

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

LELAND CALVIN GASSERT for the DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
(Name) (Degree)
in EDUCATION presented on 1-20-71
(Major) (Date)

Title: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE
UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR STUDENT
GOVERNMENT POSITIONS AND OTHER STUDENTS AND THE
EFFECT OF THE ELECTION EXPERIENCE UPON THOSE
PERCEPTIONS

Abstract approved: _____

Redacted for Privacy

Arthur L. Tollefson

The purposes of this study were to determine whether the generally accepted procedure of campus elections as a method of choosing student government representatives (1) appears to encourage the candidacy of students who hold perceptions of the university environment similar to other students who do not choose to become candidates; (2) results in the election of a group of candidates who perceive their environment in a distinctly different manner from other candidates; (3) is an experience which affects the perceptions of the student candidates in their attitudes toward the university; and (4) is an experience which differentially affects the attitudes of student candidates who win in the elections and those who lose.

The study included two groups of male students at Oregon State University. One group included 54 male undergraduates who were candidates for student government offices during the spring quarter, 1970. The comparison group included 67 male undergraduates who were qualified but had not chosen to become candidates.

The two groups were compared on the basis of their responses to the College and University Environment Scales before the election campaign began and approximately six weeks later, four weeks after the elections had been completed.

The data was subjected to statistical analysis to determine the validity of the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales of students who are candidates for student government elected offices and students who are not candidates.

2. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) between student candidates when measured before the election process which would distinguish those who later won or lost the elections.

3. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the

College and University Environment Scales) of students who participate in the election experience from those students who are not candidates.

4. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of the winners of the student government elections compared to the losers of the student government elections, between winners and non-candidates, or between losers and non-candidates.

Significance levels were accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study:

1. Students who chose to become candidates for student government elections differed in their perceptions of the university environment from students who did not choose to become candidates.

2. Students who were ultimately successful in winning elections differed significantly in their perceptions of the university environment from those students who were ultimately unsuccessful candidates.

3. The student election experience did not significantly affect the perceptions of the university environment of students seeking student government office, whether the students won or lost in the elections.

The two major limitations of the study were (1) the comparison group in the study consisted of male undergraduates who were eligible to seek student government offices and does not represent the male undergraduate population at large; and (2) the candidate population in this study is small. When a small population is considered, differences between groups must be relatively large for tests of significance to reach the conventional .05 level.

© 1971

LELAND CALVIN GASSERT

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A Comparative Study of the Perceptions of the
University Environment of Candidates for
Student Government Positions and Other
Students and the Effects of the
Election Experience Upon
Those Perceptions

by

Leland Calvin Gassert

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson for his constant support and constructive criticism throughout the development and completion of this study.

Thanks and appreciation are also extended to the author's graduate committee: Dean Robert Chick, Dr. Lester Beals, Dr. Pat Atteberry, and Dr. William Crooks.

In addition, the author is indebted to Dr. Norbert Hartman for his aid in developing the statistical design for this study.

My sincere thanks to my wife Joyce for her support, encouragement, and understanding throughout my graduate program.

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

1-20-71

Typed by Susie Kozlik for Leland Calvin Gassert

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	4
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	7
Research Hypotheses	8
Definition of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Historical Background	15
The Changing Emphases of Student Involvement in University Governance	21
Student Leaders and Leadership	31
Student Perceptions and the College and University Environment Scales	37
College Student Elections	42
Summary of Reviewed Literature	46
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	49
Criteria for Selection of the Groups	49
Selection of the Candidate Group	50
Limitation Related to the Candidate Group	51
Selection of the Non-Candidate Group	51
Limitations Related to the Non-Candidate Group	52
The Follow-up Procedure	53
Sources of Data	54
The College and University Environment Scales	54
Official University Records	55
Treatment of Data	56
Scoring and Coding Procedures	56
Statistical Treatment of Data	57
Summary	62
IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	64
Findings Related to the Hypotheses Under Investigation	64
Summary of Findings	73

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	74
Summary	74
The Groups Studied	75
The Literature	75
Method and Procedure	76
Limitations	77
Conclusions	78
Discussion	78
Candidates and Non-Candidates	78
Winning and Losing Candidates	80
Recommendations	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	93
Appendix B	95
Appendix C	96
Appendix D	97
Appendix E	98
Appendix F	100

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Groups Studied Compared to Total Invited to Participate	51
2 Distribution of Candidate Group According to Winners and Losers	54
3 Comparative Perceptions of the University Environment of Candidates and Non-Candidates Before Elections	65
4 Comparative Perceptions of the University Environment of Winning and Losing Candidates Before Elections	66
5 Change in Perception of the University Environment of Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections	69
6 Change in Perception of the University Environment of Winning Candidates Compared to Losing Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections	70
7 Change in Perception of the University Environment of Winning Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections	71
8 Change in the Perception of the University Environment of Losing Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections	72

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR STUDENT GOVERNMENT POSITIONS AND OTHER STUDENTS AND THE EFFECTS OF THE ELECTION EXPERIENCE UPON THOSE PERCEPTIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

Students are more involved in the governance of colleges and universities today than at any time in the history of higher education since the medieval universities.

The acceptance by universities of students as "equal partners" in much of the decision making of higher education has brought about a significant realignment in the relationship between students and the traditional decision makers of the university. Katz and Sanford sum up this change when they state:

... one central fact has emerged, namely, that students have arrived as a new power, a fourth estate which is taking its place beside the traditional estates of faculty, administration and trustees. (Katz and Sanford, 1966, p. 397)

The student demonstrations at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1964 marked a turning point in the relationship of students and their universities. (Aceto 1968) That confrontation and those that followed at other institutions were highly visible signs of the widespread dissatisfaction of students with their status in the university community. These events may also be viewed from a world-wide perspective in which "a profound change in relationships between leaders and

followers, between experts and novices, between teachers and students is taking place." (Freedman 1967, p. 189)

The rapid and general acceptance during the last decade of a greater student involvement in university governance has also changed the character of some of the traditional organizations within the university. The character and role of student government in particular has reflected this changing relationship of the student in the governing structure of the university.

Recent years have seen a renewed emphasis upon granting student governments more primary responsibility in such areas as extra-curricular activities, student regulations, and student discipline. (Draft...1970) At the same time, student governments often represent the student population in the broader context of institutional governance. Student governments' influence in this area extends from representation on governing boards to the appointment of student representatives on a wide range of faculty, university, and governing board committees.

In a survey completed in 1967, Williamson and Cowan (1968) found that over 60 percent of the major universities and colleges in this country have student representatives on administrative policy-making committees.

Another aspect of the changing character and role of student governments is commented upon by Van Loon:

Even student governments, often characterized chiefly by their preoccupation with extravagant social weekends, ... and student leaders, formerly seen as "Uncle Toms" serving administration ends by quieting student unrest, are emerging as a new breed dedicated to working for student power and the betterment of society. (Van Loon, 1968, p. 3)

With the rapid expansion of the influence of student governments and the impact of their leaders upon policy formulation in the university, the procedures for choosing student government leaders become more important.

Stroup has leveled criticism toward one aspect of student government election procedures in this statement:

The claim that students need to participate in political action in order to learn how to live in the 'world' is clearly invalid. Experience is a teacher of all things. Cannot a student learn to be the worst sort of wardheeling politician as well as a 'statesman' if he is permitted to enjoy politics devoid of educational standards? (Stroup, 1964, p. 147)

The importance of electing student leaders who hold the same general attitudes as their constituencies toward the university has been stressed by Hand (1938). Allen et al. goes on to declare, "the nature of the elections of student government officers determines the future relationships of students." (Allen et al., 1954, p. 136)

At the same time, Gottlieb and Benjamin (1963) suggest that some students are more readily and extensively influenced by their college experience than others. The need to study the explicit relationships between specific experiences in college and changes in student behavior

is stressed by Berdie. In spite of the need, he points out that such research "is so meager as to be almost nonexistent." (Berdie, 1966, p. 336)

This study is an attempt to consider some of the effects of the election process upon candidates for student government positions at Oregon State University.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The almost universal method for selecting student government leaders is through elections involving the general student population. Little is known, however, of the effects of such an experience upon the students who take part as candidates. In addition, there has been little consideration of whether the present procedures of electing student government officers is producing candidates who reflect the same general attitudes toward the university community as their fellow students.

The problem for this study was essentially twofold: first, to determine if changes of perceptions and attitudes toward the university environment occur among students who seek student government offices as a result of the campaign and election experiences to a different degree than students who are not candidates; second, to compare

the perceptions of the university environment of students who are candidates with those who are not candidates.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study may be summarized in the following statements of objectives:

1. To determine whether students who become candidates for student government offices differ from students who are not candidates in the manner in which they perceive the university environment. Many studies have focused upon the characteristics of student leaders. In considering the growing role of elected student government leaders in the governance of universities, it is important to know whether the election system generates candidates for these leadership positions who are representative of student attitudes generally or whether the present system is producing candidates who view the university environment in a significantly different manner, whether more positive or negative, than other students who have not chosen to become candidates.

2. To investigate whether there are differences in the pre-election perceptions of the university environment between candidates who win the elections and candidates who lose the elections; between those who win the elections and non-candidates; and between those who lose the elections and non-candidates. If candidates represent a continuum of attitudes toward the university environment as indicated by their

perception of that environment, does the electorate tend to choose candidates who perceive the university in a manner significantly different from the other candidates? Are the ultimately successful candidates more likely to be those who most nearly approximate the prevailing non-candidate perception of the university environment, or do they perceive the environment in a way which sets them uniquely apart from both their non-candidate and losing candidate fellow students?

3. To determine whether the election experience has a consistent effect, positive or negative, upon any change in the perception of the university environment on all candidates, both winners and losers. While it may be expected that winners and losers would experience the election process in a different manner because of the effects of victory or defeat, the common experience of the political campaign and the interaction of candidates with various aspects of the university environment may provide a common change in perception. Since the purpose of electing student representatives is to choose representatives rather than to change the attitudes of the candidates, any common effect of that experience upon the attitudes of the candidates is of particular interest.

4. To determine whether the election experience has a different effect upon the perception of the university environment of candidates who win the elections and candidates who lose the elections; upon winners compared to non-candidates; upon losers compared to

non-candidates. Any change in perceptions of the university effected by the election experience may not be apparent when the effect of the election experience upon candidates as a group is compared to non-candidates. The effect of a winning election experience upon student perceptions may be the opposite of the effect of a losing election experience. These opposing effects may cancel each other when considered together. Thus, it is important to determine whether the election experience is a different experience for those who win and those who lose the election.

Significance of the Study

Campus elections, particularly those involving the entire student body for a period of time in campaigns, primary elections, and general elections, are commonly accepted as the appropriate democratic method of choosing representatives for student government and ultimately, university governance. Changes are being proposed to this method such as allowing representatives to be named to student government upon completion of a petition signed by fifty students whom they are to represent. (Alexander, 1969)

Little study has been focused, however, upon whether the present method of electing representatives provides leaders who perceive their university in the same way as do other students who have not chosen to be candidates. At the same time, little is known about the

impact of the campaign and election process upon the attitudes and perceptions of the students who are the candidates. If negative changes in attitude, as reflected in changed perceptions about the university, are occurring, it is possible that some alternative method, such as suggested by Alexander, should be considered.

The importance of the current and future role of student government in university governance is too great to be continued on the basis of a tradition inherited from an earlier university environment without careful consideration of the effects of its processes.

This study should provide some of the empirical data necessary to consider the present widely followed procedure of campus-wide elections to choose student representatives who may vitally affect university decisions.

Research Hypotheses

The following series of null hypotheses were formulated to facilitate statistical treatment of the data.

1. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of students who are candidates for student government elected offices and students who are not candidates.*

* The comparison group used for this study is described in detail in Chapter III page 51

2. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) between student candidates when measured before the election process which would distinguish those who later won or lost the elections.
3. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of students who participate in the election experience from those students who are not candidates.
4. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of the winners of the student government elections compared to the losers of the student government elections, between winners and non-candidates, or between losers and non-candidates.

Definition of Terms

Academic Ability: For the purpose of this study, the cumulative grade point average earned at Oregon State University at the conclusion of winter term 1970 will be considered as the measure of

academic ability.

Candidates: Those male students who were confirmed to be official candidates by the Associated Students Senate Service and Elections Committee were considered in the candidate group for this study. To be eligible for candidacy, each student met the following standards:

1. He must have earned at least twelve hours of credit in his most recently completed term.
2. He must be registered for at least twelve hours currently.
3. He must not be on probation.
4. He must have a cumulative grade point average above 2.00 and not have been on academic probation for more than one term.

Non-candidates: Male students included in this control group met the same criteria as those who were candidates except that they were not candidates for student government offices.

Major offices: Those student government positions for which all students can vote were included in this category. The positions include: President, First Vice President, Second Vice President, and Treasurer of the Associated Students of Oregon State University; Senators at Large in the Student Senate; and President and Board of Directors member of the Memorial Union.

Minor offices: Those student government positions for which less than the entire student body can vote were included in this category.

The positions include: all class officer positions, Student Senate positions from the various schools, and Student Senate positions for the residence halls and for foreign students.

Socio-economic level: The socio-economic level of the parents of students in this study was determined by the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position. A description of this scale is included in Appendix A.

Perception of University Environment: Perception of the University environment is defined by the five scales and two subscales of the College and University Environment Scales. The following definitions were taken directly from the College and University Environment Scales Second Edition Technical Manual (Pace, 1969, p. 11) and should be considered working definitions of what each of the scales and subscales attempts to measure.

Scale 1. Practicality: The 20 items that contribute to the score for this scale describe an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities. There are both vocational and collegiate emphases. A kind of orderly supervision is evident in the administration and the classwork. As in many organized societies there is also some personal benefit and prestige to be obtained by operating in the system--knowing the right people, being in the right clubs, becoming a leader, respecting one's superiors, and

so forth. The environment, though structured, is not repressive because it responds to entrepreneurial activities and is generally characterized by good fun and school spirit.

Scale 2. Community: The items in this scale describe a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty that encompasses the college as a whole. The atmosphere is congenial; the campus is a community. Faculty members know the students, are interested in their problems, and go out of their way to be helpful. Student life is characterized by togetherness and sharing rather than by privacy and cool detachment.

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

questioning and dissent and a tolerance of nonconformity and personal expressiveness.

Scale 4. Propriety: These items describe an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. There is an absence of demonstrative, assertive, argumentative, risk-taking activities. In general, the campus atmosphere is mannerly, considerate, proper, and conventional.

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

Subscale 1. Campus Morale: The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by acceptance of social norms, group cohesiveness, friendly assimilation into campus life, and, at the same time, a commitment to intellectual pursuits and freedom of expression. Intellectual goals are exemplified and widely shared in an atmosphere of personal and social relationships that are both supportive and spirited.

Subscale 2. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-student Relationships: This scale defines an atmosphere in which professors are perceived to be scholarly, to set high standards, to be clear, adaptive, and flexible. At the same time, this academic quality of teaching is infused with warmth, interest, and helpfulness toward students.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A search of the literature indicates that there have not been any studies reported which deal with the problems specifically delineated for this study. Studies and reports which relate generally to the areas of student government, student leadership, and student perceptions of their university environment are reviewed in this chapter.

The organization of the material is as follows: (1) historical background of student government and student involvement in university governance; (2) the changing nature of student involvement in university governance; (3) student leaders and leadership; (4) student perception and the College and University Environment Scales; and (5) student elections.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first organized student government on the university level has been attributed to the thirteenth century medieval universities of Bologna and Paris. Cardozier (1968) indicates that the most complete student control of universities occurred at the University of Bologna during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The structure of the student governmental organization at these universities according to Klopff (1960) was generally built upon "nations" which were essentially self-governing groups of students from a

common country who had banded together for self-protection in their "adopted" country.

The students, particularly in the universities following the pattern of Bologna, controlled all aspects of the university and many aspects of the towns in which they were located. They established all rules and regulations for themselves and their professors, as well as such matters as the amount of rent to be charged by landlords and the handling of all cases of discipline of students whether in relation to a university regulation or a municipal law. (Findlay 1940)

At Bologna, each of the student "nations" elected a councilor, who with the other elected councilors, elected the university rector. The rector at Bologna was required to be a student of at least 24 years of age, have completed at least five years study of law, be unmarried, and designated a secular clerk by the Church. (Cardozier 1968)

The role of student self-government in the medieval universities is summarized by Findlay as follows:

These medieval students did not look upon self-government as an extra-curricular experience, for it was anything but that to them. Self-government was an accepted part of every day's routine uncomplicated by student council constitutions, elections using the Australian ballot, or advice from any sponsor in the person of a dean of men or faculty advisor. (Findlay, 1940, p. 316)

The waning of student power in the governance of the medieval universities, according to Cardozier (1968), was caused by the abuse of this power by the students and specifically by a change in the

economics of the universities. With the recognition of the economic benefits a university brought to a community, local merchants in Bologna and other university centers raised funds to endow professorial chairs. With their economic futures tied to the town, professors were no longer subject to the power of student fees alone, and gradually the faculty gained the controlling position within the university. (Cardozier 1968)

The English universities, which were to be a major influence on American higher education, not only experienced this same swing from student toward faculty control, but also instituted governance over their students' lives through the residential nature of their universities and the supervision provided in the residence halls by the faculty living there. (Cardozier 1968)

One of the earliest experiments in student government in an American college was carried out at William and Mary in 1779. There, the students were allowed to elect representatives to a central body which handled routine discipline and had some functions in setting rules for behavior. (Falvey 1952)

Probably the most liberal of the early American experiments in student self-government was that fostered by Jefferson at the University of Virginia in the early 1800's. Jefferson's plan, according to Falvey (1952, p. 40) "included an honor system for all examinations, control of most student activities, and the handling of ordinary cases of discipline" by its student government.

Brubacher and Rudy (1958) list three primary reasons for the failure of the University of Virginia plan:

(1) The Virginia legislature refused to establish the proposed court system and was unwilling to make the proposed student proctor a justice of the peace.

(2) The majority of the students turned out to be much younger and more unruly than the mature and serious students Jefferson had expected.

(3) The students had a strong code which prevented them from informing on one another.

Oberlin College, founded in 1833, was a pace-setting liberal institution in many respects including the involvement of its students in the administration of the college. It set a pattern followed by many other colleges in granting greater participation to students in college governance. (Findlay 1940)

Klopf (1960) lists Trinity, Yale, and Union colleges as other noteworthy examples of experiments in early forms of student self-government. He indicates that such experiments were based largely upon the Jeffersonian concept that student self-government provided important education for citizenship.

Following the Civil War, many changes were affecting higher education in this country including the rapid growth of universities, the introduction of the elective system, and the influx of German-educated

scholars onto the faculties. (Rudolph 1965) The changes tended toward treatment of students as responsible adults and moved away from some of the harsher in loco parentis practices of earlier years. One of the developments of this era was a number of student self-government plans which, according to Brubacher and Rudy (1958), illustrated the improved relationships between faculty and students.

The growth of extensive student participation in institutional policy-making was effectively limited to only a few institutions until late in the nineteenth century. (Lunn 1957) In a survey completed in 1899, Sheldon (1901) reported five distinct forms of student participation in university and college governance;

- (1) Student courts in conjunction with the honor system.
- (2) Advisory committees to the faculty.
- (3) Committees for the maintenance of order in dormitories.
- (4) Committees of more or less general disciplinary powers.
- (5) Student body associations for general student interests.

According to Lunn (1957) the student personnel movement provided an important spur to the increased involvement of students in university governance, particularly following World War I. The philosophy of the student personnel movement, according to Brubacher and Rudy (1958) was aimed at the development of more educational emphases in such areas as student housing, while directing fraternities and other student organizations into constructive channels, and

stimulating a sense of a responsibility by widening the scope of student government.

After the First World War, student governments became involved in three main areas of responsibility: the maintenance of discipline, regulation of examinations (the honor system), and supervision of dormitory regulations. Some student governments were delegated much authority over student activities while others were closely supervised. (Brubacher and Rudy 1958)

Younger (1931) spoke out against the paternalistic stance of colleges toward their students and supported the expansion of self-government in three areas: first, a decisive voice in matters affecting their own discipline such as the hours fraternities and unions should remain open and when dances should be held as well as their own behavior in general; second, a voice relating to automobile policies and parking; and third, a consultative voice in matters affecting the beauty and cleanliness of their surroundings. He believed that the pursuit of this policy would lead to better discipline and fewer outbreaks.

A joint faculty-student committee approach to the regulation of student activities was reported by Harriman (1937) after a four-year trial period at Bucknell University. In this joint faculty-student committee, Harriman noted that student activities could be brought into harmony with the whole educational purpose of the college and, if desired, be used to effect purposeful change in campus life.

In a survey of 122 institutions representing all types and sizes of colleges throughout the country, Peterson (1943) found that 88 percent of the institutions declared that their students governed themselves and only six percent denied their students at least some form of self-government.

McKown noted the acceptance of student self-government across the country in 1944 in this statement:

In practically all colleges and universities there are found three areas of responsibility: the administration, legally responsible for policies, finances, property, personnel, and publicity; the faculty, responsible for instruction and contribution to existing knowledge; and the student body, through its representatives, responsible for the organization, promotion, and handling of the many extracurricular activities. (McKown, 1944, p. 13)

A survey by the United States National Student Association in 1955 reported by Lunn (1957) that 92 percent of a representative sample of more than 400 campuses had functioning student government organizations.

The Changing Emphases of Student Involvement in University Governance

From the time of Jefferson's experiment at the University of Virginia, student self-government has generally been assigned two primary purposes; foremost has been its purpose as a laboratory for student development in the skills, attitudes, and methods of democratic citizenship and second, it has carried on whatever functions and

responsibilities delegated to it by the administration of the university. (Allen et al. 1954)

Anderson declared the need for practical experience in the area of citizenship training when she stated, "in the complexity of government procedures today, the future citizen must, at all levels of school training, have more training in participation than in the mere memorization of facts about government." (Anderson, 1938, p. 627)

The principal justification for student government according to Hand (1938) is in its ability to turn the college campus into a laboratory where students can learn democracy by living democratically.

President Edmund Ezra Day, in a conference with the members of the student council at Cornell University reported that, "the most important benefit to be gained from the whole program of student government is the carry-over into community life. . . participation in student government may be comparable to a training school for good citizenship." (Student.... 1938, p. 680)

Welsh in speaking for the United States National Students Association stated the long-range purpose in having a student government as, "self-evident; it is to provide students with a practical education in democratic self-government." (Welsh, 1949, p. 67)

The benefits of citizenship training were emphasized by Falvey when she stated, "the most direct purpose of student participation is training in the role of the citizen." (Falvey, 1952, p. 14) She also

listed the development of individual acceptance of responsibility for the success of a group undertaking, the experience of formulating policies and purposes for the community, the opportunity for the expression of student opinion and releasing of student tensions, and the development of leadership on the campus as purposes of student participation.

Mueller (1961) describes three objectives of student government with the most important being citizenship training. The other two are the aiding of campus communication and control and the building of campus morale.

In a sweeping criticism of student government's role in the teaching of democratic principles, Svoboda declares that student governments lack any real power and therefore cannot act as a model of democratic functioning. "The consequences of non-democratic student governments are misunderstandings of democratic theory and processes, cynicism about and mistrust of school officials, and apathy about participation by the students themselves in democratically organized institutions." (Svoboda, 1966, p. 179)

The actual effect of student participation upon decisions of the university has received the attention of students since colonial times in this country.

Leonard (1956) provides a number of examples from early college historical files of the influence of students upon decisions of their institutions from influencing the appointment or dismissal of presidents and

faculty members to petitioning to change the hours during which the college library would remain open.

An early study of student attitudes concerning the effectiveness of student government in changing administrative regulations, curriculum, and other areas of life at Rutgers University was reported by McMahon and Foster (1932). Their study revealed that while freshmen were more impressed than seniors with the effectiveness of the student council, all students felt the council to be the most effective means available for student participation for most purposes.

The use of combination committees of faculty and students was recommended by Hand (1938) for the consideration of problems involving the social regulation of students.

Kelley noted widespread indications of the desire of administrations to seek student opinion, to appoint joint student-faculty-administrative committees and to seek wider functions for the student government in the established administrative system. She noted that, "the traditional college social system seems to be moving into new patterns of relationships, not only student-student but student-faculty and student-faculty-administrative." (Kelley, 1949, p. 238)

Falvey noted two trends in student involvement in university governance in 1952. First, a movement toward community government rather than student government, with active student participation in an increasing variety of administrative concerns, and second, recognition

that student participation is a group process of social action rather than individualistic cooperation. (Falvey 1952)

Educators in the 1950's considered student government as fulfilling two major purposes: (1) the training for democratic leadership and community participation, and (2) the contribution students make to the development of educational programs at the institution. (Lunn 1957)

Lunn considers that the second purpose of student participation is the more important when he states:

If institutional administration is so conceived as to allow students to participate on as wide a basis as possible in policy formulation and their unique substantive contribution is solicited and realized, then the objectives of training for citizenship and inspiring the campus to respect democratic procedures will be satisfied automatically. (Lunn, 1957, p. 7)

The importance of participation in the actual governance of the university is emphasized by Klopff also who states that the purpose of student government is to "provide a means whereby students may organize so as to be able to participate effectively in those functions of a college or university which directly affect their social, economic, physical, and intellectual welfare." (Klopff 1960, p. 47)

Hellerich agrees that while student government has some importance as a model for teaching democratic processes, "it is even more important as a means of effecting a liberalization of the administration structure of a college or university and the relations of students with faculty and administrators." (Hellerich, 1960, p. 275)

In a study of student attitudes toward participation in university administration, Golden (1966) surveyed three institutions in New York State: one public, one private non-sectarian, and one Catholic. She found that students in all institutions were most concerned about having influence upon decision-making which had the most immediate influence on their lives rather than on decisions affecting the lives of future students.

While students have gained increasing responsibility for the management of their own affairs, Williamson stresses that major conflicts do not usually arise from problems of the extracurricular activities. Instead, he explains, controversy stems, "from students' insistence that they participate in policy making and in actual governing of university affairs--as opposed to student's extracurricular affairs--both academic and nonacademic." (Williamson, 1961, p. 378)

Gallo (1964) points out that students are divided on what student government should be. One group, and most common, sees it as a community government, a real part of the administration of the university. A second major position, however, conceives student government to be most effective as a pressure group, lobbying organization, agitator, or simply a mouthpiece of the students.

The demands of students for a greater voice in decision making in the university appears to be part of a new general movement. Aceto calls it a "new mood that is a distinct break with the character of

university life in the post-war decades of the late 1940's, the 1950's, and the early 1960's." (Aceto, 1968, p. 68)

Neff (1968) believes that student leadership has become convinced in recent years that they can no longer operate within the administrative structure of the university. Because of this, he sees students choosing to organize as a separate power bloc to force change in the university from the outside.

The helpless frustration of powerlessness, according to Johnstone is fundamental to the militancy of any group. "At the heart of student militancy, then, is the question of the proper decision-making role of the student within our institutions of higher education." (Johnstone, 1969, p. 206)

The new student activism of the 1960's is viewed by Cutler as a product of their times. "In one generation, virtually all of the elements in our total socio-politico-economic-technological environment have been revolutionized . . . today's college generation has grown up in this revolutionary context." (Cutler, 1966, p. 155) He suggests that the development of trust in the system by students can come only through their increased participation in the system.

Katz, in a review of the Free Speech Movement of 1964 at Berkeley, emphasizes that the student activists receive broad support for their objectives from their fellow non-participating students even though these same students may not support the activist tactics. He

sums up the Free Speech Movement's implications in these words:

It would be missing much of the significance of this protest to think of it primarily in housekeeping terms--deficiencies in channels of communication or in legal arrangements. The fundamental thrust of the student protest was the result of a more or less deep dissatisfaction with the educational process, its content, methods, and personnel, and its inadequacies in meeting the student's developmental needs, including their intellectual ones." (Katz, 1968, p. 404)

While many students and educators are urging greater student participation in the governing structures of universities, Freedman sees the incorporation of students into the structure as a defensive mechanism on the part of the establishment. "If students are brought into the establishment, they are not likely to press their case so forcibly as when they were on the outside." (Freedman, 1966, p. 151)

Bowles (1968) suggests that if students want to achieve real influence on the academic life of their institutions, they must concentrate upon the faculty centers of power. He particularly suggests that students become participants on the departmental level with the belief that nearly all university issues resolve themselves down to departmental issues.

The activist student movement is interpreted by Powell (1969) as a movement to democratize the university. He recommends student control over such areas as social rules, dormitory policies, and student activities. Powell recommends students and faculty sharing power over the curriculum while students, faculty, and administration

determine over-all institutional policy on an equal basis.

Kerlinger voices some thoughts in opposition to greater student involvement in academic governance:

Students should participate in making decisions on those matters that are legitimate to student concerns and that do not infringe on the legitimacy of others. They should participate in decision making on those matters for which they have competence and not on those matters for which they lack competence. Finally, they should participate in decision making only on those matters for which they can be held responsible. (Kerlinger, 1968, p. 46)

Kerlinger includes student discipline, living conditions and arrangements, student publications, and student social affairs as appropriate areas for student decision making. (Kerlinger 1968)

Two principal problems result from granting student groups power in decision making according to McGuire (1960). First, no matter what power is assumed by the student government, it is still the administration that bears public responsibility and legal responsibility for its decisions. Second, the transiency of students makes membership of students on policy committees a hindrance to policy questions which may not be resolved within a single academic year.

Another voice in opposition to student participation is raised by Stroup (1957) who lists the following disvalues of faculty-student committees: (1) the discontinuity of student membership, (2) student incompetency, (3) lack of sufficient student maturity, (4) the limited time of students for committee work, (5) the lack of legal authority of

students, and (6) the over-emphasis by students upon equal power instead of the right decision.

Keyes (1968) believes that a case for student involvement in decision making can best be made on the grounds that student involvement will make those decisions more acceptable to them. His principles of student involvement include that (1) students be given a real vote on real issues, (2) in areas largely of student concern, they should have ultimate control, and (3) the partnership must be worked at to make it effective.

In a survey of disruptive and violent confrontations on the campus during the 1968-69 academic year, Bayer and Astin (1969) found the following:

- (1) Of all four-year institutions in the country, 6.2 percent experienced at least one incident of "violent" protest during the year.
- (2) Of all four-year institutions in the country, 22.4 percent experienced "disruptive" protests.
- (3) Of those experiencing "violent" protests, 72 percent provided students with increased power in the institution. Of those experiencing "disruptive" protests, 69 percent provided students increased power, while of those with no major protests, 58 percent provided increased student power. The increase in student power was usually through greater student representation on university committees or changes in institutional rules and regulations governing students.

Smith (1965) points out that ad hoc leadership groups are currently emerging which bluntly bypass the traditional structures for student participation such as student government, special interest clubs, fraternities and the like.

The effectiveness of official student government groups is being challenged today according to Davis. The effectiveness of student government, he believes, can be enhanced only if it is given the support of administrators by recognizing it as the official voice of student concerns. "This demands real, active, voting participation by students in the highest councils, committees, and policy-making bodies of our colleges." (David, 1965, p. 36)

Student Leaders and Leadership

The study of leaders and of leadership has intrigued educators and others for many years. The studies included in this section have been chosen to represent some of the divergent approaches to the field and to report the findings of those studies which seem most appropriately related to this investigation.

In what is purportedly the first study to survey leadership in a laboratory under standard conditions and with standard procedures, Cowley (1928) tested leaders and followers in several categories including criminals, military officers, non-commissioned officers and privates, and students. He measured such traits as aggressiveness,

self-confidence, intelligence, emotional stability, finality of judgment, tact, suggestibility, and speed of decision.

He found that leaders possess different traits from their followers and that leaders in the different situations, i. e. prison vs. college, do not possess a single trait in common.

Hunter and Jordan (1939) compared a group of "leaders" selected through balloting by fraternities, faculty, and elected leaders and compared them with "nonleaders" of the same academic classes.

They found that leaders were significantly younger than non-leaders, were lighter in weight, and predominantly from fraternities. Leaders' parents were more educated and from a higher social position. Leaders had a higher position in the scale of parental occupational status than did non-leaders. Leaders also worked fewer hours per week on a job.

Compared on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, this study found no differences in neurotic tendencies between leaders and non-leaders, leaders were more "self-sufficient" and dominant, but did not differ from non-leaders in introversion-extroversion. In a measure of attitudes, leaders were more liberal toward the Negro and were significantly more liberal in general than non-leaders.

An example of a number of studies concerning student leader traits is the study of 30 men and women campus organization presidents conducted by Middleton (1941) in which leaders were rated on 24 traits

of The North Carolina Scale for Fundamental Traits by 156 other students. The six highest mean rankings for the total group of leaders were: character, intelligence, persistence, accuracy, sociability and judgment. The six lowest rankings were radicalness, modesty, emotionality, extroversion, decisiveness, and adaptability.

Williamson (1948) studied the extent to which fraternity and sorority members dominated the most important campus positions in student organizations and activities at the University of Minnesota from 1941 to 1944 and in 1947.

He concluded that fraternities and sororities dominated the top campus positions compared to their percentage of the student population at the .01 level of significance in all categories of leadership positions. These positions included governing boards and councils responsible to a membership of 200 or more students, leaders of church groups, leaders of the most active special interest groups, all-university elected positions, leading members of student publications, members of organizations honoring students for extra-curricular activities and chairmen of campus-wide groups.

Leaders, members, and non-members of recognized social, academic, and service student organizations were studied at University of California, Los Angeles, by Hartshorn (1956) to determine whether identifiable personality differences existed for each of the student groups. She found significant differences to exist among the groups

as distinguished by leader, member, and non-member as well as between the social, academic, and service groups on a number of the personality variables measured.

An extensive survey of the literature was reported by Krumboltz (1957) in an effort to determine if evidence exists to substantiate the claim that extracurricular activities make a substantial contribution to student leadership ability. His interpretation of the findings of studies dating from 1900 to 1956 are as follows:

(1) There is no conclusive evidence that high school extracurricular participation has any relationship to adult leadership.

(2) There is no conclusive evidence that the level of high school extracurricular participation carries over to college extracurricular participation.

(3) There appears to be relatively conclusive evidence that college extracurricular participation is indicative of future leadership although the extent of the relationship may depend on other factors such as the occupation of the group involved and the specific criterion used.

In a study of the persistence of leadership, Brewer (1966) followed a group of high school leaders in their subsequent college careers to attempt to determine what, if any, variables influenced their continuation of leadership roles in college. He found that the only difference between those high school leaders who persisted as leaders in college and those who did not was in the size of high school attended. Those

from larger high schools were more likely to persist as leaders.

A comparison of 50 leaders who had served as elected presidents of student organizations or as student government elected officers with 50 non-leaders was completed at Utah State University in 1959.

The findings of this study were that student leaders are more achievement oriented, better adjusted both personally and socially, have greater confidence, are more dominant and responsible, more extroverted, have greater need for esteem, have greater self-control, and greater tolerance and empathy than non-leaders. (Johnson and Frandsen 1962)

Upper-division college fraternity men were studied by Hodges (1953) to determine differences in social, cultural, physical and psychological traits and backgrounds distinguishing leaders from non-leaders. His conclusions were:

- (1) There was a close correlation between fraternity leaders and earlier elective leadership in secondary and elementary schools.

- (2) Leaders were more likely than non-leaders to have a professional or semi-professional occupational preference. When compared on the basis of their father's education and occupation, leaders were more prone to be upwardly mobile than non-leaders.

- (3) Leaders were significantly better students as reflected in a higher grade point average than non-leaders.

- (4) Leaders were younger than non-leaders.

(5) Leaders were both lighter in weight and shorter than non-leaders.

(6) Leaders tend to prefer more intellectually "mature" past-times than non-leaders.

(7) Leaders were significantly more inclined to favor men in public life who are popularly classified as liberals than are non-leaders.

In a study of values, perceptions and characteristics of student leaders compared to non-leaders at Florida State University, it was found that leaders (elected and appointed) did not differ from non-leaders in their perceptions of the university environment as measured by the College and University Environment Scales. Student leaders did have distinctively different value patterns from non-leaders and were different from non-leaders in terms of background, past behavior, and experiences. From these findings, Stillion (1968) concluded that student leaders were not representative of students in general at Florida State University.

Williamson and Hoyt (1952) studied the personality characteristics of student leaders in five classifications and by sex using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Profiles. They found that both men and women leaders in political activities leadership positions differed most (higher scale scores) from all other types of leaders on the largest number of scales.

Their conclusions were that, as a group, student leaders of political activity organizations, particularly those of a radical nature, are different from other student group leaders and could be described as unstable or neurotic.

In a study of social-political action leaders compared with several other categories of leaders, Jansen and Winborn (1968) found some significant differences in student perceptions as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Leaders of social-political action groups were significantly lower on the Community and Awareness scales than all other groups and significantly lower than all but activity leaders on the Scholarship scale.

The difference in perception on these dimensions indicate, according to the investigators, the dissatisfaction of activist student leaders with the present university environment and their desire to see that environment changed.

Student Perceptions and The College and University Environment Scales

The following studies have been selected to demonstrate the use of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) as an acceptable instrument for the measurement of student perceptions of their environment.

Berdie (1966) used the CUES in a study of University of

Minnesota freshmen to consider the differences between their expectations of the university environment measured before beginning college and their actual perceptions of that environment measured six months later. He then related the differences between these expectations and actual perceptions with a variety of reported college experiences to determine whether a correlation existed. Experiences included living arrangements, transportation to and from campus, and activities and organizations of the students.

In comparing activities participation with change scores, he found that non-participants had a greater reduction in scores than the participants. In this study, Berdie found no changes in the Practicality scale. Changes in the Propriety scale were significantly related to students who reported informal discussions with other students and those with experiences with musical organizations. The Community scale changes were related to eight of the 14 activities studied. The Awareness scale was related to five of the 14 activities while Scholarship scores were related to three activities. Berdie provided these conclusions to the study:

This analysis provides relatively little information concerning the dynamics of change or the relationships between reported experiences and change scores. It does provide evidence regarding two things. First, what students report about their experiences are related to their developing perceptions about the university, and secondly, the fact that these relationships can be observed suggests that the instrument used, CUES, has some validity in appraising perceptions students have of their environment. (Berdie, 1966, p. 342)

In a report of the psychometric properties of CUES, Berdie concluded that "reliability coefficients suggest that CUES scores do not present reliable information about individuals, although the data are satisfactory for making group comparisons." (Berdie, 1967, p. 55) His additional conclusions were:

(1) Intercorrelations for men and women show that the scales are relatively independent.

(2) Responses to CUES are not much related to such things as high school percentile rank, ability test scores, college achievement, and scores on personality inventories.

Conner (1968) used the College and University Environment Scales in a study of the entering 1964 freshman class at Southern Methodist University to determine if perception of the university environment six weeks after entering was related to later attrition. While perception of the university environment did not appear to be related to attrition, Conner found a significant difference between the mean scores of male and female freshmen on four of the five CUES scales.

In reporting on studies which had used either the College Characteristics Index (a forerunner of the CUES) or the College and University Environment Scales, Feldman and Newcomb declared, "personality traits, attitudes and values appear not to be as important as is specific location in the college environment in affecting responses to CCI and CUES although they still come into play in influencing

perception of the environment." (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969, p. 128)

Gelso and Sims (1968) used the CUES to determine whether perceptions of the environment are affected by certain characteristics of the persons perceiving the environment at a junior college. They compared students living at home, those living in college dormitories, and faculty. Their conclusions were that all three groups ranked the five scales in the same order but differed in the degree they perceived the environment to contain various characteristics. The faculty perceived significantly more Community dimension than either student group and the commuters and faculty perceived the environment as containing significantly more Propriety than did the residents.

In a study cited earlier in this chapter by Jansen and Winborn (1968), the CUES was used to determine differences in perception among five categories of leaders and between males and females within these categories. Their conclusions were that social-political action group leaders view the university environment in a significantly less favorable light in its Community, Awareness and Scholarship dimensions than other leaders.

Commuter and residence students were compared by Lindahl (1967) using the CUES at a suburban and central city college. He found more differences in environmental perception between the two colleges than between the residents and commuters. In an extension

of this study to seven California state colleges, he found a definite relationship between the proportion of the enrollment living on or near the campus and the environmental perceptions of that college. The greater the proportion of residents, the more likely the students were to describe their college environment as being characterized by Practicality and Community and not emphasizing Awareness and Scholarship. He found no relationship evident on the Propriety scale.

In a study of student and faculty perceptions, McPeck (1967) compared returning students and faculty with new students and faculty at Millikin University using the CUES. She found that returning students and faculty had strikingly similar perceptions of the university and of what the ideal university should be. New students and new faculty members also agreed with each other on what they expected the Millikin environment to be and what they believed to be an ideal university environment. Perceptions differed significantly, however, between male and female students, between classes, and according to academic major.

The CUES was used by Schoen (1966) to compare the perception of freshmen enrolled in a new experimental curriculum and academic calendar with freshmen enrolled in the traditional curriculum and calendar at Hofstra. Both groups perceived their environment similarly and neither group perceived its environment in a similar way as the "ideal" environment perceived by the college's faculty and administration.

Stillion (1968), as reported earlier in this chapter, used the CUES to compare student leaders with the general student population at Florida State University. While these leaders varied in their characteristics and values from non-leaders, they viewed the environment no differently than other students.

College Student Elections

Student elections are widely accepted as the most appropriate method for choosing student representatives for student government leadership positions. This section is used to report some of the viewpoints held regarding this practice.

Karner summarizes his views on student elections when he states, "the best students for the jobs are not elected, and the elections do not decide the issues which are at stake." (Karner, 1956, p. 123)

He suggests certain standards to govern campaigns for student government elections:

- (1) Positions in the student government should be so attractive and so important that the best qualified people on the campus will seek office.

- (2) Candidates should have a clear idea as to the way in which the student government functions, and what the vital issues will be which will face the student government.

(3) There ought to be real opposition among the candidates--at least two parties with party positions.

(4) Campaigns ought to be conducted in such a way that the chief candidates are forced to speak to as large a number of the students as possible.

Kelley reported that two of the most usual procedures for the election of student government officers were election by the school as a whole or election by organized groups within the school. She urged the use of the first method and a "proper education of the student body as to what constitutes good leadership qualities before an election takes place." (Kelley, 1949, p. 63)

Mueller addresses herself to the election process when she states:

While students have readily embraced the concept of participation, they are not yet ready for it in terms of their own structure and methods. Students need to put their own house in order before they ask for a voice in the total enterprise-- Their structures are top-heavy with the cumbersome machinery of yearly elections and procedures unsuited to the loose organization of the campus. (Mueller, 1970, p. 19)

Mueller states that because of the low percentage of students voting in campus elections, "possibly the whole business of the student's voting for his campus officers needs to be re-examined and an entirely new method of participation evolved." She goes on to point out that students may learn both good and bad from an experience in

student government or, "may absorb only the over-emphasis on the thrill of elections and of denouncing old policies in favor of new ones which are never followed through to their political outcomes."

(Mueller, 1961, p. 311)

Skippen in an analysis of elections at Kilgore College states:

There is much to be desired in the traditional system of electing student officers in junior colleges. But the system, which may be characterized as a popularity contest, bears little resemblance to the realities of political processes. What is perhaps even more unfortunate is its irrelevance to the needs of students. (Skippen, 1968, p. 24)

The securing of the election of the best possible candidates and distribution of leadership opportunities as widely as possible are considered to be the two biggest problems associated with campus leadership, according to Falvey (1952). Some approaches to the problems have been the use of a senior court to clear nominees, and the use of a faculty-student committee as an examining board to determine the fitness of candidates.

Stroup (1964) believes that the basic objective of student government is to establish faculty-student relationships which support the fulfillment of the fundamental aim of the university. He indicates that too often, student government becomes a voting apparatus by which individual students can rid themselves of responsibility or satisfy their own needs for status instead of the primary purpose of student government.

Tigar points out in considering student participation in university governance that administration and faculty have little difficulty in choosing their representatives for the various committees but:

I am not sure that a student government geared to electing the man best qualified to run the fruggiest dance is also equipped to elect those who will represent students in the formulation of campus political activity rules or curriculum reform. (Tigar, 1966, p. 173)

The election procedures and experiences surrounding student government elections elicited these remarks from Hand:

False accusations, secret coalitions, and other underhanded means are unfortunately sometimes employed in college elections and campaigns. Such campaigning can scarcely be considered good training for democracy, except from the point of view which holds that by making such mistakes the students will learn for the better. (Hand, 1938, p. 29)

Hellerich points to another potential weakness of student elections and their effect on student government leaders when he states that student government officers "in too many cases have been the representatives of those special interest groups among the students responsible for their election. And, like adult politicians, they regard their responsibility to be that of serving the interests of these groups rather than the interests of the campus at large." (Hellerich, 1960, p. 277)

Anderson suggests that student government should follow the lines of our present public government forms. "In the matter of elections provision should be made for the use of proportional representation, primaries, nominating conventions, registration of voters and

actual secret voting." (Anderson, 1938, p. 627)

Findlay (1940) gives as reasons for those student governments which do not operate well as:

(1) Members may be representing the wishes of cliques or political groups and are more puppets than representatives of the best interests of the student body.

(2) Once elected student government leaders may view their group as a closed corporation with the chief purpose the personal betterment of its members.

(3) The elected leaders may not be the best leaders available in the student body.

Summary of Reviewed Literature

While predominant at one time in Europe, student government began in the weakest of positions in America. Its purposes have been defined most often as a teaching method for democratic principles and practices, although there appears to be sufficient evidence to presume that at least one other reason for its growth was that the shift of control of student behavior to student government was more successful than previous methods used. Students, on the other hand, have attempted to influence the governance of the university by a variety of methods. Student government organizations, as a result of their acceptance by the university administrations, have become the most

popular vehicle for most student efforts in influencing university governance during the past fifty years.

Since the student activist movement began in the 1960's, students have been increasingly accepted as "equal" partners in more and more areas of university governance. The organizational method for this inclusion has often been through their official student government organization.

In a variety of studies, student leaders have been shown to differ from non-leader students on the campus. More recently, studies have indicated that activist student leaders are different from other student leaders both in their traits and characteristics and in the manner in which they perceive the university environment.

The studies reviewed in this chapter relating to student perceptions and the College and University Environment Scales point to the general acceptance of this instrument for research regarding the campus environment.

A number of these studies point out that students perceive their environment in significantly different ways according to their experiences with that environment. In addition, several studies indicate that the perceptions measured by this instrument will change in relation to the differential involvement of the student groups with their environment.

The consideration of student elections in the literature has been

largely limited to comments regarding its limitations, shortcomings, and the purposes which it should serve. No research has been found which attempts to determine what effects this experience may have upon students who seek office.

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This study included two groups of male students at Oregon State University. One group consisted of candidates for various student government offices in the campus elections held during spring quarter, 1970. The other was from a random selection of undergraduate men, used as a comparative control group, who were not candidates for any positions in that election.

The study had two purposes: first, to determine what if any changes of perceptions and attitudes toward the university environment occur among students who seek student government offices compared to students who are not candidates; second, to compare the perceptions and attitudes toward the university environment of students who are candidates with those who are not candidates and to compare the attitudes and perceptions of winning and losing candidates.

Criteria for Selection of the Groups

All male students who were official candidates for the election were invited to participate in the study. The comparison group of non-candidates males was chosen to meet the same minimal requirements of academic standing and full-time student status as the candidates.

Less than 20 percent of the candidates in recent student government elections at Oregon State University have been female and these

have been concentrated in class officer positions. Because of the difficulties this limited size poses in statistical treatment of data and the complication of concentration in those offices which receive less campaign emphasis, only males were included in this study.

Selection of the Candidate Group

Students are allowed to file for student government positions until five o'clock in the afternoon of the day prior to the official beginning of the election campaign. On that same evening, the Student Senate Services and Elections Committee holds a required meeting for all candidates or their representatives to answer questions regarding the campaign regulations.

At that meeting, all male candidates were invited to take part in the study. Those who were not present were invited to take part the next morning through a personal follow-up by the investigator. The total number of males seeking student government office was 66.

The investigator, along with two assistants, attended the required meeting for all candidates. Permission was obtained from the Chairman of the Student Senate Services and Elections Committee to administer the questionnaire to those willing to participate during the meeting. After a brief explanation to the group, a total of 45 candidates completed and returned the instruments used in the study. Telephone follow-up the next morning by the investigator resulted in nine more

completed questionnaires and data forms from candidates. As shown in Table 1, 54 candidates took part in the study representing 81.6 percent of the total number of candidates in the election, 66.

Table 1. Groups Studied Compared to Total Invited to Participate.

	Invited to Participate	Number of Participants	Percentage of Participation
Male Candidates	66	54	81.8
Male Non-Candidates	157	67	42.6

Limitation Related to the Candidate Group

In considering the candidate group, a qualification must be made in the comparison between those who won and those who lost in the elections. There were 24 winning candidates and 30 losing candidates in this study. While these two groups represent the total population of this study, male candidates who volunteered to participate, the actual size of these two groups tends to decrease the likelihood of any differences in perception reaching statistical levels of significance.

Selection of the Non-Candidate Group

Because the campus student government elections were scheduled to begin campaign activities the second week of the spring quarter, it was not possible to select non-candidates from the spring quarter enrollment print-out since it was not available at that time from the Office of the Registrar at Oregon State University.

The winter quarter enrollment print-out, as compiled by the Office

of the Registrar, was therefore used for the random selection procedure. All male undergraduates listed as full-time students on this print-out were numbered and a random sample of 300 numbers was drawn by means of a table of random numbers. (Bloomers and Lindquist, 1960)

This list of students was checked against the individual student's permanent file in the Office of the Dean of Students to eliminate those who did not meet the election eligibility criteria, and the student's winter quarter address was secured for the purpose of mailing an invitation to participate in the study. (Appendix B)

After elimination of those who did not meet the election eligibility criteria, the original random sample of 300 names had been reduced to 164. After the spring quarter enrollment print-out became available, it was learned that seven of these males had not registered for spring quarter. Thus the total number of men invited to take part in this study as the non-candidate group was 157.

Of this group, 55 responded to the mailed invitation to participate in the study. A telephone follow-up with individual administration of the instruments conducted by the investigator before the campaign began resulted in an additional 12 men completing the instruments. A total of 67 men, or 42.6 percent of those invited to participate, as illustrated in Table 1, completed the instrument and thus made up the non-candidate group for this study.

Limitations Related to the Non-Candidate Group

The following qualifications must be made concerning the nature

of the non-candidate group studied. (1) The comparison group consisted only of male undergraduate students who would have been qualified to become candidates. (2) As a result of the fact that participation in this study was entirely voluntary, approximately 60 percent of the random sample of the non-candidate group did not participate. The non-candidate group therefore is composed of those males, in a random selection of male undergraduates, who were qualified to be candidates for elected student government positions and were willing to participate in this study. Whether or not those who participated were significantly different from those who did not participate is a question this study is unable to answer.

The Follow-up Procedure

A letter (Appendix C or D) was mailed to members of the candidate and non-candidate groups in May setting a second administration of the CUES approximately six weeks after the first administration and approximately four weeks after the elections had been completed.

At this second administration of the College and University Environment Scales, 57 students completed the instrument. A telephone follow-up of those not attending this administration was conducted and another testing date set for the following week. At this time, another 36 students completed the CUES the second time. The remaining students in the two groups of this study were administered the CUES personally by the investigator during the following two weeks. All 54

students in the candidate group and all 67 members of the non-candidate group completed the CUES the second time. Table 2 illustrates the final distribution of the candidate group.

Table 2. Distribution of Candidate Group According to Winners and Losers

	Winners			Losers		
	Total	Number in Study	Percentage	Total	Number in Study	Percentage
Major Office Positions	8	8	100	17	15	88
Minor Office Positions	18	16	89	23	15	65
Totals	26	24	92	40	30	75

Sources of Data

The primary source of data for this study was the College and University Environment Scales (CUES). Information from this questionnaire was augmented with items from a supplementary data form (Appendix E) constructed by the investigator to gather additional personal and demographic information. The official student permanent files in the Office of the Dean of Students were used to gather other personal and demographic data used in the study.

The College and University Environment Scales

This research instrument was designed by Robert C. Pace and is distributed by the Educational Testing Service. The CUES is

comprised of 160 statements about college life, such as facilities and features, rules and regulations, faculty and instruction, curricula, student life, and campus organizations. Students are confronted with a true-false alternative on each item, the response indicating whether that particular statement is or is not generally characteristic of their college or university as they see it.

The final sixty questions of the questionnaire are used only by the Educational Testing Service for further development of the instrument. Since the answer sheets were scored by the investigator and the sixty questions do not relate to any of the present scales of the instrument, they were not used in this study. The scales, defined in Chapter I of this study, are:

Scale 1. Practicality

Scale 2. Community

Scale 3. Awareness

Scale 4. Propriety

Scale 5. Scholarship

Subscale 1. Campus Morale

Subscale 2. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-student Relationships

Official University Records

From the official university student personnel files located in

the Office of the Dean of Students at Oregon State University, the following information was obtained:

1. College grade point average: The student's cumulative grade point average reported by the Office of the Registrar at Oregon State University through winter quarter, 1970.
2. Year in college: The student's college class of enrollment, i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior.
3. Age: The student's age in years as of December 31, 1969.
4. School of enrollment: The academic school in which the student was currently enrolled, i.e. Forestry, Business, etc.

Treatment of Data

Scoring and Coding Procedures

The participants' answer sheets were hand-scored by the investigator. Scale scores were determined according to directions in the Technical Manual, College and University Environment Scales Second Edition (1969). Scale scores and the covariates used in this study collected from the official university records and the supplementary data form were transferred to IBM cards which were key-punched and verified by a key-punch operator at the Oregon State University Computer Center. The statistical procedures were also performed through the computer facilities of the Oregon State University Computer Center.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To measure whether the election experience of the candidate group affected its perception of the university environment and whether the candidate group's perception of that environment differed significantly from the perception of the non-candidate comparison group, the analysis of covariance statistical procedure was used.

The analysis of covariance procedure is an extension of analysis of variance to indicate the correlation between initial and final scores. It is especially useful in experiments in which the control and experimental groups are not equated at the start of the experiment. Through covariance, adjustments are made in scores which will account for differences in initial variables. (Garrett 1953)

The analysis of covariance procedure first measures the effects upon the initial responses of the subjects in the study to the CUES. On those CUES scales in which some covariate has an effect upon student responses, the effect of those covariates are adjusted upon the means of the groups being studied.

The effect of the fourteen covariates upon the pre-test scores and the differences between pre- and post-test scores on the College and University Environment Scales was determined for four models:

Model 1.

$$y = u + \text{group (candidate vs. non-candidate)} + B_1 (\text{College grade}$$

point average) + B_2 (College standing) + B_3 (School of enrollment) + B_4 (Age) + B_5 (Fraternity affiliation) + B_6 (College election experience) + B_7 (Place of residence) + B_8 (Socio-economic level) + B_9 (High School election experience) + B_{10} (Marital status) + B_{11} (Current Involvement in student government) + B_{12} (Finance of education) + B_{13} (Size of family) + B_{14} (Birth order)

Model 2.

$y = u + \text{group (winning candidates vs. losing candidates)} + B_1$
 (College grade point average) + B_2 (College standing) + . . .
 B_{14} (Birth order)

Model 3.

$y = u + \text{group (winning candidates vs. non-candidates)} + B_1$
 (College grade point average) + B_2 (College standing) + . . . B_{14}
 (Birth order)

Model 4.

$y = u + \text{group (losing candidates vs. non-candidates)} + B_1$ (College grade point average) + B_2 (College standing) + . . . B_{14} (Birth order)

$y = \text{response}$

$u = \text{mean}$

The following two sets of null hypotheses were considered:

1. H_0 (null) $B_1 = B_2 = B_3 = \dots = B_{14} = 0$

H_A (alternate) Some $B_i \neq 0$

2. H_0 (null) $B_i = 0$

H_A (alternate) $B_i \neq 0$

i = covariates one through fourteen tested with the other thirteen covariates remaining in the model.

The statistical information resulting from the testing of these null hypotheses was used to determine those covariates, if any, that had a differentiating effect on the responses of the individuals in this study.

Wherever F values resulting from the testing of the hypothesis $B_1 = B_2 = B_3 = \dots = B_{14} = 0$ on a scale indicated a variation at the .05 level of significance or higher, the covariates within that scale were investigated. Those covariates which reached the .05 level of significance under the second set of hypotheses, i. e. individual $B_i = 0$, were included in the testing of the hypotheses of this study. Also, on those scales where no covariates had a significant effect due to the first hypothesis, covariates within those scales were considered under the second set of hypotheses in order to reduce the apparent variation among individuals on that scale. A table of the covariates and their F values for each of the comparisons of this study are included in Appendix F.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Those scales in which a covariate was included were treated by the analysis

of covariance statistical model. The analysis of covariance model is illustrated below.

$$y = u + \text{group (depending upon which groups are being compared)} \\ + B_1 (\text{covariate 1}) + B_2 (\text{covariate 2}) \dots$$

$y = \text{response}$

$u = \text{mean}$

Those scales containing no covariates were treated with the analysis of variance model illustrated below.

$$y = u + \text{group (candidate vs. non-candidate)}$$

$$y = u + \text{group (winning vs. losing candidates)}$$

$$y = u + \text{group (winning vs. non-candidates)}$$

$$y = u + \text{group (losing vs. non-candidates)}$$

$y = \text{response}$

$u = \text{mean}$

In analyzing the pre-test results of the groups compared in this study, F values were determined by comparing the differences of the means of any two groups compared. In considering the significance of changes in perception between pre- and post-test results, F values were derived by comparing the differences of the means of change in perception between groups.

The purpose of adjusting scores according to the effect of the significant covariables was to enable the direct comparison of the groups in their perception of the university as measured by the scales of the

CUES. Because the influence of a covariate varies on individual scores according to the relative position of the individual on the particular covariate found to be influential and the interaction upon scores by more than one covariate is a complex factor, a comparison between covariates and their relative influence upon scale scores is not practical.

The variables used in this study were:

1. College grade point average: The cumulative grade point average at the end of winter quarter 1970.
2. College standing: The official class year in college, i. e. freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior.
3. School of enrollment: The school in which each student was currently officially enrolled, i. e. Business, Education, etc.
4. Age: The age in years as of December 31, 1969.
5. Fraternity affiliation: Whether or not the subject was a member of a social fraternity at Oregon State University.
6. College election experience: Whether the subject had been a candidate in a previous college election for student government office.
7. Place of residence: Where the student lived, i. e. residence hall, private apartment, at home with parents, etc.
8. Socio-economic level: This level was determined by ranking the occupation of the head of household of the student's family

according to the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position.

9. High school election experience: Whether the student had been a candidate for a high school student government office.
10. Marital status: Whether the student was married, single, divorced or separated, or widowed.
11. Current involvement in student government: The student's own rating of his extent of involvement in student government during the past year.
12. Finance of education: The main source of financial support for the student during the past academic year.
13. Size of family: Number of children in the family including the student.
14. Birth order: The student's order of birth related to the other children in his family, i.e. an only child, first born, second born, etc.

Summary

In this chapter, the subjects of the study were described. Procedures for selecting the candidate group and the comparison group were explained.

The analysis of covariance and analysis of variance statistical models used to evaluate the data collected in this study were included

in this chapter along with an explanation of the covariates used in the study.

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The sources of data for this study, the statistical procedures employed, and the description of the samples have been presented in earlier chapters. The present chapter is concerned with the presentation and analysis of the data obtained. These data are presented as the findings to the four null hypotheses of this study.

Findings Related to the Hypotheses Under Investigation

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of students who are candidates for student government offices and students who are not candidates.

Table 3 illustrates the comparative means, standard deviations, and F values of these two groups in their pre-election perceptions of the university environment. As is indicated in this table, the two groups varied significantly on one scale of the CUES, the Community scale. The candidate group viewed the university environment as being significantly weaker in Community characteristics than the non-candidate group. Candidates described the university environment as being significantly less friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented than did the non-candidates. The first null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

Table 3. Comparative Perceptions of the University Environment of Candidates and Non-Candidates Before Elections

Scales	All Candidates		All Non-Candidates		F Values
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Practicality	10.25	2.82	10.10	2.74	.754
Community	8.18	3.81	9.92	4.03	5.73*
Awareness	9.83	2.95	9.53	2.96	.299
Propriety	8.38	4.04	8.29	4.19	.014
Scholarship	7.09	2.69	7.11	2.97	.337
Campus Morale	9.44	3.86	9.53	3.92	.003
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-					
Student Relationships	5.07	2.09	5.22	2.15	.067

* Significant at the .05 level

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference in the perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) between student candidates when measured before the election process which would distinguish those who later won or lost the elections.

The pre-election perceptions of the university environment of those candidates who ultimately won and those who ultimately lost in the elections are compared in Table 4. These two groups differed significantly on two scales of the CUES, the Awareness scale and the Propriety scale. On both of these scales, the ultimate winning candidates viewed their university environment as having significantly more

of the characteristics comprising these scales.

Table 4. Comparative Perceptions of the University Environment of Winning and Losing Candidates Before Elections

Scales	Ultimate Winners		Ultimate Losers		F Values
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Practicality	11.04	2.56	9.63	2.90	3.06
Community	8.95	3.81	7.56	3.76	1.79
Awareness	10.58	3.25	9.23	2.59	4.97*
Propriety	9.70	3.67	7.33	4.07	4.54*
Scholarship	6.87	2.96	7.26	2.49	3.96
Campus Morale	10.29	4.14	8.76	3.54	1.74
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	5.08	2.24	5.06	1.99	.000

* Significant at the .05 level

Those candidates who went on to win in the elections tended to view their environment as one which reflected a concern about and emphasis upon personal, poetic, and political meaning to a greater degree than was viewed by those candidates who later lost in the elections. The winning candidates also viewed their campus environment as being more mannerly and conventional than did those who later lost in the elections.

Two other scales, Practicality and Scholarship, provide score differences between those candidates who later won elections and those who later lost the elections. While the differences on these two scales

do not reach levels of significance acceptable in this study, the size of the groups compared, 30 and 24, tends to understate possible significant differences. These two scales, Practicality and Scholarship, appear to be potentially differentiating between winners and losers of the candidate group.

The ultimate winners appeared to view the campus as more supportive of practical dimensions of life. They perceived the campus environment as one characterized by greater enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities than those who ultimately lost in the elections. At the same time, the ultimate winners considered the campus environment as less concerned with academic achievement and scholarship than did those who later lost.

On the basis of the significant differences indicated in Table 4, the second null hypothesis of this study was rejected.

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of students who participate in the election experience from those who are not candidates.

As illustrated in Table 5, there were no significant F values for any of the seven scales of the instrument when the change in perception of candidates as a group was compared to change in perception of non-candidates as a group. Neither group perceived the university

environment in a significantly different way, as measured by this instrument, after the election process than they had before the elections. The third null hypothesis was, therefore, not rejected.

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant difference in the change of perception of the university environment (as measured by the seven scales of the College and University Environment Scales) of the winners of the student government elections compared to the losers of the student government elections, between winners and non-candidates, or between losers and non-candidates.

Table 6 illustrates the comparative changes in perception of winning candidates with those of losing candidates between the pre- and post-test of the instrument. There were no significant F values for any of the scales comparing pre- and post-test means between these two groups. There was, therefore, no apparent differential effect of the election experience upon winners of the elections or upon losers of the elections.

Table 7 illustrates the comparative changes in perception between winning candidates and non-candidates and Table 8 provides the same comparisons for losing candidates and non-candidates. In neither of these comparisons was there a significant difference in the amount of change between pre- and post-test perceptions on any of the scales of the instrument. On the basis of the findings illustrated in Tables 6, 7, and 8 the fourth null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 5. Change in Perception of the University Environment of Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections

Scales	Candidates				Non-Candidates				F Values
	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Difference Between Mean Changes
Practicality	10.25	10.69	.44	3.08	10.10	10.14	.04	2.45	.538
Community	8.18	7.96	-.22	3.44	9.92	9.64	-.28	3.64	.419
Awareness	9.83	9.80	-.03	3.25	9.53	9.51	-.02	2.37	.007
Propriety	8.38	8.31	-.07	3.28	8.29	8.79	.50	3.07	1.00
Scholarship	7.09	6.45	-.64	3.36	7.11	6.76	-.35	1.88	.128
Campus Morale	9.44	9.37	-.07	3.47	9.53	9.53	.00	3.08	.067
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	5.07	4.72	-.35	2.37	5.22	5.24	.02	1.94	2.83

Mean Change = Pre-Test Mean Subtracted From Post-Test Mean

Table 6. Change in Perception of the University Environment of Winning Candidates Compared to Losing Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections

Scales	Winning Candidates				Losing Candidates				F-Values
	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Difference Between Mean Changes
Practicality	11.04	11.49	.45	2.66	9.63	10.06	.43	3.43	.127
Community	8.95	8.50	-.41	3.41	7.56	7.50	-.06	2.56	.005
Awareness	10.58	10.33	-.25	3.84	9.23	9.36	.13	2.73	.182
Propriety	9.70	9.04	-.66	3.98	7.33	7.73	.40	2.56	2.93
Scholarship	6.87	6.75	-.12	4.03	7.26	6.20	-1.06	2.71	1.92
Campus Morale	10.29	10.33	.04	3.99	8.76	8.60	-.16	3.07	.293
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	5.08	4.71	-.37	2.53	5.06	4.73	-.33	2.27	.004

Mean Change = Pre-Test Mean Subtracted From Post-Test Mean

Table 7. Change in Perception of the University Environment of Winning Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections

Scales	Winning Candidates				Non-Candidates				F-Values
	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Difference Between Mean Changes
Practicality	11.04	11.49	.45	2.66	10.10	10.14	.04	2.45	.477
Community	8.95	8.50	-.41	3.41	9.92	9.64	-.28	3.64	.778
Awareness	10.58	10.33	-.25	3.84	9.53	9.51	-.02	2.37	.106
Propriety	9.70	9.04	-.66	3.98	8.29	8.79	.50	3.07	2.18
Scholarship	6.87	6.75	-.12	4.03	7.11	6.76	-.35	1.88	.196
Campus Morale	10.29	10.33	.04	3.99	9.53	9.53	.00	3.08	.019
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	5.08	4.71	-.37	2.53	5.22	5.24	.02	1.94	.594

Mean Change = Pre-Test Mean Subtracted From Post-Test Mean

Table 8. Change in the Perception of the University Environment of Losing Candidates Compared to Non-Candidates Before and After the Student Government Elections

Scales	Losing Candidates				Non-Candidates				F Values
	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Change of Mean	Standard Deviation	Difference Between Mean Changes
Practicality	9.63	10.06	.43	3.43	10.10	10.14	.04	2.45	.173
Community	7.56	7.50	-.06	2.56	9.92	9.64	-.28	3.64	.169
Awareness	9.23	9.36	.13	2.73	9.53	9.51	-.02	2.37	.654
Propriety	7.33	7.73	.40	2.56	8.29	8.79	.50	3.07	.000
Scholarship	7.26	6.20	-1.06	2.71	7.11	6.76	-.35	1.88	2.00
Campus Morale	8.76	8.60	-.16	3.07	9.53	9.53	.00	3.08	.06
Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships	5.06	4.73	-.33	2.27	5.22	5.24	.02	1.94	2.33

Mean Change = Pre-Test Mean Subtracted From Post-Test Mean

Summary of Findings

The null hypotheses relating to pre-test differences between candidates and non-candidates and between those candidates who ultimately won the elections and those who ultimately lost were rejected. The candidates differed from the non-candidates in this study at the .05 level of significance in the manner in which they perceived the Community aspects of their environment. The winning candidates and losing candidates differed in their pre-election perceptions of the university environment in those aspects reported on the Awareness and Propriety scales of the College and University Environment Scales. On both of these scales, winning candidates perceived the university environment as containing more elements of Awareness and Propriety than did candidates who later lost in the elections.

No significant changes in perception of the university environment during the period of this study occurred among any of the groups studied. The null hypotheses in these areas were, therefore, not rejected.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The widespread acceptance of a greater voice for students in university governance has provided a renewed interest in appropriate forms of student involvement. Traditional student government organizations have been the recipients of much of the increased power granted students in this area. The choice of student government representatives through campus election procedures raises many questions regarding the effect of the election experience upon students as well as the effect of the election process upon the character of student government.

The purposes of this study were to determine whether the generally accepted procedure of campus elections as a method of choosing student government representatives (1) appears to encourage the candidacy of students who hold perceptions of the university environment similar to other students who do not choose to become candidates; (2) results in the election of a group of candidates who perceive their environment in a distinctly different manner from other candidates; (3) is an experience which affects the perceptions of the student candidates in their attitudes toward the university; and (4) is an experience which differentially affects the attitudes of student candidates who win in the elections and those who lose.

The Groups Studied

This study included two groups of male students at Oregon State University. One group included 54 male undergraduates who were candidates for student government offices during the spring quarter, 1970. The comparison group included 67 male undergraduates who were qualified but had not chosen to become candidates.

The Literature

The review of the literature described a changing emphasis for student government from a student activity concept providing a laboratory for the learning of democratic procedures and practices to a method of providing a representative voice for students in university governance. A number of studies pointed out differences between leaders and non-leaders in campus affairs as well as differences between leaders of activist political groups and leaders of more traditional campus organizations.

The effect of various college experiences upon student attitudes was presented in the review of the literature as a largely unexplored resource area appropriate for gaining knowledge of the effects of interactions between students and their environment.

Campus elections, as reported in the review of the literature, have been the focus of concern both of those who wish to provide greater

student involvement in university governance and those who see the elections as a potentially significant personal experience for those students who take part in them.

Method and Procedure

During the week preceding the beginning of the 1970 spring elections for student government positions at Oregon State University, the 54 male student candidates and the comparison group of 67 non-candidate males were administered the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) and a supplementary data form. The CUES instrument was again administered to all members of both groups approximately six weeks later, four weeks after the elections had been completed. Additional personal data was gathered concerning the students in this study from personnel records of the Office of the Dean of Students.

Tests of significance were computed using the analysis of variance and covariance statistical models. Statistical comparisons were made between the pre-election perceptions of the university environment of candidates and non-candidates and of winning candidates and losing candidates. Differences in the change in perceptions of the university environment were compared between candidates and non-candidates, winning and losing candidates, winning candidates and non-candidates, and losing candidates and non-candidates.

These comparisons indicated significant differences in the

pre-election perceptions of candidates and non-candidates. Non-candidates perceived significantly greater Community dimensions in the university environment than candidates.

Between those candidates who later won in the elections and those who later lost, winners perceived significantly greater Awareness and Propriety factors in the campus environment than did those who lost. There were no significant differences in the amount of change from the pre-election to the post-election administration of the instrument between any of the groups compared.

On the basis of these comparisons, Hypotheses I and II, predicting no differences among groups in their pre-election perceptions of the university environment were rejected. The results of the comparisons of changes in scores measured before and after the elections, failed to reject Hypotheses III and IV which predicted no change in perceptions as a result of the election experience.

Limitations

The limitations presented in Chapter III must be considered in any discussion of the findings of this study. The two most important limitations to be considered in this study are (1) the comparison group in the study consists of male undergraduates who were eligible to seek student government offices and does not represent the male undergraduate population at large; (2) the candidate population in this study

is small. When a small population is considered, differences between groups must be relatively large for tests of significance to reach the conventional .05 level.

Conclusions

From the findings of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Students who chose to become candidates for student government elections differed in their perceptions of the university environment from students who did not choose to become candidates.
2. Students who were ultimately successful in winning elections differed significantly in their perceptions of the university environment from those students who were ultimately unsuccessful candidates.
3. The student election experience did not significantly affect the perceptions of the university environment of students seeking student government office, whether the students won or lost in the elections.

Discussion

Candidates and Non-Candidates

The finding that candidates perceived a significantly lower level of Community scale characteristic in their college environment than

did non-candidates appears to support the conclusions of a number of studies which have found differences between leaders and non-leaders. In studies beginning with Cowley (1928) and represented by such studies as those by Hunter and Jordan (1939) and Hartshorn (1956), leaders have been shown to differ from non-leaders in a variety of traits, characteristics, and attitudes.

In studies by Berdie (1966), Lindahl (1967), and Gelso and Sims (1968) incorporating the College and University Environment Scales (CUES), student perceptions of the university environment appear to differ significantly according to their location in and experiences with that environment. The differences in perception evidenced by students who chose to seek student government leadership positions from those who did not, as shown by the data in this study, appears to support these studies and suggests that students who perceive themselves as prospective student government leaders, whether or not they share a common experience with one another, may represent experiences with the university environment which set them apart from other students.

Many student personnel workers, as well as others, are seeking to determine effective ways to delegate new powers and responsibilities to students to increase their involvement in university governance. At the same time, a representative student voice which reflects a general consensus of student opinion is sought on many issues and decision-processes. The findings of this study as well as those of

Stillion (1968), who found student leaders to differ significantly in their values and characteristics from other students, suggests that student representatives elected in the traditional fashion may not be representative of students at large.

The data of this study instead appear to provide greater support to such writers as Lunn (1957), who considered student government's greatest contribution to be its training of student leaders and the development of educational programs at an institution rather than as a representative voice for students as a whole.

Winning and Losing Candidates

The population size of the candidate group, particularly when divided into winner and loser categories, limits the conclusions which can be drawn from the data. Nevertheless, the data of this study provides evidence for tentative conclusions subject to verification by further study in this area.

Candidates who eventually won in the elections viewed their environment as containing significantly greater Awareness and Propriety scale factors. At the same time, while differences did not reach significance levels demanded by this study, winning candidates perceived a notably greater support in their campus environment for the Practicality dimensions of the CUES while perceiving less support on the Scholarship scale than did losing candidates.

This combination of differences appears to provide some rather clear comparisons between the group of student candidates who ultimately were successful in their bids for election and those who were unsuccessful. The traditional student government election process, therefore, appears to select a group from among the available candidates who perceive their environment in a significantly different manner from other student candidates.

Winning candidates appear to fit a more establishment-oriented or traditional mold of student government officer attitudes than losing candidates. Winning candidates perceived a greater openness by the institution to student opinion, a general support by the campus of controversial programs, and a general interest in and support of the arts by students. Their reporting of a greater sense of propriety throughout the campus indicates a perception of a campus environment that is more cautious, mannerly, and self-controlled than that perceived by their losing counterparts.

At the same time, the two CUES scale differences which did not reach significance levels but were of a size which appeared to be worthy of special comment indicate a supporting pattern to those scales which did show significant differences. Losing candidates perceived an environment providing greater concern for and reward of academic achievement and intellectual ability than did the successful candidates. Winning candidates perceived the campus environment as rewarding

those in the socially acceptable clubs or groups, stressing the practical outcomes of a college education, and composed of a generally compliant student population to the wishes and expectations of faculty, administration, and other students.

This pattern of differences between winners and losers suggests a picture of winning candidates who are more satisfied, establishment-oriented, and traditional in their outlook than losing candidates. In general, winning candidates perceived their campus to be open to student opinion and to controversial programs while losing candidates did not. Winning candidates believed that students were generally well-mannered, conforming, and interested in the practical results of their college education while losing candidates did not. Losing candidates, on the other hand, perceived the academic competition and intellectual environment to be greater than did winning candidates.

This study did not provide evidence of any effect of the election process upon the attitude of candidates, whether winners or losers, toward their college environment. Such a lack of change must be considered in the light of certain limitations of this study. Changes may have occurred in dimensions not adequately measured by the instrument used in this study. Attitudinal changes may have been modified by factors other than the election experience and affecting perception of the campus environment to a greater degree than or offsetting to the election experience.

Recommendations

A basic recommendation for further research is that this study be essentially replicated on several campuses in order to determine if the findings are widely applicable or the result of an unusual set of circumstances. Such studies should, if possible, include a larger population of candidates to improve the statistical comparisons among winning and losing candidates.

Longitudinal studies should be undertaken to determine the effects of holding student government office upon the perceptions of the student government officers when compared to perceptions of the general student population. Such studies would help to determine the long-range effects of student government leadership experience upon attitudes toward the university.

The current study does not provide information which would support any particular hypothesis about the causes of differences in perception between the group of candidates who ultimately won in the elections and those who ultimately lost. Studies by Berdie (1966), Lindahl (1967), and Gelso and Sims (1968) would all support a hypothesis based upon different experiences within the university environment resulting in different perceptions of that environment.

The possibility that the candidate group which lost in the elections represents a generally common experiential background within the university environment different from the winning candidate group leads to a further possibility. Major groups may exist within

the campus environment whose attitudes are not represented in the usual student government elected by the majority process of traditional campus elections.

Such a finding, while only speculative in regards to the data of this study, would be supportive of the premises suggested by Smith (1965) and Katz (1968) who see a division within the student population with the more dissatisfied elements forming a power bloc outside the traditional lines of authority. This element of dissatisfaction does appear to be a possible factor in the difference in perception found in the present study between winning and losing candidates.

If part of the reason for the forming of power blocs outside the organized university governing structure is the feeling of impotence among subgroups or subcultures resulting from lack of representation through the current election processes, those processes may need to be reconsidered to provide for representation of major subgroup or subculture viewpoints.

Studies should, therefore, be designed to consider whether current election practices provide representation of major subgroup or subcultural viewpoints. One area of study which should be beneficial in this regard would be a comparison of elected student government leaders' perceptions of the university environment with various subgroup or subculture perceptions and with a random sample of the campus population.

Such studies may also be able to assist in answering the question raised in this study concerning why winning candidates perceive the campus environment in a different way than losing candidates.

Another possible study in this area could be to consider other differences between winning and losing candidates which tend to differentiate them as groups. Such a study could consider comparisons of family background, social class, leadership experience, and various experiences at the university which may influence perception of the university environment.

The present study is necessarily limited in its applicability to final conclusions regarding the appropriate method for choosing student representatives for student government or university governance. Additional studies are needed from a range of viewpoints to more sufficiently explore the many issues of this subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aceto, Thomas. 1968. Direct action on the campus: an analysis. *Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs* 6:68-74.
- Alexander, William M. 1969. Rethinking student government for larger universities. *The Journal of Higher Education* 40:39-46.
- Allen, Lucille, et al. 1954. Student participation in campus government. In: *Student personnel work as deeper teaching*, ed. by Esther Lloyd-Jones and Margaret Ruth Smith. New York, Harper and Brothers, 131-149 p.
- Anderson, Grace M. 1938. Practical experiments in student government. *Social Education* 2:627-630.
- Bayer, Alan E. and Alexander W. Astin. 1969. Campus disruptions during 1968-1969. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education. 46 p.
- Berdie, Ralph F. 1966. College expectations, experiences and perceptions. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:336-344.
- _____. 1967. A university is a many faceted thing. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 45:768-775.
- Bloomers, Paul and E. F. Lindquist. 1960. *Elementary statistical methods in psychology and education*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 528 p.
- Bowles, W. Donald. 1968. Student participation in academic governance. *Educational Record* 49:257-262.
- Brewer, Ray E. 1966. Leadership persistency for selected high school leaders through three years of college. *The Journal of College Personnel* 7:206-212.
- Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. 1958. *Higher education in transition, an American history: 1636-1956*. New York. Harper, 494 p.

- Cardozier, V. R. 1968. Student power in medieval universities. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 46:944-948.
- Conner, J. Douglas. 1968. Relationship between college environmental press and freshman attrition at Southern Methodist University. *College and University* 43:265-273.
- Cowley, W. H. 1928. Three distinctions in the study of leaders. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 23:144-157.
- Cutler, Richard L. 1966. The new role of the student in the academic society. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, prepared by The Association for Higher Education. Washington, D. C. 154-157 p.
- Davis, Howard. 1965. What about student government? *Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs*, 2:36-38.
- Draft statement on student participation in college and university government. 1970. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 56:33-35.
- Falvey, Frances E. 1952. Student participation in college administration. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 173 p.
- Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb. 1969. The impact of college on students. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 338 p.
- Findlay, J. F. 1940. Student government -- medieval, colonial, and modern style. *School Activities* 11:315-317, 350.
- Freedman, Mervin B. 1966. New alignments of power and authority in colleges and universities. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, prepared by the Association for Higher Education, 149-153 p.
- _____. 1967. The college experience. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 202 p.
- Gallo, Gregory M. 1964. Student government: a student view. *Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs* 2:12-15.

- Garrett, Henry E. 1953. *Statistics in psychology and education*. New York, Longmans, Green, 422 p.
- Gelso, Charles J. and David M. Sims. 1968. Perceptions of a junior college environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 9:40-44.
- Golden, M. Patricia and Ned A. Rosen. 1966. Student attitudes toward participation in university administration: an empirical study related to managerial prerogatives. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:322-331.
- Gottlieb, David and Benjamin Hodgkins. 1963. College student sub-cultures: their structure and characteristics in relation to student attitude change. *School Review* 71:266-290.
- Hand, Harold C. 1938. *Campus activities*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 345 p.
- Harriman, Philip L. 1937. The student-faculty congress. *Journal of Higher Education* 8:413-416.
- Hartshorn, Elizabeth. 1956. A comparison of certain aspects of student leadership and non-leadership: significant differences on four psychometric tests. *Journal of Educational Research* 49:515-522.
- Hellerich, Mahlon H. 1960. The vital relationship between student government and campus community. *College and University* 35:271-280.
- Hodges, Harold M., Jr. 1953. Campus leaders and non-leaders. *Sociology and Social Research* 37:251-256.
- Hollingshead, August B. and Fredrick C. Redlich. 1958. *Social class and mental illness: a community study*. New York, John Wiley, 423 p.
- Hunter, E. C. and A. M. Jordan. 1939. An analysis of qualities associated with leadership among college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 30:497-509.
- Jansen, David G. and Bob B. Winborn. 1968. Perceptions of a university environment by social-political action leaders. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 41:343-345.

- Johnson, Richard T. and Arden N. Frandsen. 1962. The California psychological inventory profile of student leaders. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 41:343-345.
- Johnstone, D. Bruce. 1969. Student and his power. *Journal of Higher Education* 40:209-218.
- Karner, Erwin F. 1956. College elections -- are they serious or are they farces? *School Activities* 28:123-125.
- Katz, Joseph. 1968. The activist revolution of 1964. In: *No Time for Youth*, by Joseph Datz and Associates. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 386-417 p.
- Katz, Joseph and Nevitt Sanford. 1966. The new student power and needed educational reforms. *Phi Delta Kappa* 47:397-401.
- Kelley, Janet Agnes. 1949. *College life and the mores*. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 276 p.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. 1968. Student participation in university educational decision making. *The Record* 70:45-51.
- Keyes, Ralph. 1968. Student involvement: the why and how. *Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs* 6:77-82.
- Klopf, Gordon. 1960. *College student government*. New York, Harper, 105 p.
- Krumboltz, John D. 1957. The relation of extracurricular participation to leadership criteria. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 35:307-313.
- Lawson, Edwin D. and Walter E. Boek. 1960. Correlations of indexes of families' socio-economic status. *Social Forces* 39:149-152.
- Leonard, Eugenie. 1956. *Origins of personnel services in American higher education*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 146 p.
- Lindahl, Charles. 1967. Impact of living arrangements on student environmental perceptions. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 8:10-16.

- Lunn, Harry H., Jr. 1957. The student's role in college policy-making. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 38:378-384.
- McGuire, Edward C. 1960. The role of the student in college policy making. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 38:378-384.
- KcKown, Harry C. 1944. *The student council*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 344 p.
- McMahon, Earnest E. and C. R. Foster, Jr. 1932. The undergraduate point of view on student participation. *School and Society* 35:668-770.
- McPeck, Beth L. 1967. The University as perceived by its sub-cultures: an experimental study. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*,
- Middleton, W. C. 1941. Personality qualities predominant in campus leaders. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 13, 199-201 p.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner. 1961. *Student personnel work in higher education*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 562 p.
-
- _____ 1970. The future of the campus personnel worker. In: *College Student Personnel: Readings and Bibliographies*, ed. by Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Walter F. Johnson and Willa Norris. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 18-24 p.
- Neff, Charles B. 1968. The administrative challenge of the new student activism. *Journal of Higher Education* 39:69-77.
- Pace, Robert C. 1969. *College & university environment scales*. 2nd ed. Princeton, Educational Testing Service, p. 55.
- Peterson, B. H. 1943. Student government in collegiate institutions. *Journal of Higher Education* 14:205-208.
- Powell, Robert S., Jr. 1969. Student power and the student role in governance. *Liberal Education* 55:24-31.
- Rudolph, Frederick. 1965. Changing patterns of authority and influence. In: *Order and Freedom on the Campus. The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students*, ed. by Owen A. Knorr and W. John Minter. Boulder, Colorado, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1-8 p.

- Schoen, Walter C., Jr. 1966. The campus climate -- student perception and faculty idealism. *Journal of Educational Research* 60:3-7.
- Sheldon, Henry D. 1901. *Student life and customs*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 366 p.
- Skippen, Samuel J. 1963. Anatomy of an election. *Junior College Journal* 38:24-28.
- Smith, Robert R. 1965. Competing internal groups in the governance of colleges and universities. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, prepared by the Association for Higher Education. Washington, D. C. 92-96 p.
- Stillion, Glenn Wayne. 1968. Values, perceptions and characteristics of student leaders compared with the general student population at Florida State University. Doctoral dissertation. Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1968. 80 numb. leaves.
- Stroup, Herbert. 1957. Values and disvalues of faculty-student committees. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 35:289-293.
- _____. 1964. *Toward a philosophy of organized student activities*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 175 p.
- Student self-government at Cornell University. 1938. *School & Society* 48:679-680.
- Svoboda, William S. 1966. Student government: contradiction in theory and practice. *Social Education* 30:179-180.
- Tigar, Michael E. 1966. Student participation in academic governance. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, prepared by the Association for Higher Education. Washington, D. C., 169-174 p.
- Van Loon, Eric. 1968. Who are the activists? *American Education* 4:2-5, 28.
- Welsh, William B. 1949. Democracy through student government. *Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women* 12:67-72.
- Williamson, E. G. 1948. The group origins of student leaders. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 8:603-613.

1961. Student personnel services in colleges and universities. New York, McGraw-Hill, 462 p.

Williamson, E. G. and John L. Cowan. 1966. The American student's freedom of expression: a research appraisal. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 193 p.

Williamson, E. G. and Donald Hoyt. 1952. Measured personality characteristics of student leaders. *Education and Psychological Measurement* 12:65-79.

Younger, John. 1931. Student self-government. *Journal of Higher Education* 2:204-206.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

The following categories were used in the determination of socio-economic levels of the head of household of families of students who took part in this study. These seven classifications are:

1. Higher executives, major professionals with college degrees (doctors, lawyers, engineers, foresters), and owners of large concerns.
2. Other professionals (teachers, accountants, civil service, pharmacists, optometrists), owners of medium sized business and managers of large concerns.
3. Semi-professionals (photographers, morticians, appraisers, reporters), small business owners, managers and agents.
4. Clerks, technicians, farmers and farm owners.
5. Skilled manual employees, foreman and farm laborers.
6. Machine operators and semi-skilled employees.
7. Unskilled employees.

This classification system has been shown by Lawson and Boek (1960) as well as Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) to provide a reliable measure of social class. In comparison with other measures of socio-economic status including income levels, self-estimation scales, and interview ratings, Lawson and Boek (1960) concluded that, "occupation

serves as an acceptable method for classifying families into social strata." (p. 152)

APPENDIX B

April 4, 1970

Dear

You are invited to take part in a doctoral research project concerned with student attitudes toward various aspects of the Oregon State University campus environment. Your name, along with others in this study, was scientifically selected to represent all Oregon State undergraduate males. The research project will consist of two short questionnaires, the first to be completed at a scheduled time reserved for you below.

Each questionnaire will take only 20 minutes to complete. The answers of each individual will be completely confidential and only data from the group as a whole will be published in the study. The results of the study will be made available to officials of the University and elected student leaders. The opinions and attitudes of the undergraduate men as reflected in this study should be a useful resource in consideration of future programs for this institution.

You have been scheduled to complete the questionnaire on Wednesday, April 8 in Room 106 of the Memorial Union at _____ p. m. If this time is not convenient, an alternative time has been reserved for you at _____ p. m. in the same room.

Because you have been chosen as a representative of the undergraduate men students as a whole, it is important that you take part in the study. Complete representative participation means valid results.

Your cooperation in this project will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Leland Gassert
Graduate Student
School of Education
Oregon State University

APPENDIX C

May 9, 1970
Corvallis, Oregon

I would like to express my personal appreciation to you for your cooperation in completing the College and University Environment Scales questionnaire prior to the recent ASOSU election campaign as part of my doctoral research project.

Because part of this study is concerned with opinions which may have changed in recent weeks, it is essential that each member of the campus leadership group complete the questionnaire a second time. This final questionnaire will take only 20 minutes to complete. Your answers will be completely confidential and only grouped data will be published in the dissertation.

A time has been scheduled for you to complete the questionnaire on Wednesday, May 13, in Room 103 of the Memorial Union at _____. If this time is not convenient, an alternative time has been reserved for you at _____ p. m. in the same room. An attempt has been made to match these times with your published class schedule for your convenience.

Your continued cooperation in this doctoral research project will be most appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Leland Gassert
Graduate Student
School of Education
Oregon State University

APPENDIX D

May 9, 1970
Corvallis, Oregon

Your participation in my doctoral research project on student attitudes toward the OSU campus environment is genuinely appreciated. The second administration of the attitude questionnaire has been scheduled for May 13. The questionnaire will take only 20 minutes to complete.

As far as possible, scheduled times have been arranged to meet the requested times of the participants. Your scheduled time is _____, May 13, in Room 103 of the Memorial Union. If this time is not convenient, an alternative time has been reserved for you at _____ p. m. in the same room.

Your continued cooperation in completing this doctoral research study is most appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Leland Gassert
Graduate Student
School of Education
Oregon State University

APPENDIX E

1. Your name _____
2. Corvallis address _____
3. Corvallis phone number _____
4. Are you a member of a social fraternity which has an active chapter at Oregon State University?
_____ yes _____ no
5. Have you ever been a candidate for a college student government office which was voted upon in a general campus election such as a class office or student senate?
_____ yes _____ no
6. If your answer to number 5 above was yes, for what positions(s) or office(s) were you a candidate?

7. If your answer to number 5 above was yes, did you win or lose the election(s)? (if a candidate for more than one election, indicate total wins and total losses)
_____ won _____ lost
8. Where are you living this term?
_____ a. College dormitory
_____ b. Fraternity house
_____ c. Cooperative
_____ d. Boarding house
_____ e. At home with parents
_____ f. With relatives or family friends
_____ g. Private room off campus
_____ h. Private apartment off campus
_____ i. Other
9. Please state and briefly describe your father's occupation. If mother is head of household, mother's occupation. (circle one: Father Mother)
- Occupational title: _____
- Description of occupation: _____
- _____
- _____
10. Were you ever a candidate for a high school student government office such as a class office or student body office.
_____ yes _____ no

11. Are you

- ☐ a. Single
- ☐ b. Married
- ☐ c. Divorced or separated
- ☐ d. Widowed

12. How extensively in the past year have you been involved in the activities of student government organizations (student legislative body, election commission, etc.)?

- ☐ a. Not at all
- ☐ b. One such organization
- ☐ c. Two such organizations
- ☐ d. Three or more (or have held one or two highly responsible and time-consuming offices)

13. What has been your main source of financial support during the present academic year? (mark only one)

- ☐ a. Parents (or one parent)
- ☐ b. Wife
- ☐ c. Job
- ☐ d. Scholarship
- ☐ e. Loan
- ☐ f. Previous personal earnings and savings
- ☐ g. GI Bill, ROTC, or other governmental assistance other than scholarship or loan.

14. How many children are there in your family including yourself?

- ☐ a. one
- ☐ b. two
- ☐ c. three
- ☐ d. four
- ☐ e. five
- ☐ f. six
- ☐ g. seven or more

15. Are you:

- ☐ a. An only child
- ☐ b. First born
- ☐ c. Second born
- ☐ d. Third born
- ☐ e. Fourth or later born

APPENDIX F

COVARIATES SELECTED FOR GROUP COMPARISONS ACCORDING TO
SIGNIFICANCE WITHIN SCALES OF THE COLLEGE AND
UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES

Group Comparisons Scales of CUES	F Values of Scales	Covariates selected and Significant F Values of the Covariates
<hr/>		
Pre-test comparisons of Candidates vs. non-candidates		
1. Practicality	3.299**	College grade point average (6.26)*, school of enrollment (8.59)**, marital status (4.22)*, size of family (5.02)*, birth order (4.01)*
2. Community	2.657**	Age (4.09)*, college election experience (4.24)*, marital status (4.22)*, current involvement in student government (6.44)*, and finance of education (5.55)*.
3. Awareness	1.353	None
4. Propriety	.995	None
5. Scholarship	1.867*	College grade point average (5.21)*, size of family (13.24)**, birth order (8.02)**
6. Campus Morale	1.803	Size of family (6.72)*
7. Faculty-student Relations	1.873*	College election experience (4.44)*, finance of education (8.47)*.
<hr/>		
Pre-test comparisons of winning candidates vs. losing candidates		
1. Practicality	1.975*	School of enrollment (4.82)*
2. Community	1.715	None
3. Awareness	1.320	Socio-economic level (7.56)**, finance of education (4.11)*
4. Propriety	1.055	School of enrollment (4.76)*
5. Scholarship	1.257	Size of family (9.49)**, birth order (4.11)*
6. Campus Morale	1.555	School of enrollment (4.19)*
7. Faculty-student Relations	1.623	None
<hr/>		
* .05 level of significance		
** .01 level of significance		

Pre-test comparisons of winning
vs. non-candidates

1. Practicality	2.545**	College grade point average (8.23**) School of enrollment (7.725**), size of family (5.70*)
2. Community	2.440**	Involvement in student government (7.11**) Finance of education (6.35*)
3. Awareness	1.485	Size of family (4.37*)
4. Propriety	1.197	None
5. Scholarship	1.349	College grade point average (3.96*), size of family (6.90*), birth order (4.45*)
6. Campus Morale	1.701	Place of residence (4.63*), size of family (7.30**)
7. Faculty-student relations	2.082**	Involvement in student government (9.23**)

Pre-test comparisons of
losing vs. non-candidates

1. Practicality	2.843**	College grade point average (4.13*) School of enrollment (4.13*), family size (6.43*)
2. Community	1.994*	College election experience (5.43*)
3. Awareness	1.046	None
4. Propriety	.946	None
5. Scholarship	1.483	College grade point average (4.38*), birth order (5.97*)
6. Campus Morale	1.374	Size of family (7.58**)
7. Faculty-student relations	1.179	Finance of education (6.67*)

Change scores of candidates
and non-candidates

1. Practicality	2. 274**	Size of family (4. 28*)
2. Community	1. 337	College class (6. 59*), age (4. 97*)
3. Awareness	1. 194	Size of family (5. 519*)
4. Propriety	1. 530	None
5. Scholarship	1. 461	Place of residence (4. 33*), size of family (10. 64**), birth order (4. 55*)
6. Campus Morale	2. 187*	Size of family (16. 26**)
7. Faculty-student relations	1. 472	College class (9. 59**)

Change scores of winning
candidates vs. losing candidates

1. Practicality	2. 200*	None
2. Community	1. 216	Birth order (5. 46*)
3. Awareness	. 812	None
4. Propriety	1. 791	Involvement in student government (4. 58*)
5. Scholarship	1. 014	Size of family (7. 32*), college class (4. 62*)
6. Campus Morale	1. 149	Size of family (4. 51*)
7. Faculty-student relations	1. 308	None

Change scores of winning
candidates vs. non-candidates

1. Practicality	1.529	None
2. Community	1.295	Age (6.08*), College class (6.67*)
3. Awareness	1.201	None
4. Propriety	1.185	None
5. Scholarship	1.525	College election experience (7.01*), size of family (7.445**), birth order (4.10*)
6. Campus Morale	1.836*	Size of family (7.60**)
7. Faculty-student relations	1.305	Involvement in student government (4.13*) College class (4.91*)

Change scores of losing
candidates vs. non-candidates

1. Practicality	1.981*	Size of family (8.08**)
2. Community	1.215	Age (4.51*)
3. Awareness	1.552	College election experience (4.19*), size of family (4.85*)
4. Propriety	1.694	Age (7.50**), Place of residence (5.00*), birth order (4.15*)
5. Scholarship	1.574	Place of residence (4.11*), size of family (5.62*)
6. Campus Morale	2.287*	None
7. Faculty-student relations	1.231	College class (9.93**)
