The Meaning and Measurement of Quality in the Undergraduate Experience.

In an examination of the meaning and measurement of quality in the undergraduate experience, quality is compared with the conceptually similar but distinct concepts of adequacy and excellence. Most of the conceptual frameworks available for assessing quality are essentially unidimensional assessment strategies that rely almost exclusively on quantitative indicators such as student ability or library resources. The most popular multidimensional approach to assessing quality is the input-environment-output model. A redefinition of Stufflebeam's et al. planning and evaluation model includes: context, input, involvement, and outcome. Using these categories, the opinion and empirical research related to quality were reviewed to assess indices of quality. Quantitative quality assessment usually focuses on institutional factors about which objective, standardized measures are available or can be collected, and produce data that (1) can be used for both intra- and interinstitutional comparisons; (2) are amenable to computer-assisted analytic procedures; and (3) are compatible with the psychometric paradigm. For qualitative quality assessments, manifestations such as students' reports of satisfaction with various aspects of the institution or observations of students' involvement in the classroom or other activities are primary data sources. Holistic quality assessments are concerned with: the purpose of the target programs, information about involvement and outcomes of college attendance, an action-orientation, multiple forms of data-gathering, a public and educative function, and a value orientation. (SW)
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Most institutions of higher education share a history of steady and, at times, almost exponential expansion. At present, a large proportion of colleges and universities are preparing to educate about the same or slightly smaller numbers of students with more diverse learning requirements but have fewer "real" (inflation adjusted) dollars available. Concurrently, societal expectations for education remain unrealistically high even though the "new Federalism" and sluggish local economies have resulted in reduced appropriation levels. For these as well as other context specific reasons colleges and universities have begun to look inward to determine how to maintain "quality". Indeed, in 1980 the two largest higher education associations used quality as the cornerstone of their respective convention themes.

A number of researchers have used various methods to produce "reputational ratings" of institutional "quality" (e.g., Blau & Margulies, 1975; Cartter, 1966; Roose & Anderson, 1970). For the most part, these ratings have focused on department or major fields as the unit of analysis. With few exceptions (e.g., Heath, 1968), quality of the undergraduate experience per se has not been treated in any detail in the literature.

Few disagree that quality is an appropriate goal to pursue. Often avoided or overlooked in the search for quality is what the concept essentially entails. That is, the meaning of quality is rarely discussed. Without considering what quality implies, efforts to adequately assess quality lack focus. In this paper, the meaning and measurement
of quality in the undergraduate experience are examined. First, some consideration is given to what quality connotes. Quality is compared with the conceptually similar but distinct concepts of adequacy and excellence. Then, frameworks used to estimate quality in the undergraduate experience are reviewed and an alternative approach to aggregating indices of quality is described and used in a review of the literature on quality in higher education. The advantages and disadvantages of various approaches to measuring quality are discussed. Finally, guiding principles for holistic quality assessments are presented.

The Meaning of Quality

The concept of quality has as many as eight different nuances (Merriam, 1976, p. 944). Definitions of quality range from the vividness of color to the timbre of a vowel sound. However, Straumanis (1981) has argued that the concept of quality is best represented by a judgment continuum anchored by somewhat different applications of the concept: (1) description; and (2) evaluation (see also Harshman, 1979).

On the descriptive end, quality connotes a characteristic of someone or something without an appraisal of the value of the characteristic or the person or object exhibiting the characteristic (McCall, 1976). For example, if a high school teacher attests that an applicant for admission to Siwash University "has personal qualities consistent with Siwash standards," the recommender probably means that the prospective student possesses certain traits and academic and social experiences that, taken together, suggest the student can be successful at Siwash.
In the evaluative meaning, quality is used to describe the value of an object, person, or experience (Cartter, 1966). In the above example, if the recommender wrote, "the applicant has produced quality work throughout her four years at Eisenhower High School," the comment would suggest positive appraisal of the applicant's performance as contrasted with a potentially negative evaluation of individual achievement.

The quality continuum also reflects the degree to which clarity is represented in an object or experience (Campbell, Converse & Rogers, 1976). Indeed, one of the reasons greater specificity has not been attempted in the literature is that quality is a rather ambiguous entity, particularly when applied to higher education. The more ambiguous an entity, the less agreement on what constitutes an entity. Yet, it is easier to agree on a description of an experience than an evaluative summary of the experience. The latter calls for declarations of values and personal taste which together require a clearer definition of the entity to be evaluated. Quality in the undergraduate experience is ambiguous and, therefore, somewhat easier to describe. But the value of college is much more difficult to estimate because an evaluative assessment requires clarification of the variables and the relationships between variables that comprise students' experiences.

**Toward a Definition of Quality**

Quality is comprised of an elusive set of properties (Persig, 1974). To produce quality, function is emphasized over form; i.e., the outcome or products of any given set of experiences are usually more important than the means used to produce the outcome. Quality
and cost may be positively correlated but the relationship is probably far from perfect (Jenny, 1979; Millett, 1979). For example, if an inexpensive item is satisfactory and satisfying such as a 29¢ Bic pen or a cut rate brand of aspirin, so much the better for the consumer. Similarly, a moderately priced institution that meets the developmental needs and expectations of the student is probably preferrable to a higher priced institution (Upton, 1963).

Quality is not a normative property. That is, quality is not well served by arbitrarily forming categories or classes of high, medium, and low quality, and assigning proportionate numbers of academic programs or institutions to the various classes. Rather, quality is determined by students and others applying standards to an experience during and after thoughtful consideration of the meaning of the myriad of interactions that comprised the student's experience.

The effects of quality are expected to endure over a long term and positive (valued) if not similar outcomes are expected for most students most of the time (see Olscamp, 1978). Quality infers a high degree of fidelity between the purposes, philosophies, and goals of the institution and the behavior of persons frequenting the institution's environment (Chickering, 1969; Keeton, 1974). But the concept of quality also includes an esthetic property or some degree of sensuous pleasure. Quality may not necessarily reflect perfection, for educated persons without quirks and surprises tend to be rather uninteresting (Bowen, 1979). Indeed, such uniformity would be inconsistent with the aims of liberal education that appear in most college catalogues!

Quality in the undergraduate student experience is better thought
of as a simple elegance, a perceived sense of well being and accomplishment (Withey, 1975) including a variety of sensations shared by partners in the enterprise. Students, faculty, administrators, staff, and others feel comfortable and satisfied as a result of being involved in purposeful experiences. However, not all constituencies, particularly but not exclusively students, may be comfortable or satisfied at all times during the undergraduate program. Curricular and cocurricular challenges that upset students' equilibrium and encourage students to greater degrees of differentiation and personal integration are required to fulfill the development of the "whole person" goal to which most institutions subscribe (see Knefelkamp, 1980; Perry, 1970; Sanford, 1962).

Adequacy, Excellence and Quality

When applied to educational settings, the concepts of quality, adequacy, and excellence have similar but not interchangeable connotations. Therefore, unless distinctions are made between these terms, considerable confusion can result when interpreting the meaning of quality.

All three concepts require comparison with some predetermined criteria to reflect attainment of a particular purpose or requirement. The shades of distinction between these terms can be illuminated by applying the criteria of merit and worth. Lincoln and Guba (1979) have argued that merit represents an intrinsic, context-free value, "independent of any requirements of applicability or use" (p. 1). Scientific discoveries are often meritorious because scientists appreciate an important addition to knowledge for its own sake. If a discovery is without theoretical significance (lacks merit) but has utility in a practical
context, the discovery would be worthwhile. Worth, therefore, is an extrinsic, context specific value.

Adequacy suggests a level of sufficiency for certain persons in a specific context or setting (McCarthy, 1981; Merriam, 1977, p. 14; Wise, 1976) and embodies the elements of worth but not necessarily merit. Excellence intimates an absolute superior standard of attainment, standards that are not time or context bound and are good in their own right; therefore, the merit criteria are met but not necessarily the worth criteria. The concept of quality embodies characteristics of both merit and worth; that is, a high (but not necessarily superior) level of attainment is required that also has utility or worth (makes sense and feels right) for those involved in the experience.

For example, consider two programs designed to enhance the personal development of students in a residence hall. One activity is a series of workshops with the purpose of increasing interpersonal communication skills. The purpose of this program has both merit and worth. Liberally educated individuals are expected to be able to interact with a wide variety of persons (merit). Also students in the hall have exhibited a need for and expressed an interest in further developing their capacity to effectively communicate with their male and female counterparts (worth). The purpose of this program is defendible.

The second activity's purpose is to develop autonomy among residents in another hall. This purpose has merit in that the capacity for autonomous, independent thinking and decision making is valued in an educated society. However, the activity may not have worth if the residence unit is experiencing difficulty coordinating the policy making functions of its
various committees. An activity that encourages, at this particular point in time, active experimentation with behaviors characteristic of assertive or independent thinking persons may be ill-timed because such experimentation may actually impede attainment of the larger community's goals. Perhaps another set of activities addressing interdependence among residents would be more appropriate and therefore of higher quality at that particular time with that particular group of students.

Quality is a many-faceted property. While not "mystical" (Astin, 1980), quality is difficult to assess. Nevertheless, judgments about quality are rendered everyday. Intra- and interinstitutional comparisons for the purposes of resource allocation are common (Astin, 1980; Jenny, 1979; Young, 1976). Some of the problems associated with measuring quality may be exacerbated by flawed frameworks within which the elements contributing to quality have been considered.

Frameworks for Assessing Quality

Most of the conceptual frameworks available are essentially unidimensional assessment strategies which rely almost exclusively on quantitative indicators such as student ability or library resources. For example, in a simplistic form of an input-output or "pipeline" approach, the guiding assumption is that college is essentially a conduit through which raw materials pass relatively untouched. If high ability students matriculate, the college can expect to have many highly able, successful alumni. In other words, because the "impact" of the college is negligible, institutional quality is unimportant except insofar as attracting students is concerned.
Most observers agree that multiple dimensions of an experience must be considered to estimate the degree to which quality is present (Epstein & McFarland, 1976; Palola, 1976; Slimon, 1981). Perhaps the most popular multidimensional approach to assessing quality is the input-environment-output model (Astin, 1977, 1980). Inputs represent what students bring with them to college (ability, interests, etc.); outcomes are measures of cognitive and affective changes between students and others (faculty, peers, etc.) as well as actual institutional resources such as library holdings and so forth.

The role of the college environment can be interpreted from two perspectives (Astin, 1977). As a "factory," the institution takes the raw materials (students' input characteristics), rearranges, reconstitutes, or refines these materials, and produces a particular kind of product (developed student). Astin (1977) suggested that a medical model perspective may have greater utility in understanding the influence of the environment on students' development. Of course, students are not considered "sick;" however, the extent to and ways in which students benefit from college is not unlike an ill patient with access to a medical facility. If the student plays an active role in the process, takes advantage of the opportunities available, and understands how the experience will assist in attaining valued goals, the chances for a satisfactory learning experience ("health") increase. In this interpretation, the institution and the student share responsibility for students' outcomes.

The availability of certain institutional resources such as faculty, intramurals, library, and laboratory facilities, and student support
services and students' use of these resources make conceptually distinct contributions to quality. The former are indicators and are comprised of surrogate or proxy student or institutional characteristics. The latter are after-the-fact manifestations of student effort. To be useful in estimating quality, indicators should be empirically related to manifestations of quality (Straumanis, 1981).

A Comprehensive Quality Assurance Framework

To more clearly understand the relationship of quality to various elements of the undergraduate experience, the structured components of a popular planning and evaluation model (Stufflebeam et al., 1971) were redefined. The following conceptual framework resulted:

(a) **Context**—characteristics of an institution's environment that are relatively stable over time such as expenditures per student, size of student body, and proportion of faculty with doctorates.

(b) **Input**—characteristics of entering students such as intellectual ability, interests, and aspirations.

(c) **Involvement**—interactions (manifestations) that characterize the environment in which students live and learn such as the amount, type, and opportunity for informal interaction between students and faculty, students' satisfaction with the institution, and student effort (Pace, 1980).

(d) **Outcome**—intended products or unintended effects (manifestations) associated with college attendance such as retention rates, achievement levels, student development measures, and alumni achievements.

Using these categories as advance organizers, the opinion and empirical research related to quality were reviewed and synthesized.
to answer the following questions:

(a) What kind of indices are available to estimate quality?
(b) What indices are used most often to estimate quality and how are they derived?
(c) How can estimates of quality be improved?

Review of the Literature on What Constitutes Quality in the Undergraduate Experience

Over 200 literature entries were reviewed including:

(a) Articles appearing in professional educational journals such as *Change*, *Journal of Higher Education*, *Review of Educational Research*, and monographs such as those produced in the ERIC/AAHE Research Report series;
(b) Pertinent documents identified through a computerized search conducted by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education;
(c) Books and other published works reporting social and behavioral science efforts to estimate quality of life;
(d) Previously unpublished material and reports such as papers presented at recent meetings such as the American Association of Higher Education, the American Educational Research Association, and the Association for Institution Research.

After a preliminary review, the materials were assigned to one or more of the following categories for a more detailed analysis: (a) context indicators, (b) input indicators, (c) involvement manifestations, (d) outcome manifestations, and (e) quality assessment methodologies. Then the literature related to each of the categories was independently analyzed.
and summarized. The criteria used to determine salient indices of quality were empirical support, cogency of argument, and repetition of mention (see Huston, 1979 for a more detailed explanation of this literature review procedure). From this analysis, conclusions were drawn concerning: (a) whether various indices of quality appear useful; (b) the degree to which institutional agents such as administrators and faculty contribute to the quality of the undergraduate student experience.

In the following sections, salient indices of quality reported in the literature are summarized. A more detailed analysis of the relative utility of these indices in estimating the quality of the undergraduate experience can be found in Kuh (in press).

**Context**

Four context indices may be worthwhile indicators of quality at many institutions. Many positive indicators and manifestations of quality have been associated with institutional size (Bowen, 1977; Rock, Centra & Linn, 1979). For example, smaller institutions tend to have clearer purposes; as a result, a greater sense of community is often fostered among students attending smaller institutions (Heath, 1968). In addition, opportunities for assuming leadership positions in cocurricular activities such as student government and informal contact with faculty tend to increase (Astin, 1977; Chickering, 1969; Pace, 1981). Of course, the size of an institution does not cause these things to happen; rather size encourages their occurrence (Table 1).

Clarity of institutional purpose has been referred to repeatedly as an earmark of a high quality institution (Astin, 1980; Meeth, 1974; Keeton,
Large universities must have multiple purposes and missions to satisfy their diverse and sometimes competing stakeholding audiences (e.g., trustees, taxpayers, students, alumni). Therefore, such institutions rarely are able to project a salient purpose to most persons most of the time.

Student living environments also appear functionally linked to quality (Astin, 1977; Chickering, 1974; DeCoster & Mable, 1930; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). Students spend a disproportionate amount of time during the undergraduate years engaged in nonclassroom related activities (Wilson, 1966). Therefore, the degrees to which students are challenged by and satisfied with their living environments merit continued emphasis in the search for quality.

Formal systematic properties such as administrative structures and decision making strategies have not been empirically related to quality (Bowen, 1979). However, the informal organization comprised of norms that encourage or hinder faculty involvement with student and the extent to which students feel and act as though they are members of the academic community seem to be particularly promising areas of inquiry for those interested in enhancing the quality of the undergraduate experience (Benezet, 1981).

Insert Table 1 about here

Input

Although input indicators such as high school class rank and SAT or
ACT scores have often been used (Bowen, 1981; Millett, 1979), few empirical relationships between manifestations of quality such as value-added achievement or retention rates and input indicators have been found (Astin, 1977). The degree to which nonintellectual characteristics of students such as interests and aspirations is consistent with an institution's environmental press has been positively correlated with student satisfaction and persistence (Chickering, 1974; Moos, 1979; Pace, 1969; Stern, 1970). But as quality indicators, these variables have not been powerful predictors of quality manifestations (Table 2).

Student ability is perhaps the most often used indicator of quality (Astin & Solmon, 1979). Yet, various inquiries with slightly different foci have been unable to document whether the ability of students is positively related to the quality of the experience. Most studies linking ability with subsequent manifestations of quality have been quantitative. Perhaps case study portrayals of students with varying levels of ability in institutions with different purposes could help fill the apparent knowledge void about the relationship between student ability and quality in the undergraduate experience.

Insert Table 2 about here

Involvement

The degree to which students are involved during the undergraduate years is one of the most important and, perhaps, accurate manifestations of quality (Astin, 1977, 1979; Astin & Scherrei, 1980; Pace, 1980; Scott, 1980). Involvement is related to a variety of other indicators and mani-
festations often empirically or logically associated with quality: institutional size, general satisfaction with the institution (including satisfaction with the living environment and academic pursuits --see Kegan, 1978), persistence to completion of degree objective (Astin, 1977), postcollege community service, and income. The "quality" of effort students expend is currently receiving attention (Pace, 1979, 1980, 1981) and may prove helpful in distinguishing between students benefiting in profound ways from college and their counterparts who become dissatisfied and/or leave the institution (Table 3).

The degree to which faculty expend effort in instruction or are involved with students out of the classroom has been positively related to many manifestations of quality (Bean, 1981; Bragg, 1976; McKeachie, 1978; Menges, 1981; Pascarella, 1980; Sanford, 1967; Snyder, 1971; Student Task Force on Education at Stanford, 1973, Trow, 1975). Identification of the factors related to faculty involvement (e.g., morale, salience of institutional purpose) seems a promising line of inquiry.

Outcomes

Persistence enables students to take advantage of a variety of other opportunities related to quality (Astin, 1979); e.g., interaction with faculty and peers and participation or perhaps leadership in institutional governing processes (Table 4). Therefore, persistence is, like size, a mediating index. Yet persistence may have a pernicious influence as well (Chickering, 1971). Some students may become placated or too satisfied
with the college experience. A number of these students probably persis
t to graduation but the meanings they make of their experiences have
been rarely challenged, especially in their living environments. This is
more likely to be true for the increasing proportions of part-time commut-
ing students (Chickering, 1974; Astin, 1977).

Alumni studies are thought to be perhaps the best source of infor-
mation about college quality (Boulding, 1975; Freedman, 1962; Pace, 1979).
Bowen (1979) suggested that many important outcomes of college cannot
be documented at commencement because the impacts or changes will not
be manifested until some years later.

The 'residue of a college education--after the
initial forgetting of detail--is a virtual mystery.
Moreover, we should be interested in the values and
attitudes of alumni, their interests, their citizen-
ship, their family life, and their careers as these
may have been affected by their college experiences
(p. 25).

The search for value added outcomes of college have met with little
success (Astin & Panos, 1979). Aggregation and measurement of change
problems have often been cited as contributing factors to insignificant
findings (Astin, 1977). Interestingly, those few researchers (e.g.,
Cottle, 1975; Heath, 1968; Perry, 1970; White, 1966) who have conducted
intensive studies of small samples of students and alumni have reported
provocative accounts of what happens to students during and after college.
Like quantitative assessments of the same phenomena, these approaches
also have limitations; but the insights they may provide concerning value
added outcomes of college are descriptively rich (see Trow, 1975).

The empirical evidence has suggested that graduating from a higher "quality" college will result in greater earnings during the post-college years (Solmon, 1972; Wachtell, 1975). It is unclear whether income is more a function of the contributions of the undergraduate experience or some other variable such as socioeconomic status (see Karabel & Astin, 1972) which may be unrelated to the quality of the education experience.

Insert Table 4 about here

Quantitative and Qualitative Contributions to Quality Assessment

Quality is a multidimensional concept. After reviewing the literature on quality in the undergraduate experience, it is clearer why: (1) few assessment efforts which attempt to account for the multiple properties of quality have been mounted; and (2) most "quality assessments" rely on indicators rather than manifestations of quality.

In general, methodological approaches to quality assessment can be divided into two categories: quantitative and qualitative. Each represents a different way of attempting to describe the same series of events. In practice, most intrainstitutional efforts to estimate quality incorporate elements from both paradigms. These two approaches are separated for discussion purposes for two reasons: (1) adherence to one approach to the exclusion of the other substantially influences (a) what is assessed and (b) the assessment strategies employed; (2) quantitative methods have dominated quality assessments for a considerable period of time and therefore it seems appropriate to illuminate the advantages, limitations, and relative
utility of different approaches (Stark & Lowther, 1980). Guba's (1978) points of comparison between conventional and naturalistic inquiry serve as a framework within which the contributions of different approaches to estimating quality can be considered.

**Quantitative**

Quality assessments are often based in the logical positivism characteristic of the agricultural-botony and psychometric traditions (Sherman, 1981) and rely almost exclusively on operationally defined and objective measures (Astin & Solmon, 1979). Therefore, quantitative assessments usually focus on institutional factors about which objective, standardized measures are available or can be collected. A predetermined, reductionistic framework is used to identify those variables which appear to be related to the factor of interest. In a sense, the quality assessment is almost unrelated to human interactions and tends to overlook institutional conditions that cannot be "technically" controlled (i.e. through conventional inquiry methods such as inferential statistics). The only value perspective allowed to influence the assessment is that of the investigator's (see Table 5).

Quantitative approaches are attractive because they produce data which: (1) can be used for both intra- and interinstitutional comparisons; (2) are amenable to computer assisted analytic procedures; and (3) are compatible with the psychometric paradigm which has influenced the social sciences for decades. However, quantitative measures are less likely to account for unintended outcomes and acknowledge the range and depth of human experiences. While multivariate procedures are available, most
quantitative assessments have emphasized unidimensional perspectives on quality. Quantitative assessments of quality often correlate two or more input, context, or outcome variables such as aptitude or achievement exam scores such as Scholastic Aptitude Test or Graduate Record Examination; high school class rank; expenditures per student; proportion of faculty with doctorates, faculty salaries, library collections, and number of fellowships awarded to seniors.

Qualitative assessments sometimes referred to as "naturalistic" or ethnographic, qualitative assessments value an expansionist, phenomenological perspective compatible with ethnography. The guiding assumption is there are different ways of knowing and making meaning. Therefore, to adequately estimate the quality of the experience, those involved in the process (students, faculty, staff) must be given "an opportunity to describe...and comment on the meaning of those experiences for them" (Wolf, 1979, p. 1). Rather than indicators, manifestations such as students' reports of satisfaction with various aspects of the institution or observations of students' involvement in both in- and out-of-class activities are primary data sources. Qualitative assessments embrace a variety of relatively "subjective" data collection strategies such as observations, interviews, case studies, and review of existing documents (Sherman, 1981). The data collected are "confirmable" (Guba, 1978), but reflect the pluralistic values embedded in the institutional context. Graphic portrayals (what Guba refers to as "thick") result
which communicate a sense of "what" has been experienced "how".

Qualitative assessments are sensitive to unintended effects and outcomes. However, they tend to be labor intensive, appear less objective, and are generally cumbersome when used for interinstitutional quality assessments. The advantages and disadvantages of quantitative and qualitative approaches to quality assessment are summarized in Figure 1.

Toward a "Holistic" Appraisal of Quality

Can quality be adequately estimated using either a quantitative or qualitative assessment technique? Because quality is a multidimensional concept, data gathering strategies characteristic of both approaches are required. Exclusive use of one or the other will likely overlook elements of the undergraduate experience that could markedly influence conclusions about quality. More important, to determine what can be done to improve the present level of quality will require multiple perspectives on the college experience (Astin, 1980). For example, while quantitative efforts to rank institutions by the "quality" (ability) of their students make interesting reading (see Astin & Solmon, 1979), they offer little assistance to faculty and staff charged with identifying programs or institutional policies that could be modified to enhance quality.

A holistic, eclectic perspective of quality assessment recognizes the validity and importance of as well as the limitations of contrasting inquiry methods and the different kinds and sources of information emphasized in the quantitative and qualitative approaches (Stark & Lowther, 1980). In holistic quality assessments the data gathering strategies are eclectic and emergent in that the methods employed are dictated by students' purposes.
and characteristics, the institution's mission, and the purposes for the quality assessment. Usually more than one form of data gathering are required to illuminate the various aspects of the students' experience (see Parlett and Hamilton, 1976 for a detailed discussion of holistic "illuminative" strategies).

Guiding Principles for Holistic Quality Assessments

When considered together, the six principles introduced below serve as a general framework for holistic quality assessment. Of course, certain institutional factors or circumstances may militate against the use of one or more. In general, however, these guideposts will lend direction to quality assessment activities.

1. Quality assessment is guided by the purpose(s) of the target program or unit and of the students participating in target-sponsored activities.

One of the earmarks of quality often mentioned in the literature is purpose. Therefore, the degree to which the activities of the program or unit under study are compatible with the stated purposes of both the target program and the students may be an indicator of quality. The guiding question is, "What are we trying to do here together?"

Focusing on institutional purposes will probably increase awareness to the "problematic preferences" (competing and sometimes conflicting institutional goals--see Cohen & March, 1972) common to larger institutions. Therefore, the scope of the assessment should be consistent with levels of the organization with the clearest purposes. In other words, focusing quality assessment efforts at the academic program level within a college or on students' living units are more likely to prove helpful than attempting
to estimate the "quality" of the entire institution.

2. Quality assessment seeks manifestations or information about involvement and outcomes of the college experience.

Using indicators to estimate quality is tempting because indicator data are usually readily available and are relatively easy to manipulate. Quality in the undergraduate experience is not preordained, however. Rather, quality results from the interaction between students and institutional agents or others (e.g., peers). Therefore, questions of interest to quality assessers are "What do students do here (involvement)?" and "What happens to students as a result of their involvement (outcomes)?"

To adequately respond to the latter question, assessment activities must extend beyond the campus borders and into the post-college years.

3. Quality assessment is action oriented.

An important objective of quality assessment is to inform and guide the implementation of interventions designed to enhance the quality of students' experiences. That is, "What actions do our experiences collecting the information and the data themselves suggest concerning how to enhance quality?" Gathering information for purposes of interinstitutional comparison may have merit. However, more persons in an institution are likely to benefit in more ways if the assessors remain sensitive to changes in policies and practices which could increase quality. In this sense, quality assessment is both descriptive and evaluative.

4. Quality assessment requires multiple forms of data gathering.

"What methods and strategies will tell us what we need to know about the quality of students' experiences?" Without different ways of collecting information about students' and faculty behavior and satisfaction with their
interactions, the multiple realities that exist will not be adequately recorded. Triangulation, cross validation, and a combination of qualitative and quantitative data are required if a reasonably accurate estimate of the quality of the undergraduate experience is to result.

5. Quality assessment is a public, conscious, and educative activity. To become familiar with the purposes and expectations of students as well as institutional agents, quality assessment activities will generate more useful information when the requirements and perspectives of various stakeholder groups are considered. To operationalize this principle, collaboration between "direct" (student, faculty, staff) and "indirect" (alumni, trustees, legislature, others) contributors to quality is required to adequately describe the quality of the undergraduate experience. "How can various constituent groups be encouraged to participate and benefit from quality assurance activities?"

Participation will enable students and institutional agents to learn more about their respective roles and to reflect on the meaning of their experiences. Access to the process will also maintain enthusiasm for and commitment to acting on information generated from the assessment. Assessments will have greater internal credibility if during and after the process, participants know more about the program or unit, themselves, and what connotes quality than they did at the outset. Stakeholders should be periodically informed of the assessment strategy, findings, and potential consequences of possible quality enhancing interventions as they are identified. Particular benefits may accrue to students who experience the complexities of translating findings into action-based alternatives.
6. Quality assessment is value laden.

Pluralistic value orientations of students, faculty across units, staff, and indirect contributors make it difficult if not impossible to achieve consensus concerning what quality is and how quality can be enhanced. Both the meaning and measurement of quality are tied to local values; therefore, objective or "scientific" approaches to quality assurance may be flawed from the start. "What is important to the people in this place?" The smaller the unit and numbers of persons involved, the easier it is to respond and share understandings of value laden issues. Collaboration and negotiation may not satisfactorily resolve disagreements. But to assume quality is not tied to values is to ignore the differences between the quality of students' experiences at one institution and students' experiences at another.

Conclusion

Institutional agents can assess or adequately estimate the degree to which quality is present. However, quality assessment is a rather complex process which requires "muddling through" and a high degree of collaboration. Estimates of quality used for reasons other than intra-institutional policy decisions may be suspect, given the context-relative nature of "quality".

To assess quality, emphasis must be given to the relationship between the purpose(s) of an activity or program and the manifestations or during-and after-the-fact evidence that the college experience was meaningful and resulted in "value added" changes on the part of students and society. Persons' values differ as do the meanings they attach to the same experience. Multiple perspectives on the quality of undergraduate experience must be acknowledged and can be adequately estimated only through the use of different but complimentary data gathering approaches.
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Table 1

Relationships Between Quality and Selected Context Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Direction and Strength of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Centra &amp; Linn (1970)</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>moderate to low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1968a)</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1968b)</td>
<td>Campus leadership</td>
<td>- moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickering (1969); Heath (1968)</td>
<td>Perceived prestige</td>
<td>- moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen (1977)</td>
<td>Personal development opportunities</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeth (1974)</td>
<td>&quot;Educational advantage&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millett (1979)</td>
<td>Department &quot;quality&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeth (1974)</td>
<td>Faculty/student interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developmentally powerful - moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1980); Chickering (1969); Heath (1968); Keeton (1971); Meeth (1974)</td>
<td>- moderate to high community</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troutt (1979)</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean (1981); Benezet (1981); Berdie (1972)</td>
<td>Students involvement in and understanding of institutional operations</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen (1979)</td>
<td>&quot;Quality&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg (1976); Gaff &amp; Gaff (1981); Stanford Student Task Force (1973)</td>
<td>Student/faculty interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (1969)</td>
<td>Achievement (GPA)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troutt (1979)</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1968a)</td>
<td>Gre scores</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock, Centra &amp; Linn (1970)</td>
<td>Gre scores</td>
<td>+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams &amp; Krislov (1978)</td>
<td>Gourman (1977) Index</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solmon (1972, 1975)</td>
<td>Post college income</td>
<td>+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen (1981); Meeth (1974)</td>
<td>&quot;Quality&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student living environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (1966)</td>
<td>Knowledge acquisition</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1977); Chickering (1974); Feldman &amp; Newcomb (1969); Williams, Riley &amp; Zgliczynski (1980)</td>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>0,+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades, persistence and involvement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Relationships Between Quality and Selected Input Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Direction and Strength of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Perceived institutional affluence</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1968); Astin &amp; Panos (1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intellective/biographical characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingham (1980)</td>
<td>Liberating experience</td>
<td>+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moos (1979); Stern (1970)</td>
<td>Satisfaction with institution</td>
<td>+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1968)</td>
<td>Student-environment fit</td>
<td>+ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Direction and Strength of Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer interaction</td>
<td>&quot;Quality&quot;</td>
<td>+ low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin &amp; Scherrei (1980); Feldman &amp; Newcomb (1969)</td>
<td>Persistence, personal development, satisfaction</td>
<td>+ low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegan (1978)</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickering (1974); Bragg (1976)</td>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb (1962); Stern (1962)</td>
<td>Attrition, dissatisfaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menges (1981); McKeachie (1978)</td>
<td>Development of intellect</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolb (1981); Messick et al. (1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal student-faculty interaction</td>
<td>Student development; satisfaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascarella (1980)</td>
<td>&quot;Quality&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Task Force (1973); Sanford (1967); Trow (1975)</td>
<td>GRE scores</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centra &amp; Rock (1970)</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean (1981)</td>
<td>Graduate study</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistlewaite (1959)</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg (1976); Feldman &amp; Newcomb (1969)</td>
<td>Maximizing institutional resources</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student effort</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (1937)</td>
<td>Achievement, personal development</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Relationships Between Quality and Selected Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Direction and Strength of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persistence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1979); Kegan (1974)</td>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascarella (1980); Pascarella &amp; Terenzini (1977); Rossmann (1967); Spady (1971)</td>
<td>Faculty-student interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1975); Blake (1971); Seibel (1973)</td>
<td>Peer involvement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1975)</td>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin (1975, 1977)</td>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>+ low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin &amp; Panos (1969)</td>
<td>&quot;Value added&quot; achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascarella (1980)</td>
<td>Faculty-student interaction</td>
<td>+ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp (1970)</td>
<td>Graduate school, occupation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickering, McDowell &amp; Campagna (1969); Clark et al. (1972); Trent &amp; Medsker (1969)</td>
<td>Institutional type</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-college salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solmon (1975)</td>
<td>Gourman index</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen (1977)</td>
<td>&quot;Quality&quot; college</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaeth &amp; Greely (1970)</td>
<td>Institutional &quot;quality&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages:</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on psychometric inquiry, paradigm (objective measures)</td>
<td>Acknowledges multiple realities and purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preordinate design results in greater efficiency</td>
<td>Seeks context and participant relevant data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data amenable to traditional computer driven analytic procedures</td>
<td>Provides rich, &quot;thick&quot; descriptions of students' experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data amenable to intra- and interinstitutional comparisons across time (generalizability)</td>
<td>Serendipity is documented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underemphasize involvement, manifestations of quality</td>
<td>Labor intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively insensitive to unintended effects or outcomes (serendipity)</td>
<td>Data not easily collated or compared within or across institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidimensional (single reality) inquiry is emphasized</td>
<td>Input and, to a lesser extent, context indicators are deemphasized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in students' experiences is masked</td>
<td>Results seem &quot;subjective&quot;, not &quot;hard&quot; evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>