



A study of the characteristics of the educational environment in the Montana University System
by Edward John Dahy

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF
EDUCATION

Montana State University

© Copyright by Edward John Dahy (1977)

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to find the similarities and differences in the Montana University System; to determine whether student perceptions of collegiate environments varied in the six units and whether they varied when students were divided into various subgroups within the units.

Utilizing the cluster sample, the data was collected from 768 student reporters during Spring Quarter, 1977. The instrument used was C. Robert Pace's College and University Environment Scales. All seven scales were utilized: Practicality, Scholarship, Community, Awareness, Propriety, Campus Morale and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships.

Student perceptions of environmental climate were significantly different within the colleges when students were divided into different subgroups by class, grade point average and evaluation of collegiate experience. This variability caused complete rejection of ten of the eleven null hypotheses. However, this variability pointed out certain similarities which were more meaningful.

Five of the six units were quite low on the Practicality Scale. Three fell below Pace's normal range and two were in the range of normalcy by only one point. Low grade point average students and students who have a low evaluation of their collegiate experience consistently scored lower on all seven scales for the entire Montana University System. Additionally scores were lower for Juniors than for Sophomores and again lower for Seniors than for Juniors for the Montana University System as a whole.

The findings of the study should have value for Montana University System administrators and faculty in the evaluation of state-wide purposes and programs.

A STUDY OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT
IN THE MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

by

EDWARD JOHN DAHY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved:

Earl W. Ringo
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Robert J. Hilkaalt
Head, Major Department

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of a thesis requires the support of a multitude of people. The writer is indebted to all of them. Had they not been willing to give of their time and energy, it would have been more difficult, if not impossible, to complete this study.

Deep appreciation is extended to Dr. Earl N. Ringo, chairman of my doctoral committee, as well as to the other members of the committee, Dr. Douglas Herbster, Dr. Gerald Sullivan, Dr. Robert Thibeault, Dr. Robert Van Woert, Dr. Giles Cokelet and Dr. Harold Anderson.

My sincere gratitude is expressed to the people who made the gathering of the data possible: at the University of Montana, Dr. Arnold Bolle, Dr. Richard Solberg and Dr. Eldon Baker; at Eastern Montana College, Dr. Gardy Van Soest and Mr. Erick Erickson, at Northern Montana College, Dr. H. Warren Gardner and Dr. Lee Spuhler; at Western Montana College, Mr. Terry Cypher; at Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, Dr. Dennis Haley, and also to my son, Edward J. Dahy, who "hit the road" and collected data for me.

Special thanks to Dr. Albert Suvak and the staff of the Computer Center for their time and effort and to all of the faculty members at the six units who gave up their class time. Thanks also to the seven hundred sixty-eight students who cared enough to answer the questionnaire.

Finally, to my wife and children goes my sincere gratitude. Without your love, patience and support there would be nothing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Vita	ii
	Acknowledgements	iii
	Table of Contents	iv
	List of Tables	vi
	List of Figures	ix
	Abstract	xi
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Application	2
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Plan of the Study	4
	Summary	6
2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
	Personality Characteristics and Change in Personality	8
	Studies of Personality Change	11
	Environmental Studies	15
	→ Attitudes, Values, and Campus Environmental Influences	16
	Influence of College Environments	18
	Changes in Attitudes and Values	21
	College Structure	24
	Institutional Characteristics	27
	A Possible Model	29
	The Development of a Measure of College Environment	29
	Rationale for Development	32
	Characteristics of the College Characteristics Index	34
	College and University Environment Scales	36
	Summary	37
3	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	39
	Sampling Procedures	39
	Instrument Used in the Study: College and University Environment Scales	44
	Hypothesis	49
	Summary	51

Chapter		Page
4	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	53
	Hypothesis 1.	57
	Hypothesis 2.	66
	Hypothesis 3.	71
	Hypothesis 4.	75
	Hypothesis 5.	79
	Hypothesis 6.	83
	Hypothesis 7.	87
	Hypothesis 8.	91
	Hypothesis 9.	95
	Hypothesis 10	99
	Hypothesis 11	103
	Summary	118
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	122
	Summary	122
	Conclusions	127
	Recommendations	128
	REFERENCES	130
	APPENDIXES	136
	Appendix A.	137
	Appendix B.	143
	Appendix C.	145
	Appendix D.	147
	Appendix E.	156
	Appendix F.	164

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology	59
2	Northern Montana College	60
3	Western Montana College.	61
4	Eastern Montana College.	62
5	University of Montana.	63
6	Montana State University	64
7	Hypothesis 2, Least-Squares Analysis of Variance	66
8	Hypothesis 2, All Respondents - Mean	67
9	Hypothesis 2	69
10	Hypothesis 3, Least-Squares Analysis of Variance	71
11	Hypothesis 3, Male Respondents - Mean.	72
12	Hypothesis 3	73
13	Hypothesis 4, Least-Squares Analysis of Variance	75
14	Hypothesis 4, Female Respondents - Mean.	76
15	Hypothesis 4	77
16	Sophomores, Least-Squares Analysis of Variance .	79
17	Hypothesis 5, Sophomores	80
18	Sophomores	81
19	Juniors, Least-Squares Analysis of Variance. . .	83
20	Hypothesis 6, Juniors.	84

LIST OF TABLES, Continued

Table		Page
21	Hypothesis 6	85
22	Seniors -Least-Squares Analysis of Variance. . .	87
23	Hypothesis 7, Seniors.	88
24	Hypothesis 7	89
25	High Achieving Students - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	91
26	Hypothesis 8, High Achieving Students.	92
27	Hypothesis 8	93
28	Low Achieving Students - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	95
29	Hypothesis 9, Low Achieving Students	96
30	Hypothesis 9	97
31	High Evaluating Students - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	99
32	Hypothesis 10, High Evaluating Students.	100
33	Hypothesis 10.	101
34	Low Evaluating Students - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	103
35	Hypothesis 11, Low Evaluating Students	104
36	Hypothesis 11.	105
37	Summary of Means	110
38	Sex - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance	120

LIST OF TABLES, Continued

Table		Page
39	Sex Means - Montana University System	109
40	Between Grades - Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	111
41	Grade Mean- Montana University System	112
42	Evaluation of Collegiate Experience - Least- Squares Analysis of Variance.	114
43	Evaluation of College Experience - Montana University System	115
44	Grade Point Average - Montana University System Least-Squares Analysis of Variance.	116
45	GPA Mean Scores - Montana University System . .	117
56	Summary of Means.	120

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Normal Profiles for TC, ES, and GU Contrasted with Actual Profiles of Montana University System Units.	65
2	Practicality Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System.	149
3	Awareness Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	150
4	Scholarship Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	151
5	Community Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	152
6	Propriety Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	153
7	Campus Morale Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	154
8	Quality of Teaching and Faculty and Student Relationship Scale. Normal range of CUES scores based on national sample, with computed scores for Montana University System	155
9	Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology	158
10	Northern Montana College.	159
11	Western Montana College	160
12	Eastern Montana College	161

Figure		Page
13	University of Montana	162
14	Montana State University.	163
15	Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology	165
16	Northern Montana College.	166
17	Western Montana College	167
18	Eastern Montana College	168
19	University of Montana	169
20	Montana State University.	170

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find the similarities and differences in the Montana University System; to determine whether student perceptions of collegiate environments varied in the six units and whether they varied when students were divided into various subgroups within the units.

Utilizing the cluster sample, the data was collected from 768 student reporters during Spring Quarter, 1977. The instrument used was C. Robert Pace's College and University Environment Scales. All seven scales were utilized: Practicality, Scholarship, Community, Awareness, Propriety, Campus Morale and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships.

Student perceptions of environmental climate were significantly different within the colleges when students were divided into different subgroups by class, grade point average and evaluation of collegiate experience. This variability caused complete rejection of ten of the eleven null hypotheses. However, this variability pointed out certain similarities which were more meaningful.

Five of the six units were quite low on the Practicality Scale. Three fell below Pace's normal range and two were in the range of normalcy by only one point. Low grade point average students and students who have a low evaluation of their collegiate experience consistently scored lower on all seven scales for the entire Montana University System. Additionally scores were lower for Juniors than for Sophomores and again lower for Seniors than for Juniors for the Montana University System as a whole.

The findings of the study should have value for Montana University System administrators and faculty in the evaluation of state-wide purposes and programs.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Montana University System units are, in great measure, described by the types of programs which exist at the various units. Additionally, much space has been devoted in the media to statements by various groups and persons, to the necessity of avoiding duplication of programs in the University System. Student perceptions of the institution attended should have some effect on programs which are established and are continued, since these institutions exist to serve the students. Some studies have identified student characteristics, faculty backgrounds and student success. Considerable information has also been accumulated on student abilities and measured success for various categories of students.

This study has explored the similarities and differences of institutional environments in Montana's six university units. In 1961, C. Robert Pace said ". . . with the college, the crucial knowledge concerns its overall atmosphere or characteristics, the kinds of things that are rewarded, encouraged, emphasized, the style of life which is valued in the community and is most visibly expressed and felt." (1)

The more recent instruments, such as the College Characteristics Index, and the College and University Environment Scales, which have

been developed to measure environmental characteristics, as they exist in our colleges, rely on their ability to discriminate between environments on collegiate campuses. These instruments rest on the assumption that rules and regulations, facilities, student-faculty relationships, classroom methods, extra-curricular activities and all of the other factors in the total college environment, result in specific environments which students perceive and which exert an influence upon them.

Early developers and researchers in this area have found that substantial differences exist among institutions when they are classified as to the organizational structure, control, location and other characteristics by which colleges may be classified: (See pages 22-28.)

APPLICATION

With student numbers again on the increase, an understanding of the environmental characteristics at each of the six units of the Montana University System, would seem essential as programs are considered for retention, cancellation or introduction. Students' perceptions of the environmental climate together with evaluations of the education which students are currently receiving, at each of the six units, should prove to be of value to the Legislature, the Board of Regents, and the Commissioner of Higher Education, as they consider these matters. The results of this study allow them to add a new

dimension to their decision making - that of relating environment to program. The researcher believes this to be a most valuable tool.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to compare the educational climate at the six units of the Montana University System, as perceived by the students in each unit.

Specific questions to which answers were sought were:

1. How do the students evaluate their particular units and their collegiate experience?
2. What are the environmental characteristics of the individual units?
3. How do the individual units compare, one with another on these characteristics?
4. Do student groups within each of the units and by total group agree or disagree in their perceptions of the institutional climate when they are subdivided on various student characteristics?
5. Are the six units similar or different from environmental patterns of the colleges and universities studied in norm groups?

Answers to these questions contribute to an understanding of the role served by each of the six units in higher education in Montana and in service to their students. Student characteristics have been

determined by the descriptive data collected. The perceptions of institutional press of college environments were tested under specific hypotheses which relate to the questions stated above.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

This study was an investigative study for which a survey method was considered to be appropriate. The theory for the research had already been developed and now was focused on the university system of one state.

The sample was chosen from the sophomore, junior, and senior classes with the number of students tested based on the recommendations contained in the instrument itself. This number was determined by the size of the institution tested. Fall, 1976 figures were used in determining institutional size. Greater detail on this procedure is provided in Chapter 3.

The College and University Environment Scales was the standardized analytical instrument used. This questionnaire, developed by Pace, and included as Appendix A, provides a measure of environmental climate within institutions. It asks each respondent to indicate whether the statements made are either true or false depending upon whether or not they describe practices or characteristics of the respondent's institution.

Four major assumptions were made in pursuing this study:

1. The students tested were representative of the total collegiate population in the six units of the Montana University System.

2. The students did respond honestly in reporting their perceptions of their unit's characteristics as identified by the instrument.

3. Institutional climate at the six units can be measured by scores on the College and University Environment Scales.

4. Knowledge of the functioning of perceived institutional environment will prove valuable in the assessment of institutional programs, objectives and guidance of student educational programs.

Two limitations of this study were acknowledged:

1. No generalizations beyond the State of Montana may be made on the basis of the study, since the study was limited to the six units of the Montana University System.

2. No attempt was made to relate student needs to the environmental climate of the six units of the Montana University System.

The major value of the study is that the individual institutional characteristics of each one of the six units of the Montana University System will be made available for consideration by those studying the programs available at each of the six units.



DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Environmental climate is identified as the operational pattern

of rules, practices, and happenings on a college campus and how the students and faculty relate to them.

2. Need is that which the student feels as a result of a corresponding press.

3. Press is the aggregate awareness of students about their college environment in the sense that it exerts a directive influence on their behavior.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a brief introduction to this study of environments in the Montana University System. The concept of a collegiate environmental study has been developed as another tool in the appraisal of colleges and universities. The environmental climate is identified as the operational pattern of rules, practices, and happenings on a college campus and how the students and Faculty relate to them. Measuring instruments have been developed which provide insights into these relationships and the effect of the institution upon students and faculty.

This study has extended this approach specifically to the Montana University System. By grouping students in various ways an attempt was made to determine whether student perceptions of environments differ because of the differeng group characteristics.

The findings have value in understanding the role of each of the

six units and in introduction, cancellation and transfer of programs. The findings also provide current information on student evaluation of their college experiences.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Since the purpose of this study was to make comparisons of environmental climate as perceived by various subgroupings of students within the Montana University System, background information in the previous chapter was presented. The present chapter seeks to relate such background to a report on the professional literature which seems pertinent to this investigation. The research design for this study generally differs from those identified in the literature.

Because the literature most relevant to this study is that associated with the development of Pace and Stern's College Characteristics Index, which was the specific predecessor of the College and University Environment Scales, the present chapter has been organized into three sections pertaining to the development and use of that instrument, namely: (1) personality characteristics and changes in personality; (2) attitudes, values and campus environmental influences; and (3) the environment of the college campus. These three sections are followed by a concluding section which highlights implications for the present study.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND CHANGES IN PERSONALITY

One of the earliest works on personality, Explorations in

Personality (2), authored by Henry Murray, identified indices by which overt and manifest needs of individuals could be identified. These indices are as follows:

1. A typical behavioral trend or effect,
2. a typical mode,
3. the search for, avoidance or selection of attention and response to one of a few types of press,
4. the exhibition of a characteristic emotion or feeling, and
5. the manifestation of satisfaction with the achievement of a certain effect, or the manifestation of dissatisfaction when there is a failure to achieve a certain effect. (2:124)

This same author, in seeking to understand the dynamics of behavior, identified two specific variables about which he found it necessary to have knowledge; namely, those describing the needs of the individual and the press of the environment. According to Murray, the individuals act in terms of the situation as they see it. He also maintains that any situation, which confronts individuals with press, automatically creates within the individual a corresponding need or drive. "Press," said Murray (2:54) is "a temporal gestalt of stimuli which usually appears in the guise of a threat of harm or promise of benefit to the individual." He thus related press and need to personality variables and this early researcher subsequently identified a number of personality variables. These variables formed the basic foundation for much of the research done by various researchers in the field including Pace and Stern, whose work eventually led to the development of the College Characteristics Index, the Activities

Index, and the College and University Environment Scales.

But other psychologists have also been concerned with personality characteristics as they relate to continuing college attendance. Harry Grace, for example, observed in "Personality Factors and College Attrition" (3) that the personality factors of responsibility, independence, and anxiety helped to determine whether or not a student dropped out of college. However, in reviewing more specific personality variables a pertinent statement made by B. F. Skinner in "Freedom and the Control of Men" (4) seems appropriate:

In turning to the external conditions which shape and maintain behavior of men, while questioning the reality of inner qualities to which human achievements were once attributed, we turn from the ill-defined and remote to the observable and manipulable. (4:48)

In a letter of reply to the above article, Eleanor Miller observed that every college catalog assumes Skinner's underlying hypothesis that different physical or cultural environments make different and better men. She countered with the query whether we should not realize what is being done before the students identify the counter controls or before someone raises the question about controlling the controller (5).

Such observations which relate the inner qualities of an individual and the environmental conditions in which an individual moves really concern administrative and supervisory personnel in all types

of educational institutions. If the environment can be adequately described and the impact of that environment upon the specific personalities can be predicted, then Miller's concern in the previous statement becomes much more meaningful. Some attempts to attain this goal have been demonstrated through research which deals with personality change.

Studies of Personality Change

Through use of a series of testing procedures E. Lowell Kelly in "Consistency of the Adult Personality" (6) noted that significant changes took place in human personality even during the years of adulthood. With this identification of changes in personality, he concluded that these changes were neither sudden nor large enough to threaten an individual's self perception, nor did these changes impair the individual's daily interpersonal relationships. This could mean, if the premises were accepted, that personality development involves a number of variables and that an individual's personality is in a constant state of flux or growth throughout his adult life. From such premises one might conclude that changes of personality may very likely occur during an individual's life in a college environment.

Somewhat later, A. R. Gilliland in "Changes in Religious Beliefs of College Students" (7) noted during the period 1933-1949 a positive change in their attitudes toward God and influence of their religion on

conduct, among students at Northwestern University. Gilliland made no direct inferences about the cause of the observed changes among college students except that the increase seemed consistent with the increase in church membership during the same period of time.

In a similar study done at Dartmouth, Irving E. Bender in "Changes in Religious Interest: A Retest After 15 Years" (8) also noted an increase in the religious values within the group studies after a fifteen-year period. The increase was observed for 80 percent of the individuals within his sample.

Walter T. Plant, in his study, "Changes in Ethnocentrism Associated with a Two-Year College Experience", (9) found that actual increments in education were associated with changes in levels of ethnocentrism.

In studying the relationships among interests during the college years at DePauw University, John C. Wright and Barron S. Scarborough reported in "Relationship of the Interest of College Freshmen to Their Interests as Sophomores and as Seniors", (10) that a high degree of relationship between interests identified by students as freshmen and those identified by the same students as sophomores and seniors.

Following an investigation of authoritarian attitudes within a group of students in women's colleges and the changes in such attitudes from the time students were freshmen to the time they were

seniors, Donald R. Brown and Denise Bystry in "College Environment Personality and Social Ideology of Three Ethnic Groups" (11) noted that very few of the significant changes that did occur could be attributed to extenuating circumstances. They commented that the syndrome measured by their version of the authoritarian scales seemed to be reflected in a consistent pattern on two standardized personality instruments. This led them to give credence to the theory that they were dealing with a generalized trait pattern and not a specific attitude. Further, on the basis of their investigations, they felt that an individual's authoritarianism might be altered, at least in its social attributes, by differential experiences.

Joseph A. Del Papolo chose a somewhat different area of application for his research, namely, the relationship between an individual's personality structure and his opinions and attitudes toward his student-teacher relationship as reflected in his observable behavior in a classroom setting. He concluded, in his article "Authoritarian Trends in Personality as Related to Attitudinal and Behavioral Traits of Student Teachers" (12) that the authoritarian students tended to get lower scores than the equalitarian students on an inventory of attitudes about student-teacher relationships.

In his study "Assessing Theological Student Personality Structure", (13) George G. Stern tried to identify the stereotype

personality model that the seminary faculty had for what they considered to be the potentially successful minister. His comparison of this model with the characteristics of students demonstrated the value of the faculty stereotyped model in their evaluation of student performance. On the basis of his investigation, however, he concluded that the criteria for determining the potential success of an individual as a minister should not be determined within the seminary but should rather be established by criteria based upon actual ministerial contact with the social community.

On the basis of research conducted at an Illinois college, Eleanor Miller, in "Non-Academic Changes in College Students", (14) concluded that individually measured characteristics do change throughout the college experience. She maintained that these changes could be differentiated between those caused by the college environment as such, and those caused by development and maturation and/or outside influences. In somewhat similar fashion, Jerome Kagan, et. al, in "Personality and I.Q. Change", (15) concluded that their research showed that changes in environmental conditions could depress or raise the tested IQ level. They further observed that such changes might be explained in terms of personality variables.

Charles McArthur postulated in "Sub-Culture and Personality During College Years", (16) that personalities differ not so much because of

the social class in which an individual is found but more because of the subculture in which he finds himself. The subculture reference in his study was commonality of religious background. He suggested that if association because of similar religion is subcultural, certain dominant traits might be attributed to the religious background.

Environmental Studies

When changes in personality variables were related to the impact of environment upon college students, a new set of investigations emerged. Some found positive influences and others found no significant influence of the campus environment upon the individual. Some of the individual research which showed positive, negative, or no impact of various factors of college life has been summarized below.

To T. R. McConnell, in "A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education", (17) characteristics seemed to play an influential role in determining the atmosphere within the college. He willingly assumed that the type of student body present on the campus played a significant role in creating the type of environment that existed.

The administrative relationship was deemed important to Francis J. Kerins who suggested in "Student Autonomy and Administrative Control" (18) that the tie between the student body and the administration of the school affected the total environment of the institution. He further suggested that, although much more authoritarianism may be

a psychological entity, it was a theoretical position which might better be described in terms of inarticulate drives than by verbalized ideas. He concluded that if this were true the authoritarianism aspect of the inner-relationship between the two groups, administration and student body, could be reflected in the environment as perceived by the students. He was willing to recognize that conflict between the administration and the student body was inevitable and even suggested that such conflict could be desirable.

Joseph Jackson dealt with a different dimension. He noted in "The Effect of Classroom Organization and Guidance Practice Upon the Personality Adjustment and Academic Growth of Students" (19) that teacher tenure and teacher-pupil relationships characterized by warmth and feeling contributed significantly to the emotional wants of the persons in that institution.

ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES

Partially as an outgrowth of his investigation on the influence of the college upon student character, Edward Eddy in "The College Influence on Student Character", (20) concluded that the purely academic activities of the students could either be stimulated or stultified by prevalent attitudes, extra class activities or manners and morals of the campus. He identified six elements which he thought

influenced the development of character and intellect of an individual on the college campus, namely:

1. level of expectancy,
2. effect of environment,
3. concept of teaching,
4. organization of the curriculum,
5. degree of student responsibility, and the
6. opportunity for religious understanding and practice. (20:8)

The first two elements, according to Eddy, resulted from the overall attitude and approach of the college, while the other four contributed to and emerged from everything else that occurred on the campus.

H. S. Becker and Blanche Geer in "Student Culture in Medical School" (21) suggested that the student culture as found in an institution helped students provide a measure of perspective from which they could build a consistent pattern of response to activities within the institution. Further, the student culture provided students with social support and allowed them, as individuals and/or as a group

. . . . independently to assess faculty statements and demands so that they can significantly reinterpret faculty emphasis and in a meaningful way make what they will of their education. (21:73)

These authors concluded that student culture provided the basis of many of the faculty's difficulties with students.

In his study "The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution" (22) Sanford Dornbusch determined that the best attitude

of a new cadet could have been one of unquestioning acceptance of tradition and custom. Continuing, he stated that the Coast Guard Academy isolated cadets from the outside to help individuals identify themselves with their new roles. He suggested that this change in individual self conception eventually caused the cadets to identify themselves with the Academy.

From a different orientation, a study of women's colleges, Mervin B. Freedman in Impacts of College, New Dimensions in Higher Education (23), held that students and student bodies may differ widely in such characteristics as their degree of readiness for new experiences, interest in the impractical versus liberally oriented education and in their orientation to advanced education. He concluded that differences of this sort might create differences in student perceptions of the existing college environment.

Influence of College Environments

Rose K. Goldsen's "Recent Research on the American College Student" (24) concluded that students, as they are exposed to a college environment for a period of time, become socialized and tend to accept the dominant values of that community. This common experience ultimately leads them to acknowledge the purposeful existence of the school's value structure. To illustrate the change in values from the freshmen year to the senior year she reported that entering

freshmen usually select security as their most desired goal whereas seniors choose creativity within an endeavor. Goldsen categorized the choice of the freshmen as an instrumental value and the choice of the seniors as a goal value.

Stern accepted the inevitability of this influence of the college environment when he said in "Assessing Theological Student Personality Structure": (25)

Few teachers can assert that their sole function in the classroom is to transmit cold, factual knowledge in a delimited area. In point of fact we succeed in communicating a great many things to students which are not found as formal statements in the course syllabus or the school catalog. For we are concerned not only with the transmission of the fund of knowledge and appropriate skills which are necessary for the effective exercise of any given professional role; we are equally concerned with the development of appropriate attitudes and values and the specific patterns of interpersonal relationship, which are characteristic of that role. (25:83)

Frederick M. Jervis and Robert G. Congdon commented in "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Educational Values", (26) the intellectual growth within a university is the communication that exists between members of the faculty and the student community. These researchers identified as significant the difference between what students wished to gain from college and what the faculty considered worthy of inclusion in the program of higher education. Jervis and Congdon noted, in contrast to Goldsen's observation, that the expectations of freshmen and seniors were not greatly different. In their particular

investigation, students and faculty were in general agreement on the four major college objectives; except in the rank order assigned to these objectives. For students this rank order of college objectives was:

1. vocational preparation,
2. self fulfillment,
3. self understanding, and
4. intellectual growth.

The faculty reversed the rank order of the first and fourth student objectives. This led the investigators to conclude that the two groups were working out their own needs in separate ways.

In a study of Bennington College, Theodore Newcomb learned that the women attending the school entered into a college life that was intense. He reported in "Personality and Social Change" (27) that this intensity exists primarily:

. . . where they are granted unprecedented degrees of freedom and personal responsibility for their conduct; where students are so selected that they offer much more competition than was met in high school; where there is much more pressure to come to terms with public issues; and where there are people of intelligence and good breeding who do not agree with their families. (27:10)

He discovered that little or no change occurred from the freshmen year to the senior year in homogeneity of attitudes. He did note, however, that the majority of freshmen were closely clustered about the conservative side of the midpoint of most scales, the remainder ranging between the two extremes. The seniors, on the other hand, showed

little clustering at any point and few students demonstrated extremely conservative scores. On the basis of this evidence Newcomb suggested that attitudes do become a function of the college community, and since the college community is not constant, it is likely to have varying effects upon the participants. The changes in attitude of these students had only a slight relationship to the courses of study which they pursued as students. This finding tended to emphasize, said Newcomb, the effect of the total environment upon students.

Changes in Attitudes and Values

In the Goldsen, et. al. study What College Students Think (28) the researchers noted that students at the close of their college years arranged their values for education in a much different hierarchy than they did as freshmen or sophomores. Further, they called attention to the fact that by the end of their four years within the college environment, students became socialized and tended to accept the predominant educational values of the environment, thereby acknowledging their existence and legitimacy. Accordingly, the authors felt that changes within students could not be understood merely by considering individual student changes but, to be more valid, had to be understood through consideration of the total campus culture.

Philip E. Jacob in Changing Values in College (29) was interested in determining the changes that might occur in student value patterns

during college careers, specifically due to involvement in various methods of social science that the values of his college student samples were remarkably homogeneous, that the majority of students were extremely self-centered and that traditional moral values had high priority for most students. He further learned that students normally expressed need for religion and placed a high value on college with special interest in their own institution. In addition, he noted that this homogeneity in values continued throughout college years with the result that greater conformity existed at the end of the four-year period than at the beginning. At the same time, Jacob was unable to discern whether demonstrated changes in students' values could be attributed to curriculum or to the basic social science courses in the general education program. He felt that the methods of instruction employed seemed to have only minor influence upon student value judgments. He suggested that the impetus to change, when changes did occur, could not be primarily attributed to the formal educative process. Finally, Jacob concluded that the major overall effect of higher education upon a student's values was to bring about general acceptance of a set of standards and attitudes.

In a statement, entitled "Implications from Recent Research on College Students", (30) Paul Heist commented on this relationship. He maintained that college counselors who seek to assist and understand

students must first study and understand the cultures and subcultures of the campus.

Donald L. Thistlewaite approached the problem from the structure of the program. He observed that the faculties which inspired achievement in the natural sciences had differing traits from those who stimulated achievement in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. In "College Environment and Development of Talent", (31) he listed the environmental characteristics of faculties that encouraged achievement in those two areas, namely:

A. Natural Science

1. contacts with students characterized by informality and warmth,
2. emphasize high academic standards,
3. high standards of evaluation of faculty productivity and selection of new faculty members,
4. faculty does not play the role of big brother, and
5. tendency to be non-directive in teaching methods.

B. Arts, Humanities, Social Science

1. excellent social science faculty and resources,
2. high degree of energy as well as controversy in instruction,
3. broad intellectual emphasis,
4. frequent contacts with students outside the classroom,
5. flexible, unstructured curriculum.

6. emphasis upon independent study and critical attitude,
7. excellent offering in art and drama, and
8. relatively infrequent appraisals of student performance.

Thistlewaite demonstrated that even though both faculties had similarly desirable results, i.e., achievement within the area, the type of established relationship and curriculum differed.

College Structure

Charles H. Page questioned the bureaucratization of college life and its effect upon the individual. His remarks focused upon college functions, manifest and latent, and the structural consequence of bureaucratization in college and university life. He concluded in "Bureaucracy and Higher Education" (32) that the student body of an institution is changed from a group "to be nourished individuals, each marked with a precious individuality, to a client-public of inexpert and provoking bases."

As early as 1940, Robert K. Merton commented, in "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality", (33) that bureaucratic organization, if it is to operate successfully -- and he would include a college under this category -- must attain a high degree of reliability of behavior. It must also provide an unusual degree of conformity with institutionally prescribed patterns of action.

At the outset of the research undertaken by Marvin Siegelman and Robert Peck, the authors established theoretical assumptions about the need patterns of individuals in relation to their occupational choice. They established different job-role requirements for different occupations. Accordingly they assumed that persons chose occupations which allowed them to satisfy some of their dominant personality needs through the role they saw for themselves within their chosen occupations. They felt, since job-role requirements of a specific occupation satisfy dominant needs of a certain type of individual, that the major portion of individuals in a given vocation do actually have common personality-need patterns. On the basis of such thinking and assumptions the authors developed in "Personality Patterns Related to Occupational Roles", (34) a model of the typical personality patterns for the occupations considered: chemists, ministers, and career military officers.

Leon Festinger demonstrated in his study "Wish Expectations and Group Standards as Factors Influencing Levels of Aspiration", (35) that group aspiration level was affected by whether the individuals knew how their performance on a task compared with that of another group. He offered the illustration of a group which was placed below another group. The discrepancy store -- i.e., the average difference between performance and estimate at the next trial -- would be likely

to change upward by such knowledge.

W. H. Sewell, et. al, introduced another complicating factor in their study "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration" (36) when they hypothesized that levels of educational and occupational aspirations of youth of both sexes were associated with the social status of their families.

At the same time Ernest E. Shannon found no significant differences between problems of students in church-related colleges and those in public educational institutions. He noted, in "Personnel Services Extended to Students of Selected Church-Related Colleges in Solving Their Problems", (37) that academic problems were identified most often in both and that these were also called the most serious. At the opposite extreme health and religious problems were least frequently mentioned and were considered to be least serious for students in the investigated institutions.

In the Heist study "Personality Characteristics of Dental Students", (38) the main motivating force prompting students' efforts appeared to be advancement or achievement. This goal was most often associated with a desire to advance from a lower socioeconomic level to professional status.

Mason W. Gross agreed on the impossibility of identifying any one aspect of college life as contributing chiefly toward intellectual

development. In "The Climate of Learning", (39) he was unable to corroborate the frequently held connotation that one segment provides all that is worthwhile during college life.

In "Personal and Social Development" (40) which is a look at students within a college environment, Martha Norman and Loren R. Tomlinson concluded that personal development ought to be considered apart from social development. This was supported in Walter I. Murray's study, "Conflict and Tension Areas on the Campus." (41) He commented that the conflict situations and tensions were important to the analysis of college student behavior.

Not all of the attitudes and values that become a part of an individual's pattern of behavior can be attributed to the institutional environment, however. At least, such a statement is true if we agree with Irvin Jack Lehmann in his study "Learning: Attitudes and Values," (42) when he summarized the importance of ethnic, cultural and racial factors in an individual's development of attitudes and values.

Institutional Characteristics

At the undergraduate level T. R. McConnell and Paul Heist reported in "Do Students Make the College", (43) that a great many students tend to find their own intellectual level and to seek an education among intellectual peers within the many diverse colleges and universities available in the country. These authors concluded

too, that interest could be depressed and intellectual effort of students stultified in securing their college education. They classified colleges according to whether they were more or less productive in interest and intellectual effort and on the basis of comparisons between the groups. The more productive were those significantly higher in the areas of complexity of outlook and aesthetic values, but lower on authoritarian and religious values.

James S. Davie and A. Paul Hare considered culture, meaning consensus of opinion and behavior on a campus, to be the most important single external factor influencing students experience. They suggested in "Button-Down Collar Culture - A Study of Undergraduate Life at a Men's College", (44) that the relative importance of this external factor depended upon the presence or absence of other external factors, and the strength of these factors.

According to Robert R. Sears in "A Theoretical Framework for Personality and Social Behavior", (45) the social milieu and the interpersonal relations within which a person acts determine his psychological properties. Such conditions seem to indicate that change could and would occur.

In her book "College Life and the Mores", (46) Janet A. Kelley commented that each college is a society with its own particular social limits and creates its own system of relationships. Within

such a framework the students develop associations to fulfill their own needs. Based on the results of her research, she concluded that the whole social control of a campus lies in the multifarious workings of the mores of the campus.

A Possible Model

Although the model designed by J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba in "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process", (47) nomothetic-idiographic, was more specifically designed for considering the relationships between the administrator and his staff, it has some relevance to the present discussion. These authors stated that institutions of learning are purposive, peopled, structural, normative and sanction-rearing and that role might mean positions, offices, or status within the institution. The role in such cases must then be defined in terms of role expectations. Therefore, the theoretical approach that conceived the model mentioned can be seen to apply to the present discussion especially when one reads the following statement of the authors:

. . . inhabiting the system there are individuals with certain personalities and need dispositions whose interactions comprise what we call 'social behavior'. (47:428)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MEASURE OF COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

The present study has selected the College and University

