

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Donald Ray Sanderson for the Doctor of Education
(Name) (Degree)
in Education presented on Sept. 28, 1970
(Major) (Date)

Title: A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of
the University as Perceived by Male and Female Elected
Student Residence Hall Leaders and Non-Leader
Residence Hall Students

Abstract approved:

Redacted for Privacy

Arthur L. Tollefson

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of the university environment of four selected groups of residence hall students at Oregon State University: male elected residence hall leaders (N-52), male non-leader residence hall students (N-52), female elected residence hall leaders (N-53), and female non-leader residence hall students (N-53).

Since the intent of the study was to compare the perceptions of the university environment between elected residence hall leaders and non-leader residence hall students, the non-leader groups were selected to resemble the leader groups on the factors of sex, cumulative grade point average, school of enrollment, class standing, and chronological age.

The participants in the study completed the College and University Environment Scales during a

two-week period early in the fall term 1969. All of the students contacted to take part in the study returned the completed instrument. This standardized instrument consists of the following five scales plus two subscales:

(1) Practicality, (2) Community, (3) Awareness, (4) Propriety, (5) Scholarship; subscales, (1) Campus morale, (2) Quality of teaching and faculty relationships.

Null hypotheses stating that no significant differences would appear between the groups compared were tested. The following comparisons were made: (1) elected leaders (male and female combined) with non-leaders (male and female combined); (2) male elected leaders with male non-leaders; (3) female elected leaders with female non-leaders; (4) male elected leaders with female elected leaders; (5) male non-leaders with female non-leaders; (6) male residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders) with female residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders combined).

For each pair of groups, differences between means were tested using the "Students t test" with the .05 and .01 levels of significance being accepted as indicating degrees of confidence that differences were real.

From the findings of this study the following conclusions were drawn:

1. It can be concluded that residence hall female leader and residence hall female non-leader

students generally have similar perceptions of the university environment, and that residence hall female students in general have a more congruent view of the university environment than residence hall male students.

2. It was concluded that sex differences have a greater influence on the residence hall students' perception of the university environment than does the leadership factor.
3. It was concluded that non-leader male residence hall students in general seem to have a more negative view of the perceived campus environment than the other groups. However, male residence hall students who attain positions of leadership have a more positive perception of the university environment than the non-leader male group.

© 1971

DONALD RAY SANDERSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
UNIVERSITY AS PERCEIVED BY MALE AND FEMALE
ELECTED STUDENT RESIDENCE HALL LEADERS
AND NON-LEADER RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS

by

Donald Ray Sanderson

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1971

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education ^U
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

Sept. 28, 1970

Typed by Erma McClanathan for Donald Ray Sanderson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with sincere appreciation and gratitude that the author acknowledges and sincerely thanks Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson for his graciousness, inspiration, and constructive criticism throughout the development of this study. Sincere gratitude is also extended to the author's graduate committee: Dr. Lester Beals, Dean Robert Chick, Dr. William R. Crooks, and Dr. James Park.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Norbert Hartmann and Mr. Dave Junge for their assistance in the statistical analysis connected with this study.

Finally, sincere appreciation is expressed to my wife, Nancy, for her constant devotion and encouragement throughout my entire graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Research Hypotheses	9
Definition of Terms	10
II. Review of Related Literature and The College and University Environment Scales	14
College and University Environment Scales	14
Studies Showing Acceptability of the Instrument	18
Historical Development of Residence Hall Government	21
Selected Studies on Elected Student Leaders	28
Summary	33
III. Methodology and Procedure	35
Design of the Study	35
Selection of Subjects	37
Characteristics of Leader and Non-Leader Groups	39
Collection of Data	39
Analysis of Data	41
IV. Analysis of Data	45
V. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	56
Summary	56
Findings	59
Conclusions	65
Recommendations	66
Bibliography	68

Appendix

Appendix A.	Letter of Invitation	73
Appendix B.	Test Scores of Male Non- Leaders	74
Appendix C.	Test Scores of Male Elected Leaders	76
Appendix D.	Test Scores of Female Elected Leaders	78
Appendix E.	Test Scores of Female Non-Leaders	80

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Comparison of Selected Characteristics of the Four Study Groups	40
II. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using t Test for Residence Hall Elected Leaders (L) and Non-Leaders (NL)	47
III. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Elected Male Leaders (ML) and Non-Leader Male Students (MNL)	48
IV. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Female Elected Leaders (FL) and Female Non-Leaders (FNL)	50
V. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Male Elected Leaders (ML) and Female Elected Leaders (FL)	51
VI. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Male (MNL) and Female (FNL) Non-Leader Students	53
VII. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Male (M) and Female (F) Students	54

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
UNIVERSITY AS PERCEIVED BY MALE AND FEMALE
ELECTED STUDENT RESIDENCE HALL LEADERS
AND NON-LEADER RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today in higher education there is increased emphasis upon involving students in university governance. Events on the campus of the University of California, Berkeley, during the fall of 1964, and at other institutions of higher learning during the subsequent years, have dispelled the long held assumption of political apathy among college and university students. Concern about the complacent and passive student has been replaced by intense efforts among the academic community to discover new ways of involving students in the decision-making process of university governance (Draper, 1965).

The traditional and well established means of providing students a voice in governing the university seems no longer adequate. New forms of organization for student government are being implemented with varying degrees of success. Students today are gaining official representation at all levels of the university governing structure from traffic committees to board of trustees. The American Association of University Professors (1966) emphasized the need for student participation at all levels of university

governance in the following statement:

The variety and complexity of the task performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, and students. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

The task of implementing communications demands recognition of the fact that the student population of a given institution is made up of a number of communities and sub-cultures (Trow, 1960; Frantz, 1969).

Williamson (1961) emphasized the need for educators to recognize that group differences exist on university campuses to the same degree that individual differences exist.

Pace (1960) stated that administrators and faculty members at institutions of higher education do not understand the character of their student bodies or the way in which the campus environment affects student attitudes toward the university.

Hollander and Regula (1969) stated that elected group spokesmen or leaders are an effective means of providing group representation. They further suggested that greater demands are made on elected leaders than on appointed group leaders. The subsequent effect is that the elected group leader is more effective.

The need for college self-studies that would provide

institutions of higher education with factual data regarding the composition of their student bodies was called for by Stern (1963).

It is reasonable to assume that, in our society, student participation in governmental affairs of the university will continue to be through elected student representatives. However, Newcomb (1966) pointed out that educators need to be aware that student group attitudes change as the membership of the group changes and that group spokesmen need periodic reselection.

This study is an attempt to determine if those students who participate in residence hall student government differ in their perceptions of the university environment, when compared with students living in the residence hall who are not involved as leaders in the governmental process.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the increased awareness that students need to be represented in university affairs and despite the recognition that various subgroups exist within the student body, there is a paucity of research as to whether democratically selected student representatives do in fact represent the views of their respective constituency.

At Oregon State University the residence hall student government is comprised of student leaders elected by students residing in the residence halls. It is assumed that

through the democratic election process the students will select leaders who are representative of their views and concerns; however, emperical data is lacking to substantiate this assumption. It is to this problem that this study addresses itself.

The nature of student representation in residence hall student government programs is worthy of study. One needs to be in contact but a short time with institutions that have such groups to hear a variety of speculative statements regarding their characteristics. One commonly held notion seems to be that elected residence hall leaders can represent students residing in the residence halls. Also, it is common to hear statements that male and female students have entirely different needs and perceptions regarding the university.

As stated by Sanford (1967), our culture consistently fails to develop the talents of its women. Women are assumed to have different abilities, needs, and personality characteristics than men. Colleges and universities need to experiment with educational procedures that assist young women in making knowledgeable educational and vocational decisions.

Oregon State University offers an unusual opportunity to study such groups of students. Both a large and growing residence hall system and a well organized residence hall student government program exist on campus.

Historically the residence hall student government at Oregon State University has been divided by sex. However, beginning in the fall of 1970, the traditional men's and women's residence hall councils will combine into one residence hall governing body.

Against the background of current interest in involvement of students in university governance, new organizational forms of student government, and apparent lack of research regarding the nature of student leadership, the present study was conceived and developed.

Purpose of the Study

The specific purpose of this study is to compare the perceptions of the university environment of four groups of residence hall students at Oregon State University. The perceptions of the university environment of male and female residence hall elected leaders and non-leaders will be identified using the College and University Environment Scales (CUES). The five scales plus two subscales of CUES are:

1. Practicality
2. Community
3. Awareness
4. Propriety
5. Scholarship

Subscales:

1. Campus morale
2. Quality of teaching and faculty relationships

The objectives of this study will be to determine:

1. If differences exist between residence hall elected student leaders and non-leader students residing in the residence halls in their perception of the university environment.
2. If differences exist between residence hall male elected leaders and non-leader male students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment.
3. If differences exist between residence hall female elected leaders and non-leader female students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment.
4. If differences exist between residence hall male and female elected leaders in their perception of the university environment.
5. If differences exist between residence hall male and female non-leader students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment.
6. If differences exist between residence hall male and female students in their perception of the university environment.

Significance of the Study

The data gathered from this study will prove useful to the administration, faculty, and student personnel staff at Oregon State University in their relationships with residence hall students. At a time when the maintenance of adequate communications among all members of the university community is so crucial, it is very important that student leadership be truly representative of the many small groups that develop within large living complexes (Chickering, 1967). More specifically, improved understanding of the perceptions of the university environment of residence hall students is important in the maintenance of a positive climate for student relations in residence halls at Oregon State University. This understanding of student perceptions will also provide a frame of reference for anticipating and interpreting the needs of residence hall students.

Falvey (1952), Mueller (1961), and Wren (1951) have all emphasized that it is the responsibility of institutions of higher learning to derive the maximum educational benefit from the awareness and concern of students and student leaders. Each of these student personnel educators has stressed that student personnel faculty must identify the needs and characteristics of campus leaders so that educational programs can be made as relevant and effective as possible.

Information gained from this investigation should have significance for the director and staff of the residence hall program office at Oregon State University in their planning and counseling with the elected officers of residence hall student government. Data suggesting how the elected leaders perceived their campus environment as compared with non-leaders should help to provide guidelines for assuring adequate representation and communication.

Additionally, it is hoped that hypotheses and questions will be generated by the data which will lead to further research at Oregon State University and other colleges and universities.

Limitations of the Study

The study was admittedly limited relative to analysis of the data in the following ways:

1. The data was accurate in so far as the College and Environment Scales is a valid instrument in measuring students' perceptions of the university environment.
2. It must be recognized that all of the participants in the study were Oregon State University students.
3. It is always possible that some uncontrolled variable could have affected the responses of the students.

Research Hypotheses

In order to facilitate statistical treatment of the data, the following research hypotheses were formulated in the null form:

1. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between elected residence hall leaders and non-leader students residing in residence halls as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
2. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between male elected residence hall leaders and non-leader male students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
3. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between female elected residence hall leaders and non-leader female students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
4. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female elected residence hall leaders, as measured by the College and University

Environment Scales.

5. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female non-leader students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

6. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Definition of Terms

Residence Halls

Residence halls at Oregon State University are University owned student housing complexes. Residence halls at Oregon State University offer in addition to living quarters, educational, recreational, and social programs for student residents.

Residence Hall Student Government

Residence hall student government at Oregon State University is the student organization having university authorized jurisdiction in program development, and

responsibility for formulation of opinions and attitudes representative of residence hall students. All students, male and female, elected to an office in residence hall student government must have the following qualifications:

- 1) be a full-time student at Oregon State University;
- 2) be a member of the sophomore, junior, or senior class;
- 3) hold a cumulative Oregon State University grade point average of 2.00 or higher based on a range of 0.00 to 4.00;
- 4) be currently residing in the residence halls.

Male Residence Hall Leaders

Male residence hall leaders are students elected to the residence hall government office of floor president or vice president.

Female Residence Hall Leaders

Female residence hall leaders are students elected to the residence hall government office of floor president or vice president.

Non-Leader Students

Non-leader students meet the same qualifications of class rank, enrollment status, cumulative grade point average, and residing in residence halls as do elected

leaders, with the exception that they do not hold an elected residence hall government position. Also, non-leader students did not hold elected leadership positions in other forms of campus student government. The non-leader student group was used as the control group for this study.

Cumulative Grade Point Average

Cumulative grade point average was computed at the end of spring term, 1969, and is an average of the students' total grade points earned at Oregon State University.

Perception of University and Campus Environment

The terms "perception of the university environment" and "campus environment" are used interchangeably in this study. Perception is defined by the five scales and two subscales of the College and University Environment Scales. This instrument will be described in detail in Chapter II of this study.

Upperclass Students

Upperclass students are defined as male or female students who have completed a minimum of three terms at Oregon State University and earned at least 45 hours of credit at the conclusion of spring term, 1969.

Transfer Students

Transfer students are defined as male or female students with upperclass standing who have not attended Oregon State University for a minimum of three consecutive terms.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
AND THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES

The College and University Environment Scales (CUES) will first be described. To show its acceptability as a valid instrument to measure student perception of the university environment, selected studies which have used the CUES will be reviewed.

This review of literature will also be concerned with the following two topics:

1. Historical development of residence hall government. This topic was chosen because it is important to trace the early and continuous involvement of students in the governance of residence halls, beginning with the early trends of student participation and ending with the current concept of living-learning centers and coeducational living arrangements.

2. Selected studies on elected student leaders. Since the present study concerns itself with elected student leaders of residence halls, selected studies concerning elected student leaders in general will be reviewed.

College and University Environment Scales

The College and University Environment Scales, 2nd Edition, by C. Robert Pace, published and distributed by the Institutional Research Program for Higher Education,

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967, will be the instrument utilized. This instrument contains 160 true-false items and is to be used in defining the atmosphere or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the university as students perceive it. The instrument contains the following five scales plus two special subscales (Pace, 1967).

Scale 1. Practicality

The 20 items (that contribute to the scores) 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 participation 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 is responsive 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 suggest 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, and interest in ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline -- all these are characteristic of the environment.

Definition of the Special Subscales

Campus Morale. The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by acceptance of social norms, group cohesiveness, and friendly assimilation into campus life. At the same time, a commitment to intellectual goals is exemplified and widely shared in an atmosphere of

personal and social relationships that are both supportive and spirited.

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

Studies Showing the Acceptability of the Instrument

The following studies utilized the College and University Environment Scale as an instrument to measure the perceptions held by students of the university environment.

In a study by Centra (1966) to determine if perceptions of the university environment differ among academic units of a university, the CUES was administered to a random sample of 500 juniors and seniors in ten colleges at Michigan State University. In general, the students' evaluation of the practical level of student awareness and propriety of the university were similar between colleges. Differences were apparent in estimations of the degree of community atmosphere and level of scholarship. It was also noted that students' perceptions of the total university were similar to those perceptions of their own colleges. The results indicated that students generalized from the environment with which they were familiar to the

university environment as a whole.

Duling (1969), investigating at a large state university the differences that might exist between male and female students, married and single students, social fraternity or sorority members, and native and transfer students, administered the CUES to 748 eligible students. The results indicated that subgroups do differ in the perceptions of at least some aspects of their college environment. Significant differences indicated that women students saw the institution as more group-centered, conforming, and cooperative than did men.

Baker (1966), in a study comparing residence hall students, students residing in private boarding houses, and students who lived at home with both parents, found that students who reside in residence halls and boarding houses are more dependent upon the university for need satisfaction than are students who reside with their families.

Berdie (1966) investigated changes in attitudes and student characteristics and their relationship to college experiences by testing 7,000 entering freshmen at the University of Minnesota before the beginning of classes. Six months later, 292 students of the original sample were retested. It was found that changes in perceptions of the university were unrelated to living and transportation arrangements or to high school grades or academic aptitude. Changes in community and awareness scales were related to

college experiences such as participation in discussion groups, informal contacts with upperclassmen, and participation in social events.

To study the relationship of environmental press and attrition, Conner (1968) tested more than 1,000 Fall 1964 entering freshmen at Southern Methodist University. Men's and women's views of campus press differed; however, no significant relationship between environmental press and attrition was found.

Centra (1967), investigating the effectiveness in promoting a more intellectual, less hotel-like atmosphere, administered the CUES to 483 randomly selected students residing in small residence halls and large living-learning centers. It was found that the feeling of community in the living-learning halls was as strong as in the small halls, indicating that the special arrangements were promoting a congenial, cohesive atmosphere.

Jansen and Windborn (1968) compared the perceptions of the university environment of student social-political action leaders with religious, residence hall, activity, and fraternity leaders at Indiana University. The social-political action leaders scored lower on the awareness and community scales. Females in all groups scored significantly higher on all scales.

Boyer and Michael (1968) found that faculty members and seniors at seven small religious colleges were in close

agreement on all scales of the CUES. The colleges surveyed appeared to have a strong sense of community feeling and propriety.

The results of another study by Yonge (1968), at the University of California, Davis, found that several College and University Environment Scales items related to scale scores on the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Results shed some doubt on the theoretical assumption that the individual and his environment may be analyzed separately.

Historical Development of Residence Hall Government

From their early beginnings colleges and universities have been involved with the issues of student housing and student self-government. McKown (1937) identified the University of Bologna in twelfth century Italy as the beginning of student self-government in residence.

Cowley (1934) stated that in 1262, Bologna faculties were lecturing to almost 10,000 students, and in the same century the University of Paris numbered 30,000 students. That the influx of these hordes of students created a housing problem of considerable magnitude is clear when one remembers that medieval cities seldom numbered more than 5,000.

The involvement of medieval students in housing and self-government was chronicled by Rashdall (1936):

... one of the first university officials and the most important were the taxors, who jointly with arbitrators, appointed, fixed the rents of houses used by scholars.

Rait (1912) concluded that these early student housing units called hostels were democratic, self-governing groups which set up their own financial and disciplinary regulations and their own methods of enforcement.

Findlay (1940) pointed out three facts regarding the intense involvement of medieval students:

1. They were not faced with the problem of adjusting themselves to an intricate, complex institution such as our modern university. Higher education in those days was reduced to its simplest form.
2. These medieval students did not look upon self-government as an extracurricular experience. Self-government was an accepted part of every day's routine.
3. These medieval student bodies were not made up of mental striplings. They were mature in experience, extremely serious in purpose, intensely active in their pursuit of knowledge. Thus it is only natural that we find student government of a free, somewhat undisciplined, oftentimes undefined kind of operation.

By the fifteenth century, control of the medieval universities had passed from the students to the faculty.

At the University of Paris in 1452, students were required to live in housing units controlled by a member of the faculty. Later, at Oxford and Cambridge, the idea of students and faculty living and working together in an organized fashion was expanded into the British residential college concept (Thorndike, 1944).

Brubacher and Rudy (1958) cited two basic differences between the British and early American philosophies regarding the housing of students and the residential university concept:

- a) At Oxford and Cambridge the residential colleges developed into highly significant educational agencies due to their removal of the faculty responsibility for enforcing religious rules and maintaining conduct control. Special deans and proctors were charged with this responsibility, which allowed dons and students to live and work together in the pursuit of academic and social discourse.
- b) American dormitories during the nineteenth century became little more than body shelters. Faculty were saddled with the enforcement of strict religious rules and conduct control. This, coupled with the difficulty of travel for consultation with parents, brought about the substitute parent concept of American colleges and set the stage for the

development of the student-teacher relationship as one of natural enemies.

Brubacher and Rudy further stated that the dramatic response of the pre-Civil War college student to the harsh disciplinary system which ruled him was violent and open rebellion.

Rudolph (1962) claimed that in attempting to deal with problems of student discipline there were a few scattered efforts before the Civil War to involve students in residential self-government. Amherst College's "House of Students" was an early experiment in student government.

One of the first examples of student participation in university government was at William and Mary College in 1779. The students elected representatives to a central body which handled lesser details of general improvement and routine discipline. It was from this experiment that Thomas Jefferson may have developed his concepts for his student government plan at the University of Virginia in 1825 (Leonard, 1956).

Shay (1964) explained that the transition to an older group of students during the post-Civil War period was under way by the 1880's. The average age of students entering the university was 19 or older, and at this age could be treated in a more adult manner than those two years younger.

In 1894, Sheldon (1901) conducted a survey of 40

institutions comprised of 20 small colleges and 20 of the largest American universities. He found five distinct classes of student participation in university government: a) student courts; b) student advisory committees to the faculty; c) general disciplinary committees; d) student committees for the maintenance of order in dormitories; e) student body associations intended to unify and make representative all student interests.

Strozier et al. (1950) expressed the view that today whatever success may be achieved in creating proper living conditions and the proper atmosphere in a residential unit, the necessity for government will exist, if "government" means giving form and structure to the relationship and interactions of the people sharing a community life. Student government is more than an experience in self-governance. It is:

- 1) an instrument by which institutions encourage student initiative and foster a program of activities;
- 2) a form of limitation on the rights of the individual for the collective rights of the group.

Dowse and Harrison (1957) agreed with Strozier by stating that today the need for student government within a residence hall or living unit arises as a direct result of a number of people living together and sharing facilities.

Residence halls in the modern university should be linked with the total complex life of the university and of the community in which it exists. Residence hall government must give high priority to the agencies of all campus government. Every hall should be aware of its position with this campus student government and should take an active part in the operation of all campus government (Gardner, 1956).

Riker (1965) stated that the future success of residence hall housing is in effective living-learning centers that have three essential elements:

1. Programs, developed as a framework for student action and reaction in learning.
2. Staff, selected and organized to sustain the program.
3. Physical facilities, designed to meet the requirements of students, program, and staff.

These elements are closely interrelated and must be developed together.

Williamson (1958) observed that students traditionally have tended to develop residence hall programs with a minimum of educational content. Williamson suggested that greater educational value is achieved in these programs when both faculty and students are included in program development.

However, Murphy (1969) explained that as the current

trends of residence hall educational programs continue, well organized student government is fundamental. Student government has been somewhat successful in making residence hall living an increasingly important part of the student's total educational experience. Recent nationwide emphasis on the development of an educational atmosphere within residence halls explains the rapid increase in the living-learning center concept of student housing, as outlined by Riker (1965).

Greenleaf (1965) predicted that in the future, coeducational residence halls, where male and female students share certain common facilities, will continue to increase in number. Co-ed residence halls provide a challenging and stimulating educational atmosphere for many students. However, the concept of coeducational student housing is new only to the larger university campuses. Coeducational living has long existed on many smaller campuses such as Oberlin and Antioch colleges. Larger universities have traditionally housed men and women students not only in different residence halls but in different geographical areas of the campus. Indiana University has had some form of coeducational housing since 1956 and a combined men's and women's student government since 1959. Greenleaf cites the advantages of coeducational housing as:

- 1) creates a more stimulating environment,

- 2) increased opportunities for leadership through coeducational activities,
- 3) allows student government to develop on a more democratic basis,
- 4) provides for greater efficiency in assigning and utilizing professional staff,
- 5) general social behavior patterns appear to be better in the co-ed living center.

Greenleaf further stated that combining men's and women's student government has proven to be of educational value to both sexes because:

- 1) women students are provided with competitive experiences with men and have the opportunity to experience how men tend to make decisions in a less deliberate manner than women;
- 2) men become aware of the need to incorporate women into the decision-making process, and experience women's tendency to be more deliberate and more concerned with detail in democratic processes.

Selected Studies on Elected Student Leaders

Stillion (1968) reported that there were distinctive value patterns, perceptions and characteristics of students who became campus leaders at Florida State University. He identified and described these characteristics, values, and perceptions and discussed the implications these factors

have in the determination of policies and relationships among student leaders and the general student body. The results of the study showed the following:

1. Student leaders have distinctive value patterns as compared with non-leader students.
2. Student leaders are characteristically different in terms of background, past behavior, and experience from the general student population.
3. Because of these differences, student leaders do not appear to be representative of students in general.

In a similar study at Michigan State University, Paulus (1967) investigated student activist leaders, student government leaders, and students classified as non-leaders and non-activists. Twenty-five students from each population were selected on the basis of sex, grade level, major, and grade point average. These students then responded to a series of scales on the College Student Questionnaire and College and University Environment Scales. The findings indicated that:

1. Student government leaders are the least independent and socially aware.
2. Student government leaders disapprove of non-activists to a greater extent than do activist leaders.
3. Non-activists are more satisfied with the

overall setting of the university than are student activists and student government leaders.

Brooks (1967) studied the views and perceptions of student leaders, faculty, and administrators regarding the acceptability and perceived effectiveness of selected methods of student expression. The investigation attempted to determine if the views of certain student subgroup leaders, faculty, and administration differed, and to identify the direction of these differences. The findings indicated that although student senate leaders are the elected representatives of the student body, their views tend to be atypical of other student leaders. The views and perceptions of religious, fraternal, and residence hall leaders are almost identical to the views of conservative social political action leaders.

The results of another study by Barker (1962) showed that Michigan State University organization leaders were different in socio-economic and educational background from non-joiners. Also, leaders tended to have higher grade point averages.

At the University of Minnesota, Patchek (1957) studied the need for counseling for student leaders. The study revealed that student leaders usually live more strenuous lives than student non-leaders. Student leaders spend 15 to 20 hours a week on leadership activities, and have extreme strain placed upon their human relationships.

Perry (1955) found that Northwestern University male co-curricular activities leaders, when compared with the student body as a whole and a random sample of Northwestern non-leader men, were:

- 1) superior in intelligence and had above average grade point averages;
- 2) aspired to professional level work rather than scientific, technical, or social service areas.

Thrash (1959) conducted a study to discover the characteristics of a selected group of women student leaders at Northwestern University in regard to self-concepts and attitudes toward the University. The findings revealed that women leaders thought students, faculty, and administration created the university climate. They described the climate as both conforming and creative, both social and intellectual in emphasis. Also, the majority of leaders observed that groups living with students of different backgrounds and leadership responsibilities contributed most to their personal growth.

In a recent study, Baine (1968) found that stereotyping according to sex still exists in leadership positions held by men and women in coeducational student associations. This was emphasized by the fact that of 187 institutions surveyed, 179 had male student body presidents and 147 had women serving as student body secretaries.

Dua (1964) tested the hypothesis that definite

personality characteristics may typify leaders according to the campus groups they lead. The study indicated there is a tendency for elected leaders to show greater dominance, to indicate greater theoretical values, and to possess a greater acceptance of the leader role than non-leader students. The major significance of the findings lies in the support they afford to the concept that identification of personal and social variables characterizing leadership among college students is possible.

Goldman (1957), in a recent review of the literature, concluded that:

1. No conclusive evidence exists that high school extracurricular participation either has or has not a relationship to adult leadership.
2. No evidence has been found showing that the level of high school extracurricular participation carries over to college extracurricular participation.
3. There does appear to be some 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.

Summary

The need to ascertain the impact of the university environment upon its students has, in recent years, become quite apparent to educators. The primary cause of this recent awareness by faculty and administration is the rapid growth in numbers of students attending colleges and universities and the diverse backgrounds from which these students come. Review of the literature suggests: (1) that students tend to generalize from their living environment with which they are familiar to the campus environment as a whole; (2) that student subgroups differ in their perception of the university environment; (3) that changes in campus environmental perception of community and awareness were related to student participation in small group activities and social events; (4) that men's and women's views of campus press do differ; and (5) that at religious colleges faculty and senior students were in agreement on all scales of the CUES.

From a historical viewpoint, it seems evident that early student housing began as the sole responsibility of the student and that student self-government was in fact a necessity for daily living; that in the past, American educators did not consider student housing units to be educational facilities, but rather viewed them as conduct control devices and economical body shelters for housing

students. Some authorities emphasize the need for residence hall student government as an educational experience for students. Others foresee more students than ever living in university-owned or -controlled housing. The trend is toward living-learning centers and coeducational residence halls which will provide students not only a bed to sleep in, but an educational environment conducive to human growth and development.

Research on student leaders indicates: (1) that student leaders have distinctive value patterns as compared with non-leader students; (2) that student leaders tend to have higher grade point averages and are more professionally oriented in their academic pursuits than non-leader students; (3) that stereotyping according to sex still exists in student leadership positions; (4) that personality characteristics typify leaders according to the groups they lead; and (5) that high school extracurricular participation does not appear to influence the chances for leadership involvement in later life.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

This chapter will describe the design of the study, how the student sample was selected, how the data were collected, and how the data were analyzed.

Design of the Study

In order to meet the objectives of this study as stated in Chapter I, the following rationale was incorporated into the design of the study. Since the intent of the study was to compare the perceptions of the university environment between elected resident hall leaders and non-leader students residing in the residence halls at Oregon State University, the following factors were controlled:

1. Sex
2. Cumulative grade point average
3. School of enrollment
4. Class standing
5. Chronological age

Since studies frequently show that motivations and behavior of men are different from women in relation to many issues, it seemed logical to study men and women leaders separately. Consequently, it was also necessary to have separate non-leader groups for comparison.

Second was the factor of academic achievement.

Elected residence hall leaders at Oregon State University are required to maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.00. In order to prevent differences between grade point averages from influencing the results of the study, a group of non-leader students was selected whose grade point averages were at least 2.00, but also closely resembled those of the leader groups.

Another factor deemed necessary to be controlled at Oregon State University was that of school of enrollment. It was the consensus of opinion of various knowledgeable people that the daily exposure of the students selected as participants in this study could be greatly influenced by the environmental press in the ten different schools of the university. An example of this concern was the emphasis upon learning about things in such schools as Engineering and Forestry, and the emphasis upon learning about people in such schools as Humanities, Social Science and Education. Consequently, careful consideration was given to school of enrollment in an effort to obtain non-leader groups that closely resembled the leadership groups on this factor.

Class standing was controlled in order to insure an equal degree of familiarity with the university. Elected student leaders at Oregon State University must be upperclassmen. The members of the non-leader group were therefore also upperclassmen. Additionally, the proportion of

students in each class was the same for the non-leader group as for the leader group.

To account for possible differences in maturity, an attempt was made to match the leader groups and non-leader groups as closely as possible according to chronological age.

Selection of Subjects

Four groups of residence hall students were selected to participate in this study. The four groups consisted of: (1) male elected residence hall leaders; (2) male non-leader residence hall students; (3) female elected residence hall leaders, and (4) female non-leader residence hall students.

Leader Groups

The leader groups, both male and female, consisted of all residence hall floor presidents and vice presidents at O.S.U. The offices of floor president and vice president are the highest elective student positions on each floor of the residence hall complexes. In the fall term of 1969, when this study was conducted, there were 52 male residence hall floor presidents and vice presidents, and 53 female floor presidents and vice presidents. All of these students participated in the study.

Non-Leader Groups

A sample of 52 male non-leader students and 53 female non-leader students was selected that resembled the elected leader groups according to the following procedure:

1. The following characteristics of the members of the leadership groups were tabulated:
 - (a) sex
 - (b) cumulative grade point average
 - (c) school of enrollment
 - (d) class standing
 - (e) chronological age
2. A total population of 439 male and 340 female upperclass non-leader students residing in the residence halls at O.S.U. during the fall term 1969 was identified. The source of these data was the official records file located in the Dean of Students Office.
3. An initial random sample of 100 male and 100 female upperclass non-leader students was selected.
4. The records of these 200 students were individually examined. Fifty-two male and 53 female students were selected who, as a group, most closely resembled the leader groups according to the characteristics listed above (1).

Characteristics of Leader and Non-Leader Groups

Table I compares (1) cumulative grade point averages, (2) schools of enrollment, (3) class standing, (4) chronological age of the members of each of the four groups of residence hall students selected for this study. It can be seen from the table that the members of the non-leader groups do resemble the elected leader groups on the required characteristics. The figures are so comparable that it is obvious there are no statistical-significant differences.

In addition, official records were checked to insure that all participants in the study had a minimum of three terms of residence hall living experience at Oregon State University and that they were currently residing in the residence halls fall term 1969.

Collection of Data

The data in this study, used in attempting to differentiate between elected leader and non-leader groups in perceptions of the university environment, consisted wholly of the results of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) as defined in Chapter II. The CUES was administered in the following manner:

(a) Leadership Group. The elected leaders were administered the instrument at their initial hall council

Table I. Comparison of Selected Characteristics of the Four Study Groups.

Characteristic	Male Leaders N(52)	Male Non-Leaders N(52)	Female Leaders N(53)	Female Non-Leaders N(53)
<u>Cumulative GPA</u>				
2.00-2.49	16	19	23	23
2.50-2.99	20	14	14	15
3.00-3.49	14	16	12	12
3.50-3.99	2	3	4	3
<u>School Enrollment</u>				
Agriculture	9	6	4	1
Business and Technology	3	3	6	5
Education	3	3	16	19
Engineering	13	17	0	0
Forestry	6	9	0	0
Home Economics	0	0	11	8
Pharmacy	1	1	0	0
Science	9	5	5	7
Humanities and Social Science	8	8	11	13
<u>Class Standing</u>				
Sophomore	32	36	44	41
Junior	18	14	7	11
Senior	2	2	2	1
<u>Age</u>				
18	6	1	6	4
19	26	27	35	33
20	15	14	19	13
21	4	8	3	3
22	1	2	0	0

meeting, fall term 1969. Those who were absent at the initial meeting were contacted by telephone and administered the instrument the following week.

(b) Non-Leader Group. The instrument was administered to the non-leader students during a meeting specifically called for that purpose. At the initial testing session 54 of the 105 male and female non-leader students responded. At a follow-up session an additional 37 of the remaining 51 responded. The remaining 14 were contacted by telephone and completed the instrument individually. All of the non-leader students contacted took part in the study and the testing was completed within a two-week period early in the fall term 1969.

The participants' answer sheets were hand scored. Each answer sheet was checked three times for possible error. The data were then punched on a standard punch card and analyzed for significant difference by the control data 3300 machine located in the Oregon State University computer center.

Analysis of Data

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between elected residence hall leaders and non-leader students residing in residence halls as measured

- by the College and University Environment Scales.
2. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between male elected residence hall leaders and non-leader male students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
 3. There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between female elected residence hall leaders and non-leader female students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
 4. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female elected residence hall leaders, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
 5. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female non-leader students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.
 6. There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female students residing in

residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

In order to statistically test the hypotheses the following comparisons were made:

1. Elected leaders (male and female combined) with non-leaders (male and female combined)
2. Male elected leaders with male non-leaders
3. Female elected leaders with female non-leaders
4. Male elected leaders with female elected leaders
5. Male non-leaders with female non-leaders
6. Male residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders combined) with female residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders combined)

Comparisons were not made between male leaders and female non-leaders or between female leaders and male non-leaders. These comparisons were not made since the purpose of the non-leader group comparisons were to control for leadership and sex differences.

For each pair of groups, difference between means were tested using the "Students t test" with the .05 and .01 levels of significance being accepted as indicating degrees of confidence that differences were real (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967). The following is a general outline of the test statistic used in analyzing the data:

n_1 — number in first group

n_2 — number in second group

\bar{x} — sample mean of one group

\bar{y} — sample mean of second group

where
$$s_x^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n_1 - 1}$$

and
$$s_y^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{n_2 - 1}$$

μ_1 — population mean of first group

μ_2 — population mean of second group

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x} - \bar{y}) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{s_{\bar{x} - \bar{y}}}$$

where
$$s_{\bar{x} - \bar{y}}^2 = s_{\rho}^2 \frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1 \times n_2}$$

and
$$s_{\rho}^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1) s_x^2 + (n_2 - 1) s_y^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

Because of the statement of the null hypothesis

$$(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 0$$

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was conducted and the results analyzed to provide data about the perception of the campus environment of elected residence hall leaders and non-leaders.

In this chapter the data are tabulated and analyzed in the following six sections:

1. Differences between elected leaders and non-leaders, on the CUES Scales
2. Differences between male elected leaders and male non-leaders, on the CUES Scales
3. Differences between female elected leaders and female non-leaders, on the CUES Scales
4. Differences between male elected leaders and female elected leaders, on the CUES Scales
5. Differences between male non-leaders and female non-leaders, on the CUES Scales
6. Differences between male leaders and non-leaders and female leaders and non-leaders, on the CUES Scales

For each of these six comparisons the following general hypotheses were tested using the "Students t" statistic:

Null Hypothesis H_0 : There is no significant difference between the groups.

Alternate Hypothesis H_1 : There is a significant difference between the groups tested.

These hypotheses were tested at both the one percent and the five percent confidence levels.

Differences Between Elected Leaders
and Non-Leaders on the CUES Scales

As is indicated in Table II, Awareness was the only item measured which showed a significant difference between the leaders and non-leaders. Furthermore, this parameter was significant only at the .05 confidence level. The significantly higher score of elected leaders indicated that they perceived the campus environment as being more conducive to Awareness than did non-leader students.

Differences Between Male Elected Leaders
and Male Non-Leaders on the CUES Scales

Table III indicates that there were significant differences measured between male elected leaders and non-leaders in two of the seven categories. In measuring on the Awareness scale a significant difference was recorded at the .05 confidence level. The same was true concerning the Campus Morale factor. None of the other five factors measured showed significant differences at either level. Male leaders had higher scores on both scales that were significant, indicating that they perceived the campus

Table II. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Elected Leaders (L) and Non-Leaders (NL).

		Elected Leaders		<u>N</u>		
		Non-Leaders		105		
		Mean	SD	t	1.977 Sig. at .05	2.611 Sig. at .01
Practicality	L	10.78	2.47	.5682	accept	accept
	NL	10.97	2.37			
Community	L	9.62	3.74	.6087	accept	accept
	NL	9.29	4.17			
Awareness	L	11.00	3.26	2.293	reject	accept
	NL	10.00	3.05			
Propriety	L	9.30	3.70	.0514	accept	accept
	NL	9.33	4.25			
Scholarship	L	6.80	2.73	.3380	accept	accept
	NL	6.93	2.56			
Campus Morale	L	10.96	4.12	1.831	accept	accept
	NL	9.94	3.92			
Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	L	5.44	2.21	1.136	accept	accept
	NL	5.10	2.15			

Table III. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Elected Male Leaders (ML) and Non-Leader Male Students (MNL).

				N		
				52		
				52	1.985	2.630
		Mean	SD	t	Sig. at .05	Sig. at .01
Scale 1 Practicality	ML	10.69	2.49	.6159	accept	accept
	MNL	10.40	2.27			
Scale 2 Community	ML	10.36	3.62	1.132	accept	accept
	MNL	9.51	3.98			
Scale 3 Awareness	ML	10.44	2.99	2.5008	reject	accept
	MNL	8.98	2.96			
Scale 4 Propriety	ML	9.03	4.00	.6617	accept	accept
	MNL	8.51	3.99			
Scale 5 Scholarship	ML	6.82	2.47	.1896	accept	accept
	MNL	6.73	2.68			
Scale 6 Campus Morale	ML	10.92	4.17	2.1290	reject	accept
	MNL	9.30	3.53			
Scale 7 Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	ML	5.63	1.80	1.3728	accept	accept
	MNL	5.11	2.04			

environment to be more conducive to Awareness and sensed a higher degree of Campus Morale than did male non-leaders.

Differences Between Female Elected Leaders
and Female Non-Leaders on the CUES Scales

Table IV indicates that there were no significant differences between female elected leaders and female non-leaders on any of the seven scales of the CUES. The lack of significant differences on any of the seven scales indicated that female leaders and female non-leaders perceived the campus environment in a similar manner.

Differences Between Male and Female Residence
Hall Elected Leaders on the CUES Scales

Table V indicates that Community was the only item measured which indicated a significant difference between male leaders and female leaders. The difference was significant at the five percent level. The significantly higher score of the male leaders indicated that they perceived the campus environment as being more conducive to a sense of Community than female leaders.

Table IV. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Female Elected Leaders (FL) and Female Non-Leaders (FNL).

				Female Leaders		Female Non-Leaders	
		Mean	SD	t	N		
					53		
						1.985	2.630
						Sig. at	Sig. at
						.05	.01
Scale 1 Practicality	FL	10.86	2.480	1.4022		accept	accept
	FNL	11.52	2.366				
Scale 2 Community	FL	8.90	3.75	.2141		accept	accept
	FNL	9.07	4.38				
Scale 3 Awareness	FL	11.54	3.44	.8945		accept	accept
	FNL	11.00	2.82				
Scale 4 Propriety	FL	9.56	3.39	.7431		accept	accept
	FNL	10.13	4.38				
Scale 5 Scholarship	FL	6.79	2.98	.6388		accept	accept
	FNL	7.13	2.45				
Scale 6 Campus Morale	FL	11.00	4.12	.5353		accept	accept
Scale 7 Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	FL	5.26	2.55	.3606		accept	accept
	FNL	5.09	2.28				

Table V. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using the t Test for Residence Hall Male Elected Leaders (ML) and Female Elected Leaders (FL).

		Male Leaders		<u>N</u>		
		Female Leaders		52		
		Mean	SD	t	1.985 Sig. at .05	2.630 Sig. at .01
Practicality	ML	10.69	2.49	.3617	accept	accept
	FL	10.86	2.48			
Community	ML	10.36	3.62	2.0251	reject	accept
	FL	8.90	3.75			
Awareness	ML	10.44	2.99	1.752	accept	accept
	FL	11.54	3.44			
Propriety	ML	9.03	4.00	.7277	accept	accept
	FL	9.56	3.99			
Scholarship	ML	6.82	2.47	.0642	accept	accept
	FL	6.79	2.98			
Campus Morale	ML	10.92	4.17	.0949	accept	accept
	FL	11.00	4.12			
Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	ML	5.63	1.80	.8560	accept	accept
	FL	5.26	2.55			

Differences Between Residence Hall
Male and Female Non-Leader Students
on the CUES Scale

Table VI indicates that there were significant differences measured between male and female non-leaders in two of the seven categories. In measuring on the Practicality scale a significant difference was recorded at the .05 confidence level. However, the Awareness scale showed a difference was significant at the .01 level. Female non-leaders had higher scores on both scales that were significant. This is an indication that they perceived the campus environment to possess more qualities of Practicality and Awareness than male non-leaders.

Differences Between Male and Female
Residence Hall Students on the CUES Scales

As indicated by Table VII, Awareness was the only item measured that showed a significant difference between the male and female residence hall students. Furthermore, this parameter was significant at the .01 confidence level. Female students' higher score on the scale that was significant indicated that they perceived the campus environment as being more conducive to Awareness than male students.

Table VI. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using t Test for Male (MNL) and Female (FNL) Non-Leader Students.

		Male Non-Leaders		t	Female Non-Leaders	
		Mean	SD		1.985 Sig. at .05	2.630 Sig. at .01
Practicality	MNL	10.40	2.27	2.480	reject	accept
	FNL	11.52	2.36			
Community	MNL	9.51	3.98	.5425	accept	accept
	FNL	9.07	4.38			
Awareness	MNL	8.98	2.96	3.573	reject	reject
	FNL	11.00	2.82			
Propriety	MNL	8.51	3.99	1.970	accept	accept
	FNL	10.13	4.38			
Scholarship	MNL	6.73	2.68	.7988	accept	accept
	FNL	7.13	2.45			
Campus Morale	MNL	9.30	3.53	1.654	accept	accept
	FNL	10.56	4.21			
Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	MNL	5.11	2.04	.0497	accept	accept
		5.09	2.28			

Table VII. Comparison of Differences in Score Distribution on the Seven Scales of the CUES using t Test for Residence Hall Male (M) and Female (F) Students.

			Male	<u>N</u> 104			
			Female	106			
		Mean	SD	t	1.977 Sig. at .05	2.611 Sig. at .01	
Practicality	M	10.54	2.38	1.955	accept	accept	
	F	11.19	2.43				
Community	M	9.94	3.81	1.749	accept	accept	
	F	8.99	4.06				
Awareness	M	9.71	3.05	3.649	reject	reject	
	F	11.27	3.14				
Propriety	M	8.77	3.99	1.962	accept	accept	
	F	9.84	3.91				
Scholarship	M	6.77	2.57	.5009	accept	accept	
	F	6.96	2.72				
Campus Morale	M	10.11	3.93	1.1945	accept	accept	
	F	10.78	4.15				
Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships	M	5.37	1.93	.6475	accept	accept	
	F	5.17	2.41				

Summary

There were no significant differences found on the Propriety, Scholarship, or Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationship scales among the four groups under study.

Significant differences were found on the Practicality, Awareness, Community, and Campus Morale scales.

The groups differed most frequently on the Awareness scale. This scale was found to be significantly different when comparing the following groups:

1. Elected leaders to non-leaders
2. Male leaders to male non-leaders
3. Male non-leaders to female non-leaders
4. Male residence hall students to female residence hall students

Significant differences in the Practicality scale were found between male non-leaders and female non-leaders. A significant difference was found in the Community scale between male leaders and female leaders. The Campus Morale scale appeared as significantly different in the comparison between male leaders and male non-leaders.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of four sections. First, the purpose, problem and procedures were reviewed; second, findings were drawn based upon the data analyzed in Chapter IV; third, conclusions were formulated on the basis of the findings; and fourth, recommendations were made based upon the conclusions.

Summary

The problem of this study was to ascertain if elected residence hall student leaders do, in fact, represent the views of their respective constituency. In addition, comparisons were made between male and female elected residence hall leaders and two comparable non-leader groups. The instrument used in the investigation to compare the perceptions of the university environment of residence hall elected leaders and non-leaders was the College and University Environment Scales (CUES). This instrument was described in detail in Chapter II. The five scales plus two subscales of CUES are:

1. Practicality
2. Community
3. Awareness
4. Propriety

5. Scholarship

Subscales:

1. Campus morale
2. Quality of teaching and faculty relationships

The objectives of the study were to determine:

- 1) if differences exist between residence hall elected student leaders and non-leader students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment;
- 2) if differences exist between residence hall male elected leaders and non-leader male students residing in the residence hall in their perceptions of the university environment;
- 3) if differences exist between residence hall female elected leaders and non-leader female students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment;
- 4) if differences exist between residence hall male and female elected leaders in their perception of the university environment;
- 5) if differences exist between residence hall male and female non-leader students residing in the residence hall in their perception of the university environment;
- 6) if differences exist between residence hall male

and female students in their perception of the university environment.

Summary of Procedures

The procedures followed to meet the objectives of the study were:

1. Selection of leader groups: The total population of 52 male elected residence hall leaders and 53 female elected residence hall leaders were given the CUES during the fall term 1969. During the same period of time the non-leaders (52 males, 53 females) completed the instrument.
2. From the official records located in the Dean of Students Office, the following characteristics of the leaders were identified:
 - (a) Sex
 - (b) Cumulative grade point average
 - (c) School of enrollment
 - (d) Class standing
 - (e) Chronological age
3. A total population of 439 male and 340 female upperclass non-leader residence hall students was identified as living in residence halls fall term 1969.
4. An initial random sample of 100 male and 100 female students was selected.

5. The records of these 200 students were individually examined and 52 males and 53 females, who closely resembled the leader groups, were selected to participate in the study.

Summary of Analysis of Data

In order to statistically test the hypotheses the following comparisons were made:

1. Elected leaders (male and female combined) with non-leaders (male and female combined)
2. Male elected leaders with male non-leaders
3. Female elected leaders with female non-leaders
4. Male elected leaders with female elected leaders
5. Male non-leaders with female non-leaders
6. Male residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders combined) with female residence hall students (leaders and non-leaders combined)

Statistical comparisons were made by utilizing the "Students t test." All differences were tested at the .05 and .01 level of significance.

Findings

The following findings were based upon the analysis of the statistical data gathered.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics

between elected residence hall leaders and non-leader students residing in residence halls as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

A significant difference was observed at the .05 level of confidence on the Awareness scale of the CUES between elected residence hall leaders and non-leaders. The first null hypothesis was rejected. Elected leaders appeared to perceive a campus environment stressing expressiveness, expansion, and enrichment of personality. It also suggests that elected leaders sense a significantly greater concern for self understanding, reflectiveness, and personal meaning in their campus surroundings than did their non-leader counterparts. It should be noted that male non-leaders had a lower mean score than any of the other groups.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between male elected residence hall leaders and non-leader male students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Significant differences between male elected residence hall leaders and non-leader male students residing in residence halls were observed at the .05 level of confidence on the Awareness and Campus Morale scales of the CUES. Therefore, the second null hypothesis was rejected.

Male elected leaders appeared to be characteristically more concerned for self understanding, with a greater sense of reflectiveness and personal meaning in their campus surroundings than shown by their non-leader counterparts. Male leaders indicated that they were more inclined to perceive the campus environment as stressing enrichment of personality, expressiveness, and expansion of the individual than are non-leaders.

The high mean score of male leaders on the Campus Morale scale suggests that they perceived an environment characterized by greater acceptance of social norms, greater group cohesiveness, and more friendly assimilation into campus life than by non-leaders. Additionally, it suggests that male leaders perceive the campus environment as having a higher commitment to intellectual goals and an atmosphere of personal and social relationships that are more supportive and spirited than male non-leaders.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in perceived campus environmental characteristics between female elected residence hall leaders and non-leader female students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Significant differences between female elected residence hall leaders and non-leader female students residing in residence halls were not observed on any of the seven

scales of the CUES. Therefore, the third null hypothesis was accepted.

Female leader and non-leader female students were in complete agreement on all seven scales of the CUES, indicating that they have comparable perceptions of the university environment.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female elected residence hall leaders, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Significant differences between male and female elected residence hall leaders were observed at the .05 level of confidence on the Community scale of the CUES. Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis was rejected.

Male leaders described the campus environment as being more friendly, cohesive, and group-oriented than perceived by the female leaders. Additionally, this indicates that male leaders sense more emphasis upon faculty members knowing students, and that student life is characterized by togetherness and sharing rather than privacy and cool detachment, than female leaders.

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female non-leader students residing

in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Significant differences between male and female non-leader students were observed on the Practicality and Awareness scales of the CUES at the .05 and .01 level of confidence. Therefore, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected.

Female non-leader students perceived the campus environment as being characterized by more enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities than male non-leaders. Also, female non-leaders sense the campus environment as being more orderly, and that supervision is more evident by the administration and classroom work than felt by male non-leaders. They also perceive higher benefits and prestige to be obtained by participation in the system, knowing the right people, and in being a leader than do male non-leaders.

As indicated by the female non-leaders' higher mean score on the Awareness scale, they perceive the Oregon State University campus as emphasizing more self understanding and reflectiveness than their male counterparts. Also, this indicates a greater concern within the campus environment regarding a stress for awareness of self, society, and of aesthetic stimuli.

Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences in the perceived campus environmental characteristics between male and female students residing in residence halls, as measured by the College and University Environment Scales.

Significant differences between male and female students residing in residence halls at Oregon State University were observed at the .01 level of confidence on the Awareness scale of the CUES. Therefore, the sixth null hypothesis was rejected.

This indicates that female residence hall students perceive the campus environment as stressing more expressiveness, expansion and enrichment of personality: that they sense a significantly greater concern for self understanding, reflectiveness, and personal meaning in their campus surroundings than do their male counterparts.

The nature of the findings indicates that despite the fact that there were some significant differences between the groups compared, elected residence hall leaders and non-leader students are generally similar in their perceptions of the university environment. As demonstrated in the analysis of the data and stated in the findings, five of the six null hypotheses were rejected. However, of the five rejected hypotheses, three were rejected due to a difference on just one of the seven scales; the remaining two rejected hypotheses indicated

significant differences on only two of the seven scales. However, the data from this study does not indicate why these male leaders perceived the environment in this significantly different manner.

The Awareness scale appeared as a significant difference in four of the six comparisons made. Male non-leaders in all of these cases obtained the lowest mean Awareness scale score. Also, the male non-leader group obtained the lowest mean score on the Campus Morale and Practicality scales.

Sex seems to influence the Awareness of the university environment. Female residence hall students in general appear to be more aware as shown by their obtained mean scores. The Awareness scale scores of the female groups were higher than both the male groups.

However, both male and female leaders obtained higher Awareness scale scores than their non-leader counterpart groups.

Conclusions

From the findings of this study the following salient conclusions and implications were drawn. These conclusions are supported by the findings of Berdie (1966), Stillion (1968), and Duling (1969).

1. It can be concluded that residence hall female leader and residence hall female non-leader

students generally have similar perceptions of the university environment, and that, as supported by Jansen and Winborne (1968), residence hall female students in general have a more congruent view of the university environment than residence hall male students.

2. The results of this study concur with the findings of Conner (1968) in which it was concluded that sex differences have a greater influence on the residence hall students' perception of the university environment than does the leadership factor.
3. In agreement with a study by Perrie (1965), non-leader male residence hall students in general seem to have a more negative view of their perceived campus environment. However, male residence hall students who attain positions of leadership have a more positive perception of the university environment.

Recommendations

On the basis of the results of this study it is recommended that:

1. Further studies be undertaken at Oregon State University and on other college and university campuses which would employ the CUES in a manner similar to that which was used in this study in

comparing elected residence hall leader and non-leader students.

2. Studies need to be undertaken which go beyond the scope of this investigation to determine how demographic and sex factors influence elected leaders' and non-leader students' perception of the university environment.
3. Further consideration needs to be given to the comparison of residence hall student government leaders' perception of the campus environment to that of elected leaders of other campus organizations, and to include other basic report variables not included in this study.
4. A large-scale longitudinal investigation should be conducted to determine if the leadership experience has any measurable effect upon the perceived campus environment of those students who have served in such leadership capacities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baine, Emmie V. 1968. Women holders of leadership positions on the coeducational campus. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 32:39-41.
- Baker, S. R. 1966. The relationship between student residence and perception of environmental press. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:222-224.
- Barker, Louis A. 1962. A comparison of university student organization leaders and non-joiners in academic abilities and personality characteristics. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 44:126-129.
- Berdie, Ralph F. 1966. College expectations, experience and perceptions. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:336-344.
- Boyer, E. L. and W. B. Michael. 1968. Faculty and student assessments of the environments of several small religiously oriented colleges. *California Journal of Educational Research* 19:59-66.
- Brooks, Gary Donald. 1967. A study of the acceptability and perceived effectiveness of selected methods of student expression to faculty, student leaders and administration. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 8:3-19.
- Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. 1968. *Higher education in transition*. New York, Harper. 406 p.
- Centra, John A. 1966. Major field as a variable in student perceptions of a large complex university. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:325-336.
- Centra, John A. 1967. Student perceptions of residence hall environments: living learning vs. conventional units. Paper read at American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas.
- Chickering, Arthur W. 1967. College residence and student development. *Educational Record* 48:179-186.
- Conner, Douglas J. 1968. The relationship between college environmental press and freshmen attrition at Southern Methodist University. *College and University* 43:265-273.

- Cowley, W. H. 1934. The history of student residential housing. *School and Society* 40:705-712.
- Dowse, Eunice and Mary Harrison. 1957. The educational program of the residence hall. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 20:58-57.
- Draper, Hal. 1965. The new student revolt. New York, Grove Press. 156 p.
- Dua, Prem S. 1964. Personality characteristics differentiating women leaders from nonleaders in a university. *National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 27:128-132.
- Duling, John A. 1969. Differences in perceptions of environmental press by selected student subgroups. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 32:130-132.
- Falvey, Francis E. 1952. Student participation in college administration. New York, Columbia University. 206 p.
- Findlay, J. T. 1940. Student government, medieval, colonial and modern style. *School Activities* 15:315-350.
- Frantz, Thomas T. 1969. Student subcultures. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 10:16-20.
- Gardner, Evelyn. 1956. The multiple relationships of residence halls. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 20:83-90.
- Goldman, Leo. 1957. Construction of a student leadership rating scale. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 8:87-98.
- Greenleaf, Elizabeth A. 1965. Coeducational residence halls. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 25:106-111.
- Hollander, Julian and C. R. Regula. 1969. Endorsement of the group spokesman as a function of his source of authority, competence and success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 11:42-49.
- Jansen, David G. and Bob Windborn. 1968. Perceptions of a university environment by social political action leaders. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 47:218-222.

- Leonard, Eugenie A. 1956. Origins of personnel services in American higher education. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press. 117 p.
- McKown, Harry Charles. 1937. Extracurricular activities. New York, Macmillan. 734 p.
- Muller, Kate Hevner. 1961. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston, Houghton Mifflin. 562 p.
- Murphey, Raymond O. 1969. Developing educational meaning for residence halls. The Journal of Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs 7:61-64.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Research on student characteristics: current approaches. In: The College and the Student, by L. E. Dennis and J. F. Kauffman. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1966. p. 101-116.
- Pace, Robert C. 1960. Five college environments. College Board Review 41:24-28.
- Pace, Robert C. 1967. College and university environmental scales. 2d ed. Princeton, Educational Testing Services. 60 p.
- Patchek, Paul H. 1957. A university's attempt to counsel student leaders. Journal of Higher education 28:137-142.
- Paulus, George S. A multivariate analysis study of student activities leaders, student government leaders, and non-activists. Doctoral dissertation. East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1967. 143 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Perry, J. Warren. A study of the characteristics of male student leaders in cocurricular activities at Northwestern University. Doctoral dissertation. Chicago, Northwestern University, 1955. 369 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Rait, Robert Sangster. 1912. Life in the medieval university. Cambridge, The University Press. 164 p.
- Rashdall, Hastings. 1936. The universities of Europe in the middle ages. New York, Oxford University Press. 593 p.

- Riker, Harold C. 1965. College housing as learning centers. Monographs in Student Personnel No. 3. Washington, D.C., The American College Personnel Association. 56 p.
- Rudolph, Frederick. 1962. The American college and university, a history. New York, Knopf. 516 p.
- Sanford, Nevitt. 1967. Where colleges fail. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass. 215 p.
- Shay, John E. 1964. The evaluation of the campus residence hall, part II: the resurgence. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 28:25-33.
- Sheldon, Henry Davidson. 1901. Student life and customs. New York, Appleton. 366 p.
- Snedecor, George and William Cochran. 1967. Statistical methods. Iowa State University Press. 539 p.
- Statement on government of colleges and universities. 1966. American Association of University Professors, Bulletin 52:375-379.
- Stern, G. G. 1963. Characteristics of the intellectual climate in college environments. Harvard Educational Review 33:5-41.
- Stillion, Glenn Wayne. Values, perceptions and characteristics of student leaders, compared with the general student population at Florida State University. Doctoral dissertation. Gainesville, Florida State University, 1968. 85 numb. leaves. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts 29:1429. 1968)
- Strozier, Robert M. et al. 1950. Housing of students. American Council on Education Studies 14:40-43.
- Thorndike, Lynn. 1944. University records and life in the middle ages. New York, Columbia University Press. 448 p.
- Thrash, Patricia Ann. Women student leaders at Northwestern University: Their characteristics, self-concepts, and attitudes toward the university. Chicago, Northwestern University, 1959. 180 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)

- Trow, M. The campus viewed as culture. In: Research on college students by The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960. 205 p.
- Williamson, E. G. 1958. Students' residences: shelter or education. The Personnel and Guidance Journal 36:392-397.
- Williamson, E. G. 1961. Student personnel workers' responsibility for student expression on social issues. The Personnel and Guidance Journal 40:123-128.
- Wrenn, Gilbert C. 1951. Student personnel work in college. New York, The Roland Press Company. 570 p.
- Younge, George D. 1968. Personality correlates of the college and university environment scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement 28:115-123.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Letter of Invitation

November 5, 1969

Dear _____

During the past three weeks I have been conducting a study of OSU residence hall floor presidents and vice-presidents. I have just completed interviewing your hall officers and now need to interview some residence hall students that are not elected officers.

I am doing this study for my doctoral thesis. What I am trying to find out is if men and women residence hall students at OSU see the University in the same way. As you can see, this is non-threatening and will take no more of your time than 20-25 minutes.

I need your participation. Please be at Bruce Gilbertson's room (Head Resident of Sackett), Apt. 2572, Monday at 6:15 p.m. If you have additional questions you may contact Bruce. Also, you can contact me at the Student Activities Center in person or by phone, ext. 2101.

Thank you,

Don Sanderson
Student Activities Center
Memorial Union, ext. 2101

APPENDIX B

Test Scores of Male Non-Leaders on the College and University Environment Scales as Listed: (A) Practicality; (B) Community; (C) Awareness; (D) Propriety; (E) Scholarship; (F) Campus Morale; (G) Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships.

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
1	12	11	12	8	5	12	7
2	12	13	7	5	6	5	6
3	10	6	11	6	2	6	5
4	10	12	11	9	7	9	6
5	11	15	12	8	6	10	8
6	7	1	6	4	8	3	1
7	10	7	9	3	9	4	4
8	10	5	8	6	4	5	3
9	8	9	6	8	7	7	7
10	12	6	8	14	6	8	5
11	12	18	6	11	9	11	8
12	13	8	5	6	2	4	2
13	10	12	4	6	4	8	5
14	14	12	9	16	4	14	4
15	11	11	11	7	13	12	9
16	11	15	13	13	4	13	8
17	8	16	7	14	7	13	6
18	6	11	6	4	10	10	5
19	11	10	12	7	7	12	8
20	11	14	11	13	5	11	8
21	12	11	10	10	4	11	7
22	10	5	7	7	7	8	2
23	9	5	8	8	5	6	3
24	9	11	13	17	5	12	7
25	10	7	12	11	8	15	4
26	10	8	12	6	8	10	7
27	14	9	10	6	3	7	4
28	9	8	12	12	8	10	8
29	6	7	6	4	5	7	3
30	10	5	11	11	9	14	6
31	8	6	4	4	11	5	2
32	14	8	8	2	7	4	2
33	13	6	8	9	5	9	4
34	9	9	11	10	5	12	6
35	10	16	8	16	10	16	5

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
36	11	8	3	4	11	4	2
37	7	5	8	6	6	5	3
38	7	8	6	5	4	4	4
39	9	8	7	6	8	8	5
40	12	10	8	11	9	11	3
41	10	12	5	11	8	9	2
42	12	3	7	12	4	8	3
43	8	12	13	12	7	13	7
44	13	11	14	5	6	11	5
45	13	14	7	3	7	10	6
46	15	6	12	8	6	12	5
47	13	12	11	7	4	13	5
48	12	10	13	10	12	13	6
49	9	14	8	14	11	6	8
50	14	13	5	2	12	5	5
51	8	8	6	6	2	6	5
52	6	18	8	10	8	13	7

APPENDIX C

Test Scores of Male Elected Leaders on the College and University Environment Scales as Listed: (A) Practicality; (B) Community; (C) Awareness; (D) Propriety; (E) Scholarship; (F) Campus Morale; (G) Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships.

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
1	10	16	10	6	7	9	7
2	7	13	5	4	9	11	5
3	9	7	7	8	7	8	4
4	9	8	8	12	5	9	4
5	7	8	6	2	9	4	5
6	9	10	8	8	6	5	5
7	14	8	16	11	4	14	6
8	13	7	6	7	3	7	3
9	5	15	15	16	5	15	9
10	8	4	6	4	4	2	2
11	13	10	8	6	12	14	4
12	13	12	11	3	11	7	4
13	6	10	7	3	8	8	8
14	6	10	7	6	8	8	6
15	7	6	10	13	5	9	5
16	11	13	14	6	7	12	7
17	10	2	9	2	5	4	5
18	11	14	11	14	7	14	7
19	13	12	8	11	6	10	6
20	12	15	13	14	9	16	6
21	10	11	9	8	5	9	6
22	13	3	7	7	7	5	2
23	12	10	11	6	2	10	6
24	12	10	8	9	7	13	4
25	14	9	13	4	7	12	5
26	12	8	11	9	6	11	4
27	7	8	7	12	9	6	4
28	11	8	7	5	13	11	4
29	11	8	10	6	3	7	7
30	8	18	15	18	5	18	9
31	8	10	11	15	11	12	6
32	10	14	11	12	7	17	4
33	9	9	8	3	7	6	6
34	10	13	13	10	11	16	10
35	12	12	14	10	9	18	8

APPENDIX C (Cont'd)

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
36	11	12	13	9	8	10	4
37	15	15	15	12	8	19	6
38	12	16	13	9	11	18	8
39	12	13	12	8	8	13	7
40	14	16	14	13	8	18	9
41	10	6	14	11	6	13	7
42	11	8	10	10	2	10	6
43	15	11	12	15	7	14	7
44	11	14	13	14	8	16	7
45	10	13	10	7	5	13	5
46	12	15	14	16	5	11	7
47	15	6	5	9	4	7	2
48	14	12	13	10	7	13	6
49	12	10	10	9	8	8	6
50	11	10	14	12	5	12	5
51	8	5	12	4	4	7	5
52	11	6	9	12	5	9	4

APPENDIX D

Test Scores of Female Elected Leaders on the College and University Environment Scales as Listed: (A) Practicality; (B) Community; (C) Awareness; (D) Propriety; (E) Scholarship; (F) Campus Morale; (G) Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships.

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
1	7	4	8	6	4	8	0
2	9	6	7	7	2	4	4
3	11	10	13	11	8	12	6
4	9	10	15	7	9	12	6
5	12	13	15	13	10	16	7
6	9	11	10	12	3	12	6
7	9	8	11	5	6	12	7
8	10	6	7	11	4	8	3
9	9	11	10	8	7	10	5
10	9	7	13	8	7	10	4
11	13	12	7	10	8	12	5
12	13	15	17	12	7	19	8
13	11	16	18	16	11	19	11
14	8	13	9	6	7	13	7
15	8	6	9	10	3	9	5
16	11	8	13	5	6	12	1
17	12	8	15	10	5	11	9
18	7	6	5	10	2	5	1
19	7	6	10	3	18	7	2
20	14	11	15	10	8	13	8
21	9	3	9	9	6	7	4
22	10	12	9	9	11	8	5
23	12	13	16	9	10	13	9
24	12	3	10	8	4	8	2
25	10	9	15	14	9	15	5
26	11	6	11	11	7	11	5
27	11	3	10	8	2	7	3
28	12	15	12	6	5	15	9
29	4	4	7	4	4	7	5
30	12	16	15	5	4	16	10
31	10	12	14	13	3	14	6
32	11	6	13	7	9	10	4
33	15	14	18	17	10	20	8
34	13	9	15	12	8	15	5
35	15	2	10	8	2	7	2

APPENDIX D (Cont'd)

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
36	10	7	10	8	7	11	1
37	10	9	16	14	6	17	8
38	9	15	11	11	6	14	7
39	14	5	8	7	8	7	3
40	14	7	7	10	5	7	4
41	15	11	9	11	8	8	3
42	12	11	15	14	10	13	10
43	12	13	18	17	7	20	7
44	13	7	8	10	11	9	5
45	15	5	16	8	8	14	6
46	10	8	11	12	5	8	3
47	12	11	7	14	7	9	4
48	10	3	10	5	5	7	3
49	11	5	6	8	9	3	3
50	7	9	12	10	11	6	4
51	15	11	13	7	6	10	7
52	8	12	11	16	7	16	8
53	14	9	13	5	5	7	6

APPENDIX E

Test Scores of Female Non-Leaders on the College and University Environment Scales as Listed: (A) Practicality; (B) Community; (C) Awareness; (D) Propriety; (E) Scholarship; (F) Campus Morale; (G) Quality of Teaching and Faculty Relationships.

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
1	14	9	12	13	9	12	7
2	12	5	8	12	4	7	3
3	11	7	10	14	5	9	2
4	10	7	11	8	5	9	4
5	9	18	16	15	11	20	9
6	11	7	12	11	6	11	4
7	8	13	14	16	8	18	6
8	12	3	8	4	8	7	4
9	13	7	16	13	7	14	3
10	13	7	13	11	4	12	6
11	16	7	10	16	6	10	5
12	9	9	16	18	8	12	8
13	10	16	10	13	9	12	8
14	12	16	9	12	11	15	7
15	13	5	14	2	11	8	6
16	10	9	15	6	9	14	7
17	10	11	9	9	9	8	5
18	12	11	15	16	4	12	5
19	12	13	13	11	7	11	8
20	11	16	7	14	7	13	6
21	13	15	8	13	11	13	4
22	11	12	9	11	1	10	3
23	13	5	8	4	8	3	2
24	10	11	14	12	8	15	7
25	7	5	6	3	8	6	6
26	13	3	14	16	7	15	4
27	10	9	9	9	8	10	6
28	11	2	7	9	4	2	2
29	12	18	16	15	8	20	10
30	10	8	12	8	4	12	8
31	12	5	12	7	8	12	4
32	14	5	6	10	9	4	5
33	9	4	8	10	3	5	1
34	14	16	11	8	7	14	8
35	16	11	13	12	10	16	6

APPENDIX E (Cont'd)

Subject No.	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
36	10	11	8	8	5	7	3
37	6	8	9	8	7	9	3
38	11	9	12	12	4	11	9
39	11	7	9	10	4	9	3
40	13	5	10	3	7	7	4
41	10	10	11	15	9	15	8
42	16	16	10	18	8	14	5
43	8	5	12	12	10	13	2
44	7	8	6	9	1	7	6
45	10	11	11	14	7	12	5
46	16	1	14	1	11	10	2
47	13	7	8	4	7	4	2
48	12	10	11	7	8	13	4
49	12	12	11	9	9	10	7
50	11	17	13	13	10	11	8
51	17	10	11	10	5	6	6
52	12	4	11	8	7	6	1
53	13	5	15	4	7	3	3
