

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 954

HE 004 829

TITLE Research Profiles: Student and Campus Characteristics.

INSTITUTION Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Experimental and Special Training Branch.

PUB DATE Sep 73

NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS College Students; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Mental Health Programs; *Research Methodology; *Student Characteristics; Student College Relationship; Student Welfare

IDENTIFIERS Colorado State University; *Oregon College of Education

ABSTRACT

This document provides a research design by which to gather accurate, descriptive baseline data on campus and student characteristics so that mental health personnel can assume a proactive role in the planning and conducting of educational programs that ameliorate student problems and/or enhance school and student educational goals. Data generated from the research model were gathered from Oregon College of Education (OCE) and Colorado State University (CSU). Results indicated (1) CSU serves a student population that is highly urban in nature, whereas OCE serves a student population emanating from rural communities with populations of less than 10,000 or from farms and ranches. (2) Both institutions provide services to a primarily Caucasian, middle-class student body with only a very small representation from minority groups. (3) Both CSU and OCE freshmen populations list as their primary goals the mastery of their particular academic field and the development of identity through a process of self-discovery and development of social awareness on campus. (4) A significant percentage of students from both schools experience a higher degree of goal incongruency than most of their classmates. For related documents concerning campus mental health, see HE 004 815, HE 004 816, HE 004 827, HE 004 828, HE 004 830. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 012 295
HE 012 295

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

Research Profiles: Student and Campus Characteristics

Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education



Research Profiles
Student and Campus Characteristics

This report is a result of work done by the ORGANIZATION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ON THE RURAL CAMPUS TASK FORCE of the WICHE program, Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses, funded by a grant (MH 12419) from the National Institute of Mental Health, Experimental and Special Training Branch.

Task Force Members

Dr. John L. Schuitz, Chairman
Professor, Department of Anthropology
Colorado State University

Lenora Bohren
Graduate Student
Department of Anthropology
Colorado State University

Dr. Edward C. Knop
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
Colorado State University

Dr. Wayne L. Larson
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Montana State University

Larry Porter, Codirector
Indian Education Workshop
Wapata, Washington

Frank Serrano
Northwest Regional Education Laboratory
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Courtland Smith
Assistant Professor
Department of Anthropology
Oregon State University

Dr. William Venema
Director
Student Counseling Service
Oregon College of Education

Dr. Deward E. Walker
Codirector
(Culture Change Program)
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado

Dr. Hill Walker
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Oregon

Dr. Louis P. Zurcher
Social Psychologist
Western Behavioral Science
Institute
La Jolla, California

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
An Equal Opportunity Employer

P. O. Drawer P

Boulder, Colorado 80302

September 1973

FOREWORD

The WICHE program Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses was designed to focus on the very complex human concerns evolving from the current state of higher education. The program, in its study of these problems, has convened task forces deliberately comprised of representative members from the university community and from the larger community. The task force design was used not only to facilitate an exchange of ideas, but also to explore applications of the community model as a means for resolving campus problems.

The first task force report, *Quality of Educational Life, Priorities for Today*, describes changes occurring within and beyond the campus that are forcing the higher education system to become more flexible in its philosophy and operations. Members of the task force felt that the response of the education system to its changing social context is crucial.

To aid campus administrators in their response, the second task force report, *Consultation: A Process for Continuous Institutional Renewal*, discusses how campus conditions can be assessed, trends and needs can be identified, and programs and policies can be designed and evaluated through an institutional audit and consultation process.

The third task force report, *New Designs: Prevent Educational Casualties, Promote Educational Growth*, decries the monolithic nature of higher education's environment and the toll it takes upon its members. Task force members felt this oppressive milieu causes such high levels of stress that wholly new approaches are needed for effective prevention. They therefore suggest several new campus designs.

The fourth task force report, *The Ecosystem Model: Designing Campus Environments*, also directs attention to campus environmental factors which cause undue levels of student distress. The ecosystem model provides mechanisms to identify student/environment transactions and processes to build better educational environments.

Work carried out by members of the program's fifth task force, Organization of Mental Health Services on the Rural Campus, provides a research design by which to gather accurate, descriptive baseline data on campus and student characteristics so that mental health personnel can assume a proactive role in the planning and conducting of educational programs which ameliorate student problems and/or enhance school and student educational goals. The task force's final report, *Research Profiles: Student and Campus Characteristics*, was written by its chairman, Dr. John L. Schultz, with valuable assistance from Lenora Bohren.

There was so much data generated by the research model, which was administered on two college campuses, that only an initial analysis of findings could be presented in this report. Dr. Schultz was unable to have task force members review and add their analysis of the data to the manuscript since the report had to be in print by the end of the program's grant period. Therefore, the report reflects his opinions and not necessarily those of the other members of the task force.

I wish to express my appreciation to the task force for their participation and contributions to the program. The task force meetings and subsequent implementation of the research design were exciting learning experiences for us all. I would also like to express my thanks to the program's staff, Carol Francis, Linda Martin, and Lu Anne Aulepp, for their assistance with task force meeting arrangements and the preparation of the task force report for publication.

James H. Banning, Ph.D., Director
Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses

Research Profiles:
Student
and Campus
Characteristics

RESEARCH PROFILES
STUDENT AND CAMPUS CHARACTERISTICS

Within the past decade it has become increasingly apparent that mental health problems among students are rising at an alarming rate. Moreover, this is also becoming more apparent among colleges and universities which have traditionally served the so-called rural areas of the western United States. Concomitant with this increase in student mental health problems has been the devotion of increasing amounts of resource and professional personnel to mental health related programs. However, many of these efforts have been stifled for a variety of reasons, and much of the data shows there has been no significant reduction in the magnitude of the problem. Several reasons often cited for this limited success are (1) the continued employment of "traditional" counseling techniques when modifications in techniques and conceptual frameworks are urgently needed, (2) the lack of reliable baseline data defining the student population (and the various subpopulations) served by the university, and (3) inadequate knowledge of the structural configuration and goals/process framework of the university-community environment and the interrelationships between its various components.

The Organization of Mental Health Services on the Rural Campus Task Force was created primarily to investigate mental health problems on rural campuses in the West. In response to the assignment, members of the task force elected to concentrate their energies on making available valid empirical data on student and structural characteristics of various rural universities. It was felt that if data regarding the nature of university social systems were gathered and made available to counselors and others involved in campus mental health fields, the task force would have provided a useful service. Consequently the task force devoted a major portion of its time during the 1972 academic year to the foundation of an adequate research design and the selection of specific universities which would be representative of rural colleges in the West.

Conceptually, universities were ranked along a continuum ranging from those which were judgmentally agreed upon as highly rural (e.g., Western Montana College of Education, Oregon College of Education) to those which, although located in a predominantly rural area, resembled colleges and universities located in major urban centers (e.g., Oregon State University, the University of Wyoming, Colorado State University). Ultimately, Oregon College of Education and Colorado State University were selected.

Research activities began at both of these universities during the fall quarter of 1972 and continued for the next 13 months. The present report represents the major findings of this research effort.

The Research Framework

The two schools were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Both are predominantly rural in terms of geographical setting, with no significant level of industrialization, and both are basically university-agricultural communities.
2. Both have little ethnic variation in their student body composition.
3. Both universities indicated considerable interest in the project and agreed to cooperate in the program.
4. The schools represent opposite poles of the educational spectrum: OCE being primarily a unipurpose school and CSU being primarily a multipurpose school.
5. The schools represent opposite poles of the rural college continuum in terms of student body size and community size:

| <u>University</u> | <u>Student Population</u> | <u>Community Population</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| OCE | 4,000 | 5,000 |
| CSU | 17,000 | 45,000 |

6. Both schools are equidistant from metropolitan centers:

OCE--70 minutes from Portland
CSU--70 minutes from Denver

After choosing Oregon College of Education and Colorado State University as the target research institutions, a 10 percent student sample, 203 freshmen from CSU and 157 freshmen from OCE, was selected. Each student participated in approximately six hours of testing, which included three separate instruments.

The first was the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI), which is designed to provide data on stress as well as a multitude of other personality characteristics. In this study, the primary function of the OPI scale was to provide a measure of the impact the university had on the student. The instrument was administered in the fall quarter and again in the spring. The amount of change experienced by the student was to be noted and analyzed. Unfortunately, this data could not be analyzed in time for inclusion in the task force report.

The second instrument was the College Survey Questionnaire (CSQ). It was administered during the fall quarter and yielded data on student biographical and demographic characteristics, secondary school information, and a variety of attitudes regarding higher

education. The latter information, when analyzed with regard to the data gathered by the third instrument, did provide a preliminary picture of university impact on students.

Finally, the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was administered to the two student populations and to a sample of faculty and administration at each school to determine what the congruencies and incongruencies between each of these university subpopulations would indicate concerning their perspectives on the school environment and its goals. Further analysis of the data concerned the congruencies and incongruencies exhibited among the students, in order to learn about subgroups within each school's student body.

In conjunction with the above research instruments, the task force devised an unstructured interview (see Appendix A). Thirty-six students, who represented approximately 10 percent of each residence category, were given two intensive unstructured interview sessions. The purpose of the unstructured interviews was to (1) chart the manner in which the student subgroups flowed through the institutional environment, (2) gather data on student perception regarding the various components of the university including the contact points and contact agents they experienced throughout the academic year, (3) categorize both the positive and negative experiences perceived by the students, and (4) learn which coping mechanisms they would tend to select under stressful conditions. The unstructured interviews were approximately 1.5 hours in length and were recorded to provide access to the basic data file in the future.

Student Populations

In the past, many programs and innovations have had to rely on either inadequate data or a priori judgment about what a given student population was like. The task force members felt that accurate data on the nature of student populations were critical to the planning and development of programs related to campus mental health, because it is essential to know and understand who is being treated before actual treatment can begin. They also felt that student data should include biographical, demographic, and attitudinal information on the total population as well as accurate delineation and description of any population subgroups. Thus the research model's data results were analyzed with these goals in mind.

CSU Profile

Two hundred and three incoming freshmen students were tested at Colorado State University during the 1972-73 academic year. This number represents approximately 10 percent of the freshman class and is statistically representative of the freshman class at large

on the basis of age, sex, and residence. Therefore, comments made regarding the sample population in this report are representative of the total freshman population.

1. General Characteristics

In terms of general population characteristics, one of the most interesting findings from the CSQ data analysis to date was that CSU students are mainly from large, metropolitan urban areas. Fifty-five percent of the sample came to CSU from cities and suburbs with a population of more than 500,000. Only 19 percent came from towns of fewer than 10,000 or ranch and farm communities. Clearly, while CSU still maintains a rural atmosphere, in many respects its student population is decidedly urban in nature. This is especially significant since many individuals and many academic programs are still geared to serving the needs of rural students.

As expected, CSU primarily serves Colorado students. Almost one-half of the student sample was from Colorado. The only other geographic areas providing a significant number of students were other mountain states and the Pacific Northwest (29 percent).

An overwhelming majority of the students were Caucasian. American Indians, Blacks, Chicanos, and other minority groups made up less than four percent of the sample. This percentage generally agrees with data regarding the entire student body, and in recent years various programs have been instituted by CSU to rectify ethnic imbalances. However, there is no significant evidence to show that this distribution has been altered. If this is a desired goal, as indicated by the initiation of special programs, then data show that a more concerted effort is needed.

2. Demography

Analysis of the CSQ demographic data obtained from the sample demonstrates that CSU's student body can be generally characterized as middle class, probably typical of the youth found in other universities throughout the West.

Major characteristics of the student sample were

- a. Ninety-four percent of the students came to CSU from public high schools and over 60 percent had ranked within the top 40 percent of their graduating class.
- b. Their parents generally appear economically and socially stable. Seventy-five percent of the parents have an income of \$10,000 or more, and 47 percent make in excess of \$20,000 per year. Almost 90 percent of the sample indicated their parents were married and living together, and only 7 percent indicated their parents were divorced. Sixty percent

of the students reported that their mother provided some sort of supplemental family income.

- c. Virtually all of the CSU sample has had the benefit of adequate parental education. Over 90 percent of the students indicated both parents had at least a high school education and almost 50 percent of those parents had had four years of college or advanced degrees.
- d. Finally, a majority of the parents, according to the students, were fairly active in organized religious groups (63 percent Protestant, 20 percent Catholic) and a majority (60 percent) were reported to have political favoritism towards the Republican Party.

3. Attitudes

The incoming freshmen exhibited what seemed to be a mood of enthusiasm, concern, and doubt. The majority of students (60 percent) indicated on the CSQ tests that they planned to pursue professional, business, or academic careers. While the majority were supported by their parents, close to 40 percent were attempting to carry much of the financial burden of their education through part-time employment, savings, loans, or various types of scholarships. Thus, most of these students take education quite seriously and perceive it to be very important to later achievements.

These same students, however, perhaps because of the value they place on educational success, also acknowledged problems which they perceived to be relatively serious and the cause of considerable concern to them. Only 13 percent indicated that they expected to encounter no serious problems while attending college. For the purposes of this study, the specific issues which created feelings of concern and doubt provide insight into the manner in which the CSU environment is perceived by its freshman class.

The CSQ data indicated that the areas in which students expected to gain the most personal satisfaction during college are also the areas in which they felt they would experience the most serious problems, that is, in their coursework and in obtaining a better sense of personal meaning and identity. Most of the sample students felt that one of the university's primary roles should be aiding students in "finding themselves" in terms of self-discovery, self-insight, or the discovery of new interests and talents. However, 55 percent indicated these two areas, coursework and finding themselves, were expected to be their greatest source of worry during freshman year and subsequent years.

As the year progressed, the unstructured interviewing demonstrated that these fears were well founded and that the university provided little if any satisfaction. The general analysis of IGI

data suggests one reason for this. The CSU faculty and administration placed far less value on student aspirations to self-discovery than did the students. In the case of coursework, interviews revealed that students expressed dissatisfaction over the rigid nature of particular departmental requirements, large classes, etc. It is important to note here that while most students recognized the importance of class assignments, classwork, and scheduled examinations, more than half would prefer an academic climate which emphasized independent studies. No doubt at least some frustrations were experienced when these students encountered an environment which provided virtually no independent studies on the freshman level.

Supportive evidence for the possible detrimental effects of not achieving the personal goal of self-discovery was provided by analysis of individual IGI scores. Fifteen percent of the CSU sample proved to be highly incongruent with their university environment as they perceived it. For these students, self-discovery was specified as the primary educational goal. In terms of an ideal university environment, they placed highest value on individual personality development and far more value on personal development than the CSU faculty and administrators.

In addition, the IGI data provided evidence to suggest these apprehensions are compounded when these students perceive that their university places little emphasis on academic training which would lead to or augment a career orientation, and that the university in general places little emphasis on maintaining any degree of social awareness outside of its immediate academic environment. Clearly, these students are in direct conflict with their environment in terms of a satisfactory progression towards achievement of priority goals. That is, they do not fit well into the CSU environment as they presently perceive it to exist.

The students experiencing this upper extreme of high interconstituent incongruency have distinguishing characteristics. For instance, the general student population is predominantly male. The high incongruency students are predominantly career-oriented females. Generally the high incongruency students are from middle-income families, business owners or managers, who reside in communities at both extremes of the rural/urban continuum. And most of these homes are considered by the students to be authoritative, closely knit family units where the mother contributes to the family income and has an equal say with the father.

In school these students are generally majoring in social science and are geared toward a career in academia or creative arts. They are serious about their studies. Most graduated in the top percentiles of their high school class and chose the university because of its strength in their desired major. They look for satisfaction in their college experience by mastering content in their major courses and achieving self-discovery. The combination of

self-discovery and mastery of their major field accentuates their desire for more independent study and more freedom of choice in their course selection.

In their desire for self-discovery these students appear to be striving to attain independence from their parents and from their peers. Data show that they tend to ignore peer views and are generally opposed to their parents' views. Thus, while these students perceive their parents as rather conservative, they tend to be more liberal and active in their views.

This description perhaps explains why these students are dissatisfied with the current university environment in terms of career orientation; self-discovery, and a more liberal or socially oriented climate. As shown by the above statements, however, these students do not want to eliminate the traditional academic climate; rather, they want to improve it and orient it more in the direction of specific career training.

OCE Profile

One hundred and fifty-seven incoming freshmen were tested at Oregon College of Education during the 1972-73 academic year. This number represents approximately 15 percent of the freshman class and is statistically representative of the freshman class at large on the basis of age, sex, and residence. Therefore, comments made regarding the sample population are representative of the total freshman population.

1. General Characteristics

In terms of general population characteristics, CSQ data showed that OCE students are mainly from rural areas. Over 50 percent of the sample came to OCE from towns of fewer than 10,000, ranches, or farms. Only 15 percent of OCE students came from large urban areas. In this respect the concept of OCE as a rural school serving primarily rural students is much more in keeping with the popular image of a rural school than CSU.

As expected, OCE serves primarily Oregon students. Sixty percent of the freshman sample was from Oregon. And, as is the case with CSU, OCE is predominantly Caucasian (96 percent). It, too, has attempted several minority recruiting programs but apparently has not attained any significant increase in the percentage of minorities in its student body.

2. Demography

The OCE student body can be characterized as predominantly middle class. Other major characteristics of the student sample were

- a. Ninety-two percent of the students came to OCE from public high schools and over 50 percent graduated in the top 30 percent of their class.
- b. Their parents generally appear to be economically and socially stable. A majority of the families earn \$10,000 or more and 34 percent earn in excess of \$20,000. More than 75 percent indicated that their parents were married and living together, and only 6 percent indicated that their parents were divorced. Seventy-four percent of the students reported that their mothers provided some sort of supplemental family income.
- c. A great majority of the OCE sample has had the benefit of adequate parental education. Over 80 percent indicated that both parents had at least a high school education, and almost 25 percent of those parents had had four years of college or advanced degrees.
- d. Finally, a majority of the parents, according to the students, were fairly active in organized religious groups (55 percent Protestant, 16 percent Catholic) and a majority (60 percent) were considered conservative as either Republicans or Democrats while the students perceived themselves to be more liberal and less religious than their parents.

3. Attitudes

OCE freshman students exhibit much the same mood as the CSU students; namely, enthusiasm, concern, and doubt. For obvious reasons, a large number of students (42 percent) are education majors and desire to pursue an academic career. And, like their CSU counterparts, many are supported by their parents, while 45 percent carry much or some of the financial burden of their education. Thus, for most at OCE, education is a serious though specialized undertaking.

Because of their seriousness of purpose and commitment, most expected to encounter problems. Only 18 percent felt they would have no serious problems at college. The CSQ data showed that the areas in which students expected to attain greatest satisfaction--do well in coursework and acquire a better sense of personal identity--were also very often the areas of greatest concern and doubt for them. Fifty percent of the sample students felt these primary goals to be their greatest source of worry.

During the course of the year, the unstructured interviews revealed that the students felt their college provided an atmosphere of self-discovery and intellectual development. However, they suggested that these goals could be fulfilled to an even greater

degree. For instance, the students would prefer to have more choice in selecting courses, more independent studies, more variety in learning experiences, and more career or vocationally oriented curricula with research in addition to education.

Supportive evidence of the amount of dissatisfaction students experience or the incongruency felt with regard to academic climate was provided in the analysis of individual IGI scores. Fifteen percent of the sample proved to be highly incongruent with the perceived college environment. Highest incongruency scores were registered on items pertaining to the degree of importance placed on academic learning and on practical application of learning in terms of off-campus experiences, more individualized studies, and the degree of social awareness evidenced by the school. The students placed more importance upon a practical application of learning than did either the faculty or administration, and the faculty and administration placed more importance on academic learning than did the students.

There are distinguishing characteristics among the students experiencing this upper extreme of high interconstituent incongruency. Although the student population is predominantly female, the percentage of women increases within the high interconstituent incongruency group, and these women are more career-oriented than their peers. With regard to family background, these students most often come from white, middle-income, Catholic families in which the parents are skilled workers and craftsmen. The families reside in either small rural or large suburban areas. The students consider their families to be fairly close and authoritative, exerting pressures with respect to grades and choice of college. Data also indicated a high incidence of working mothers who command an increasing say in the decision-making process in these families.

The students themselves are almost totally education majors who are concerned about the utility of their pending degrees. They are serious students who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school class. Their concept of satisfaction at college is to master course content and, to some degree, achieve self-discovery. This was further expressed through the unstructured interview in their desire for more independent study and more freedom of choice in course selection. In the process of self-discovery, these students are striving to attain independence from their peers and parents by attempting to ignore peer views and to oppose their parents' views. For example, these students consider themselves to be less religious and more politically liberal and active than their peers or parents.

Thus, in significant ways, test data have indicated that students experiencing highest interconstituent incongruency are similar at both campuses. Generally, both groups of students are questioning the value of a traditional academic climate and are suggesting a more liberal or politically relevant educational environment,

i.e., one that is more concerned with career orientation, self-direction, and social awareness. Analysis of a portion of the unstructured interview data also indicates these individuals rarely turn to other individuals (aside from siblings and one or two peers) for help in controlling these frustrations. Several of them feel they have only two options--drop out of school or change majors--because they perceive that they must take steps to adapt to their environment if they are to remain. Few of the students perceived that the environment would be changed to better adapt to their needs.

The Institutional Environment

The second focus of our research has been to assess the ways in which the three major constituents of a university perceive their present environment and how they feel this environment should be modified in the future. Previous research indicates that a major source of student stress may stem from serious goal incongruencies existing among faculty, students, and administrators within a given university environment. That is, what the students perceive as their personal goals and what they feel should be the goals of the university may be quite different from the perceptions of the faculty and administration. If this degree of incongruency is serious enough for particular students or groups of students, they will find themselves at odds with their campus environment and increased stress and anxiety may result. Ultimately, research suggests, such stress will likely exceed tolerable limits and lead to various coping mechanisms such as drugs, sex, alcohol, or withdrawal in an effort to reduce stress to manageable proportions; suicide attempts are also responses to intolerable stress.

To measure perceptions regarding the goals framework of a university, the task force relied on the Institutional Goals Inventory, which was developed as a tool to help colleges delineate goals and establish priorities. Theoretically, the research instrument measures perceptions related to 13 outcome goals and 7 process goals (see Appendix B). Briefly, these 20 goals are

Outcome

1. Academic development
2. Intellectual orientation
3. Individual/personal development
4. Humanism/altruism
5. Cultural/aesthetic awareness
6. Traditional religiousness
7. Vocational preparation
8. Advanced training
9. Research
10. Meeting local needs
11. Public service
12. Social egalitarianism
13. Social criticism/activism

Process

1. Freedom
2. Democratic governance
3. Community
4. Intellectual aesthetic environment
5. Innovation
6. Off-campus learning
7. Accountability/efficiency

Each of these goals is evaluated by the respondent, who tells how he or she perceives it to be presently and how important it should be in the future. The evaluations are given on a five-point, forced-choice scale, ranging from "of no importance at all" to "of extreme importance." We have defined outcome goals as those goals which are substantive objectives institutions may be seeking to achieve, e.g., improving the quality of graduate programs, research achievements, or public service programs. Process goals are those which relate to internal campus objectives: the educational processes and campus environments. Ideally, process goals should complement the outcome goals of a given university and, in fact, be designed to facilitate achievement of the stated outcome goals.

CSU Campus Characteristics

Because of the large, heterogeneous, multipurpose nature of CSU, it was expected that a significant degree of perceived goal incongruency would exist among its three major constituents. The results obtained from the IGI have shown this generally to be the case.

While there was incongruency on at least 15 of the 20 goals, there were six goals where the incongruency appeared most serious. Among the process goals these were: democratic governance, off-campus learning, and accountability/efficiency. The other three were output goals concerning traditional religiousness, social egalitarianism, and social criticism/activism. Most of the incongruencies were perceived by the student constituency. The faculty and administration demonstrated few incongruencies for either the present or the ideal university environment. However, the students were at particular odds with the faculty and administration over the importance they thought should be placed on outcome goals in an ideal campus environment, the substantive objectives of the university.

That is, the students would prefer that more emphasis be placed on such goals as individual/personal development, social egalitarianism, social criticism/activism, democratic governance, and off-campus learning. They tended to feel that participation in today's real world requires the development of personal and social awareness and vocational preparation through practice in on-the-job training, field programs, etc., as well as pure academic preparation.

A majority of the faculty and administrators, on the other hand, agreed that while these goals were important, more emphasis should be placed on goals designed to continue the traditional university image and environment. That is, academic development, intellectual orientation, research, and accountability/efficiency. Further, the only significant disagreements between CSU faculty and administrators appeared to be over the goals of democratic governance and an open, candid community environment. In both cases, the administrators assigned higher priority to these goals than did the faculty. Otherwise these two constituents appeared very homogeneous in terms of their evaluation of the present university environment and their perceptions of how it should be structured ideally.

OCE Campus Characteristics

At OCE there was considerably more interconstituent incongruency than was initially expected given the more homogeneous, unipurpose nature of the Oregon teachers' college. However, it was the students again who perceived the greatest personal/environmental incongruency. They were at odds with the faculty and/or administration on 16 of the 20 goals in regard to the present environment and on 14 of the 20 goals concerning an ideal environment. The only areas in which there was agreement among the three constituencies were the areas of humanism/altruism, individual/personal development, and accountability/efficiency.

Goal disparity at OCE focused mainly on the nature of the present environment. Students agreed with faculty and administrators on the need for a more intellectual orientation and a more open learning environment. However, they also perceived the need to have their academic training supported by as much off-campus experience as possible and felt that research opportunities and advanced training in various study areas needed to be improved in the future.

At OCE faculty and administrator perceptions were closer than either student and faculty or student and administrator perceptions. However, there were some differences between faculty and administration perceptions. In particular, the administration placed greater importance on the roles freedom, democratic governance, and innovation should have in the campus environment than did the faculty. With regard to outcome goals, a similar incongruence was noted. The administrators saw academic development and intellectual orientation as playing a large enough role in the campus environment. Faculty members felt that the degree of importance these areas should have in daily campus life was not being realized and that more emphasis on them was desperately needed. But the administrators and faculty had no disagreement on the degree of emphasis to be placed on all 20 goals in the ideal environment.

Thus, at OCE there appeared to be greater interconstituent disagreement over perceptions of the college environment as it exists pres-

ently than over how it should exist ideally. The highest degree of interconstituent agreement occurred between the faculty and administrators, and the highest degree of interconstituent disagreement occurred between the students and faculty. In general, the students perceived the importance of academic quality and excellence but felt ideally more emphasis should be placed on vocational preparation, advanced training, research, public service, social egalitarianism, and off-campus learning. On the other hand, the faculty and administrators thought these goals were important but would prefer to better the intellectual atmosphere without greater emphasis on social and career goals.

Summary

Throughout the existence of the task force, members were extremely interested in gathering data that would expand our present knowledge of the campus community social system. Thus, it was agreed very early that perhaps the greatest services the task force could perform would be (1) to develop a research methodology which could be utilized on any campus, (2) to collect valid empirical data which would be made available to counseling and mental health personnel whose campus characteristics correspond to those selected for the task force research, (3) to provide the research participants, CSU and OCE, with accurate information regarding the biographical, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics of their entering freshmen students, and (4) to explore the three major constituencies--students, faculty, and administrators--regarding their perceptions of the school's framework of goals. The last endeavor is perhaps the most important since it represents an area that, until recently, has received little or no research attention. Yet evidence continues to mount concerning its importance as a factor related to increased stress levels among students across the country.

Unfortunately, at the time of this writing much of the data analysis remained unfinished. The data from the Omnibus Personality Inventory, for example, have not been correlated with the goal incongruity scores obtained on the IGI. Also, the relationships among anxiety levels, incongruity scores, and growth levels (e.g., Grade Point Averages) have not been adequately analyzed. However, among the most significant results of the data analysis to date are these:

1. Colorado State University serves a student population that is highly urban in nature, whereas Oregon College of Education serves a student population emanating from rural communities with populations of less than 10,000 or from farms and ranches.
2. Both institutions provide services to a primarily Caucasian, middle-class student body with only a very small representation from minority groups.

3. Both CSU and OCE freshmen populations list as their primary goals the mastery of their particular academic field and the development and/or solidification of identity through a process of self-discovery and development of social awareness on campus. Neither of these goals is perceived as being satisfactorily realized under the present environmental conditions.
4. A significant percentage of students from both schools experience a higher degree of goal incongruity than most of their classmates. A number of shared characteristics can be noted in both of these groups. The students are predominantly career-oriented females. They are the product of close family ties and of parents who are perceived to be quite authoritative. They are potentially good students at the university level since they graduated in the top ranks of their secondary class. And they actively seek to remove themselves from conservative parental and peer group pressures.
5. A degree of interconstituent goal incongruity is found to exist on both campuses, but several significant differences between campuses did occur which appear to justify the continuum approach. That is, there is evidence to suggest that many of the incongruities may be present at a majority of rural campuses. However, the differences which emerged indicate that a finer distinction is needed for research purposes.
6. The highest degree of goal incongruity on both campuses was found among students.
7. On both campuses, the faculty and administration strongly favor the perpetuation of a campus environment emphasizing traditional academic goals such as academic excellence, accountability and efficiency, and intellectual orientation. However, at OCE the administration accepts the notion that these goals can be achieved in an environment which fosters freedom, democratic governance, and innovation as well as the more traditional practices such as classwork, assignments, and regular examination.
8. The students at both campuses, while accepting the importance of the more traditional practices, desire environmental modifications that allow innovation, off-campus learning, democratic governance, and more emphasis on individual/personal development and self-discovery, which they perceive to be critical for

their economic and social survival in the world beyond the campus.

9. Finally, data from the unstructured interviews support the above-mentioned perceptual problem areas because a majority of the students perceive that these goals are not being realized and efforts in these directions are being stifled by the present nature of the environment.

The task force hopes that in the near future further analysis of data collected through the research model will provide additional insights into the effects an institutional environment has on its student population. Any substantive conclusions beyond those mentioned in this report would be conjectural at this time and must of necessity await further analysis of the data.

A P P E N D I X A

Unstructured Interview Guide

I. Student System Flow Section

1. How long before registration day did you arrive in Fort Collins/Monmouth?
 - A. Why did you select Colorado State University/
Oregon College of Education?
2. What were your initial impressions of Fort Collins and CSU/Monmouth and OCE?
 - A. Monmouth
Fort Collins (positive)
 - B. Monmouth
Fort Collins (negative)
 - C. OCE
CSU (positive)
 - D. OCE
CSU (negative)
3. After arriving in Fort Collins/Monmouth what positive or negative experiences did you have prior to registration day? (e.g., housing, unfriendliness)
4. Describe for me (step by step) your activities during the two days of registration.
 - A. What (if any) would you classify as bad experiences you had during registration period? (enumerate)
 - B. What (if anything) did you do about these experiences or could you have done?
5. Describe for me, as accurately as you can, all your activities during the first week after you completed registration and began classes. (interviewer should probe for all possible contact points)
 - A. After informant has listed all contact agencies and contact points, interviewer should have informant evaluate each in effort to isolate negative experiences.

6. You mentioned that you came into contact with _____.
Could you describe that situation for me in detail?
 - A. Would you evaluate this first interaction as a positive or negative experience and why?
 - B. If negative, what steps (if any) did you take to deal with the situation?

(interviewer should repeat questions 6, 6A, and 6B for each contact point mentioned by informant)

7. Could you describe for me now, all your activities during the second and succeeding weeks until now?
 - A. Questions 6, 6A, and 6B should be repeated for each new contact point mentioned.
 - B. Interviewer should (in each week) probe for possible contact points informant forgot or failed to mention. (e.g., student hangouts and social clubs)

II. Student Stress--Growth Evaluation Section

8. In general terms, could you evaluate for me the experiences that you have disliked during your first quarter here at CSU/OCE?
 - A. In what ways specifically is CSU/OCE different from what you imagined prior to coming here?
 - B. Of the items you just mentioned, which would you state were really stressful or created stress or anxiety for you?
9. Are there any ways or have you had any experiences which you definitely would evaluate as having been beneficial to you at CSU/OCE this quarter?
 - A. How (if at all) do you feel you have grown or developed this quarter?
10. If you had it to do over, what would you have done differently that you did not do the first time through?
 - A. What will you do differently next quarter?

III. Student "Coping Mechanism" Section

11. As we've gone through the interview you have mentioned

a number of "bad experiences" you have had this quarter, or events that you feel have caused personal stress or anxiety. These include (list for respondent).

A. In case of _____, how did you handle the problem? (repeat for each)

12. During the course of the quarter have you ever done any of the following:

| Mechanism | Regularly | Occasionally | Rarely | Have Stress-Related | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------|---------------------|----|
| | | | | Yes | No |
| Drinking | | | | | |
| Drugs (specify) | | | | | |
| Sexual Intercourse | | | | | |
| Professional Counseling | | | | | |
| Nonprofessional Counseling (by whom) | | | | | |
| Withdrawal | | | | | |
| Work (physical) | | | | | |

13. You have indicated that you have _____ as a means of coping with stress.

- A. Do you think it helped at all?
- B. Why did you decide on that particular method rather than another? (probe for specific qualities of coping mechanism that were appealing to respondent)
- C. What is it about these methods (enumerate) that "turns you off?"

APPENDIX B

Descriptions of the 20 Goal Areas in the Institutional Goals Inventory¹

OUTCOME GOALS

Academic Development—this goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus. (1,4,6,9)*

Intellectual Orientation—this goal area relates to an *attitude* about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to lifelong learning. (2,5,7,10)

Individual Personal Development—this goal area means identification by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence. (3,8,11,13)

Humanism/Altruism—this goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally. (14,17,20,23)

Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness—this goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities. (15,18,21,24)

Traditional Religiosity—this goal area is intended to mean a religiosity that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental—in short, *traditional* rather than "secular" or "modern." (16,19,22,25)

Vocational Preparation—this goal area means offering specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning. (26,30,36,38)

Advanced Training—this goal area can be most readily understood simply as the availability of postgraduate education. It means developing and maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the professions, and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas. (27,31,32,41)

Research—this goal area involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research. (28,34,35,37)

Meeting Local Needs—this goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities. (29,33,39,40)

Public Service—this goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs. (44,47,50,51)

*The numbers in parentheses are the four Goal Statements that make up each Goal Area.

Social Egalitarianism—this goal area has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills. (42,45,48,52)

Social Criticism/Activism—this goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society. (43,46,49,53)

PROCESS GOALS

Freedom—this goal area is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life styles. (54,57,60,63)

Democratic Governance—this goal area means decentralized decision-making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them; and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution. (55,58,61,64)

Community—this goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators. (56,59,62,65)

Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment—this goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus. (66,69,73,76)

Innovation—this goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life; it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance. (67,70,74,77)

Off-Campus Learning—this goal area includes time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; study on several campuses during undergraduate programs; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination. (68,72,75,78)

Accountability/Efficiency—this goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals. (79,81,83,87)

¹From the Institutional Goals Inventory published and distributed by Institutional Research Program for Higher Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. ©1973 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

*Regional Meetings of Federal and State Agencies
Advisory Committee*

DR. JAMES G. ALLEN, Department of Human Development,
University of Hawaii

DR. PAUL BLOLAND, Vice President Student Affairs,
University of Southern California

DR. ALFREDO CASTANEDA, Chairman for Mexican-American
Studies, University of California at Riverside

JOHN EVERITT, Student, University of Colorado

JEWELLE GIBBS, Staff Psychiatric Social Worker,
Stanford University

DR. ERNEST W. HARTUNG, President, University of Idaho

ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Chairman, Academic Affairs Committee,
State Board of Higher Education, State of Oregon

MARJORIE LYNCH, Regional Director, ACTION, Region 10,
Seattle, Washington

JAMES HARQUARDT, M.D., Director, Student Health Center,
University of Colorado

Advisory Interstate Committee for Health Education

DR. ROBERT H. EPOEPSCH, Executive Director

ROBERT L. STUBBLEFIELD, M.D., Associate Director, MCHB,
and Director of Mental Health and Related Areas

DR. JAMES H. BARRING, Program Director, Improving
Mental Health Services on Western Campuses

DR. ANNE APPLEPP, Staff Associate, Improving Mental
Health Services on Western Campuses