engaged in projects aimed at improving the quality of urban life. |
| 7. This institution attempts each year to sponsor a rich program of cultural events—lectures, concerts, plays, art exhibits, and the like. | | 19. A concerted effort is made to attract students of diverse ethnic and social backgrounds. |
| 8. There are no written regulations regarding student dress. | | 20. At least one chamber music concert has been given within the past year. |
| 9. Professors from this institution have been actively involved in framing state or federal legislation in the areas of health, education, or welfare. | | 21. At least one poetry reading, open to the campus community, has been given within the past year. |
| 10. A number of nationally known scientists and/or scholars are invited to the campus each year to address student and faculty groups. | | 22. The institution imposes certain restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty members. |
| 11. This institution deliberately seeks to admit a student body in which a variety of attitudes and values will be present. | | 23. One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to try to select students with fairly similar personality traits. |
| 12. Quite a number of students are associated with organizations that actively seek to reform society in one way or another. | | 24. A number of faculty members or administrators from this institution have gone to Washington to participate in planning various New Frontier, Great Society, and subsequent programs. |
| | | 25. There are a number of student groups that meet regularly to discuss intellectual and/or philosophic topics. |

Respond to statements on this page by gridding either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA)	AGREE (A)	DISAGREE (D)	STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.	If you strongly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution.
26. In general, decision making is decentralized whenever feasible or workable.			41. Power here tends to be widely dispersed rather than tightly held.
27. Many faculty members would welcome the opportunity to participate in laying plans for broad social and economic reforms in American society.			42. A wide variety of religious backgrounds and beliefs are represented among the <i>faculty</i> .
28. This institution tends to attract students from a somewhat restricted range of socioeconomic backgrounds.			43. A wide variety of religious backgrounds and beliefs are represented in the <i>student body</i> .
29. Meaningful arrangements exist for expression of student opinion regarding institutional policies.			44. Serious consideration is given to student opinion when policy decisions affecting students are made.
30. An essentially free student newspaper exists on this campus (with accountability mainly to its readership).			45. How best to communicate knowledge to undergraduates is not a question that seriously concerns a very large proportion of the faculty.
31. Little money is generally available for inviting outstanding people to give public lectures.			46. In reality, a small group of individuals tends to pretty much run this institution.
32. Generally speaking, there is not very much contact between professors and undergraduates outside the classroom.			47. Certain radical student organizations, such as Students for a Democratic Society, are not, or probably would not be, allowed to organize chapters on this campus.
33. Senior professors seldom teach freshman or sophomore courses.			48. Governance of this institution is clearly in the hands of the administration.
34. Application of knowledge and talent to the solution of social problems is a mission of this institution that is widely supported by faculty and administrators.			49. Professors get to know most students in their undergraduate classes quite well.
35. A visitor to this campus would most certainly notice the presence of poets, painters, and political activists.			50. In arriving at institutional policies, attempts are generally made to involve all the individuals who will be directly affected.
36. In dealing with institutional problems, attempts are generally made to involve interested people without regard to their formal position or hierarchical status.			51. Most faculty members do not wish to spend much time in talking with students about students' personal interests and concerns.
37. Either tutorials or extensive independent studies are important features of the undergraduate curriculum.			52. The notion of colleges and universities assuming leadership in bringing about social change is not an idea that is or would be particularly popular on this campus.
38. This institution tends to be dominated by a single "official" point of view.			53. Compared with most other colleges, fewer minority groups are represented on this campus.
39. Religious authority has meant some curtailment of academic freedom for faculty and students.			54. Certain highly controversial figures in public life are not allowed or probably would not be allowed to address students.
40. When recruiting new faculty, care is taken to seek candidates with a particular set of personal values.			

Continue responding to statements on this page by gridding either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA), AGREE (A), DISAGREE (D), or STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>55. Eccentric convictions and unpopular beliefs among faculty members are generally not frowned upon by senior administrators or governing board members.</p> <p>56. The student newspaper comments regularly on important issues and ideas (in addition to carrying out the more customary tasks of student newspapers).</p> <p>57. There is wide faculty involvement in important decisions about how the institution is run.</p> <p>58. Because of the pressure of other commitments, many professors are unable to prepare adequately for their undergraduate courses.</p> <p>59. Most faculty members are quite sensitive to the interests, needs, and aspirations of undergraduates.</p> <p>60. Senior administrators generally support (or would support) faculty members who spend time away from the campus consulting with governmental agencies about social, economic, and related matters.</p> <p>61. Faculty members feel free to express radical political beliefs in their classrooms.</p> <p>62. Students, faculty and administrators all have opportunities for meaningful involvement in campus governance.</p> <p>63. In recruiting new faculty members, department chairmen or other administrators generally attach as much importance to demonstrated teaching ability as to potential for scholarly contribution.</p> <p>64. The governing body (e.g., Board of Trustees) strongly supports the principle of academic freedom for faculty and students to discuss any topic they may choose.</p> | <p>65. Students or faculty members whose records contain suggestions of unusual characteristics e.g., bizarre dress, unpopular ideas, etc. are not encouraged to remain here.</p> <p>66. Many opportunities exist outside the classroom for intellectual and aesthetic self-expression on the part of students.</p> <p>67. A concept of "shared authority" (by which the faculty and administration arrive at decisions jointly) describes fairly well the system of governance on this campus.</p> <p>68. Capable undergraduates are encouraged to collaborate with faculty on research projects or to carry out studies of their own.</p> <p>69. Most faculty on this campus tend to be reasonably satisfied with the status quo of American society.</p> <p>70. The governing board does not consider active engagement in resolving major social ills to be an appropriate institutional function.</p> <p>71. Institutional authorities have reprimanded faculty members who have publicly registered their dissent concerning policies of the state or federal government.</p> <p>72. Idiosyncratic or nonconformist student personal styles and appearances e.g., beards, long hair tend to be viewed with disfavor by institutional authorities.</p> |
|---|---|

STUDENTS: STOP HERE

SECTION 3

Respond to statements on this
page by gridding either:

- | YES (Y)
If the statement
applies or is true
at your institution. | NO (N)
If the statement does
not apply or is not true
at your institution. | DON'T KNOW (?)
If you do not know
whether the statement
applies or is true. |
|--|---|---|
| 73. This institution operates an adult education program, e.g., evening courses open to local area residents. | | 85. There are a number of research professors on campus, i.e., faculty members whose appointments primarily entail research rather than teaching. |
| 74. Government or foundation research grants comprise a substantial portion of the institution's income. | | 86. There are a number of courses or programs that are designed to provide manpower for local area business, industry, or public services. |
| 75. Courses are offered through which local area residents may be retrained or upgraded in their job skills. | | 87. Courses dealing with artistic expression or appreciation are available to all adults in the local area. |
| 76. There is a long-range plan for the institution that is embodied in a written document for distribution throughout the institution. | | 88. At the present time, there is greater emphasis on departmental planning than on institution-wide planning. |
| 77. Counseling services are available to adults in the local area seeking information about educational and occupational matters. | | 89. The average teaching load in most departments is eight credit hours or fewer. |
| 78. Reports of various institutional studies are announced generally and made available to the entire teaching and administrative staff. | | 90. Faculty promotions generally are based primarily on scholarly publication. |
| 79. A number of departments frequently hold seminars or colloquia in which a visiting scholar discusses his ideas or research findings. | | 91. The curriculum is deliberately designed to accommodate a great diversity in student ability levels and educational-vocational aspirations. |
| 80. There is a job placement service through which local employers may hire students for full- or part-time work. | | 92. Analyses of the philosophy, purposes, and objectives of the institution are frequently conducted. |
| 81. One or more individuals are presently engaged in long-range financial planning for the total institution. | | 93. Planning at this institution is <i>continuous</i> rather than one-shot or completely nonexistent. |
| 82. Quite a number of faculty members have had books published in the past two or three years. | | 94. Extensive laboratory facilities exist for research in the natural sciences. |
| 83. Facilities are made available to local groups and organizations for meetings, short courses, clinics, forums, and the like. | | 95. Attention is given to maintaining fairly close relationships with businesses and industries in the local area. |
| 84. The institution has a long-range plan based on a reasonably clear statement of goals. | | |

Respond to statements on this page by gridding either:

- | STRONGLY AGREE (SA) | AGREE (A) | DISAGREE (D) | STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD) |
|---|--|---|--|
| If you strongly agree with the statement as applied to your institution. | If you mildly agree with the statement as applied to your institution. | If you mildly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution. | If you strongly disagree with the statement as applied to your institution. |
| 96. There is a general willingness here to experiment with innovations that have shown promise at other institutions. | | | 108. Currently there is wide discussion and debate in the campus community about what the institution will or should be seeking to accomplish five to ten years in the future. |
| 97. Most faculty members consider the senior administrators on campus to be able and well-qualified for their positions. | | | 109. Professors engaged in research that requires use of a computer have easy access to such equipment. |
| 98. In the last few years, there have been a number of major departures from old ways of doing things at this institution. | | | 110. Most administrators and faculty tend to see little real value in data-based institutional self-study. |
| 99. In general, the governing board is committed to the view that advancement of knowledge through research and scholarship is a major institutional purpose. | | | 111. Staff infighting, backbiting, and the like seem to be more the rule than the exception. |
| 100. A sense of tradition is so strong that it is difficult to modify established procedures or undertake new programs. | | | 112. The institution is currently doing a successful job in achieving its various goals. |
| 101. High-ranking administrators or department chairmen generally encourage professors to experiment with new courses and teaching methods. | | | 113. Proposed curricular changes seem to be accepted or rejected more on the basis of financial considerations than of assumed educational merit. |
| 102. Few, if any, of the faculty could be regarded as having national or international reputations for their scientific or scholarly contributions. | | | 114. The curriculum committee of the college concerns itself with basic curriculum issues rather than, for example, merely approving or disapproving new courses. |
| 103. The change that has taken place at this institution in recent years has been more the result of internal and external influences than of institutional purposes (and deliberate planning based thereon). | | | 115. One or more important scientific breakthroughs have been achieved at this institution in the past five years. |
| 104. Generally speaking, top-level administrators are providing effective educational leadership. | | | 116. Close personal friendships between administrators and faculty members are quite common. |
| 105. It is almost impossible to obtain the necessary financial support to try out a new idea for educational practice. | | | 117. In comparison with most other institutions, faculty turnover here appears to be somewhat high. |
| 106. Generally speaking, communication between the faculty and the administration is poor. | | | 118. Almost all ideas for innovations must receive the approval of top-level administrative officials before they can be tried out. |
| 107. There have been few significant changes in the overall curriculum in the past five years. | | | 119. There are no courses or programs for students with educational deficiencies, i.e., remedial work. |
| | | | 120. This institution would be willing to be among the first to experiment with a novel educational program or method if it appeared promising. |

Continue on to next page.

Continue responding to statements on this page by gridding either:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA), AGREE (A), DISAGREE (D), or STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 121. Although they may criticize certain practices, most faculty seem to be very loyal to the institution. | 127. In my experience it has not been easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing. |
| 122. There is a strong sense of community, a feeling of shared interests and purposes, on this campus. | 128. The location of this campus makes it easily accessible to students who live at home and commute. |
| 123. In general, faculty morale is high. | 129. Senior administrators do not consider advancement of knowledge through research to be an important institutional purpose. |
| 124. There is an air of complacency among many of the staff, a general feeling that most things at the college are all right as they are. | 130. This institution considers its most valuable service to lie in educating the upper ten percent or so of secondary school graduates. |
| 125. There is an institutional research agency at this institution which does more than simply gather facts for the administration. | 131. Most faculty would not defend the institution against criticisms from outsiders. |
| 126. The faculty in general is strongly committed to the acknowledged purposes and ideals of the institution. | 132. Laying plans for the future of the institution is a high priority activity for many senior administrators. |

*Comments and criticisms regarding any aspect of the inventory are welcomed;
space is provided on the back of the answer sheet.*

No page 102

APPENDIX D
DESCRIPTION OF COLLEGES IN THE STUDY

Willamette University

Methodist in its beginnings, Willamette University was founded in 1834 at Salem, Oregon as an Indian mission school. In 1853, the school was granted a charter as "Wallamette University". The College of Medicine was established in 1866, the College of Law (first in the Northwest) in 1883, the College of Music in 1973, and the Graduate School of Administration in 1974. The undergraduate population is 1350 students with an additional 400 in the law school and 50 in the graduate program. There are just over 100 instructors on the faculty.

The "key" to the University's educational program is described as its liberal arts core curriculum. There are no required courses although competence in English composition must be demonstrated. Nineteen traditional majors as well as music and theatre are offered. An innovative program in urban and regional government is available to prepare students for careers in these areas. Overseas study programs are also offered.

Willamette is located in the capitol of the state in close proximity to the core of the city and the state capitol buildings. While urban in nature, 70% of the undergraduate students live in university-provided housing. All full-time undergraduates of less than junior status under 21 years of age must reside in university housing. Rules of conduct are very general in nature with the student's life style primarily the choice of the individual. Religious organizations are encouraged on campus but no formal university-sponsored religious programming is offered. A chaplain's office is maintained (College Bulletin 1974-75).

George Fox College

Founded as Pacific Academy by early Quaker settlers at Newberg, Oregon in 1885, the institution received its present name in 1949. Newberg is a small rural town of 7700 founded by Quakers and located in the Willamette Valley 40 miles south of Portland.

George Fox is an independent coeducational liberal arts college governed by a board of trustees elected by the Friends Church. While other denominations are represented on the campus, all members of the campus community are expected to comply with specific religious and moral objectives.

The college consists of nearly 450 undergraduate students and 35 teaching faculty. The catalog characterizes the educational philosophy as set within the framework of Christian higher education and aims to provide liberal arts and preprofessional training in a setting that is "vitaly Christian and intellectually vigorous..." Academic programs are offered leading to the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. These programs include general education, teacher preparation, liberal arts, religious, and preprofessional. A core curriculum of general education courses as well as studies in Bible and religion are required of all graduates.

Well-defined standards of conduct and life-style are set by the college for its community. The use of drugs, alcohol and tobacco are specifically forbidden. Students less than 23 years of age are required to live in college-provided housing where visitation is regulated and closing hours kept (College Bulletin, 1974-75).

Lewis and Clark College

Albany Collegiate College was incorporated at Albany, Oregon in 1867. A lower division was established in Portland in 1934 to help increase enrollment. Four years later, the Albany campus was closed and moved to Portland. In 1942, the college moved to its present site in southwest Portland, taking the name Lewis and Clark. It is an independent coeducational liberal arts college governed by a board of trustees. Historically, the college has been related to the United Presbyterian Church. There are, however, no sectarian or denominational restrictions placed on any of the constituencies of the college. The student enrollment exceeds 2500 (including the school of law) with 130 on the faculty.

Lewis and Clark is described as designed to help its people "learn to live rather than to make a living". It sees the importance of developing healthy and positive moral attitudes and self-responsibility. Strong emphasis is given on the campus to intellectual inquiry and study. Students are encouraged in individualized research and study projects as well as off-campus social and educational involvement. Overseas study programs constitute a significant part of the curriculum.

The curriculum is offered by 21 departments in five basic divisions; Applied Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. The Bachelor of Arts, Sciences and Music are offered. The curriculum is highly flexible with interdisciplinary courses and off-campus studies offered.

Lewis and Clark is a residence-college with a large percentage of its students living in college-provided housing. Single students under 21 years of age are required to live on campus. Standards of conduct are not specifically defined except where violations of state and federal law are involved. Strong emphasis is placed on individual responsibility for conduct and attitudes which will help preserve the freedom to learn (College Bulletin, 1969-70, 1974-75).

Linfield College

Founded in 1849 and chartered ten years later as The Baptist College at McMinnville, Linfield is one of the oldest colleges in the west. It is an independent, residential, and coeducational college which views itself as being "a college of the liberating arts" Though affiliated with the American Baptist church, Linfield today is non-sectarian. The college is located at McMinnville, Oregon, a rural town of 12,000 located some 40 miles southwest of Portland. The present enrollment at Linfield is just under 1000 students with a faculty of approximately 100.

The educational philosophy underlying the Linfield experience is aimed at helping students understand themselves. The college community is characterized as one which assures the freedom to investigate the problems of the world and acquire the skills to help in their solution. The Linfield philosophy places strong emphasis on the importance of the liberal arts in the learning experience. There is also a clearly stated objective of preparation for gainful employment.

The college offers two undergraduate degrees, the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Sciences. Programs leading to these degrees are available in 21 departments with extensive interdepartmental offerings as well. A program called the Linfield Plan allows the student to combine study with employment for year-round enrollment. A required group of "core" courses include those common to the liberal arts with exposure to religion and philosophical thought.

The campus community is comprised of many religious traditions and no credal requirements are imposed on any member of the college. All students, except seniors, are expected to live in college housing. While students are expected to adhere to certain general standards of conduct, there are no specific codes or rules relating to student life-styles (College Bulletin, 1969-70, 1974-75).

Pacific University

Pacific was founded in 1842 as a school for orphans by Congregational missionaries. In 1849, Tuality Academy was chartered and five years later a new charter included Pacific University. A separate school of music was established in 1906 and the College of Optometry joined the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Music in 1945. The University is located in Forest Grove, a rural town of 7000, 22 miles south of Portland. It is independent in control and coeducational with an enrollment of 1200 and a faculty of 89.

The University is described as a voluntary cooperative community. It exists for the students and strives to meet their educational needs.

The liberal arts tradition at Pacific attempts to be more than general education. There is an effort to translate study in specific areas to vocationally useful tools. To achieve this goal, the university has adopted a concept identified as a "liberal arts education with a career focus". The concept includes spending three years in on-campus study and one year in career internship. Students are required to take three interdisciplinary courses in their college career selected from a core of courses called the "Common Inquiry Core of Courses".

Pacific University maintains ties with the Congregational Church. Students are encouraged to worship and live according to their religious commitments. Religious programs and organizations are available on campus. All students except seniors are required to live on campus. Moral and spiritual values are stressed and guidelines for conduct are given. A large number of clubs and organizations are available to the student as well as a number of yearly events of the "traditional college" nature (College Bulletin, 1967-68, 1974-75).

Reed College

Reed College was founded by the trustees of the Reed Institute, created by the will of Amanda Reed, the widow of a pioneer Oregon businessman. It is located in Portland, Oregon, a city of 400,000. The basic character of the college was established by the Reed will which specified that the college be non-sectarian and by the first president whose heavy emphasis on scholarship is still very evident today.

The first catalog stated:

Intercollegiate athletics, fraternities, sororities,
and most of the diversions that men are pleased to
call college life ... have no place at Reed College ...
Only those who want to work, and to work hard ...
are welcome.

The present enrollment at Reed is 1200 students with approximately
120 faculty employed.

Reed College demands of its students a strong intellectual
commitment. They are expected to maintain high academic standards
with independent study and research given high priority. Seniors
must successfully defend a thesis study prior to graduation. Reed
has distinguished itself as providing a liberal arts education
"conforming in all its parts to the highest possible standards of
intellectual excellence".

The academic program of the college is highly structured with
a number of core and interdisciplinary courses required of all
graduates. Teaching at Reed for the most part is conducted in con-
ferences of 15 or 20 students. Analysis, exchange and challenge
of ideas is encouraged.

Life outside the classroom is informal and unstructured. Student
and faculty life styles are unregulated. Informal social events, are
generated largely by students themselves and often take the form of
folk dances, informal singing, films and fairs. Conduct is restrained
only to the extent that it interferes with the freedom of others or the
welfare of the college community (College Bulletin, 1972-73, 1966-67,
1974-75).

University of Portland

The University of Portland is an independent, urban, coeducational institution founded in 1901 by the Congregation of Holy Cross, a Catholic society. In 1967, the society transferred ownership and responsibility for the University to a board of regents composed of clergy and laity of various religious denominations. It is now considered to be a wholly autonomous institution. The university is located in Portland, a city of 400,000. It has an undergraduate population of 1650 and a faculty of 170.

The university describes its educational philosophy as one "dedicated to the "breadth of education rather than narrow specialization". While committed to the liberal arts tradition, professionally oriented programs of study are offered. The university cites as its purpose to provide an intellectual, spiritual, cultural, and social environment that encourages in the student intellectual curiosity and commitment to meaningful service in society.

The university consists of one college, the College of Arts and Sciences, consisting of 10 departments, and four professional schools: Nursing, Business Administration; Engineering; and Education. All students are introduced to a core curriculum which includes the major areas of the humanities and sciences.

There is a strong emphasis on religious life on the campus and a well developed program to support it. While a large percentage of students come from Catholic families, many other denominations are represented. There are chapel and church services available but they are not mandatory. A full-time campus ministry staff is pro-

vided. There are a minimum of student conduct guidelines and these are general in nature (College Bulletin, 1974-75).

Warner Pacific College

Warner Pacific College was incorporated as Pacific Bible College at Spokane, Washington in 1937. The institution's early curriculum was designed primarily for the training of church leaders. In later years, some liberal arts courses were introduced. The school moved to Portland in 1940 and became known as Warner Pacific College in 1959. The institution is independent, governed by a corporation of ministers of the Church of God. The college board of trustees is selected from the church at large. The enrollment is 350 undergraduate students and 22 instructors constitute the teaching faculty.

The college is characterized as a four-year, coeducational, liberal arts college with a careers orientation. The college holds that "true learning is both liberating and relevant". Religion is viewed as a way of life which gives perspective for human learning, relationships and serves as a basis for life-long learning and living.

The general education requirements at Warner Pacific contain an integration of religion, philosophy, the sciences, sociology, psychology, literature, economics, history and political science. All these facets of the program are drawn together in a major college offering called The Culture of Western Man, a 36-hour program. All students pursuing a BA or BS degree are required to complete the course and it is unique part of the college curriculum. In addition to these offerings,

courses common to the liberal arts are offered. Teacher education, pastoral ministries and Christian education are major offerings.

The college is identified as a Christian college and takes a strong personal interest in the spiritual and moral welfare of its students. There is a planned religious and social program with required attendance at regular chapel programs. Codes of student conduct are well established and include proscriptions on alcohol, tobacco, drugs and gambling. All unmarried students except "town students" are required to live on campus (College Bulletin 1974-75).

Western Baptist Bible College

Western Baptist Bible College was established at Phoenix, Arizona in 1935 as an independent, interdenominational Bible institute. It later came under the direction of the Board of Regular Baptists. The institute took its present name in 1946, and in 1969 moved from Oakland, California to a site five miles southeast of Salem, Oregon. The college is controlled by a board of directors elected by the denomination. The board is composed of 21 men, 18 of which must be ordained ministers and all but three, members of churches of the denomination. The present enrollment is 500 students with a faculty of 25.

Western Baptist Bible College is described as having a two-fold purpose--personal and professional. In the personal realm, the college seeks to educate the "whole man", producing spiritual maturity, intellectual competence, cultural, and social awareness, esthetic growth and physical growth. Professional training at the college is directed primarily at church-related vocations.

The Educational program includes, in addition to general education studies, a core of Biblical studies. Three basic degrees are offered; the Bachelor of Theology, the Bachelor of Religious Education and the Bachelor of Science, with majors in history, music and social science.

The college can be characterized as strongly church-related and conservative. Admission is limited to those students who can give "satisfactory evidence of a definite Christian conversion." The faculty are required to sign a doctrinal statement each year. Students are drawn primarily from Regular Baptist churches from western states. Ethical and moral standards are clearly defined and student conduct closely regulated. Religious programs including required chapel and Christian service assignments are a part of college life (College Bulletin 1974-75).