

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 357

HE 004 523

AUTHOR Porter, Martha
TITLE A Report of Faculty and Student Evaluations of the
Instructional Environment.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
PUB DATE Mar 73
NOTE 79p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; *College Faculty; Evaluation;
Faculty Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Instructional
Improvement; Questionnaires; Research Projects;
*Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Memphis State University

ABSTRACT

This study defines key elements of the instructional environment at Memphis State University perceives and analyzes student and faculty assessments of this environment, and determines the extent of significant patterns of similarity or dissimilarity in the views expressed. Data were collected by a review of related research literature and questionnaires for students and for faculty members. Results indicated, faculty and upper and lower division students had a "somewhat positive" attitude toward the instructional environment. Recommendations suggest specified areas for further study including student orientation and advising, university degree requirements, and instructional environment. Appendices include questionnaire forms. (MJM)



Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

ED 081357

A REPORT OF
FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Reproduced
for
ERIC

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

MARCH, 1973

MARTHA PORTER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 004 523

Memphis State University

ED 081357

A REPORT OF
FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

MARCH, 1973

MARTHA PORTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I:	INTRODUCTION.....	1
SECTION II:	FACULTY EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT.....	7
SECTION III:	LOWER DIVISION STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT.....	18
SECTION IV:	UPPER DIVISION STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT.....	30
SECTION V:	GROUP COMPARISONS.....	44
SECTION VI:	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	49

FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATION OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

Concepts and designs for measuring the impact and quality of undergraduate college experiences vary with the differing viewpoints of the multiple influences comprising the total college environment. Edmond Marks stated, however, that a pattern of environmental grouping was evident and that "...definitions and assessment techniques that have been developed with respect to the college environment fall rather neatly into two distinct conceptual classes."¹ Marks' explanation and description of the two "conceptual classes" seem significantly appropriate to the introduction and discussion of this study on the instructional environment at Memphis State University.

The first conceptual class focuses upon specific, observable properties of the environment and the student body. Environmental items of study include the size of the student body; the average intelligence of the student body; the students' choices of major fields; and certain specific student activities such as what they wear, their amount of time spent studying, the frequency of intellectual arguments, and their social activities.²

The second concept, according to Marks, "...defines and assesses the college environment in terms of individual perceptions, for example, student, faculty and administrative perceptions of environmental attributes."³ Major scales which employ this technique are The College Characteristics Index by Pace and Stern, The College and University Environment Scales by Pace,

and, to some extent, The College Student Questionnaire from Educational Testing Service.

The essential difference between these two approaches can be seen more clearly by comparing parallel items from different scales. The first, selected from a typical College Characteristics Index scale, exemplifies the perceptual approach of the second concept:

In many classes student have assigned seats.

In this example the student is asked to make a subjective, qualitative judgment concerning what constitutes "many," and he must report an impression or perception about general classroom rules. This same example, treated according to the first concept, would become:

Students had assigned seating.

This item, taken from the Inventory of College Activities, would be answered by the student for a particular class in which he was enrolled.⁴

Students or faculty are rarely asked in either of these two approaches to make qualitative judgments or to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their experiences. Instead the students answer "true" or "false" to descriptive statements; "yes," "no," "frequently" or "occasionally" to a list of activities; and "very descriptive," "in between," or "not at all descriptive" to questions concerning the psychological, social or academic climate of the school. Interpretation of student responses is left to the researcher, administrator, and faculty member who must decide if the environment is efficient, desirable or effective in meeting institutional goals.

This one important factor absent in the two conceptual classes, the apparent lack of direct expressions of qualitative judgments, led to this research attempt to develop a method and a means of perceiving and analyzing the most direct student and faculty assessments of the fulfillment of the primary role of the institution: instruction. The classroom experience has been cited as the most significant source of university influence upon students during their undergraduate years.⁵ Therefore, the study was designed to meet instructionally oriented objectives.

Specifically, the purposes of the study were: (1) to define key elements of the instructional environment; (2) to perceive and analyze student and faculty assessments of this environment; and (3) to determine the extent of significant patterns of similarity or dissimilarity in the views expressed.

To meet the first objective, current research on measurement and evaluation of the college environment was surveyed, focusing on those factors that most directly affect the classroom experience. From research the following areas were selected for study: (1) class content; (2) teachers; (3) methods of instruction; (4) course requirements; (5) class participation; (6) student-faculty interaction; (7) degree requirements; (8) counseling; and (9) scholarship.

In this survey of research literature the various methods designed to measure perceptions of the college environment were examined. For the purposes of this study the semantic differential, designed to be a reliable method of "...assessing the interaction between people and situations,"⁶ was determined to be the most effective means of gathering qualitative reactions from a large group. And, deemed essential to this study, the semantic

differential also provides for the "communication of meaning...(through) a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures."⁷

Ordinarily, if we want to find out what something means to a person, we ask him to tell us.... Unrestricted linguistic output of this sort has high presumptive validity, unless we question the honesty of the subject.... But what spontaneous linguistic output may gain in validity and sensitivity, it certainly loses on other grounds--casual introspections are hardly comparable and do not lend themselves to quantification.⁸

With the semantic differential, "...both the direction and the intensity of each judgment"⁹ are recorded. Responses are indicated through the use of scaled polar adjectives with values attributed as indicated:

	Counselors							
	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	
Effective	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Ineffective
Organized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unorganized
Successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unsuccessful

In analyzing responses, the scale is divided into 7 intervals which are identified, from the most positive to the most negative response; as follows:

+3.0	+2.6	very positive
+2.5	+1.6	quite positive
+1.5	+0.6	somewhat positive
+0.5	-0.5	neutral
-0.6	-1.5	somewhat negative
-1.6	-2.5	quite negative
-2.6	-3.0	very negative

The areas selected for study, class content, teachers, etc., were paired with evaluative scales in the survey instruments sent to faculty members and both upper and lower-division students. Any differences encountered in courses of study and counseling services were taken into account in the structure of the student questionnaires. Faculty questionnaires covered all the areas selected for study (see Appendix A).

To ensure the opportunity for expression of direct, evaluative comments concerning the instructional environment, two questions were included in each questionnaire which called for open, subjective descriptions of ineffective and effective experiences deemed outstanding to the respondent.

Responses to the semantic differential portion of the questionnaire were analyzed in three ways. First, mean responses to each question were calculated for the three different responding groups. Second, the mean responses were factor analyzed to determine to what degree correlation existed among questions within each group. Third, to test for significantly similar or dissimilar patterns of responses within and between the three groups, a coefficient of pattern similarity was employed. The Cattell coefficient of pattern similarity is appropriate for use when the "...components of the pattern or profile are independent measures...",¹⁰ as was indicated in the factor analyses of all three survey instruments, and when the patterns are to be matched "...not for some known, particular performance, but for every possible contingency of comparison...."¹¹ Any differences in patterns cited are significant at the .01 level.

The subjective descriptive responses were categorized by topic and percentage distributions calculated in each group.

The faculty questionnaire was distributed to all full-time faculty members of the University; 439 replies (65.1%) were received. The two student questionnaires were distributed to a randomly selected 10% sample of all upper and lower-division students. When initial returns were not sufficient to form an adequate sample, follow-up questionnaires were mailed to the first sample group and questionnaires were sent to another 10% random sample of students. Of the lower-division students, 329 (4.1%)

responded; 408 (76%) of the upper-division students completed the questionnaire.

Results of the study are given in the next five sections: Section II, Faculty; Section III, Lower division students; Section IV, Upper division students; Section V, Group Comparisons; and Section VI, Summary.

SECTION II

FACULTY EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

MEANS

The general pattern of faculty responses to the semantic differential scales indicated a "somewhat positive" view of the instructional environment of the University. This pattern of mean responses is graphed in Table 1. Three questions were exceptions; means were in the neutral range for scales pertaining to the quality of scholarship in the University, and to the personal attention and curricular guidance afforded students by University College counselors (See questions 7, 12, and 13 on Faculty Questionnaire, Appendix A).

The most positive mean response was in the area of departmental encouragement of student interest in their respective fields. The lowest mean responses occurred uniformly in areas which did not have specific departmental associations: quality of scholarship in the total University; University degree requirements; counseling services in the University College; and the total academic or instructional environment of the University. The distributions of negative, neutral and positive responses from which these means were obtained are shown in Table 2.

PATTERNS OF RESPONSE

Subgroups within the faculty, identified by demographic data on the first page of the survey instrument and discussed in this Section, were tested with the Cattell coefficient for significant differences in patterns of responses. The subgroups were identified by: (1) rank; (2) college; (3) years at Memphis State; (4) degree level; and (5) age.

TABLE 1

MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY MEMBERS




TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL AND POSITIVE RESPONSES OF FACULTY

Question	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Total	Mean
1. Subject Matter	42	51	355	448	1.24
2. Teaching Methods	54	67	318	439	.98
3. Teachers	75	71	320	466	.96
4. Course Requirements	62	81	311	454	1.06
5. Student Class Participation	92	64	314	470	.99
6. Out-of-Class Contacts with Students	56	55	358	469	1.36
7. Quality of Scholarship - University	126	105	232	463	.32
8. Quality of Scholarship - Department	84	82	312	478	.88
9. University Degree Requirements	111	88	261	460	.61
10. Departmental Requirements	68	53	353	474	1.29
11. Departmental Encouragement of Students	61	45	372	478	1.39
12. U.C. Counselors: Personal Attention	132	69	152	353	.02
13. U.C. Counselors: Curricular Guidance	144	73	123	340	.26
14. Faculty Advisors: Personal Attention	70	51	317	438	1.11
15. Faculty Advisors: Curricular Guidance	59	57	322	438	1.17
16. Instructional Environment	109	79	284	472	.59

(1) Rank

There were four instances of significant differences between ranks. Associate professors showed a pattern of responses significantly different from that of instructors and assistant professors; professors differed significantly from instructors and associate professors. Responses that were generally more positive than the mean were given by professors and assistant professors while associate professors tended to be uniformly less positive in their responses.

(2) College

When the subgroups were divided by college and tested, there were significant differences in every instance except between the Colleges of Business Administration and Education. The greatest difference existed between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering.

Faculty in the College of Arts and Science were consistently less positive than the total group while the College of Engineering showed generally more positive responses. These differences can be seen in the mean responses graphed for each of the colleges in Table 3.


(3) Years of Experience

Significant differences existed in only two instances when years of experience at Memphis State was the factor tested. Faculty members who had 10 or more years of experience differed significantly from those who had 1 to 2 years of experience, as well as from the group who indicated 6 to 9 years at MSU.

Those faculty members in the group with 10 or more years of experience gave responses that were in every instance more positive than the

TABLE 3

MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY FROM
THE COLLEGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
EDUCATION AND ENGINEERING



group means. Faculty members with 1 to 2 years of experience were uniformly less positive in their responses.

(4) Degree Level

When the faculty respondents were divided into subgroups by degree level, each of the subgroups showed a significant difference from all the other subgroups.

Faculty members holding the master's degree expressed a generally more positive view than that held by the total group.

(5) Age

Tests upon the subgroups as divided by age produced two groups that had significantly similar patterns--those in the 30-39 and 40-49 groups. Faculty members under 30 years of age differed significantly from all other groups; they expressed a more generally negative view. The two groups that were similar, 30-39 and 40-49, differed significantly from faculty members in the 60 or over group. Those in the 60 or over and 50-59 groups expressed more positive views than were the mean for the total group.

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES:
INEFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

The first subjective survey question asked faculty members to cite an incident which led them to view a part of the University's instructional environment as ineffective or disappointing for students. Two-hundred and seventy-five faculty members responded to this question; listed below are topics the responses included and the percentage of replies in each topic category. Some replies discussed more than one category, therefore, the percentage distribution total exceeds one hundred percent.

CATEGORIES OF INEFFECTIVE PARTS
OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	Percent
1. University degree requirements	18%
2. Teachers	16%
3. Academic Experiences	13%
4. Advising by University College	12%
5. Student-teacher interaction	11%
6. Advising by faculty	11%
7. Academic standards	9%
8. Administrative restrictions on faculty	6%
9. Academic policies	5%
10. Programs available	4%
11. Grading, evaluation	3%

Characteristic excerpts from the first six categories of responses, which comprise 81% of the replies, are given below.

Category One: University degree requirements

Eighteen percent of the respondents described the present curricular requirements as "rigid," "restrictive," and "inflexible." Particularly cited were "...the rigid degree requirements of the various colleges on the freshmen and sophomore level...." A typical comment noted that "...the student is denied the opportunity to explore..." and due to the number of required courses, students cannot study their major field in sufficient depth.

Category Two: Teachers

Faculty participants who described teachers as an ineffective part of the instructional environment felt that part of the faculty was "...lacking in competence....," "outdated" and "...indifferent to their students and responsibilities...." Incidents were cited in which teachers were absent from class, or, when present, appeared unprepared.

Category Three: Academic Experiences

Poor academic experiences, due chiefly to "...large, impersonal,

boring..." classes, were described by 13% of the faculty who responded. These large classes, which made it "...impossible to give...care and attention to individual students..." and by virtue of their size promoted student feelings of being "only a number," received the greatest emphasis. Also cited was the poor preparation received by students for upper-division and graduate work.

Category Four: Advising by University College

Twelve percent of the participating faculty agreed with the respondent who felt that "the implied promise of professional, adequate counseling by the University College is not actually being delivered."

Instances were cited in which students had complained to faculty members of being poorly advised. To some faculty members there seemed to be "...an obvious directing of students away from (certain) studies...." Based upon student comments, the counseling was also described as "...impersonal, uninformed (and) hurried...."

Category Five: Student-teacher interaction

Student-teacher interaction was described as "...impersonal and ineffective..." by 11% of the faculty members responding. This was attributed in some instances to large classes, but it was also noted that "faculty members make little effort to direct themselves to students or to encourage some level of student-faculty involvement." Some faculty members felt that students do not take advantage of opportunities, such as clubs, that are available.

Category Six: Advising by faculty

Eleven percent of the faculty members responding commented that advising

of upper-division students by faculty members was "...most ineffective...." The faculty cited frequent complaints of poor advice, little interest, and advisors being there "...merely (to) sign a registration blank...." Several instances of delayed graduation, due to poor advising, were noted, and one faculty member felt that "...many students graduate without a clear understanding of how their 'academic major' relates to the...world in which they must...'make a living'...."

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES:
EFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

The second subjective question asked faculty members to cite incidents which illustrated a particularly effective or outstanding part of the instructional environment. There were two-hundred and fifteen replies to this question. Listed below are the topics covered and the distribution of responses.

CATEGORIES OF EFFECTIVE PARTS
OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	Percent
1. Teachers	26%
2. Academic programs	19%
3. Student-teacher interaction	18%
4. Academic experiences	11%
5. Academic freedom/encouragement	7%
6. Resources	5%
7. Advisors	5%
8. Academic policies and standards	4%
9. Curriculum requirements	3%
10. Potential	2%

Excerpts from the first four categories of responses, which comprise 74% of the replies, are given below.

Category One: Teachers

Twenty-six percent of the faculty respondents observed that teachers were the most effective part of the instructional environment. One respond-

ent indicated that he was "...impressed by the quality of instructors and their desire to be helpful to the students." Numerous instances of student feedback to faculty about outstanding teachers were noted. Several faculty members, however, answering both subjective questions with the same response, felt that teachers "are our greatest strength and our greatest weakness."

Category Two: Academic programs

Effective academic programs, particularly the "...opportunity (for students) to secure instruction in a wide variety of fields and interests...", were commented on by 19% of those faculty responding. Laboratory and applied experiences in education, music and theater were also mentioned as outstanding academic programs available.

Category Three: Student-teacher interaction

In these responses, as well as in the first category of responses (Category One: Teachers), some faculty members saw student-teacher interaction as both effective and ineffective. Noting the contradiction, one respondent cited a lack of involvement between students and professors but also felt that "...there is still an effort to maintain a human element in the instructional process."

Several faculty members based their remarks on student comments which "...indicated that their informal association with many teachers has been very good." They described instances of "specially organized help sessions..." and the "...willingness of faculty to help individual students...."

Category Four: Academic experiences

Academic experiences such as student and faculty involvement in the community, laboratory situations, field trips, and other opportunities for

"...practical application(s) of classwork..." were described as outstanding by 11% of the faculty members responding. Many replies cited "evidence of student enthusiasm, even excitement..." that resulted from a direct involvement in course work and applications.

SECTION III
LOWER DIVISION STUDENT EVALUATION OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

MEANS

Lower division student responses to the semantic differential scales disclosed a "somewhat positive" view of the instructional environment of the University. There were three exceptions: questions regarding University degree requirements and the total instructional environment had means in the "neutral" range, and the question concerning student impressions of their University College advisors as persons had a mean in the "quite positive" interval. All mean responses are graphed in Table 4.

The most positive mean response was with regard to student impressions of their University College advisors as persons. The question concerning University degree requirements received the lowest mean response. The distributions of negative, neutral and positive responses from which all means were obtained are shown in Table 5.

PATTERNS OF RESPONSES

Seven subgroups within the lower division students were identified by demographic data from the survey sheet and tested with the Cattell coefficient for significant differences in patterns of responses. The subgroups were identified by: (1) classification, (2) age, (3) race, (4) sex, (5) commuter/dorm residents, (6) full-and part-time, and (7) transfer and non-transfer.

TABLE 4
 MEAN RESPONSES
 LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS




TABLE 5
 DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL,
 AND POSITIVE RESPONSES FROM LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS

<u>Question</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Subject Matter	40	36	208	284	1.18
2. Teaching Methods	48	44	192	284	.95
3. Teachers	50	40	244	334	1.13
4. Course Requirements	72	55	155	282	.66
5. Class Participation	53	46	185	284	1.07
6. Out-of-Class Faculty Contacts	52	62	157	271	.93
7. Quality of Scholarship	43	67	152	262	.74
8. University Degree Requirements	102	53	116	271	.13
9. U.C. Advisor - Personal	30	30	218	278	1.69
10. U.C. Advisor - Counselor	51	23	202	276	1.35
11. Instructional Environment	81	56	151	288	.42

(1) Classification

There was no significant difference between the patterns of responses given by freshmen and sophomores.

(2) Age

Lower division students in the age group 16-20 differed significantly in their responses from those in the other two groups of ages 21-25 and 26-40. Those in the 16-20 age group were generally less positive in their responses than the other groups.

(3) Race

When the lower division students responding were divided by race into two groups, a significant difference did exist between the patterns of responses given by white and black students. Mean responses from these two groups are graphed in Table 6.

(4) Sex

There was no significant difference between the patterns of responses given by male and female students.

(5) Commuter/Dorm Resident

A significant difference did exist between the patterns of responses given by students who commuted to campus and students who were dormitory residents. The mean responses, graphed in Table 7, indicated that a generally less positive viewpoint was held by dormitory residents, particularly regarding University degree requirements and the total instructional environment.

(6) Full-/Part-time

No significant difference was seen in the patterns of responses given by the two groups of students classified by full-time and part-time status.

TABLE 6

MEAN RESPONSES OF WHITE AND BLACK LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS





TABLE 7

MEAN RESPONSES OF COMMUTER AND DORMITORY RESIDENT LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS



ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Quite Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Quite Positive Very Positive

— Commuter (261)
- - - Dormitory Resident (68)

(7) Transfer/Non-Transfer

Lower division student respondents who had transferred into the University differed significantly in their pattern of response from those students who had attended only Memphis State. Their patterns of responses, graphed in Table 8, show transfer students with a slightly less positive viewpoint. The greatest difference in responses was seen on the scale pertaining to the quality of scholarship in the University.

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES:
INEFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

Two hundred and eighty lower division students responded to the first subjective survey question, which asked them to describe a disappointing or ineffective experience related to the instructional environment. Given below are topics which the responses included and the percentage of replies in each topic category. Some respondents discussed more than one topic in their replies; therefore, the percentage distribution total exceeds one hundred percent.


CATEGORIES OF INEFFECTIVE PARTS OF THE
INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	<u>Percent</u>
1. Teachers	26%
2. University Degree Requirements	17%
3. Academic experiences	16%
4. Evaluation and grading	15%
5. University College advisors	11%
6. Student-teacher interaction	10%
7. Academic policies	6%
8. Academic programs	4%
9. Registration	3%

Characteristic excerpts from student comments and summary statements for the first six categories, which comprise 95% of the replies, are given below.

TABLE 8

MEAN RESPONSES OF TRANSFER AND
NONTRANSFER LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS



Category One: Teachers

Twenty-six percent of the lower-division respondents described disappointing experiences with teachers. Rude remarks, discouraging attitudes, and the feeling that the teacher "...really did not care if the class passed or failed" were cited in the replies. Monotonous lectures and instances of poor explanation by teachers were also described.

Category Two: Structure of University Degree Requirements

Lower-division student responses paralleled faculty remarks concerning degree requirements. Seventeen percent of the students responding felt, as did the faculty, that the number of required courses prevented students from studying their major field in sufficient depth.

Category Three: Academic Experiences

Large lecture classes which restricted involvement and disappointing class content received emphasis from 16% of the lower-division student respondents. Several students felt that materials and methods were "...geared more to high school than to college" and expressed dissatisfaction with their classroom experiences.

Category Four: Evaluation and Grading

Fifteen percent of the lower-division respondents felt that evaluation procedures and assignment of grades in their classes were unfair. Varying standards were perceived among teachers and instances were cited in which students felt that personality rather than performance had influenced a grade.

Standardized departmental tests and testing situations in large lecture classes were also described as ineffective.

Category Five: University College Advisors

Counseling received from University College advisors was described as ineffective by 11% of the lower-division student respondents. Typical of the responses was one student's comment that "advisors should be more helpful, especially to freshmen." Several students characterized the counseling they received as "rushed" and "impersonal" while other students related instances in which they felt they had received incorrect information from the counselors.

Category Six: Student-teacher Interaction

Ten percent of the lower-division respondents described their teachers as "impersonal" and "indifferent". A recurring comment was that "...the teachers do not take the time to know you." Large classes, in some instances, were recognized as a cause of this problem; however, small class situations were described in which "...the teacher knew no one's name at the end of the semester." Difficulties were also described in seeing teachers outside of class for individual help.

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES: EFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

The second subjective question, which asked for a description of an outstanding or effective part of the instructional environment was answered by 261 lower-division students. Listed below are topics which the responses included and the percentage of replies in each topic category. As before, some respondents mentioned more than one topic in their replies, therefore, the percentage distribution total exceeds one hundred percent.

CATEGORIES OF EFFECTIVE PARTS OF THE
INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	Percent
1. Teachers	38%
2. Student-Teacher Interaction	19%
3. Academic Experiences	17%
4. University College Advisors	12%
5. Nothing Positive	12%
6. Academic Programs	4%
7. Evaluation and Grading	2%
8. Registration	1%

Excerpts and summary statements for the first five categories of responses, which comprise 98% of the replies, are given below.

Category One: Teachers

In contrast to the replies on ineffective experiences with teachers, 38% of the lower-division students responding to this question described their experiences with teachers as "interesting" and "rewarding." Teachers who "...cared about (their) students as individuals..." and who would "...go out of (their) way to help..." were described by the respondents. Instances in which teachers encouraged class participation and interest in the subject matter were related; exemplifying these responses was the student who commented: "I have learned and liked what I learned."

Category Two: Student-Teacher Interaction

Nineteen percent of the lower-division students responding to this question related experiences with teachers who were "understanding", "helpful", and "friendly." Repeatedly, instances of out-of-class conferences and special make-up tests were described, with emphasis on those teachers who "...make time to see their students and help them as much as possible."

Category Three: Academic Experiences

Course experiences which brought new interests, field trips, opportunities for applications of course content, and laboratory experiences were described as outstanding by 17% of the lower-division students responding. A wide variety of incidents were related, involving departments and courses throughout the University; those mentioned most frequently were English, psychology, speech and drama, health, and physical education.

Category Four: University College Advisors

"Helpful," "friendly," and "encouraging" were representative terms used by 12% of the lower-division respondents in describing their University College advisors. Exemplifying this attitude was the comment about an advisor "...who cares, who will listen, and who will help..." One student felt that his advisor had "...been the best part of (his) school experiences."

Category Five: Nothing Positive

Twelve percent of the lower-division students responding to this question noted a lack of outstanding or effective experiences. Typical comments were "Nothing has really impressed me" and "I'm sorry to say there have been no ..." outstanding experiences.

SECTION IV

UPPER DIVISION STUDENT EVALUATION OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

MEANS

As did the other two groups, upper-division students indicated a "somewhat positive" attitude toward the instructional environment on the semantic differential scales. The graph of these means, presented in Table 9, shows four scales outside this range: questions concerning University degree requirements and faculty advisors had means in the "neutral" range, and the question concerning student impressions of their University College advisors as persons had a mean within the "quite positive" range.

The question concerning University degree requirements again received the lowest mean response. The mean within the "quite positive" range for the question regarding University College advisors as persons was the most positive mean response. The distributions of negative, neutral, and positive responses from which all means were obtained are shown in Table 10.

PATTERNS OF RESPONSE

Eight subgroups within the upper division students, identified by demographic data from the survey sheet, were tested with the Cattell coefficient for significant differences in patterns of responses. The subgroups were identified by: (1) College, (2) Classification, (3) age, (4) race, (5) sex, (6) commuter/dorm resident, (7) full-/part-time, and (8) transfer/non-transfer.

MEAN RESPONSES OF UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS




TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL AND POSITIVE RESPONSES
FROM UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS

<u>Question</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Subject Matter	107	30	258	395	.81
2. Teaching Methods	60	44	290	394	1.21
3. Teachers	50	44	303	397	1.47
4. Course Requirements	96	59	243	398	.78
5. Class Participation	63	58	278	399	1.18
6. Out-of-Class Faculty Contacts	66	63	259	388	1.16
7. Departmental Encouragement of Students	92	58	243	393	.82
8. University Degree Requirements	157	75	170	402	.07
9. Departmental Requirements	86	58	258	402	.97
10. Faculty Advisor: Personal Attention	152	46	205	403	.24
11. Faculty Advisor: Curricular Guidance	136	74	185	395	.24
12. U.C. Advisor: Personal Attention	24	23	149	196	1.55
13. U.C. Advisor: Curricular Guidance	52	22	122	196	.80
14. Quality of Scholarship -- Department	51	71	263	385	1.16

(1) College

Upper-division student respondents from The College of Engineering differed significantly from respondents in the other three undergraduate colleges. These engineering students were generally more positive in their responses than the total group. There was also a significant difference between the patterns of responses of upper-division respondents in The College of Arts and Sciences and The College of Education. Student respondents from The College of Education were generally less positive in their replies than the total group.

(2) Classification

A significant difference did exist between the patterns of responses from junior and senior students answering the survey questions. The graph of their mean responses, presented in Table 11, shows that student respondents classified as juniors were somewhat less positive in their replies than senior respondents.

(3) Age


The small group (12) of upper-division student respondents who were "over 40" differed significantly in their pattern of responses from all other age groups. Those in the "over 40" group were generally more positive in their replies than the total group, as can be seen in Table 12.

(4) Race

There was a significant difference between the patterns of responses for white and black upper division student respondents. These patterns, graphed in Table 13, show the greatest difference in means to be on the question regarding teachers.

TABLE 11

MEAN RESPONSES OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR STUDENTS



MEAN RESPONSES OF FOUR AGE GROUPS
WITHIN UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS





TABLE 13

MEAN RESPONSES OF WHITE AND BLACK
UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS



(5) Sex

There was no significant difference between the patterns of responses given by male and female upper division students.

(6) Commuter/Dorm Resident

Although dormitory residents who responded to the survey were generally less positive than the total group, the differences between upper-division commuter students and dormitory residents were not significant.

(7) Full-/Part-time

No significant difference was found in the patterns of responses given by the two groups of upper-division students classified by full-time and part-time status.

(8) Transfer/Non-Transfer


Upper-division transfer students who replied to the survey differed significantly from upper division student respondents who had attended only Memphis State. The graph of these response patterns, presented in Table 14, shows that a somewhat less positive attitude is held by transfer students.

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES:
INEFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

The first subjective survey question was answered by 304 upper division students. These students described disappointing or ineffective experiences related to the instructional environment; the topics which the responses included and the percentage of replies in each topic category are shown below. As before, some respondents discussed more than one topic in their replies, thus causing the distribution total to exceed one hundred percent.

TABLE 14

MEAN RESPONSES OF TRANSFER AND NONTRANSFER
UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS



CATEGORIES OF INEFFECTIVE PARTS OF
THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	Percent
1. Advising by faculty	26%
2. University degree requirements	20%
3. Teachers	20%
4. Academic Experiences	9%
5. Academic Programs	9%
6. Academic Policies	9%
7. University College Advisors	5%
8. Student-teacher Interaction	4%
9. Transfer Credit Evaluation	3%

Representative comments and summary statements for the first six categories, which comprise 84% of the replies, are given below.

Category One: Advising by Faculty

Twenty-six percent of the upper division respondents described disappointing experiences with their faculty advisors. Incorrect information, an impersonal attitude and difficulties in getting appointments were noted; reflecting what the students perceived as lack of interest was the comment "My advisor couldn't care less about me." Transfer students in particular expressed dissatisfaction with their orientation to the University and counseling by advisors.

Student respondents indicated the desire to spend more time with advisors for curricular and career decisions; one student noted that "teachers need to be more aware of how important advising is to students...."

Category Two: University Degree Requirements

University degree requirements were labeled "inflexible," "rigid," and "unnecessary" by 20% of the upper-division respondents. The foreign language requirement received particular emphasis, but requirements in English, art and music were also criticized. A biology major's response was

typical: "I've spent so much time becoming a 'well-rounded scholar' that I don't know anything about Biology."

Echoing faculty remarks, student respondents stated that excessive requirements prevented them from studying their major area in depth.

Category Three: Teachers

"Boring" was the adjective most frequently employed by 20% of the upper division respondents who described disappointing experiences with teachers. Reflecting what the students saw as a lack of interest in teaching was one student's statement that "Some teachers don't have any enthusiasm at all...." Most of those replying felt that, while their teachers were knowledgeable in their area, they gave poor presentations of the course content.

Category Four: Academic Experiences

Nine percent of the upper division respondents discussed classroom experiences which had been disappointing. In most cases, these students felt that the materials or methods were not practically related to their occupational needs. Other students were disappointed in the emphasis of their classes; eg., literature rather than speaking skills in foreign language.

Category Five: Academic Programs

A larger variety of curriculum offerings in certain areas was seen as necessary by 9% of the upper division respondents. These students described what they felt were weak points in their major programs; one student commented, with regard to his major; "I ran out of...courses to take."

Category Six: Academic Policies

The comments on academic policies, made by 9% of the upper division respondents, were concerned with a variety of topics. Policies concerning the ratio of credit hours to class hours in physical education and art, the English proficiency examination, registration procedures, course scheduling, and communication of policy changes were among those seen as ineffective by these students.

ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES: EFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

Two hundred and sixty-eight upper division students responded to the second subjective question concerning effective or outstanding experiences related to the instructional environment. The topics included in these responses and the percentage of replies in each topic category are listed below. The distribution total again exceeds one hundred per cent.

CATEGORIES OF EFFECTIVE PARTS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

	Percent
1. Teachers	33%
2. Student-Teacher Interaction	25%
3. Academic Experiences	19%
4. Nothing Positive	11%
5. Advising by Faculty	10%
6. Programs and facilities	8%
7. University degree requirements	3%
8. Evaluation and testing	2%

Representative comments and summary statements for the first five categories are given below.

Category One: Teachers

"Enthusiasm" and "concern" were qualities most frequently mentioned by 33% of the upper-division student respondents who described effective

experiences with teachers. In their replies, the students tended to single out a teacher who had impressed them through his personality or teaching style; one student praised a teacher who was "...enthusiastic about his subject and interested in...his students."

The creation of new interests through the teacher's interest was mentioned frequently; reflecting this was the statement one student made that "When you find a teacher that really is interested in the subject it makes a big difference."

Category Two: Student-teacher interaction

Exemplary of the feelings of 25% of the upper-division respondents was one student's statement; "I have appreciated the effort made by a few of my professors to get to know me personally." Evidences of friendly interest and concern from their teachers were described by these students; conferences, help sessions, and informal advising were frequently mentioned in the responses.

Category Three: Academic Experiences

Nineteen percent of the upper division respondents described experiences in particular classes which had been outstanding to them. Most of the replies focused on "...attempt(s) to relate the subject matter to contemporary needs and events." Field trips and student teaching experiences which had revealed "...practical applications for some of the things taught in class..." were cited frequently.

Category Four: Nothing Positive

Commenting on a lack of outstanding or effective experiences related to the instructional environment, 11% of the upper division students

responding to this question made statements such as "Nothing has impressed me" and "I have yet to find anything within the instructional environment which could be termed outstanding."

Category Five: Advising - Faculty and University College

Advisors in the University College and among the faculty were described as "concerned," "helpful" and "interested" by 10% of the upper division respondents. The personal attention and interest received by the students again drew comment; one student felt that his "...faculty advisor's interest in...(him) as a person and as a student...(had) been outstanding."

SECTION V

GROUP COMPARISONS

Three major groups were considered in this study: faculty members, lower division students and upper division students. Although the questionnaires for each group were structured in slightly different ways, there were some questions common to all the groups. Using these questions, the groups were paired and tested for significant differences between the patterns of responses through use of the Cattell coefficient.


1. Faculty members / Lower division students

Mean responses to the nine questions these two groups had in common are graphed in Table 15. The Cattell coefficient indicated that a significant difference did exist between the two patterns of responses. The question regarding University degree requirements (#8) brought the largest variation in mean responses between the two groups (lower division students: .06 - neutral, faculty members: .55 - somewhat positive).

2. Faculty members / Upper division students

A significant difference existed also between the patterns of responses from faculty members and upper division students. The mean responses from these two groups, graphed in Table 16, show the greatest variation on the two questions regarding faculty advising of upper division students (#'s 10 and 11). The student group had less positive responses about University degree requirements (#8), but were more positive about their teachers than were the faculty respondents.


MEAN RESPONSES FROM
LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS
AND FACULTY MEMBERS



Very Negative Quite Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Quite Positive Very Positive




MEAN RESPONSES FROM UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS
AND FACULTY MEMBERS



3. Lower division students / Upper division students

The pattern of responses for lower division students was significantly different from that of upper division students. Mean responses for these groups, graphed in Table 17, indicate a less positive attitude on the part of lower division students for every question but the first, regarding subject matter. Question three, regarding teachers, brought the greatest variation in mean responses between the two groups.

MEAN RESPONSES FROM
UPPER DIVISION AND LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS



SECTION VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All groups studied -- faculty and upper and lower division students -- indicated generally a "somewhat positive" attitude toward the instructional environment as defined in this report. These results are not inconsistent with the findings of other studies on student attitudes. Feldman and Newcomb, in reviewing a large number of studies for their book, The Impact of College on Students, found that:

For the most part, students are satisfied with college: usually only a minority...at any school expresses dissatisfaction with the quality of instruction and the intellectual level of the college. But, if not actually dissatisfied, neither are the majority of students overwhelmingly pleased with the quality and excitement of their academic and intellectual experiences. Their satisfaction can be described best as being lukewarm.¹

These "somewhat positive" response patterns, obtained through an averaging process, indicate overall, group attitudes. The subjective responses, which cannot be "averaged," present facets of the instructional environment as either positive (outstanding and effective) or negative (disappointing and ineffective). When the subjective responses from all groups were combined, the following negative and positive major (greater than 10%) categories emerged:

<u>Positive Responses</u>		<u>Negative Responses</u>	
Teachers	32%	Teachers	21%
Student/teacher interaction	21%	Advising	20%
Academic experiences	16%	University Degree req.	18%
		Academic Experiences	13%
		Student/teacher int.	11%

The three categories under "Positive Responses" also received negative comments. This recalls one faculty member's statement that teachers "...are

our greatest strength and our greatest weakness...." Both student and faculty comments ranged from the highest praise to vehement criticism. Recognizing that individuals, bringing different attitudes and abilities into a situation, will form diverse impressions of the same incident, it appears, nevertheless, that the quality of a student's or faculty member's experiences in the institution is a function of the individuals with whom he is in contact. From the comments made, it would seem that this quality is very uneven for many students and faculty members.

Two other topic categories received negative comments from more than 10% of the respondents. University degree requirements seen as ineffective by 18% of the total group of respondents were often characterized as too extensive and rigid.

The University's system of advising students, both by the University College staff and by faculty members, was seen as ineffective by 20% of all respondents.

Evidence is accumulating that faculty are particularly important in influencing occupational decisions and educational aspirations. In over a dozen studies in which students were asked to name the important sources of influence on their vocational planning and decisions, faculty...ranked as extremely important.²

In view of this, and the comments received from students on the value of advising, it would appear that more emphasis could be placed on developing an effective system of advising.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Memphis State University is a large institution which has experienced rapid growth. This should not, however, be a factor in the quality of individual experiences. "...Large size does not automatically lessen the

meaningfulness of student-teacher contact, ...the extent to which the student comes into direct contact with the professor depends more upon the attitude and efforts of the institution than upon its size."³

Based upon this research, specified areas for recommended study are:

- 1) Student orientation and advising: It is recommended that attention be given to curriculum design and career planning; orientation for freshmen and transfer students; and the development of an advising system which would provide for the involvement of faculty members with an expressed interest in advising.
- 2) University degree requirements: A review of the entire structure of degree requirements is recommended. The study would include comparisons with current requirements at other universities with attention given to the ratio of required and elective hours; the varying needs of different types of students; and the possibility of interdepartmental survey courses to relate introductory courses that now appear to be isolated units.
- 3) Instructional Environment: It is recommended that attention be given to finding ways of overcoming student and faculty-perceived deficiencies in the teaching and learning environment of the University.

Whether the deficiencies are caused by large classes, "rigid" requirements, the advising system, "indifferent, impersonal" attitudes or mediocre efforts, this research indicates an immediate need for review of those factors contributing to this study's implications of mediocrity in many areas of the instructional environment of the University.

REFERENCES

- ¹Edrond Marks, "Individual Differences in Perceptions of the College Environment," Journal of Educational Psychology, LXI, p. 270.
- ²Alexander Astin, The College Environment (Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1968), pp 6-8.
- ³Marks, loc. cit.
- ⁴Astin, loc. cit.
- ⁵Astin, op. cit., p. 50.
- ⁶J. Hunt, "Traditional Personality Theory in the Light of Recent Evidence," American Scientist, LII, pp 30-96.
- ⁷C. E. Osgood, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 18.
- ⁸Osgood, loc. cit.
- ⁹Osgood, op. cit., p. 20
- ¹⁰Raymond B. Cattell, " r_p and Other Coefficients of Pattern Similarity," Psychometrika, XIV, p. 281.
- ¹¹Cattell, op. cit., p. 295.
- ¹²Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), p. 249.
- ¹³Feldman and Newcomb, op. cit., p. 253.
- ¹⁴Feldman and Newcomb, op. cit. p. 268.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE



Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete by checking the appropriate blanks or by filling in the spaces indicated.

1. Rank:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor | <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Professor |

2. College _____

Department _____

3. Years at Memphis State University:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> more than 10 |

4. Degree Level:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate | <input type="checkbox"/> Masters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Masters + 60 | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Masters + 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> No Degree |

5. Age:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> under 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> 50 - 59 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30 - 39 | <input type="checkbox"/> 60 or over |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 40 - 49 | |

Perceptions
of

Memphis State University

In completing the survey, judgments should be made on the basis of your total experience. Please do not answer with one teacher, one course, or one situation in mind. Each statement focuses upon a different aspect of the instructional environment; beneath each statement is a set of evaluative and descriptive scales. The scales should be marked in the following manner:

IMPORTANT

1. Place the checkmark in the middle of the space, not on the boundaries:

THIS: X : _____ : _____ NOT THIS: _____ X : _____

2. Mark one space between every pair of adjectives. DO NOT OMIT ANY.

If your feeling about the underlined portion of the statement is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should check as below:

FAIR X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNFAIR
 OR
 FAIR _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X UNFAIR

If you feel that your opinion is CLOSELY RELATED, you should mark as below:

STRONG _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WEAK
 OR
 STRONG _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ WEAK

If your opinion seems ONLY SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), you should mark as follows:

PERFECT _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ IMPERFECT
 OR
 PERFECT _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ IMPERFECT

If your opinions are NEUTRAL, or you feel the SCALE IS IRRELEVANT and unrelated to the statement, then check the middle space.

SAFE _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ DANGEROUS

*If you cannot answer a question--for instance, if you are not familiar with the University College--mark NA _____ at the lower right hand corner of the set of scales.

PERCEPTIONS OF
INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

1. You consider the subject matter of University courses to be:

COMPLETE _____	INCOMPLETE _____
INTERESTING _____	BORING _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____
DISORGANIZED _____	ORGANIZED _____
USELESS _____	USEFUL _____
	NA _____

2. The teaching, or methods of instruction, in the University, is, in your opinion:

EFFECTIVE _____	INEFFECTIVE _____
INFLUENTIAL _____	UNINFLUENTIAL _____
ORGANIZED _____	DISORGANIZED _____
GOOD _____	BAD _____
BORING _____	INTERESTING _____
	NA _____

3. The teachers of the University, as people, have impressed you as:

UNFRIENDLY _____	FRIENDLY _____
INTELLIGENT _____	UNINTELLIGENT _____
INDIFFERENT _____	EAGER _____
SENSITIVE _____	INSENSITIVE _____
TOLERANT _____	INTOLERANT _____
	NA _____

4. The requirements and outside demands of courses are, in your opinion:

FAIR _____	UNFAIR _____
USEFUL _____	USELESS _____
INTERESTING _____	DULL _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____
	NA _____

5. Student involvement and participation in classes has been in your experience:

COMPULSORY _____	VOLUNTARY _____
COMFORTABLE _____	UNCOMFORTABLE _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
ENCOURAGED _____	DISCOURAGED _____
INFREQUENT _____	FREQUENT _____
	NA _____

6. Informal, or out-of-class contacts with students are:

SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT
UNFRIENDLY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FRIENDLY
COMPULSORY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	VOLUNTARY
COMFORTABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNCOMFORTABLE
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS NA _____

7. The overall level or quality of scholarship in the University (students, faculty, programs, etc.) is, in your opinion:

SUPERIOR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INFERIOR
SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT
SHALLOW	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DEEP
CAREFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CARELESS
INCREASING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DECREASING NA _____

8. The overall level or quality of scholarship in your department (students, faculty, programs, etc.) is, in your opinion:

SUPERIOR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INFERIOR
SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT
SHALLOW	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DEEP
CAREFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CARELESS
INCREASING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DECREASING NA _____

9. The general structure of University degree requirements is, in your judgment:

COMPLEX	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SIMPLE
BAD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GOOD
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED
UNFAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FAIR
USEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	USELESS NA _____

10. The general structure of your departmental major requirements is, in your judgment:

COMPLEX	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SIMPLE
BAD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GOOD
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED
UNFAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FAIR
USEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	USELESS NA _____

11. Departmental encouragement of student interest in and enthusiasm for the field has been, in your opinion:

CONCERNED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INDIFFERENT
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS
INFLUENTIAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNINFLUENTIAL
NONEXISTENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	EXISTENT
PERSONAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMPERSONAL NA _____

12. The personal attention and supervision given to students by University College advisors are, in your opinion:

SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT
INFLUENTIAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNINFLUENTIAL
IMPERSONAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FRIENDLY
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS
CARELESS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CAREFUL NA _____

13. The curricular guidance given by University College advisors to students in planning their program of courses is, in your opinion:

CONFUSING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INFORMATIVE
COMPLETE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INCOMPLETE
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED
INCOMPETENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COMPETENT
PERSONALIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMPERSONAL NA _____

14. The personal attention and supervision given to upper-division students by faculty advisors are, in your opinion:

SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT
INCOMPLETE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COMPLETE
INFLUENTIAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNINFLUENTIAL
IMPERSONAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FRIENDLY
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS NA _____

15. The curricular guidance given by faculty advisors to upper-division students in planning their program of courses is, in your opinion:

CONFUSING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INFORMATIVE
COMPLETE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INCOMPLETE
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED
INCOMPETENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COMPETENT
PERSONALIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMPERSONAL NA _____

Again, think of the major parts of the instructional environment of the University (teachers and advisors, courses, the requirements of the curriculum, academic policies). Of these think of the one part that you feel is particularly outstanding or effective for students.

There may be a number of things which caused you to feel that this part of the instructional environment is effective, but what was the most important incident that influenced you? Describe the situation and just what happened.

LOWER DIVISION QUESTIONNAIRE

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete by checking the appropriate blanks or by filling in the spaces indicated.

1. Registered in:

University College

_____ College
_____ Department

2. Classification

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

4. Race:

White

Black

Other

7. Full-time

Part-time

8. Transfer

Non-transfer

3. Age:

16 - 20

21 - 25

26 - 40

over 40

5. Sex:

Male

Female

6. Commuter

Dorm resident

Perceptions of

Memphis State University



In completing the survey, judgments should be made on the basis of your total experience. Please do not answer with one teacher, one course, or one situation in mind. Each statement focuses upon a different aspect of the instructional environment; beneath each statement is a set of evaluative and descriptive scales. The scales should be marked in the following manner:

IMPORTANT

1. Place the checkmark in the middle of the space, not on the boundaries:

THIS: X : _____ : _____ NOT THIS: _____ X : _____

2. Mark one space between every pair of adjectives. DO NOT OMIT ANY.

If your feeling about the underlined portion of the statement is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should check as below:

FAIR X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNFAIR
 OR
 FAIR _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ X UNFAIR

If you feel that your opinion is CLOSELY RELATED, you should mark as below:

STRONG _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WEAK
 OR
 STRONG _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ WEAK

If your opinion seems ONLY SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), you should mark as follows:

PERFECT _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ IMPERFECT
 OR
 PERFECT _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ IMPERFECT

If your opinions are NEUTRAL, or you feel the SCALE IS IRRELEVANT and unrelated to the statement, then check the middle space.

SAFE _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ DANGEROUS

*If you cannot answer a question--for instance, if you are not familiar with the University College--mark NA _____ at the lower right hand corner of the set of scales.

SECTION ONE
Instructional Environment

1. You consider the subject matter of your courses to be:

COMPLETE _____	INCOMPLETE _____
INTERESTING _____	BORING _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____
DISORGANIZED _____	ORGANIZED _____
USELESS _____	USEFUL _____
	NA _____

2. The teaching, or methods of instruction, is, in your opinion:

SKILLFUL _____	BUNGLING _____
INFLUENTIAL _____	UNINFLUENTIAL _____
DISORGANIZED _____	ORGANIZED _____
GOOD _____	BAD _____
BORING _____	INTERESTING _____
	NA _____

3. Your teachers, as people, have impressed you as:

UNFRIENDLY _____	FRIENDLY _____
INTELLIGENT _____	UNINTELLIGENT _____
INDIFFERENT _____	EAGER _____
SENSITIVE _____	INSENSITIVE _____
TOLERANT _____	INTOLERANT _____
	NA _____

4. The requirements and outside demands of your courses have been, in your opinion:

FAIR _____	UNFAIR _____
USEFUL _____	USELESS _____
INTERESTING _____	DULL _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____
	NA _____

5. Your personal involvement and participation in classes have been:

COMPULSORY _____	VOLUNTARY _____
COMFORTABLE _____	UNCOMFORTABLE _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
ENCOURAGED _____	DISCOURAGED _____
INFREQUENT _____	FREQUENT _____
	NA _____

Think of the major parts of the University's instructional environment (your teachers and advisors, your courses, the requirements of the curriculum, academic policies). Of these, think of the one part that has been particularly disappointing or ineffective for you.

There are probably a number of things which caused you to feel that this part of the total instructional environment is ineffective or disappointing, but what was the most important incident that influenced you? Describe that incident.

Again, think of the major parts of the University's instructional environment (your teachers and advisors, your courses, the requirements of the curriculum, academic policies). Of these, think of the one part that has been particularly outstanding or effective for you.

There may be many things that influenced you favorably or were good experiences, but what was the most important incident that really impressed you? What in particular happened that you considered outstanding and effective? Describe the situation and just what occurred.

SECTION TWO
University College

1. Your University College advisor,

as a person, has impressed you as:

FRIENDLY _____	UNFRIENDLY _____
INTELLIGENT _____	UNINTELLIGENT _____
INTOLERANT _____	TOLERANT _____
SENSITIVE _____	INSENSITIVE _____
INDIFFERENT _____	EAGER _____

as a counselor, has impressed you as:

EFFECTIVE _____	INEFFECTIVE _____
BAD _____	GOOD _____
ORGANIZED _____	UNORGANIZED _____
UNINTERESTED _____	INTERESTED _____
INFLUENTIAL _____	UNINFLUENTIAL _____

2. The Pre-College Counseling program in the University College was:

HELPFUL _____	HARMFUL _____
CONFUSING _____	INFORMATIVE _____
ORGANIZED _____	UNORGANIZED _____
FRIENDLY _____	IMPERSONAL _____
BAD _____	GOOD _____

NA _____

3. Do you feel that your University College advisor is interested in you as a person?

Yes No

4. Do you feel that your advisor has made an effort to become familiar with your academic background?

Yes No

5. Do you feel that your advisor is thoroughly familiar with the curriculum requirements for your area of interest or major?

Yes No

6. Are you able to see your advisor when you need to:

- Yes, am always able to see my advisor
- Yes, but usually have to wait a short time
- Yes, but have to wait a long time
- Yes, but I usually feel rushed during our conference
- No, my advisor is not usually there

7. Has your advisor shown an interest in your educational interests and plans?

Yes No

8. Has your advisor shown an interest in your particular career goals?

- Yes, and has given me specific career information
- Yes, but has not been very helpful
- No, not at all

9. Has your advisor ever offered to arrange with the Counseling Center for you to take vocational aptitude or interest tests?

- Yes, and I took the tests
- Yes, but I was not interested
- No, but I would like to take such tests
- No, but I am not interested

10. Has your advisor been helpful in working out your schedule of classes each semester?

Yes No

11. Has your advisor helped you with special schedule changes or adjustments such as late drops, section changes, etc.?

Yes, has been very helpful

No, but I have not needed such help

No, did not give help when needed

12. What do you consider to be the greatest strength of the University College?

13. What do you consider to be the greatest weakness of the University College?

14. What specific improvements in the University College would you suggest?

UPPER DIVISION QUESTIONNAIRE



Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete by checking the appropriate blanks or by filling in the spaces indicated.

1. Registered in:

University College

_____ College
_____ Department

2. Classification:

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

4. Race:

- White
- Black
- Other

7. Full-time

Part-time

8. Transfer

Non-transfer

3. Age:

- 16 - 20
- 21 - 25
- 26 - 40
- over 40

5. Sex:

- Male
- Female

6. Commuter

Dorm resident

Perceptions of

Memphis State University

In completing the survey, judgments should be made on the basis of your total experience. Please do not answer with one teacher, one course, or one situation in mind. Each statement focuses upon a different aspect of the instructional environment; beneath each statement is a set of evaluative and descriptive scales. The scales should be marked in the following manner:

IMPORTANT

- Place the checkmark in the middle of the space, not on the boundaries:

THIS: X : _____ : _____ NOT THIS: _____ X : _____

- Mark one space between every pair of adjectives. DO NOT OMIT ANY.

If your feeling about the underlined portion of the statement is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should check as below:

FAIR X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNFAIR
OR
FAIR _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X UNFAIR

If you feel that your opinion is CLOSELY RELATED, you should mark as below:

STRONG _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WEAK
OR
STRONG _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ WEAK

If your opinion seems ONLY SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), you should mark as follows:

PERFECT _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ IMPERFECT
OR
PERFECT _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ IMPERFECT

If your opinions are NEUTRAL, or you feel the SCALE IS IRRELEVANT and unrelated to the statement, then check the middle space.

SAFE _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ DANGEROUS

*If you cannot answer a question--for instance, if you are not familiar with the University College--mark NA _____ at the lower right hand corner of the set of scales.

PERCEPTIONS OF
INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

1. You consider the subject matter of courses in your major area to be:

COMPLETE _____	INCOMPLETE _____
INTERESTING _____	BORING _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____
DISORGANIZED _____	ORGANIZED _____
USELESS _____	USEFUL _____

NA _____

2. The teaching, or methods of instruction, in your major area is, in your opinion:

SKILLFUL _____	BUNGLING _____
INFLUENTIAL _____	UNINFLUENTIAL _____
DISORGANIZED _____	ORGANIZED _____
GOOD _____	BAD _____
BORING _____	INTERESTING _____

NA _____

3. In your major area, your teachers, as people, have impressed you as:

UNFRIENDLY _____	FRIENDLY _____
INTELLIGENT _____	UNINTELLIGENT _____
INDIFFERENT _____	EAGER _____
SENSITIVE _____	INSENSITIVE _____
TOLERANT _____	INTOLERANT _____

NA _____

4. The requirements and outside demands of courses in your major area have been, in your opinion:

FAIR _____	UNFAIR _____
USEFUL _____	USELESS _____
INTERESTING _____	DULL _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
MEANINGFUL _____	MEANINGLESS _____

NA _____

5. Your personal involvement and participation in classes of your major have been:

COMPULSORY _____	VOLUNTARY _____
COMFORTABLE _____	UNCOMFORTABLE _____
DIFFICULT _____	EASY _____
ENCOURAGED _____	DISCOURAGED _____
INFREQUENT _____	FREQUENT _____

NA _____

6. Your informal, or out-of-class contacts with faculty in your major department have been:

SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT	
UNFRIENDLY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FRIENDLY	
COMPULSORY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	VOLUNTARY	
COMFORTABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNCOMFORTABLE	
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS	NA _____

7. Departmental encouragement of interest in and enthusiasm for the field has been, in your opinion:

CONCERNED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INDIFFERENT	
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS	
INFLUENTIAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNINFLUENTIAL	
NONEXISTENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	EXISTENT	
PERSONAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMPERSONAL	NA _____

8. The general structure of University degree requirements is, in your judgment:

COMPLEX	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SIMPLE	
BAD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GOOD	
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED	
UNFAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FAIR	
USEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	USELESS	NA _____

9. The general structure of departmental requirements for your major is, in your judgment:

COMPLEX	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SIMPLE	
BAD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GOOD	
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED	
UNFAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FAIR	
USEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	USELESS	NA _____

10. The personal attention and supervision you have received from your faculty advisor are, in your opinion:

SUFFICIENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INSUFFICIENT	
INFLUENTIAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNINFLUENTIAL	
IMPERSONAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FRIENDLY	
MEANINGFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEANINGLESS	
CARELESS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CAREFUL	NA _____

11. The curricular guidance you have received from your faculty advisor in planning your program of courses is, in your opinion:

CONFUSING _____	INFORMATIVE _____
COMPLETE _____	INCOMPLETE _____
ORGANIZED _____	UNORGANIZED _____
INCOMPETENT _____	COMPETENT _____
PERSONALIZED _____	IMPERSONAL _____

NA _____

12. The overall level or quality of scholarship in your department (students, faculty, programs, etc.) is, in your opinion:

SUPERIOR _____	INFERIOR _____
SUFFICIENT _____	INSUFFICIENT _____
SHALLOW _____	DEEP _____
CAREFUL _____	CARELESS _____
INCREASING _____	DECREASING _____

NA _____

Think of the major parts of the University's instructional environment (your teachers and advisors, your courses, the requirements of the curriculum, academic policies). Of these, think of the one part that has been particularly disappointing or ineffective for you.

There are probably a number of things which caused you to feel that this part of the total instructional environment is ineffective or disappointing, but what was the most important incident that influenced you? Describe that incident.

Again, think of the major parts of the University's instructional environment (your teachers and advisors, your courses, the requirements of the curriculum, academic policies). Of these, think of the one part that has been particularly outstanding or effective for you.

There may be many things that influenced you favorably or were good experiences, but what was the most important incident that really impressed you? What in particular happened that you considered outstanding and effective? Describe the situation and just what occurred.

SECTION TWO
University College

If you were not in the University College, check the space to the left and omit the remainder of the questionnaire.

1. Your University College advisor, as a person, impressed you as:

FRIENDLY _____	UNFRIENDLY _____
INTELLIGENT _____	UNINTELLIGENT _____
INTOLERANT _____	TOLERANT _____
SENSITIVE _____	INSENSITIVE _____
INDIFFERENT _____	EAGER _____

2. Your University College advisor, as a counselor, impressed you as:

EFFECTIVE _____	INEFFECTIVE _____
BAD _____	GOOD _____
ORGANIZED _____	UNORGANIZED _____
UNINTERESTED _____	INTERESTED _____
INFLUENTIAL _____	UNINFLUENTIAL _____

3. The Pre-College Counseling program in the University College was:

HELPFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HARMFUL
CONFUSING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INFORMATIVE
ORGANIZED	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNORGANIZED
FRIENDLY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMPERSONAL
BAD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GOOD

4. Do you feel that your University College advisor was interested in you as a person?

Yes No

5. Do you feel that your advisor made an effort to become familiar with your academic background?

Yes No

6. Do you feel that your advisor was thoroughly familiar with the curriculum requirements for your area of interest or major?

Yes No

7. Do you feel that you were properly advised in planning your program of courses for entrance into your major area of study?

Yes No

8. Were you able to see your advisor when you needed to?

Yes, was always able to see my advisor

Yes, but usually had to wait a short time

Yes, but had to wait a long time

Yes, but I usually felt rushed during our conference

No, my advisor was not usually there

9. Did your advisor show an interest in your educational interests and plans?

Yes No

10. Was your advisor helpful in working out your schedule of classes each semester?

Yes No

11. Did your advisor show an interest in your particular career goals?

Yes, and gave me specific career information

Yes, but was not very helpful

No, not at all

12. Did your advisor ever offer to arrange with the Counseling Center for you to take vocational aptitude or interest tests?

Yes, and I took the tests

Yes, but I was not interested

No, but I would have liked to take such tests

No, but I was not interested

13. Did your advisor help you with special schedule changes or adjustments such as late drops, section changes, etc.?

Yes, was very helpful

No, but I did not need such help

No, did not give help when needed

14. What do you consider to be the greatest strength of the University College?

15. What do you consider to be the greatest weakness of the University College?

16. What specific improvements in the University College would you suggest?
