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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The assumption that the college experience is different for the student who continues to live at home and the student who lives on campus is an accepted one in the literature of higher education. A further assumption is that living at home may well discourage or limit the process of education, particularly the part that takes place outside of the classroom in the peer group culture as well as in faculty–student relationships.

Historically in the United States, the residential college was the first type established. Students attending the college often lived in the home of the president. As enrollments grew, the faculty lived with the students in a campus building. The rise of the municipal universities in the nineteenth century was one attempt to allow students to continue higher education in their home communities. At the present time, residence halls are becoming part of the urban campus as well as the campus located in the village. Many community colleges or university branches which are located so that students may live at home during the first two years of college have been
"Going away to college" is almost synonymous with "enrolling in college" in the United States. There is still prestige attached to living away from home and many commuting students feel that they are missing a vital part of campus life.

Townsend, in her report of freshman students, quotes the responses of students who feel commuting is a handicap rather than an asset.

I don't know why you talk about freshman as if they were unique. I'm just going on in school under the same public school system, and for all I can see school is still just class periods and homework. I still live on the same block and have the same friends and activities as ever.¹

I know my family can't understand what is happening to me and there is constant conflict between us on how I should spend my time and so on.²

A commuter who was most pleased about college life also longed for the life in the residence hall:

Dormitory life per se has no great attraction for me, since I have more freedom and privacy at home. Yet there are so many people I should like to know better, and the only way to really know a person is to live with her.³

²Ibid., p. 50.
³Ibid., p. 67.
Reasons why students who were able to live at home preferred to live in the hall were investigated by Vanden Bosch. Students indicated that living in a hall gave them an opportunity to escape from family disharmony as well as offer them a valuable experience in living with peers. Some chose to live on campus because of the time and difficulty they had in commuting; others were seeking better study conditions, and the time to participate in campus activities.¹

Mueller discusses the isolation of the commuting students from each other as well as from resident groups and other groups whose activities happen in the evening. The traveling time spent each day, the fact that family ties loosen more reluctantly, and that there are interests away from campus and collegiate lives are other factors which affect the education of the commuting student.²

Data collected over twenty years of counseling in New York City College is discussed by Richardson in relation to four influences which result in a fragmented developmental setting for the commuter student. An unrealistic emphasis upon importance of money-making is present in the city. The family puts pressure upon the student to maintain the ethnic identity particular to the provincial pocket in which they live. The family is often apathetic about

¹H. C. Vanden Bosch, "Factors Determining Local Students to Seek Dormitory Housing at an Urban University," School and Society, LXXXI (April 2, 1955), 104.

education for women students. Men often lack a male model and have a disparaging view about their father. The college presents impersonal demands for scholarly excellence and values contrary to those taught at home. Both men and women students feel little involvement with other students outside the classroom. The social milieu produces anxieties among commuter students about social competency.¹

Jones observed four psycho-social problems of commuter students in a community college:

1. Delayed emancipation among adolescent students living at home.

2. Conflict between parental values and those learned at school.

3. Conflicts over independence from and dependence upon authority.

4. Maintenance of secondary school identification.²

Four problems are listed by Demos in integrating the commuter college student to the college campus:

1. Involvement in activities.

2. Meaningful individual contact with faculty administration.

3. Close interpersonal contact with other students.

4. Difficulty of breaking through barrier of anonymity or de-personalization.


He labels the belief that it is desirable to work one's way through college as the "commuter's myth". Students who work many hours away from campus in order to earn enough money for tuition might be eligible for loans or scholarships so that they might spend more time on campus.¹

Millett points out the special problems of a university with a commuting student body in these words:

The home environment may not encourage learning of the student. The student may be so distracted by various aspects of urban living that he gives less and less attention to learning. The student may miss that part of the educational process which does promote learning by the close association of students and scholars and by the practice of student group activity.²

The recent essay concerning the student in higher education published by the Hazen Foundation summarizes the prevalent attitude about the commuting students in this way:

The task of creating an environment conducive to human growth is not an easy one even on the college campus, but it is far more difficult when the student is a commuter, as are more than half of American college students. The problem of integrating cognitive and non-cognitive development in a commuter college is staggering, and at first glance seems to be almost insoluble.³

¹George D. Demos, "Problems of Integrating the Commuter College Student to the College Campus," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XXXVI:2 (March, 1966), 336-337.


In considering the most effective social organization of a campus, Sanford states:

Students learn from each other... and where they live apart, geographically or psychologically, from the academic centers of the college they may actually acquire a culture that is in many respects in opposition to the intellectual culture that the faculty would like to introduce them to.¹

Newcomb writes that the most common assumption among faculty members is that the peer-group influence is second only to the characteristics that a student brings to college with him in determining the results of the college education. This leaves the influence of professorial tutelage in third place in determining the process of change which occurs in a student's life during his college years.²

McCarn, who investigated the commuter group in 1955, lists advantages of the commuter student:

1. Can retain identity in his own group.
2. Lives in his permanent culture.
3. Benefit of family counseling.
4. Situation may spur him to use his time wisely.


5. Easy access to town and gown for advice.
6. Better conditions for study.¹

Andrews points out that the residential college student who has had prior conflict with his family has little opportunity to resolve these conflicts directly and is prone to project upon the university the struggle with parents. The commuter student is faced with the same conflict but can continue to work directly with it.²

Trends which have been more evident since the beginning of this decade indicate that the majority of college students will spend at least part of their college years in an institution near their home. The attempt to provide higher educational facilities for all students and to see that financial assistance is given to those who cannot afford the cost of a college education has been answered in many states by providing the first two years of college education within commuting distance of all prospective students.³


John Dale Russell in 1962 emphasized the new trend:

If there is one "emerging pattern" of financial assistance to students at this time, it is probably the policy of providing more centers of higher education close to the homes of large numbers of young people.¹

In 1961-62, Bokelman and D’Amico surveyed 1,964 institutions to determine what percentage of students were housed in residence halls. Private colleges housed a greater percentage than public schools and more women were housed than men. One-half or more of the men lived on campus in 59 per cent of the private colleges and in 33 per cent of the public colleges. One-half or more of the women lived on campus in 79 per cent of the private colleges and 55 per cent of the public colleges.²

Klotsche reports that the majority of students who attend college are living at home at the present time. He predicts that this trend will continue on the basis that more students from the urban areas and from the lower income class will be attending college.³


Significance of the Study

The percentage of university students who live at home for all or a portion of their undergraduate education is continuing to rise. If there are differences between the attitudes of these and those who live on campus, they need to be identified and explored. The largest concentrations of commuting students will be enrolled in a publicly supported university which is located in a large metropolitan area. The University of Cincinnati meets these qualifications.

Although some studies indicate that differences do exist between the outcomes of educations for a commuter and a resident student, few attempts have been made to discover whether the difference can be related to the living environment or whether differences were apparent before the students enrolled at the university. This study attempts to measure student attitudes at the beginning of the college experience as well as at the end of the freshman year.

Statement of the Problem

The focus of this study is on freshman students enrolled in a public university located in a metropolitan area. Although the campus community was for many years primarily a commuter campus, the present community includes a significant proportion of students who live in residence halls, fraternity and sorority houses, apartments,
and rooming houses adjacent to the campus. The purposes of this study are:

1. To compare students who live on campus with students who live at home on the basis of academic aptitude, motivation for grades, family social status, attitudes, and philosophy of higher education at the beginning of the freshman year.

2. To compare these same groups of students on the basis of academic achievement, attitudes, philosophy of higher education, and satisfaction with the university experience at the end of the freshman year.

3. To compare these same groups of students on the basis of change in attitudes and philosophy of higher education during the freshman year.

**Plan of the Study**

Chapter I has attempted to identify assumptions which are present in writings concerning the experience of students who live at home in comparison to students who live on campus. In the second chapter, research which is pertinent to the comparison of commuter and residence hall students is reported and summarized.

The design of the study described in terms of the setting, the sample, the instrument used, collection and treatment of data, and hypotheses formulated is reported in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains the analysis of the data. Chapter V presents summary and implications of the study. Appendixes include local option items and items composing the scales of the questionnaires.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Academic Achievement and Attrition Rate

Reports of research which is related to the understanding of the commuting student and the comparison of the commuting student and the resident student is limited. The focus which was investigated first in this area concerned the effect of the living environment of the student on academic achievement.

Reeves and Russell studied 929 students enrolled as freshman in 1929-30 and 1930-31 to discover what relationships, if any, existed between types of living environment and college grades at the University of Chicago. Students living in different types of housing were paired by such measures as high school average and scores on psychological examinations. The types of living environments were ranked in order according to the degree of favorable effect on grades. For men the following list is in descending order:

1. Non-fraternity men living in dormitories
2. Men living in rooming houses
3. Non-fraternity men living at home
4. Fraternity members living at home
5. Fraternity members living in fraternity houses
6. Fraternity pledges living at home

Women students were listed according to degree of favorable effects
on grades in the following order:

1. Women living in dormitories
2. Women living at home
3. Women living in rooming houses

Diener studied 74 over-achievers and 64 under-achievers in an effort to discover any differences or any similarities. The places of residence included dormitory, fraternity house and sorority house, own home, rooming house, apartment shared with other students, and house rented individually by unmarried student. For over-achievers as a whole and over-achieving males, the largest percentage lived in the dormitories; the next largest group lived in their own homes, and the smallest group lived in fraternity houses. With both the under-achievers and under-achieving males, the fraternity house was listed first as a place of residence; own home was listed second; and dormitory was listed third. Women over-achievers listed sorority house first; dormitory second; and own home, third. Buckner compared scholarship of freshman fraternity pledges living in the houses and residence hall men and found no effect or influence upon scholarship during the first semester.


The effect of fraternity, residence hall, and off-campus living on 1,181 male students who entered Indiana University in 1954 was studied by Matson. He further subdivided the group by labeling fraternities as high prestige, middle prestige, and low prestige. Men in fraternities with a middle or high prestige reputation and residence halls tended to be influenced toward high achievement when compared with men in the off-campus groups and the low prestige fraternities. Students in fraternities of low prestige and men in off-campus living arrangements appeared to be influenced negatively in academic achievement.¹

Prusok and Walsh studied male students enrolled for the first time as freshmen in 1961. The total group was divided according to four housing groups: fraternity, residence hall, living at home, and off-campus. When academic ability was controlled, no differences were found in adjusted grade point averages among freshman men living in fraternities, residence halls, living at home, or off-campus.²

Alfert studied the dropout rate and satisfaction of 153


students who lived at home, in rooms in private homes, boarding houses, university dormitories, Greek houses, or co-op houses during the four years they were in college. Students with the highest dropout rate lived in boarding houses and private rooms. Men with the lowest dropout rate lived in dormitories and co-op houses. Women with the lowest dropout rate lived in sorority houses. No relationship was found between academic aptitude and dropout rate. Students living in private rooms, at home, and in boarding houses told interviewers of their feelings of isolation and being left out of campus activities. Those at home missed the sense of achievement of living away from home.¹

Multiple Factors

In recent years, the interest in the campus environment has stimulated studies which are concerned with attitudes and personalities of students as well as academic achievement.

Sicuro studied 273 randomly selected freshmen who were enrolled at the central campus and 101 randomly selected freshmen who were enrolled at an off-campus academic center. ACT scores and high school ranks were obtained from permanent records. The Alport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values and the Dizney-Roskins Questionnaire

¹Elizabeth Alfert, "Housing Selection, Need Satisfaction, and Dropout from College," Psychological Reports, XIX (August, 1966), 183-186.
were administered in freshman English classes. No significant differences were found between ACT scores, high school ranks, or attitudes. More students at the central campus were members of high income families with more parents in the professions and with higher degrees of formal education. Twenty-five per cent of the students in the academic center stated that they would not have attended college if the center were not there. Academic center students had fewer extracurricular activities, and academic awards in high school; more married students were enrolled at the center; and the typical center student was eight months older than the typical student at the central campus.1

Prusok attempted to discover the characteristics of the single off-campus resident student which would be important in assessing his relationship to the institution. Although the questionnaire was designed primarily for students living off-campus rather than at home, those students living at home also were included in the sample. The author concludes that the off-campus student is a somewhat marginal member of the university community. He lists three reasons why the typical student personnel program does not reach the commuter as much as it does the on-campus student:

1N. A. Siouro, "Comparison of Academic Aptitudes, Certain Values and Personality and Background Characteristics of Students in Off-Campus Centers and on Central Campus of the Same University," Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (January, 1965), 229-232.
1. Impersonal communicative links such as the student newspaper and bulletin boards do not suffice to remove the communication barrier between the off-campus student and the institution.

2. Off-campus students do not seem to want the structured experiences that are typically part of the student personnel program.

3. Off-campus students may need greater independence than students who choose to live in residence halls or sorority or fraternity houses.²

An example of the second point is that off-campus students turned to other students, instructors, and faculty advisers rather than to the counseling service or student personnel services for help with problems in any area.

Jones studied the characteristics of commuting students at The Ohio State University to determine the personal and environmental characteristics to participation in campus organizations and activities. In response to the question of the reasons for attending the University, 25.8 per cent cited finances; 17.9 per cent, proximity; 41.1 per cent, combination of factors; and 10.1 per cent, other. Students who had the highest cumulative point hour ratios coupled with high academic goals participated in campus activities to a greater extent than other students. The number of hours under twenty which the student worked had little effect on participation,

but those who worked thirty-one to forty hours a week participated little in campus activities. The greater the distance from campus, the less is the probability of participation in campus activities and services.¹

Drasgrow studied 26 variables for 81 students who lived at home and 81 students who lived in residence halls. The groups were matched for sex, marital status, college, and year in college. Five of the variables were statistically significant. The first significant pair was socio-economic status of parents and education attained by father. Both were significantly higher for residence hall students. Scores on the ACE and Cooperative English tests were significantly lower for residence hall students. Residence hall students worry significantly more about such things as occupational possibilities, finances, harmony in the hall, and ability to concentrate.²

This study was a follow-up study to a previous one which indicated that students who lived in residence halls tended to stay in college longer than students who lived at home. The author is pursuing this but no studies have been published.

A study of four groups of freshman students—residence hall women, residence hall men, commuter women, and commuter men—to


investigate whether or not there were differences in the needs and problems of resident and commuter students is reported by Stark. A random sample of 35 students composed each group. The Cooperative English Test—Reading Comprehension, the Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitude, and the Mooney Check Lists as well as a personal questionnaire developed by the author were completed by each subject. The two groups of commuters checked a significantly greater number of problems in the areas of finances, living conditions, employment, and home and family than the two groups of residence hall students on the Mooney Problem Check List. The two groups of commuter students had significantly lower scores on the vocabulary section of the Cooperative English Test. There were no significant differences in regard to the number of students who worked for pay, the number of students who participated in extracurricular activities, or the number of students who wished to speak with a counselor.¹

A comparison of freshman commuter students with resident students on a primarily residential campus is reported by Appleton. The entire commuter population of 311 freshmen was divided into one group of 58 local commuters and a second group of 253 non-local commuters. These groups were compared to a control sample of 296 resident students selected at random from the 2,435 resident freshmen. Data were obtained from testing done for all entering students at the

beginning of the year and at the end of the academic year. Local commuters showed a higher educational, socio-economic level, ranked lower in high school class, and were more likely to have no preference for a major field of study than the resident students in initial characteristics. There was no difference in age, amount of financial support, or academic ability between these two groups. Non-local commuters were older, came from lower socio-economic level, had less financial support from home, were lower in academic aptitude, and were more likely to have no preference of a major field of study than the resident students. There was no difference in high school class rank.

Comparison of the first year experience of the three groups showed that very little time was spent with faculty outside of class by any of the groups, although the local commuters spent more time than either of the two other groups. Both commuter groups placed more emphasis on class and course experience than did the resident students; the commuter groups also spent less time in bull sessions than the residents. Non-local commuters spent more time in the library but there was no significant differences among the groups in study practices. In immersion in campus life, non-local commuters reported fewer positions of leadership, less fraternity or sorority affiliations, attendance at fewer campus events outside the classroom, and more time spent in the grill. The non-local commuters expressed more doubts about the university being the best one for them.
No significant differences were noted in academic achievements, although the withdrawal rate was greater for the non-local commuter than for either of the other two groups. Comparison of results on the Inventory of Beliefs, Differential Values Inventory, and Test of Critical Thinking indicated no significant differences between groups in nature and direction of change during the year. Implications for further research suggest studies of commuter population for individual institutions, particularly in the areas of effect of distance of commuting from the campus and number of withdrawals.

Stafford and Sommer compared 72 freshman women who were forced to live off-campus because of a lack of space with 72 freshman women living in campus residence halls. The largest difference was found about feelings of isolation: 42 per cent of apartment dwellers and 38 per cent of residents of private off-campus halls felt isolated in comparison to 11 per cent of residents of on-campus halls. On-campus residents were involved in twice as many activities as off-campus women.2

Grygier reports a study in which a questionnaire was completed by 800 University of Toronto students, half campus residents


and half non-residents. Differences in family background were noted for the two groups. Parents of residential students more often than those of commuter students had attended a university and desired college enrollment and a higher level of academic achievement for their children. More commuter than resident students had specific vocational goals, had low motivation, and little interest in course content, and reported conflict with parents and a desire to live away from home. Stress in residents was produced by environmental change and in non-residents by increased responsibility. Both groups experienced feelings of not belonging.¹

A student-faculty committee at Wayne State University have published a report after studying the problems of the commuting student on the Wayne State campus. Recommendations were made in an effort to give the commuting students the same sense of community as the residential students have.²

Perception of Campus Environment

Several studies have been made in an attempt to discover relationships between living environment and perception of the college environment. Standing and Parker hypothesized that students who


lived near the university would have a more accurate perception of the university when they entered. The students completed the Stern College Characteristics Index during the orientation period. The hypothesis was not substantiated.\(^1\) Wood studied the relationship of the College Characteristics Index to achievement and other variables for college women at the University of Georgia. The place of primary residence or the place of residence at the college of the 132 freshman women had no significant relationship to their perception of the college environment.\(^2\)

In contrast to this study, Baker reported that there was a significant difference according to the type of residence in which the student lived in the perception of the college environment. One hundred and ten students filled out the College Characteristics Index. The sample was divided into three groups: students who live in dormitories, students who live in boarding homes, and students who live with their own parents. The null hypotheses concerning the CCI factors of student dignity, self expression, and vocational climate were rejected between dormitory residents and boarding home.


\(^2\)Paul Leslie Wood, *The Relationship of the College Characteristics Index to Achievement and Certain Other Variables for Freshman Women in the College of Education at the University of Georgia*, (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, 1963).
residents. The null hypotheses concerning aspiration level, student dignity, academic achievement, group life, academic organization, and social form were rejected between dormitory residents and students who resided with their families. The author suggests that boarding and dormitory residents seem less aware of press of the college environment and in one sense are more dependent upon the university for their need satisfaction, but are also in a better position to have their needs satisfied than are residents who are members of the community.¹

A pilot study by Penney and Buckles of student concerns and sources of assistance led the authors to state as one of the implications that the responses of commuting students compared to residents were inconclusive. However, they did indicate the need to revise some commonly held assumptions about commuters and what they gain from their college experience.²

Subcultures

Gottlieb conducted a research on all students in a large public university who had originally enrolled in 1958 and were still


registered in 1962. Percentages in each subculture were reported for students according to social class as measured by father's occupation, home town, religion, and mean grade-point average; shift in changes; attitudes toward dependence on age group behavior patterns, commitment of religious beliefs, necessity of religious faith, and rules and regulations; immediate expectations upon graduation in regard to concern with income and security; and major type of activity in their future careers.

Nonconformists did not come from only metropolitan areas but also from small towns. There was a relatively high proportion of Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants found in the nonconformist and academic subcultures. The mean grade-point averages were highest for nonconformists followed by academic, vocational, and collegiate. In the shift within the four years, the greatest was toward the academic subculture. The highest change was within the nonconformist subculture and the least within vocational.

The findings concerning attitude change show that nonconformists change most and collegiates least in respect to dependence upon age group. In regard to religions, the nonconformist changed most followed by academic, vocational, and collegiate. The academic subculture regarded religion as more important after four years. This same order was found in attitude toward rules and regulations. The vocational subculture look for security in career desires after graduation. The collegiates are concerned with making money and
anticipate administration. The academic and nonconformist sub-
cultures look toward teaching and social service work. The value
orientation of the nonconformists is humanistic and intellectual and
of the collegiates is materialistic. The academic and vocational
subcultures are in between.¹

Studies Using the College Student Questionnaires

According to reports from the Educational Testing Service,
this instrument was used in over 75 institutions in 1967, but most
studies are either still in the process of being completed or too
recently completed for publication.

Fleischer has reported the results of the administration
of CSQ-1 to the freshmen who entered Boston University in September,
1966. Students in this study included 3,105 individuals. Results
are reported for the fourteen colleges of the University. Great var-
iability of the scale score means was noted for the individual col-
leges. The results are to be used to provide background and attitu-
dinal information about the group as part of a study in estimating
student dropout rate. Plans for administering the CSQ-2 two years
after the original testing was done are envisioned.²

¹David Gottlieb, "College Climate and Student Subcultures,"
The College Student, ed. by Wilbur B. Brookover, (New York: The

²Sylvia Fleischer, The Boston University Class of 1970,
(Boston: Boston University, 1967).
Summary of Related Research

In comparing and summarizing the research results of the various studies, it is important to remember that the reported studies were done over a span of forty years and, for the most part, are limited to students on one campus. No uniform method of dividing the population into groups in reference to place of residence has been used. Differences among the campuses included proportion of residence hall and commuter students, geographic location of the institution, size of the student body, environmental press, and admission standards.

In studies in which relationships between academic average and the place of residence were found a general pattern prevails. Men who live in residence halls have the highest averages and men who live in fraternity houses and off-campus have the lowest averages. Several recent studies indicate no significant difference in academic averages in relationship to place of residence. The dropout rate tends to be higher for those students who live off-campus.

No clear cut trend is identified concerning measures of attitudes, problems, study habits, academic ability, high school rank, or values although many differences have been noted in each of these areas. The socio-economic status of the commuting student is generally lower than the resident student. Another general finding is that participation in campus extracurricular activities is less
for students living off-campus, whether at home or in private halls and boarding houses. This is closely related to the general feeling among off-campus residents that they are isolated from the campus. The commuters report less satisfaction with the total campus experience than do the residents.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Setting

The University of Cincinnati, founded in 1819, is a coeducational institution which is municipally owned but receives financial support from the State of Ohio as well as tax support from the City of Cincinnati. The University is located on 200 acres in a suburb which is two miles from the heart of the city. Ten undergraduate colleges, the Graduate School, the College of Medicine, the College of Law, the Evening College, and the Summer School comprised the University in 1966. Of the ten undergraduate colleges, eight offered baccalaureate degrees; the other two awarded associate degrees. The eight baccalaureate colleges were McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Education and Home Economics, College of Business Administration, College of Nursing and Health, College of Design, Architecture, and Art, College of Pharmacy, and College Conservatory of Music. The two-year undergraduate colleges were University College located on the main campus and Raymond Walters Branch located at Blue Ash, a suburb of Cincinnati. The University is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and also by many professional associations in fields such as nursing, architecture, design,
pharmacy, engineering, and teaching.

According to enrollment statistics issued by the Office of the Registrar, 25,587 students registered at the University in September, 1966. Students enrolled in the day colleges numbered 15,927. Included in the day colleges were 10,472 men and 5,455 women. The distribution of the 10,796 students enrolled in the baccalaureate colleges according to college of registration is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
ENROLLMENT IN BACCALAUREATE COLLEGES IN THE AUTUMN QUARTER, 1966, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Freshman</th>
<th>Total Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.&amp;H.E.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ad.</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men comprised 62 per cent of the freshman enrollment and 65 per cent of the total undergraduate enrollment. Women comprised 38 per cent of the freshman enrollment and 35 per cent of the total undergraduate enrollment. Although the College of Arts and Sciences registered the largest number of students for any one college, this college registered only 29 per cent of the freshman enrollment and 27 per cent of the total enrollment in the baccalaureate colleges.

Seventy-seven per cent of the students in the undergraduate baccalaureate colleges lived in Ohio. Of these, 32.7 per cent lived in Cincinnati and 44.3 per cent lived in other areas of Ohio. Students from other states within the continental United States equaled 22.6 per cent of the total group, while foreign students comprised only .4 per cent. In 1966, students from Cincinnati were charged about half the tuition that students from other areas of the state paid. Out-of-state residents paid approximately 10 per cent more than state residents and 60 per cent more than city residents. The distribution of the students enrolled in the baccalaureate colleges according to place of home residence is presented in Table 2 on the following page.

All colleges required graduation from high school as a prerequisite for admission. Other requirements were unique to each college. The general policy for admission was:

Admission to the baccalaureate colleges and assignment to residence halls normally will be based upon the chronological order of receipt of the completed application
modified by predicted grade-point average and by evi
dence of particular preliminary training or talent. The predicted grade-point average of an applicant will be computed on the basis of such factors as high school rank and program, SAT or ACT scores, achieve­ment tests, special tests, special talent or ability and the counselor's recommendation.¹

**TABLE 2**

BACCALAUREATE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT BY LOCATION OF
STUDENT'S HOME RESIDENCE AUTUMN QUARTER, 1966²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ohio outside City</th>
<th>States outside Ohio</th>
<th>Outside United States</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.&amp;H.E.</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ad.</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; H</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>4760</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Certain high school courses or units were listed as pre­requisites for each college. The McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business Administration, the College—

¹University of Cincinnati, Information for Prospective Students, (Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1966), p. 4.
Conservatory of Music, the College of Design, Architecture and Art, and the College of Education and Home Economics required that an applicant be in the upper one-half of his high school graduating class. The College of Engineering, the College of Nursing and Health, and the College of Pharmacy required that the applicant be in the upper one-third of his high school graduating class.

Special tests included Level I Mathematics Achievement Test, Architectural School Aptitude Test, and a pre-nursing aptitude test. Auditions and personal interviews were also part of the admission process for some colleges.¹

The program required of freshmen is determined by the faculty of the college in which they are registered. Every student in every baccalaureate college is required to complete nine hours of English Composition. Although students take introductory courses in the particular college in which they are enrolled, the majority of courses designated for the freshman year in each baccalaureate college are taken in the College of Arts and Sciences in such areas as natural and physical sciences, languages, philosophy, mathematics, and the social sciences. Most courses in which freshman enroll include students from all eight baccalaureate colleges.

¹University of Cincinnati, Information for Prospective Students, (Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1966), pp. 4-8.
The housing policy is written for all undergraduate students on the main campus. In 1966, the policy was:

All full-time undergraduate men who do not live in their own homes are required to live in University residence halls as long as space is available. Exceptions are made for fraternity pledges and active members to live in their houses. When spaces in both University residence halls and fraternity houses are exhausted, students may live in University approved homes.

All full-time undergraduate women who do not live in their own homes are required to live in University residence halls. Exceptions are made only in cases of students who may request to live with close relatives. These requests must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Women for approval before final admission. In the sophomore and subsequent years, any student who is an active member of a sorority may request to live in her sorority house.¹

In the fall of 1966, there were 1366 hall spaces for undergraduate men and 1225 spaces available for undergraduate women. All the men's halls in use were constructed after 1950; two women's halls which housed 430 women were constructed prior to 1950. The units ranged in size according to occupancy from 66 students in a temporary hall for men to 495 students in a women's hall which was opened in the fall of 1964.

Students at the University had the opportunity to participate in a wide range of cultural activities both on campus and in the metropolitan area. Social groups included fifteen national panhellenic groups and twenty-two interfraternity council groups.

¹University of Cincinnati, Information for Prospective Students, (Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1966), p. 25.
University recognized interest groups, theatrical and musical groups, recognition societies, and activity groups numbered over three hundred. Student government was organized on the University, College, and Residence Hall levels. National honor societies included Phi Beta Kappa, Mortar Board, Omicron Delta Kappa, Alpha Lambda Delta, Phi Eta Sigma, and numerous honor societies for departments and colleges. A wide range of varsity and intramural sports were available to participants and spectators.

Sample

The students in the sample used in the statistical analysis enrolled as first quarter freshmen in one of the eight baccalaureate colleges at the University of Cincinnati in September, 1966. They completed three quarters—autumn, winter, and spring—in the academic year, 1966-67. Each one of the students was enrolled at one of two time periods for English 101 in the autumn quarter. Each one of the students also responded to a written or phoned request during the spring quarter and filled out part two of a questionnaire they had completed part one of at the first class meeting of English 101 in the autumn quarter.

An original group of 570 students completed part one of the questionnaire during the first class period of English 101 in the autumn quarter. Requests to complete part two of the questionnaire were made to 504 students who were still enrolled at the university in May, 1967.
The sample is divided into four groups according to sex and place of residence while attending the university. The four groups, the designation used to identify the group, and the description of the group is presented below:

- **WC**: Women who lived on campus in a residence hall for the academic year, 1966-67
- **WH**: Women who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67
- **MC**: Men who lived on campus in a residence hall or fraternity house or in a private room approved by the university during the academic year, 1966-67
- **MH**: Men who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Women Campus</th>
<th>Women Home</th>
<th>Men Campus</th>
<th>Men Home</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Population&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>2581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Sampled</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Population figures calculated from the scholarship summaries for the spring quarter, 1966-67, prepared by the Office of the Registrar, University of Cincinnati.

The number of students in the sample and in the population is presented in Table 3 according to the four groups. The hypothesis that each group in the population is equally represented in
proportion to its size in the sample groups was tested on binomial probability paper. The hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level.

The number of students in the population in each college and the number of students in the sample in each college are presented in Table 4. From inspection, it is evident that each college is not equally represented in the sample in proportion to its size.

**TABLE 4**

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN POPULATION AND NUMBER AND PER CENT IN SAMPLE BY COLLEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>No. in Population a</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Per Cent Sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.&amp;H.E.</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ad.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; H</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCH</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2591</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population figures secured from the University of Cincinnati Enrollment Statistics, spring quarter, 1966-67, prepared by the Office of the Registrar (June 8, 1967).*

Each person in the sample was enrolled as a freshman for the autumn, winter, and spring quarters at the University of
Cincinnati in 1966-67, lived either on campus during the entire year or at home during the entire year, was registered in one of the eight baccalaureate colleges, completed the College Student Questionnaires, Part 1 and Part 2, and was registered for English Composition for three quarters.

The distribution of students according to the four designated groups and college in which the student was registered is not comparable to the distribution in the population for these same factors. Although the original sample of 570 students was obtained without the subjects volunteering to spend time outside of the class hour, the students in the sample of 281 on which the study is based volunteered to spend time outside of class hours when they were asked to do so in order to complete a questionnaire.

Instrument

The College Student Questionnaires (CSQ), Part 1 and Part 2, were developed to gather biographical and attitudinal information about college student bodies. Two limitations listed in the technical manual are: (1) the CSQ is not designed to assess or diagnose individuals and should be used in an essentially survey fashion to describe groups of students; (2) the CSQ is to be used for research purposes only.¹

Part 1 is designed to be administered to entering students prior to the formal beginnings of the academic year. The two hundred multiple choice items are divided into four sections. Section 1 contains questions about educational and vocational plans and expectations; section 2, questions about activities, achievements, and perceptions during secondary school; section 3, questions about family background; and section 4, questions about personal attitudes.

Part 2 may be administered to students in any class near the end of the academic year. Two of the three sections duplicate sections 1 and 4 of CSQ-1. The middle section consists of some one hundred questions which pertain to satisfactions and involvement as students at a particular college.

Each of the questions in both parts is intended to provide unique information. Scores for thirteen scales may be obtained. Two scales, family social status and motivation for grades, are in CSQ-1 only. Six scales are unique to CSQ-2: satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, satisfaction with major, satisfaction with students, study habits, and extracurricular involvement. Five scales are common to both questionnaires: family independence, peer independence, liberalism, social conscience, and cultural sophistication. (See Appendix B.) In addition, a procedure is contained in both questionnaires which makes it possible to classify respondents into four student subcultures according to philosophy of higher education—the vocational, the academic, the
collegiate, and the nonconformist. (See Appendix C.) This typology is based on studies by sociologists Burton Clark and Martin Trow.

Since the instrument describes groups rather than individuals, ten items were deemed sufficient for all scales except the family social status scale which is based on five rather than ten items. The item concerning the father's occupation is given a weight of three. No item is used in more than one scale. The author describes the construction of the scales:

The scales in the CSQ were constructed in a logical or a priori manner rather than through factor analysis or some other essentially empirical analysis.¹

The scoring of the items range from 1 to 4. There are four alternatives on each item (except the FS items). The scale scores are the sum of each of the ten item values. Therefore, the score range for each of the scales is 10 through 40. Each of the five items on the FS scale have nine alternatives. The response to the father's occupation item is given a weight of three. Thus, the scores on the FS scale may range from 7 to 63. If one of the five items is omitted, no score is given.²

No test-retest studies of CSQ responses have been made in


²Ibid., pp. 21-22.
an effort to ascertain the reliability of the questionnaires. The author asserts that students give consistent answers to factual questions and that any shift on attitudinal items would indicate a change in feelings rather than an error in reporting. The individual score reliability estimates for eleven CSQ scales average 60-70. Illustrative data based on a sample of 700 cases indicate that the standard error of the means would be expected to fall two-thirds of the time within about .20 of a score point from any obtained mean.

The discussion of validity of the instrument is organized around the premise that all items in the CSQ have face validity. Studies are reported that substantiate the fact that biographical questionnaire items are generally valid. Responses to factual questions are more accurate than responses to non-factual questions such as those concerning future plans. Evidence of the construct validity of the scales is presented by listing correlations among the eleven scales and selected biographical and attitudinal items. A series of graphs presents group means. The general argument used for both approaches is that the results are what would be predicted on the basis of the definition of the scales.

---


2 Ibid., p. 29.

3 Ibid., pp. 29-53.

Comparative data has been published for individual items as well as scales. The sample used for CSQ-1, composed of 1,500 entering freshman, was constructed from a pool of 13,000 entering students at 48 institutions where the CSQ-1 was administered in the fall of 1965 by the Educational Testing Service. Students from 37 of the 48 colleges were included in the sample. Stratification data which refers to individual students, not to institutions, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of arts and sciences</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical school</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers college</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Comparative Data Sample for CSQ-2 is composed of 700 cases drawn from a pool of 6,680 undergraduates at 16 institutions. This subsample was stratified according to published enrollment-by-type-of-institution figures for 1963 making it more representative of the aggregate of American college students than the total sample.

Comparative data for CSQ-1 includes means and standard deviations for the total sample and separate means and standard deviations for men and women according to scale means. A notation is made when sex differences are statistically significant at the .001 level. Comparison data for individual items is in the form of percentages of students answering each alternative for each question.

Comparative data for CSQ-2 includes means and standard deviations for the total sample according to scale means. Individual item data is presented in the same way as for CSQ-1.
Collection of Data

Part 1 of the College Student Questionnaires was administered at two different class periods on the first day of class in the autumn quarter, 1966-67. All students enrolled in the baccalaureate colleges take English 101 in the same classes. Students enrolled in the two year colleges take the first year of English in classes which are planned and taught by the faculty of that particular college. All baccalaureate students reported to an auditorium at the time which their class was scheduled. During this class period, the students were assigned to sections composed of approximately thirty students. Since this process of sorting class cards took almost the total class time of one and one-half hours, the faculty of the department agreed to allow the CSQ-1 to be administered to those students who were willing to complete it while waiting for their section assignments to be made.

The administrator followed the instructions as printed in the "Supervisor's Manual for Administering the College Student Questionnaire." The administrator also read the paragraph "To the Students" which is printed on the inside cover of the questionnaire book. It was emphasized that only results for groups would be used and that the answers given by an individual would not be recorded on records or associated with that individual. During the period, six members of the Student Personnel Staff circulated to answer questions concerning the completion and to collect materials when students were finished.
All entering students accepted the questionnaire and answer sheet. Approximately ten answer sheets were not finished during the time allotted and two students entered fictitious names and identification numbers. One woman student came to the Office of the Dean of Women to be sure that the answer that she gave in respect to her family’s income would not be disclosed.

During the last three weeks of the spring quarter, 1967, a letter asking individuals to take the CSQ-2 was sent to all students who completed the CSQ-1. English professors distributed the letters to students and collected the replies during class time. The letter asked the students to indicate one of three times at which he would be willing to complete CSQ-2. After the scheduled times for taking the questionnaire, a letter was mailed to those students who did not respond and who lived at home. The second request offered them an opportunity to take the questionnaire at a time most convenient to the student. Residence hall counselors communicated with the students who lived in the halls and offered to arrange a time and place in the hall for the student to complete the questionnaire. Telephone calls were made to a random sampling of students living at home who had not responded to either letter. All students who were reached by telephone agreed to complete the answer sheet and did so.

Of the 570 students who completed CSQ-1, 504 students were enrolled at the University for the third quarter. Withdrawals numbered 65, 11 per cent of the original sample. The record for one
student in the original sample could not be located in the Office of the Registrar. She evidently did not complete registration after her admission.

**TABLE 5**

**COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WHO REGISTERED AND STUDENTS WHO DID NOT REGISTER FOR THE THIRD QUARTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Registered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7.87; \text{ df}=3; \text{ Prob.}<.05 \]

Comparison of the groups according to withdrawals was in line with previous studies in which a greater percentage of students who lived at home withdrew than those students who lived on campus. Table 5 shows that distribution of those that registered and those that withdrew within the four groups is significantly different at the .05 level.

Of the possible 504 students who could have completed CSQ-2, 281 or 56 per cent did so. A greater per cent of those students who lived on campus responded than those students who lived at home. The percentage of the students who completed CSQ-2 out of the students enrolled in the spring quarter according to groups are: WC—66 per cent; WH—57 per cent; MC—62 per cent; and MH—40 per cent.
All answer sheets were scored by the Educational Testing Service. The standard scoring service provides computer print-outs with response frequencies and proportions for total groups and four subgroups, frequency distributions, means and standard deviations for total groups and subgroups for scale scores, and comparison data for the response proportions and scale means. Four IBM data cards containing identification information, responses to local option items, responses to the individual items and scale scores are also punched for each individual.

**Academic Records**

A list of students in the original sample was given to the Office of the Registrar. Credit hours earned and quality points earned for the autumn, winter, and spring quarters, 1966-67 were posted for all students.

**Withdrawal**

The academic records of students in the sample were examined. If no grade sheet was issued for the spring quarter, 1967, the student was assumed to have withdrawn. No statistical report of withdrawals has been completed at the university in recent years.

**Treatment of the Data**

The particular treatment used is noted in the discussion of the analysis of each hypothesis. The levels of significance used are $p < .05$ and $p < .01$. 
Means of the CSQ scales were tested by the analysis of variance. If the F values were significant, the Newman-Keuls procedure was used to test differences between all pairs of group means; the results were tested by the studentized range statistic to reveal which differences between pairs of means were significant. These same procedures were used to test significance of difference of cumulative grade point average.

The chi square test was used to ascertain significant differences in class rank in high school, number of withdrawals, and most accurate self description of a philosophy of higher education.

Changes within groups between scale means on CSQ-1 and CSQ-2 were tested by a series of t tests. The computation used is that for testing hypotheses about the difference between correlated observations which is described in Winer. Changes within groups in reference to most accurate description of philosophy of higher education was tested by the McNemar test for the significance of change.

Definition of Terms

Groups

WC Women students who lived in a campus residence hall during the academic year, 1966-67


2Ibid., pp. 39-43.

WH Women students who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67

MC Men students who lived in a campus residence hall, a fraternity house, or a private room approved by the university during the academic year, 1966-67

MH Men students who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67

College Student Questionnaires

Forms of Questionnaire

CSQ-1 College Student Questionnaire, Part 1, is designed to be given to entering freshmen before the formal program begins

CSQ-2 College Student Questionnaire, Part 2, is designed to be given to students toward the close of the academic year, usually in the last month

Attitude Scales

FI Family Independence (CSQ-1 and CSQ-2)
PI Peer Independence (CSQ-1 and CSQ-2)
L Liberalism (CSQ-1 and CSQ-2)
SC Social Conscience (CSQ-1 and CSQ-2)
CS Cultural Sophistication (CSQ-1 and CSQ-2)

Satisfaction Scales

SF Satisfaction with Faculty (CSQ-2)
SA Satisfaction with Administration (CSQ-2)
SM Satisfaction with Major (CSQ-2)
SS Satisfaction with Students (CSQ-2)

Other Scales

MG Motivation for Grades (CSQ-1)
FS Family Social Status (CSQ-1)
SH Study Habits (CSQ-2)
EI Extracurricular Involvement (CSQ-2)

Data

CD Comparative data provided by Educational Testing Service
UC University of Cincinnati data resulting from study of students composing this study's sample
Limitations of the Study

1. Only those students who were willing to spend at least one hour outside the regular class period in order to complete CSQ-2 were included in the sample.

2. Students from all baccalaureate colleges of the university are represented in this sample, but not proportionately according to enrollment of the college.

Hypotheses

The purposes of the study were to compare men and women students who live on campus with men and women students who live at home at the beginning of the year on the basis of academic aptitude, motivation for grades, family social status, attitudes, and philosophy of education. These same groups were compared at the end of the year on the basis of academic achievement, philosophy of education, attitudes, and satisfaction with the university experience. Changes in attitudes and philosophy of education during the year for these groups were also compared.

The statement of the problem has been specified in operational form consisting of null hypotheses. Hypotheses 1–5 are analyzed according to the responses of students at the beginning of the academic year. Hypotheses 6–11 are analyzed according to university records for the autumn, winter, and spring quarters, 1966–67, and the responses of the students at the end of the academic year.
Hypotheses 12-14 are analyzed according to a comparison of student responses at the beginning and end of the academic year.

**Beginning of the Academic Year**

1. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the following attitudes:
   - A. Family Independence
   - B. Peer Independence
   - C. Liberalism
   - D. Social Conscience
   - E. Cultural Sophistication

2. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in motivation for grades.

3. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in high school performance as measured by class standing in high school.

4. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in family social status.

5. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education at the beginning of the academic year.

**End of Academic Year**

6. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the following attitudes:
   - A. Family Independence
   - B. Peer Independence
   - C. Liberalism
   - D. Social Conscience
   - E. Cultural Sophistication
7. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the following satisfactions:
   A. Faculty
   B. Administration
   C. Major
   D. Students

8. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in study habits.

9. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in cumulative grade point average for the academic year.

10. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH at the end of the year in extracurricular involvement.

11. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education at the end of the academic year.

Comparison of Beginning and End of Academic Year

12. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the amount of change from the beginning to the end of the year in the following attitudes:
   A. Family Independence
   B. Peer Independence
   C. Liberalism
   D. Social Conscience
   E. Cultural Sophistication
13. There will be no significant differences within the same group between means at the beginning of the academic year and means at the end of the academic year in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence
B. Peer Independence
C. Liberalism
D. Social Conscience
E. Cultural Sophistication

14. There will be no significant change within groups in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education between CSQ-1 and CSQ-2.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The data analyzed were obtained from results of the College Student Questionnaires, Part 1 and Part 2, individual student's academic record for the year 1966-67, and the Registrar's records for 1966-67.

The sample was divided into four groups according to the students' place of residence while attending the university and sex. The term used for each group and the membership of each group is listed below:

- **WC** Women who lived on campus in a residence hall for the academic year, 1966-67
- **WH** Women who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67
- **MC** Men who lived on campus in a residence hall or a fraternity house or in a private room approved by the university during the academic year, 1966-67
- **MH** Men who lived at home or with relatives during the academic year, 1966-67

All students in the sample were enrolled for the autumn, winter, and spring quarters, 1966-67, at the University of Cincinnati. All students were classified as entering freshmen in the autumn quarter and
were enrolled in one of the eight baccalaureate colleges.

The hypotheses are grouped under three headings: the beginning of the academic year; the end of the academic year; and changes during the academic year. A summary table is provided at the end of each section.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test scale score means and cumulative grade point average marks. If the F ratio revealed a significant difference, tests of differences between all pairs of ordered group means were made by using the Newman-Keuls method and the studentized range statistic. Means were arranged in order from lowest to highest.

The results of individual items are reported in frequencies. Chi square was used to test the significance of difference for these items. The McNemar test of significance of change was used to test changes during the year for frequency distributions. The t test for correlated observations was used to test differences between scale score means at the beginning and end of the year.

Section 1

Beginning of Academic Year

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MG, and MH in the following attitudes:
A. Family Independence

The ten questions of this scale deal with unity of attitudes in the family, feeling of responsibility toward the family, and consideration of parents' wishes. Each of these ten questions has a possible score of four. The possible range of scores in this scale is 10-40; the range of the UC sample is 12-34.

**TABLE 6**

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5300.88</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.40**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>379.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4921.46</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level

Hypothesis 1A was rejected at the .01 level of significance on the basis of the F ratio which is shown in Table 6.

Groups ranked from lowest to highest by means were WH, MH, WC, MC. The lowest ranked group, WH, was significantly lower than the WC group at the .05 level, and the MC group at the .01 level, as shown in Table 7 on the following page.
TABLE 7
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-1)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>21.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>3.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.45**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level

The indication from this scale is that those students who live at home perceive themselves to be less independent of their family than those students who live on campus. The one factor that should be considered in this scale is that item 148 asks how often the student plans to see his parents. This one item (one out of ten) would normally be answered, "Every day or almost every day," by any student who lives at home. This is not necessarily indicative of amount of independence when a student is living at home.

B. Peer Independence

The student who is unconcerned about how his behavior appears to his peers will score higher on this scale than a student who conforms to peer norms.
TABLE 8

PEER INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3966.71</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3888.46</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH for peer independence was not rejected. As shown in Table 8, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level. The group means arranged from lowest to highest are: MC, 22.56; WC, 23.24; MH, 23.82; WH, 23.96.

C. Liberalism

Students with high scores support an ideology of change in the political–economic–social values; students with low scores support an ideology of preservation of these values. The range of UC scores is 21 (11–32) out of a possible range of 30 (10–40). The pattern of ranks, MH, WH, WC, MC, places the students who live at home in the two lower ranks. No pattern emerges as to men or women having higher mean scores.

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in liberalism was not rejected. The F ratio as presented in Table 9 (shown on page 57) resulted in a probability greater than .05. No evidence was found of any significant difference among groups.
TABLE 9
LIBERALISM SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2889.00</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2844.71</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>16.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Social Conscience

A high score on this scale indicates a concern about social injustices such as poverty, juvenile crime, and corruption in government. Low scores represent a lack of concern.

TABLE 10
SOCIAL CONSCIENCE SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3367.06</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.435**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>218.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3148.84</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference among groups on the social conscience scale was rejected at the .01 level.
TABLE 11
SOCIAL CONSCIENCE SCALE (CSQ-1)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.45**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The group with the highest mean, WC, was significantly higher at the .01 level from both MH and MC. WH and WC did not differ significantly. WH did not differ significantly from either MC or MH. MC and MH did not differ significantly.

E. Cultural Sophistication

The interest and pleasure reported by the student in the area of the humanities determines the score on this scale. As in the other scales, a high score indicates high interest and a low score, lack of interest. The 26 point range (11-35) of the UC sample is out of a possible 30 point range (10-40).

The hypothesis that there will be no difference among groups in relation to cultural sophistication was rejected at the .01 level of significance as shown in Table 12 on the following page.
TABLE 12

CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4444.077</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.20**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>613.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>204.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3830.18</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

As shown in Table 13, MH differed at the .01 level of significance with both WH and WC. MC differed at the .01 level of significance with WC and at the .05 level of significance with WH. No significant differences were found between men on the basis of residence or women on the basis of residence.

TABLE 13

CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALE (CSQ-1)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.73**</td>
<td>4.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56*</td>
<td>3.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in motivation for grades.
The motivation for grades scale depends upon the reported desire to earn good marks in secondary school. High scores indicate a concern to earn good marks and low scores indicate a lack of concern for high marks while in secondary school.

### TABLE 14

**MOTIVATION FOR GRADES SCALE (CSQ-1)**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5354.91</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>5.119**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>294.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.132*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5060.51</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>19.169*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The hypothesis that there will be no differences among the groups was rejected at the .01 level of significance on the basis of the F ratio.

### TABLE 15

**MOTIVATION FOR GRADES SCALE (CSQ-1)**

**NEWMAN–KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>27.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .05 level**

**Significant at .01 level**
The highest ranked group, WH, was significantly higher at the .01 level from the lowest ranked group, MC. The WC group was significantly higher than MC at the .05 level. None of the other differences between groups were significant. The groups ranked from lowest to highest were MC, MH, WC, and WH.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in high school performance as measured by class standing in high school.

Item 57 of CSQ-1 asks the respondent to report his standing in his high school class. A chi square table was constructed to determine if there was significant interation between the group and the high school class standing.

### TABLE 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 30%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 40%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Top 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 15.93; \quad df = 18; \quad \text{Prob.} > .05 \]
The chi square value of 15.93 with 18 degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected. There was no evidence that past academic performance was significantly different between students who live at home and those who live on campus.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in family social status.

The family social status scale is the one scale with only five items: father's occupation, father's education, mother's education, family income, and father's nationality-ethnic background. The father's occupation is given the weight of 3 so that raw scores may range from 7-63. The scores in the UC sample ranged from 8-63.

TABLE 17
FAMILY SOCIAL STATUS SCALE (CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28156.33</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.07**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3554.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1184.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>24601.79</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>106.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The hypothesis was rejected on the basis of the F ratio which was statistically significant at the .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>44.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>10.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>8.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>6.89**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The rank order from lowest to highest was WH, MH, MC, and WC. This order supports the general assumption that students who live on campus come from families with higher socio-economic status than those who live at home. However, the only group that differed significantly from the other three was WC. The greatest numerical difference between pairs of means was between WH and WC. This was the only scale of CSQ-1 for the UC sample in which the two women's groups were ranked first and fourth.

**Hypothesis 5.** There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education at the beginning of the academic year.

Each respondent was asked to read descriptions of four philosophies of higher education and rank each philosophy according to the accuracy with which each portrayed his own point of view. The
four statements are classified in the literature as vocational, aca-
demic, collegiate, and nonconformist although these labels were not
mentioned in the text of the questionnaire. (See Appendix C.)

A chi square table was constructed to test the interaction
between the groups and the most accurate self description. The chi
square value of 2.99 with 9 degrees of freedom was not significant
at the .05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

**TABLE 19**

MOST ACCURATE SELF DESCRIPTION (CSQ-1), CHI SQUARE
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Collegiate</th>
<th>Nonconformist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.99; \text{ df} = 9; \text{ Prob.} > .05 \]

**Summary of Groups at the Beginning of Year**

At the beginning of the year, significant differences among
groups were noted in five of the nine variables tested: family inde-
dependence, social conscience, cultural sophistication, motivation for
grades, and family social status. No significant differences were
noted for four variables: peer independence, liberalism, standing in
high school class, and most accurate self description of philosophy
of higher education.
Women on campus were significantly higher than women at home on two variables: family independence and family social status. Men on campus were significantly higher than men at home on one variable: family independence. Women on campus were significantly higher than men on campus on four variables: social conscience, cultural sophistication, family social status, and motivation for grades. Women at home were significantly higher than men at home on one variable: cultural sophistication. Women on campus were significantly higher than men at home on three variables: social conscience, cultural sophistication, and family social status.

In the comparison of men on campus and women at home, men on campus were significantly higher than women at home on family independence. Women at home were significantly higher than men on campus in cultural sophistication and motivation for grades.

On cultural sophistication, women on campus were significantly higher than men on campus and men at home; women at home were also significantly higher than men on campus and men at home. Women on campus and women at home and men on campus and men at home did not differ significantly on the same variable. On family social status, women on campus were significantly higher than each of the other three groups. No other groups differed significantly from each other. On social conscience, women on campus were significantly higher than men on campus and men at home. No significant difference was noted between any other pairs of groups. On motivation for
### TABLE 20

**SUMMARY OF BEGINNING OF YEAR DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Group Rank</th>
<th>Difference between all Pairs of Group Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3 1 4 2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC—WH MC—MH WC—MC WH—MH WC—MH WH—MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2 4 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3 2 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>N-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>N-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3 4 1 2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.S.Std.</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4 1 3 2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
grades, men on campus were significantly lower than women on campus and women at home. No other pairs of groups differed significantly.

Inspection of the summary table, which appears on page 66, shows that the only two variables in which all four groups show a similar pattern were social conscience and cultural sophistication. The groups ranked from lowest to highest on both variables were: MH, MC, WH, WC.

Section 2

End of Academic Year

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence
B. Peer Independence
C. Liberalism
D. Social Conscience
E. Cultural Sophistication

A. Family Independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5617.73</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4.063**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>252.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5365.25</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Hypothesis 6A was rejected at the .01 level of significance on the basis of the F ratio in Table 21.

### TABLE 22

**FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-2)**
**NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The two lowest ranking groups, WH and MH, had equal means followed by WC and MC. Both WH and MH were significantly lower than MC, but did not differ significantly from WC. WC and MC did not differ significantly.

In comparison to the Newman-Keuls test results for these same groups at the beginning of the year, WH and WC were significantly different at the .05 level at the beginning of the year but were not significantly different at the end of the year. MC and MH were significantly different at the .01 level at the end of the year as they were at the beginning of the year.

**B. Peer Independence**

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference
among groups in peer independence was not rejected. As shown in Table 23, the F ratio had a probability greater than .05.

**TABLE 23**

**PEER INDEPENDENCE SCALE (CSQ-2)**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3761.86</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3721.80</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>14.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result was comparable to the result of the analysis of variance performed on means of these same groups at the beginning of the year. The ranking of the groups from lowest to highest remained the same as at the beginning of the year: MC, WC, MH, WH.

C. Liberalism

**TABLE 24**

**LIBERALISM SCALE (CSQ-2), SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4979.80</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>105.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4874.05</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 6C was not rejected. The F ratio as shown in Table 24 had a probability greater than .05. No evidence of
significant difference among groups was indicated.

This finding was comparable to the results of the test performed on group means for the same scale at the beginning of the year. However, the ranking of groups was different. The lowest rank was still held by MH; the second rank by WH, the third rank was held by MC rather than by WC; the fourth or highest rank was held by WC rather than MC.

D. Social Conscience

**TABLE 25**

SOCIAL CONSCIENCE SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5084.46</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>6.53**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>529.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>176.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4554.95</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>18.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference among groups on the social conscience scale, CSQ-2, was rejected at the .01 level.

The rank order from lowest to highest was MC, MH, WC, WH. MC was significantly lower than WC and WH at the .01 level. MH was significantly lower than WH at the .01 level and significantly lower than WC at the .05 level, as shown in Table 26 on the following page.
### TABLE 26

SOCIAL CONSCIENCE SCALE (CSQ-2)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.64**</td>
<td>3.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>1.64*</td>
<td>2.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level

All groups were in different rank order than they were at the beginning of the year. The two groups living at home were both one rank higher and the two groups living on campus were one rank lower. At the beginning of the year, MC was significantly lower than WC at the .01 level; at the end of the year, MC was significantly lower than both WC and WH at the .01 level. MH differed significantly from WC at the .01 level at the beginning of the year; the significant difference between this pair of groups was at the .05 level at the end of the year. MH did not differ significantly from WH at the beginning of the year; at the end of the year, MH was significantly lower at the .01 level than WH.

**E. Cultural Sophistication**

The hypothesis that there will be no significant difference among group means for the cultural sophistication scale at the end
of the year was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE 27
CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6522.70</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>15.003**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>956.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>318.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5566.45</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>21.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

TABLE 28
CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALE (CSQ-2)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>25.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03**</td>
<td>4.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14**</td>
<td>3.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The rank order from lowest to highest was MH, MC, WH, WC. MH and MC were significantly lower at the .01 level than WC and WH. Pairs of groups, MH and MC and WH and WC, did not differ significantly from each other. The rank order of the groups was the same as it was at the beginning of the year. At the beginning of the year, MC was significantly lower at the .05 level than WH; at the
and of the year, MC was significantly lower at the .01 level.

Hypothesis 7. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the following satisfaction scales:

A. Satisfaction with Faculty
B. Satisfaction with Administration
C. Satisfaction with Major
D. Satisfaction with Students

A. Satisfaction with Faculty

The ten items give the student an opportunity to rate faculty on competency, fairness in grading, accessibility, and interest in the problems of individual students. High scores indicate a general attitude of esteem by the student for the faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5288.08</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>4.02**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>231.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5056.63</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The hypothesis for the satisfaction for faculty scale was rejected at the .01 level on the basis of the F ratio as shown in Table 29.
TABLE 30
SATISFACTION WITH FACULTY SCALE (CSQ-2)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>1.11**</td>
<td>2.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at .01 level

The group means ranked from lowest to highest were MC, MH, WC, and WH. All groups differed from each other at the .01 level of significance except for MH and WC.

B. Satisfaction with Administration

High scores on this scale imply satisfaction with the nature of administrative authority and with personal interactions with the administration. Low scores imply an impression of an administration that is arbitrary, impersonal, or paternalistic.

TABLE 31
SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATION SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4630.97</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.046*</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>167.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4463.82</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>18.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
The $F$ ratio was significant at the .05 level as a result of the analysis of variance. Therefore, the hypothesis for $7B$ was rejected at the .05 level.

**TABLE 32**

SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATION SCALE (CSQ-2)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>29.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

The groups ranked lowest to highest according to means were MC, WC, MH, and WH. The lowest and the highest groups, MC and WH, were the only two groups which differed significantly from each other. This difference was at the .05 level.

**C. Satisfaction with Major**

High scores in this scale indicate a positive attitude of the student about his chosen field of academic concentration. The ten items for this scale are completed by only those students who are officially committed to a particular major. Only 179 of the 281 respondents completed these items. Two of the groups, WH and MH, had less than fifty individuals responding. Results are not
particularly meaningful for groups under the number of fifty. Groups ranked from lowest to highest were MC, WC, MH, and WH.

TABLE 33
SATISFACTION WITH MAJOR SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3952.80</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3918.38</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio as a result of the analysis of variance procedure was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected.

D. Satisfaction with Students

High scores on this scale indicate the respondent's satisfaction with his perception of scholastic integrity, political awareness, and particular styles and tastes which are characteristic of the overall student body. Groups ranked from lowest to highest according to means were MC, WC, MH, WH.

The F ratio as a result of the analysis of variance procedure was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected, as shown in Table 34 on the following page.
TABLE 34
SATISFACTION WITH STUDENTS SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3641.55</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>65.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3575.89</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 8. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and WH in study habits.

The respondents who score high on this scale feel that they spend extensive time in study, that they use systematic study routines and techniques, and that they have confidence in their ability to prepare for examinations.

TABLE 35
STUDY HABITS SCALE (CSQ-2)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5305.63</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5.463**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>312.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4993.31</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>19.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance on the basis of the F ratio as summarized in Table 35.
TABLE 36

STUDY HABITS SCALE (CSQ-2)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.931</td>
<td>24.371</td>
<td>25.221</td>
<td>25.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>22.931</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.29**</td>
<td>2.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>24.371</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>25.221</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>.25.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♦♦Significant at .01 level

The rank of groups according to means from lowest to highest is MC, MH, WC, and WH. MC, the lowest ranked group, differed significantly from both WC and WH. No other significant differences were revealed.

Hypothesis 9*. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in cumulative grade point average for the academic year.

TABLE 37

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.90</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>7.261</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♦♦Significant at .01 level
This hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance on the basis of the F ratio as shown in Table 37.

**TABLE 38**

**CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES**
**NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at .01 level

The rank of groups from lowest to highest was MH, MC, WH, WC. MH and WH, MH and WC, MC and WH, and MC and WC differed significantly from each other at the .01 level. MC was higher than MH but not significantly so; WC was higher than WH but not significantly so. The findings indicated that differences may be related to sex rather than places of residence.

Hypothesis 10. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH at the end of the year in extracurricular involvement.

A high score indicates a wide involvement and support of organized extracurricular affairs. Items are concerned with participation and interest in student government and athletics,
participation in organized groups concerned with religion, school
spirit, professional interests, and living groups, and extent of
participation and number of hours spent in activities.

**TABLE 39**

**EXTRACURRICULAR INVOLVEMENT SCALE (CSQ-2)**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5281.77</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>895.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>298.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4386.60</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The F ratio of the analysis of variance was significant at the .01 level. The hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

**TABLE 40**

**EXTRACURRICULAR INVOLVEMENT SCALE (CSQ-2)**

**NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.57**</td>
<td>4.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**
The rank order of groups from the lowest to the highest was MH, WH, WC, MC. MC was significantly higher at the .01 level as compared to all other groups. WC was significantly higher at the .01 level as compared to MH. WC was higher than WH but not significantly so.

Hypothesis 11. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education at the end of the academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Collegiate</th>
<th>Nonconformist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 8.60; df=9; Prob. > .05$

The chi square value of 8.60 with 9 degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level.

Summary of Groups at End of the Year

The results summarized in Table 42 present significant differences among groups and pairs of groups as well as ranking the groups from lowest to highest. Thirteen variables were tested for
significance of difference at the end of the year. Of the thirteen variables, significant differences were observed in the following eight: family independence, social conscience, cultural sophistication, satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, study habits, cumulative grade point average, and extracurricular involvement. No significant differences were found for peer independence, liberalism, satisfaction with major, satisfaction with students, and most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education.

Significant differences were found for social conscience, cultural sophistication, and cumulative grade point average between four pairs of groups: WH—MC, WC—MH, WH—NC, and WH—MH. In satisfaction with faculty, significant differences were found between five pairs of groups: WH—WC, WC—MC, WH—KH, MH—MC, and WH—MC. One group, WH—MC, differed significantly in satisfaction with administration. Two pairs of groups, WC—MC and WH—MC, differed significantly on study habits. On extracurricular involvement, significant differences were found between four pairs of groups: MC—NC, WC—MH, MC—WH, and MC—MH. On family independence, significant differences were found in two pairs of groups: MC—WH and MC—MH.

Women at home were significantly higher than women on campus on only one variable: satisfaction with faculty.

Men on campus and men at home differed significantly on three variables. Men on campus were significantly higher on family
independence and extracurricular involvement. Men at home were significantly higher on satisfaction with faculty.

Women on campus and men on campus differed significantly on six variables. Women on campus were significantly higher on: satisfaction with faculty, study habits, cumulative grade point average, social conscience, and cultural sophistication. Men on campus were significantly higher on extracurricular involvement.

Women at home were significantly higher than men at home on: satisfaction with faculty, cumulative grade point average, social conscience, and cultural sophistication.

Women at home and men on campus differed significantly on eight variables. Women at home were significantly higher on satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, study habits, cumulative grade point average, social conscience, and cultural sophistication. Men on campus were higher on extracurricular involvement and family independence.
TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF END OF YEAR DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>WC—WH</th>
<th>MC—MH</th>
<th>WC—MC</th>
<th>WH—MH</th>
<th>WH—MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>WH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>WH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPA</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-K</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
Changes During the Academic Year

Hypothesis 12. There will be no significant differences among groups WC, WH, MC, and MH in the amount of change from the beginning to the end of the year in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence
B. Peer Independence
C. Liberalism
D. Social Conscience
E. Cultural Sophistication

A. Family Independence

TABLE 43

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2767.71</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2742.36</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio in Table 43 was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected. The rank of group means had changed from WH, MH, WC, MC, to MH, WH, WC, MC. The difference between the highest and lowest mean had decreased from 3.26 on CSQ-1 to 2.18 on CSQ-2.
B. Peer Independence

TABLE 44

PEER INDEPENDENCE SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2461.96</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2458.76</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio in Table 44 was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected. The mean for each group was higher on CSQ-2 than on CSQ-1, but the rank order of the groups, MC, WC, MH, WH, remained the same as the rank order on CSQ-1. The difference between the highest and lowest ranked groups on CSQ-1 decreased from 1.55 to 1.15 on CSQ-2.

C. Liberalism

TABLE 45

LIBERALISM SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2291.98</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2282.90</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F ratio in Table 45 was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected. The rank order from lowest to highest on CSQ-1 was MH, WH, MC, WC; on CSQ-2, the rank order was MH, WH, WC, MC. The difference between the highest and the lowest score had increased. On CSQ-1 the difference was 1.63; the difference on CSQ-2 was 2.04.

D. Social Conscience

### TABLE 46

SOCIAL CONSCIENCE SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2871.52</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2853.00</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio in Table 46 was not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected. The order of means ranked from lowest to highest changed from MH, MC, WC, WH, on CSQ-1 to MC, MH, WC, WH on CSQ-2. The difference between the lowest and highest ranked group mean had increased from 2.72 on CSQ-1 to 3.46 on CSQ-2.

E. Cultural Sophistication

Hypothesis 12E was rejected at the .01 level of significance as shown in Table 47 on the following page.
**TABLE 47**

CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1961.03</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>114.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1846.31</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

**TABLE 48**

CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
NEWMAN-KEULS TEST OF DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.08**</td>
<td>2.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The rank of mean differences from lowest to highest was MC, WC, MH, WH. The highest ranking group, WH, differed at the .01 level of significance from WH, WC, and MC. MH, the next highest ranking group, differed at .01 level of significance from MC. MC and WC did not differ significantly from each other.

Hypothesis 13. There will be no significant differences within the same group between means at the beginning of the academic
year and means at the end of the academic year in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence
B. Peer Independence
C. Liberalism
D. Social Conscience
E. Cultural Sophistication

A. Family Independence

This hypothesis was not rejected for groups WC, MC, and MH. It was rejected at the .01 level of significance for group WH. The two groups living at home have a greater increase on this scale than the two groups living on campus.

**TABLE 49**

**FAMILY INDEPENDENCE SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CSQ-1 Mean</th>
<th>CSQ-2 Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.56**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

The students who lived at home may have had more opportunity to be aware of family independence than students who lived on campus and did not see members of their families each day.
B. Peer Independence

The hypothesis for peer independence was not rejected for any of the groups at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 50

PEER INDEPENDENCE SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF t TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CSQ-1 Mean</th>
<th>CSQ-2 Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Liberalism

The hypothesis was not rejected for groups WC, WH, and MH. On the basis of t statistics for MC, the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance for this group.

TABLE 51

LIBERALISM SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF t TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CSQ-1 Mean</th>
<th>CSQ-2 Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.567*</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
D. Social Conscience

The hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance for any group. The differences between means for CSQ-1 and CSQ-2 were slightly higher for WC and MH. The means for WH on CSQ-1 and CSQ-2 were equal; the mean on CSQ-2 for MC was .72 less than the mean on CSQ-1. None of the t statistics were significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CSQ-1 Mean</th>
<th>CSQ-2 Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Cultural Sophistication

The t statistic for groups WC, WH, and MH were significantly different at the .01 level. The hypothesis was rejected for groups WC, WH, and MH and was not rejected for MC. Table 53 which gives the summary of t tests is shown on the following page.

Hypothesis 14. There will be no significant change within groups in the distribution of most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education between CSQ-1 and CSQ-2.
TABLE 53

CULTURAL SOPHISTICATION SCALES (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF t TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CSQ-1 Mean</th>
<th>CSQ-2 Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.596**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>6.427**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.723**</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

The McNemar test for the significance of change was performed on responses from students who answered appropriate items on both CSQ-1 and CSQ-2 for self description of philosophy of higher education. Four tables were constructed for each group to test change in the four orientations. In this procedure, the chi square test is based upon number of students with changed attitudes. Since the degree of freedom is six, the chi square value would need to be greater or equal to 12.6 in order for the hypothesis to be rejected. The null hypothesis was not rejected for any group, as shown in Table 54 on page 93.

Summary of Changes During the Year

Results for the six variables on which data was available for the beginning and end of the year were analyzed according to differences of change among groups, between pairs of groups, and within groups.
TABLE 54

MOST ACCURATE SELF DESCRIPTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION (CSQ-2 - CSQ-1)
SUMMARY OF McNEMAR TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Nonconformist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural sophistication was the only variable in which significant differences were found among groups at the .01 level. Significant differences of change were found on cultural sophistication between four pairs of groups: WH-WC, MH-MC, WH-MH, WH-MC.

Significant differences of change within groups revealed that women on campus, women at home, and men at home changed significantly at the .01 level in the direction of higher mean score on cultural sophistication. On family independence, women at home was the only group which showed significant change at the .01 level. Men on campus was significantly higher at the .05 level on liberalism.
### TABLE 55
SUMMARY OF CHANGES DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Among Groups</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Between Pairs of Groups</th>
<th>Within Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC—WH</td>
<td>MC—MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AOV</td>
<td>** K-N</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Although traditionally, the colleges and universities of the United States have had a majority of students living on campus, the current situation is that more students live at home than on campus while attending an undergraduate institution and the trend indicates that the percentage of students living at home during their undergraduate years will increase. Another prediction supported by current trends is that the majority of college students will be enrolled in the future in universities which are located in metropolitan areas and supported primarily by public funds.

Students who lived on campus and students who lived at home were compared on the basis of academic background, attitudes, family social status, and philosophy of education at the beginning of the year. At the end of the year, academic achievement, attitudes, philosophy of higher education, and satisfactions with the university experience were the variables tested. The change in attitudes during the year was analyzed to discover significant differences within and among groups.
A sample of 281 freshman students were divided into four groups on the basis of sex and place of residence. All of these students enrolled as a beginning student in a baccalaureate college in the fall of 1966 at a large, publicly supported university in a metropolitan area. They included students from each of the eight colleges although not proportionately so. Each student took at least half of his courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The College Student Questionnaire, Part 1 and Part 2, was administered to these students at the beginning and end of the academic year, 1966-67. Results of the thirteen scales as well as results of selected individual questionnaire items, and the cumulative grade point averages were tested by appropriate statistical measures.

Fourteen null hypotheses were formulated. Five of these were concerned with differences among groups at the beginning of the year; six with differences among groups at the end of the year; and three with changes during the year. The findings are summarized according to each hypothesis.

**Beginning of the Year**

1. Differences among groups in the following attitudes:

   A. Family Independence.—Students living at home perceived themselves to be less independent of their family than students who were living in the residence halls. Women who live at home consider themselves less independent than men who live at home. Women who live on campus follow this same pattern in comparison to men living
on campus. Men living on campus are significantly higher than men at home and women at home.

B. Peer Independence.—Students who live on campus are more concerned about conforming to the norms of the peer groups than those students who live at home. Women are less concerned about conforming to peer pressure than men. Women who live on campus are less concerned than men who live on campus. Women who live at home are less concerned than women who live on campus.

C. Liberalism.—Students who live at home tend to support the preservation of current values more than those students living on campus. In comparison within the four groups, men occupy the lowest and highest rank with very little difference between the two groups of women according to statistical results.

D. Social Conscience.—Women were more concerned about social injustices than men. Men who lived on campus were only slightly more concerned than men who lived at home. Women on campus were more concerned than women at home. The degree of concern by women on campus in comparison to both men's groups was significantly higher.

E. Cultural Sophistication.—Women report more interest and pleasure in the humanities than do men. Men who live on campus have more interest than men who live at home. Women who live on campus have more interest than women who live at home. The differences
between men who live at home and women who live at home and men who live on campus and women who live on campus are significant.

2. Differences among groups in motivation for grades:

Women reported higher motivation for grades while in high school than men. Women at home were more motivated than women living on campus and men at home were more motivated than men living on campus. Significant differences were observed between the group with the least motivation, men living on campus, and women living on campus and women living at home.

3. Differences in class standing in high school:

No significant differences were found that would indicate that students living at home were any different than students living on campus.

4. Differences in family social status:

Students who live on campus come from families with higher social status than students who live at home. Women who live on campus are significantly higher than any other of the three groups in social status. This is the only difference in which women living at home and women living on campus rank first and fourth respectively at the beginning of the year.

5. Differences among groups in most accurate self description of philosophy of higher education:

No significant differences were found among groups. The
highest number in each group was in the collegiate subculture followed closely by the vocational subculture. A relatively small number in each group classified themselves as academic, and a definite minority chose nonconformist as their first choice.

At the beginning of the year, no significant differences were found in variables peer independence, liberalism, high school rank in class, and philosophy of higher education. Significant differences were found among groups in family independence, social conscience, cultural sophistication, and family social status.

End of the Academic Year

6. Differences among groups in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence.—Students who live at home feel that they are less independent of their families than students living on campus. Women who live at home and men who live at home feel the same degree of independence although women felt less independent than men at the beginning of the year. Men who live at home felt significantly less independent than men who live on campus. The difference between women who live at home and women who live on campus is very small.

B. Peer Independence.—Students living on campus continue in the same pattern that they reported at the beginning of the year; that of being more concerned about approval of their peers than the students living at home. The differences are not significant.
C. Liberalism.—Students living at home continue to support the preservation of current values more than those students living on campus. Men who live at home are less liberal when compared to women living at home. Men living on campus are less liberal than women living on campus. There is no significant difference among groups.

D. Social Conscience.—Men are less concerned about social injustices than women. This difference between men and women is significant. Men living on campus are less concerned than men living at home; women living on campus are less concerned than women living at home. At the beginning of the year, men living on campus reported more concern than men living at home and women living on campus reported more concern than women living at home.

E. Cultural Sophistication.—Women continue to express significantly more pleasure than men in the humanities. Men living on campus are slightly more interested than men living at home. Women living on campus are slightly more interested than women living at home.

7. Differences among groups in the following satisfactions:

A. Satisfaction with Faculty.—Women feel that faculty are more interested, more competent, and more fair than men do. Women at home indicate the most esteem for faculty and men on campus express the least esteem of any group for faculty. Men on campus rate the faculty significantly lower than all other groups. Women living at
home rate the faculty significantly higher than all three other groups.

B. Satisfaction with Administration.—Students living on campus are less satisfied with the nature of administration than students living at home. Women living at home rate the administration significantly higher than men living on campus who are least satisfied.

C. Satisfaction with Major.—Students living at home indicate a more positive attitude about their chosen field of academic concentration than students living on campus. However, the differences are not significant.

D. Satisfaction with Students.—Students who live at home are more satisfied with characteristics of the overall student body than are students who live on campus. The differences are not statistically significant.

8. Difference in study habits:

Men reported that they spend less time in study and have less confidence in preparing for examinations than do women. Men who live on campus feel they do not have as good study habits as men who live at home. Women who live at home also report that they have better study habits than women who live on campus. Men who live on campus are significantly lower in this area than both women's groups.
9. Difference in cumulative grade point averages:

Women are significantly higher in cumulative grade point averages at the end of three quarters than men. Men living on campus are slightly higher than men living at home. Women living on campus are only .03 higher than women living at home.

10. Differences in extracurricular involvement:

Students living on campus are higher in participation and interest in campus life than are students living at home. This is the only scale at the end of the year in which men living on campus are significantly higher than all other groups. At the other extreme, men living at home are significantly lower than men living on campus and women living on campus. Women living at home are lower than women living on campus, but not significantly so.

11. Differences among groups in philosophy of higher education:

No significant differences are indicated among groups. The collegiate subculture is still the one chosen by the greatest number of students in each group followed closely by the vocational. Academic subculture is chosen by more people than the nonconformist, but more students have chosen the nonconformist subculture than at the beginning of the year.

At the end of the year, significant differences among groups were observed in satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, study habits, cumulative grade point averages, family
independence, social conscience, cultural sophistication, and extracurricular involvement.

Changes During the Academic Year

12. Differences among groups in the amount of change from the beginning to the end of the year in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence.—No significant differences were found in the amount of change among groups. Women at home had the greatest increase in mean score; men at home had the next greatest increase followed by women on campus and men on campus. In comparing the differences between the highest and lowest group means, this difference had decreased from 3.26 on CSQ-1 to 2.18 on CSQ-2. The groups were more similar at the end of the year than they were at the beginning of the year.

B. Peer Independence.—Changes among groups were not significantly different. Men on campus had the greatest increase in this scale followed by women on campus, men at home, and women at home. The four groups were more similar on CSQ-2 than they were on CSQ-1.

C. Liberalism.—No significant differences were found in changes among groups. Men on campus changed the most followed by women on campus, men at home, and women at home. The difference between the groups at the beginning of the year had increased from 1.63 to 2.04 at the end of the year.
D. Social Conscience.—Changes among groups were not significantly different. Men on campus had a lower score on CSQ-2 than on CSQ-1 and had changed to the greatest extent, but even this change was very small. Men at home increased slightly; women on campus increased even less; and women at home showed no increase at all. The difference between the lowest and highest ranked group means increased from 2.72 on CSQ-1 to 3.46 on CSQ-2.

E. Cultural Sophistication.—Significant differences were found among groups. Students living at home changed more than students living on campus. Women living at home changed significantly more than any of the other three groups. Men living at home changed significantly more than men living on campus. The difference between the highest and lowest ranked groups decreased .35 from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

13. Differences within the same group between the beginning of the academic year and the end of the academic year in the following attitudes:

A. Family Independence.—Women living at home was the only group that changed significantly from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. The other groups also perceived themselves to be more independent of their families.

B. Peer Independence.—Although all groups increased in feeling of independence from conforming to the peer pressure, none of the changes were significantly different. Students on campus changed
more than students at home.

C. Liberalism.—Men who lived on campus became significantly more liberal at the end of the year than they were at the beginning. Women on campus had the next greatest change followed by men at home and women at home. All groups became more liberal during the year.

D. Social Conscience.—Changes in each group were not significant. The changes were the smallest of any of the scales. Men living on campus dropped slightly indicating less concern in social injustices. Women at home did not change at all. Men at home and women on campus indicated slightly more concern.

E. Cultural Sophistication.—Women living at home changed significantly from the beginning to the end of the year and had the greatest increase of any group. Men living at home also changed significantly and were next in the amount of change. Women living on campus also changed significantly during the year. Men living on campus had a slight change in comparison to the other three groups, but this change was not significant.

14. Change within groups in most accurate self description of higher education:

No group changed significantly in selection of most accurate self description of higher education from the beginning to the end of the year.
Differences of change among groups were significant for only one variable, cultural sophistication. Changes within groups were significant for women living at home on family independence and cultural sophistication; women living on campus on cultural sophistication; and men living at home on cultural sophistication.

Implications

1. Experiences of students do differ in light of place of residence while attending the university. The sex of students is also linked to many differences so both of these factors should continue to be considered in any future campus studies.

2. The awareness that men and women students enter the university with a difference in motivation and other indications of differences in academic readiness which continue throughout the freshman year should be considered in planning of orientation, academic advising, and opportunities for personal counseling.

3. Students who live at home may be expected to be more aware of changing relationship with their families than those who live in the halls. Presentations during parent orientation programs and provisions for commuting students to discuss this change with understanding advisers and counselors are important considerations in planning by academic and student personnel staffs.

4. Evaluation of lecture series, discussion groups, community volunteer services, and academic programs particularly in
education and the social sciences should be made in order to explore possible changes that could provide more opportunities for students to be aware of the social conditions of the city as well as the world.

5. Planners of campus buildings and facilities could become aware of the need to provide natural and convenient ways for the student who lives at home to communicate with other students and faculty members and to center out-of-class activities to a greater extent around the campus community. Possible additions would be areas in each academic building conducive to conversation with students and faculty; play areas such as tennis courts, swimming pools, and bowling alleys which are available for use during free hours between classes during the day as well as on weekends and evenings; and adequate eating facilities.

6. Being aware that students living at home are not involved in the extracurricular life of the campus as much as the students living on campus, student personnel workers and student leaders should place special emphasis on programming and student government activities to attract these students to campus life. Of particular concern are men who live at home.

7. Residence hall counselors and student governing and programming groups for the halls could concentrate on encouraging hall residents to participate in the cultural life of the city and campus, planning ways for residents to become better acquainted with
faculty and administrators, and arranging opportunities for dis-
cussion of family relationships particularly near vacation periods
or end of the year.

8. Lack of agreement between findings of this study and
similar studies on other campuses suggests that the proportion of
students living at home and students living on campus as well as the
tradition of the particular campus are significant factors in deter-
mining experiences of these groups on individual campuses.

9. Experiences on campus do affect attitudes of the stu-
dents during the first year in varying degrees of significance.
Environmental conditions as well as awareness in programming by
students and faculty are factors in influencing attitudes.

10. Identifiable differences between students who live on
campus and students who live at home are present at the beginning of
the year, at the end of the year, and in change during the year.

Suggestions for Additional Studies

1. The College Student Questionnaire, Part 2, could be
administered to the same students as those in the sample used in this
study at the completion of the fourth year of campus life. Changes
between the beginning of the campus experience and the end of this
experience as well as differences between the end of the freshman
and fourth year could be analyzed.
2. A study, comparable in design to this study, could be done using as subjects students from the two colleges of the university which award associate degrees. One of these is located on the university campus and one of these is a separate campus in a suburb of the city. Comparisons could be made between the students in the two associate degree colleges as well as with students in the baccalaureate colleges.

3. Comparable studies could be done on several campuses chosen to represent varying proportions of students who live at home and students who live on campus.

4. Each one of the variables which revealed significant differences are possibilities for more intensive studies in an effort to identify factors which are relevant to the differences.

5. A pilot project could be set up in which a selected group of students living at home would be assigned to a study desk in a commuter's center in a campus building. A counseling staff comparable to the staff in the residence halls on campus would be located in offices adjoining the study and lounge area for the project. This group could then be compared to a comparable group who live on campus. A control group of students who live at home and have no special arrangements would be needed for further comparison.
APPENDIX A

LOCAL OPTION ITEMS ON CSQ-1 AND CSQ-2

Read the four statements listed below and indicate which statement best describes your living situation at the present time by blackening the appropriate number under Column A on the answer sheet.

1. A woman student who lives in a University residence hall.

2. A woman student who lives in her own home or with relatives.

3. A male student who lives in a residence hall, a fraternity house, or a rooming house.

4. A male student who lives in his own home or with relatives.

Please indicate the college in which you are enrolled at the University of Cincinnati by blackening the appropriate number under Column B on the answer sheet.

1. McMicken College of Arts and Sciences
2. College of Engineering
3. College of Education and Home Economics
4. College of Business Administration
5. College of Nursing and Health
6. College of Design, Architecture, and Art
7. College of Pharmacy
8. College-Conservatory of Music
APPENDIX B

SCALES IN THE COLLEGE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Scale 1. Satisfaction with Faculty (SF)

1. What proportion of the faculty members who have taught you during the past year would you say are superior teachers?

   1. Very few
   2. Less than half
   3. More than half
   4. Almost all

2. In general, are you enjoying your studies in college this term as much as you had expected to?

   1. No, I am definitely enjoying them less than I had expected
   2. No, but I am only mildly disappointed
   3. My expectations for this term are reasonably well satisfied
   4. I am enjoying my studies this term much more than I had expected

3. So far this year how successful would you say your instructors at this college have been in challenging you to produce to the limit of your intellectual and creative capacities?

   1. They have been wholly unsuccessful
   2. Several have been somewhat successful
   3. Several have been quite successful
   4. Almost all have succeeded in continuously challenging my intellectual capacities
4. How many faculty members at this college have provided personal evaluations of your work which made you think that you might become a creative or productive worker in their fields?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two or three
   4. More than three

5. Of the instructors you have had this past year, about what proportion would you say came to know you by name?
   1. Almost none
   2. Less than half
   3. More than half
   4. Almost all

6. What proportion of the faculty members you have observed at this college would you say are genuinely interested in students and their problems?
   1. Very few
   2. Less than half
   3. Over half
   4. Almost all

7. Have you had the feeling in the past year or so that some of your instructors have judged (e.g., graded) you more on the basis of extraneous or irrelevant factors than on the basis of the quality of your work?
   1. Quite often
   2. Once in a while
   3. Very rarely
   4. Never

8. What has been your general impression of the tolerance for student argument and disagreement on the part of the instructors you have come in contact with this year?
   1. Some of them have definitely penalized student disagreement
   2. Some of them have not particularly welcomed disagreement
   3. Most of them have accepted student disagreement
   4. Most of them have definitely valued and encouraged reasonable student disagreement
9. During the past academic year, how competent, in your opinion, have you found your instructors to be in their own special fields?

1. I felt that several were not sufficiently competent
2. I felt that two or three were not sufficiently competent
3. One was not sufficiently competent
4. All were competent in my judgment

10. On the whole, how satisfied are you with the opportunity you have had in the past year to meet with your instructors privately about course work and your own progress?

1. Mostly dissatisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Quite satisfied
4. Extremely satisfied

Scale 2. Satisfaction with Administration (SA)

1. Would you agree that most of the existing rules and regulations on this campus are logical and necessary?

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree, but not strongly
3. Agree, but not strongly
4. Strongly agree

2. Do you agree or disagree that this college or university exercises too much authority over student life outside the classroom?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

3. On the basis of either direct experience or conversations with student friends, what is your impression of the quality of help on problems of a personal nature presently available from personnel deans (dean of students, deans of men, deans of women) at this college?

1. They are no help
2. Not usually very helpful
3. More often helpful than not
4. Consistently very helpful
4. Again from either direct experience or hearsay, what is your general impression of the courtesy and efficiency with which student problems are taken care of by various administrative or personnel divisions on this campus (e.g., admissions, registrar, loans, housing, etc.)?

1. Impression mostly negative; many improvements definitely needed
2. Impression somewhat negative; a number of improvements could be made
3. Impression reasonably positive
4. Impression very positive; student problems handled very courteously and efficiently

5. How do you feel about the assistance (or lack of assistance) in thinking through your educational and vocational plans which you have received at this college (from teachers, counselors, deans, etc.)?

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Fairly satisfied
4. Very satisfied

6. Would you say that individual students on this campus have a voice in formulating the regulations which affect them?

1. No, they have no voice
2. They have a rather weak voice
3. A moderately strong voice
4. Yes, a very strong voice

7. In your experience (direct or hearsay) so far at this college, how satisfied have you been with the fairness and impartiality by which rules regulating student personal conduct have been enforced?

1. Greatly dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Reasonably satisfied
4. Very satisfied

8. Would you agree that the college administration here generally treats students more like children than like adults?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree
9. To what extent would you say this institution is under pressure from outside sources to offer a kind of educational experience which is contrary to the kind of educational experience you are seeking?

1. There are very strong pressures of which I disapprove
2. There are moderate pressures of which I disapprove
3. There are pressures, but they are weak
4. I am aware of no such outside influence

10. How do you feel about the policies on this campus concerning such things as class attendance, number of "cuts", arriving in class on time, etc.?

1. Entirely inappropriate
2. Somewhat inappropriate
3. Appropriate for the most part
4. Entirely appropriate

Scale 3. Satisfaction with Major (SM)

1. Would you say there is anything approaching a "group spirit" or a feeling of common identity among the students in your department?

1. No, practically none
2. Yes, but it is rather weak
3. Yes, to a moderate degree
4. Yes, it is quite strong

2. Would you agree that the department or division in which you are doing your major work tends to reward conformity and punish individualism?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

3. What is your general impression of the intellectual ability of most of the students in your major department or division?

1. Most of them are below the average at this college
2. Most of them are near the average at this college
3. Most of them are above the average at this college
4. The students in my field are among the brightest on this campus

4. Would you agree that the division in which you are doing your major work has too many purely formal requirements which are more in the nature of initiation rituals than of genuine learning incentives?
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree, but not strongly
   3. Disagree, but not strongly
   4. Strongly disagree

5. How certain are you that your present major field is the one you really want?
   1. Very uncertain
   2. Somewhat uncertain
   3. Fairly certain
   4. Very certain

6. In your major department, how satisfied are you with your present academic standing insofar as you can estimate it?
   1. Very dissatisfied
   2. Somewhat dissatisfied
   3. Fairly satisfied
   4. Very satisfied

7. So far this term how interesting have you found the course work in your major field?
   1. Rather dull for the most part
   2. So-so
   3. Fairly interesting
   4. Very interesting

8. In relation to the kind of education you are seeking, how satisfied are you so far with the various competencies and specialties of the faculty in your present major field?
   1. Very dissatisfied
   2. Somewhat dissatisfied
   3. Fairly satisfied
   4. Very satisfied
9. In relation to the kind of education you are seeking, how adequate would you say is the choice of courses and the availability of suitable facilities (e.g., laboratory) in your present major department?

1. Very inadequate
2. Somewhat inadequate
3. Fairly adequate
4. Very adequate

10. Would you say that the major department or specialty you are in has prestige among this student body as a whole?

1. It does not have the prestige that most other majors or specialties have
2. Its prestige is neither particularly high nor particularly low
3. Its prestige is fairly high
4. It has a great deal of prestige on this campus

Scale 4. Satisfaction with Students (SS)

1. Would you agree that there are too many students on this campus who are so wrapped up in their intellectual development that they are close to failures as social persons?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

2. Would you agree that there are too many students on this campus who go too far with their extremist politics?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

3. Speaking generally, how satisfied are you with the degree of academic honesty and integrity characteristic of most students at this college, e.g., as evidenced by the amount of cheating on examinations, taking credit for material written by someone else, etc.?

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Fairly satisfied
4. Very satisfied
4. How satisfied are you with the amount of competitiveness for grades you have found among your classmates since you have been at this college?
   1. Very dissatisfied (i.e., they are either much too competitive or much too noncompetitive)
   2. Somewhat dissatisfied
   3. Fairly satisfied
   4. Very satisfied (i.e., they are as competitive as I would like them to be)

5. Speaking generally, how satisfied are you with the degree of concern about political, economic, and social issues shown by most students at this college?
   1. Very dissatisfied
   2. Somewhat dissatisfied
   3. Fairly satisfied
   4. Very satisfied

6. Would you agree that most of the undergraduates on this campus would just as soon avoid anything controversial?
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree, but not strongly
   3. Disagree, but not strongly
   4. Strongly disagree

7. Would you agree that there are too many students on this campus who carry their nonconformity too far, e.g., the clothes, beard, speech patterns, etc.?
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree, but not strongly
   3. Disagree, but not strongly
   4. Strongly disagree

8. Speaking generally, would you agree that too many students on this campus are overly susceptible to popular fads and fashions, such as in dress, hair styles, tastes in music, etc.?
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree, but not strongly
   3. Disagree, but not strongly
   4. Strongly disagree

9. Would you agree that too many students on this campus use personality, "pull", "apple polishing", or bluff to get through courses?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

10. Would you agree that too many of the students at this college are more concerned about their social lives—dating, parties, etc.—than they are about their academic responsibilities?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

Scale 5: Study Habits (SH)

1. Speaking generally, how efficiently have you performed during exams in the past year?

1. Quite uneasy, considerable loss of efficiency
2. Somewhat uneasy, some loss of efficiency
3. Generally have worked fairly efficiently
4. Generally have worked very efficiently

2. Compared with most of your classmates at this college, how much would you say you have studied during the present term?

1. I have studied much less than most of my classmates this term
2. I have studied slightly less than most of them
3. I have studied slightly more than most of them
4. I have studied much more than most of my classmates this term

3. Do you make notes while reading textbooks?

1. No, almost never
2. Once in a while (e.g., depending on the subject)
3. I generally do, but I have no particular note-taking system
4. I almost always make notes while reading, and I have a systematic method for doing so

4. Regardless of whether you live on or off campus, how successful have you been this term in finding a place to study which is comfortable, well lit, heated and ventilated, free from
distractions, and which you can think of as "your own?"

1. Completely unsuccessful
2. Unsuccessful for the most part
3. Successful in several of the above mentioned respects
4. Completely successful

5. How well would you say that you understand the various reference facilities of the main library on this campus and how these library services may be potentially useful to you as a student?

1. My general understanding of these matter is rather poor
2. My understanding of these matters is incomplete in a number of respects
3. For my purposes, I know about what I need to know about the library here
4. I would say that my knowledge of the library here and its potential use to me is quite complete

6. In recent weeks have you found yourself unintentionally napping or daydreaming when you intended to be studying?

1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Infrequently
4. Never

7. When going into examinations this past year, how often have you felt adequately prepared?

1. I have almost always felt inadequately prepared
2. More often than not I have not felt prepared
3. More often than not I have felt prepared
4. I have almost always felt adequately prepared

8. Have you generally kept up to date on your course assignments this past year?

1. I have usually been behind on my assignments
2. I have frequently found myself behind on assignments
3. I have usually kept my assignments up to date
4. I have almost always kept my assignments up to date
9. Do you use bibliographical note cards (or some similar technique) while preparing papers which require library research?

1. I'm not certain that I know what bibliographical note cards are
2. I know what they are, but I don't use them
3. I use them once in a while
4. I consistently use them

10. Have you kept some sort of study schedule or time budget this year?

1. No, have tended to work when the pressure was on
2. No, but have tried to follow some kind of study routine
3. Have kept a schedule, but have not been very good about following it
4. Have kept a schedule and have stuck to it fairly well

Scale 6. Extracurricular Involvement (EI)

1. How extensively in the past year have you been involved in the activities of student government organizations (student legislative body, election commission, etc.)?

1. Not at all
2. One such organization
3. Two such organizations
4. Three or more (or have held one or two highly responsible and time-consuming offices)

2. How closely do you generally follow the news about varsity and/or intramural athletics?

1. Not at all
2. Not very closely
3. Fairly closely
4. Very closely

3. To what extent have you participated in varsity or intramural sports during the past year?

1. Not at all
2. One sport
3. Two sports
4. Three or more sports
4. To what extent in the past year or so have you participated in organized activities sponsored by churches, synagogues, religious foundations, etc. (regular services excluded)?
   1. Not at all
   2. To a small extent
   3. Fairly extensively
   4. Very extensively

5. To what extent in the past year have you participated in the activities of on-campus professional organizations or organizations primarily for students in your field of major academic or career interest (e.g., American Society for Public Administration, teacher organizations, various engineer-major societies, etc.)?
   1. Not at all
   2. To a small extent
   3. Fairly extensively
   4. Very extensively

6. How extensively in the past year have you been involved in school spirit organizations and activities (e.g., rally committee, welcoming committees, student guides, etc.)?
   1. Not at all
   2. To a small extent
   3. Fairly extensively
   4. Very extensively

7. What is your estimate of the total number of hours you have devoted to organized extracurricular activities in an "average" week during the past year?
   1. None
   2. Less than five
   3. Between five and ten
   4. More than ten

8. To what extent in the past year have you participated in the organized activities of your living group (e.g., dormitory, fraternity, sorority)?
   1. Do not live in an organized living unit (i.e., I live at home, or in a private apartment, etc.)
   2. To a small extent
   3. Fairly extensively
   4. Very extensively
9. What is your opinion about the necessity for organized extracurricular activities on any college campus?

1. For the most part they are irrelevant and distracting
2. No opinion
3. They are reasonably necessary
4. They are very necessary

10. How interested are you in what the student government does on this campus?

1. Not particularly interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Quite interested
4. Very much interested

Scale 7. Family Independence (FI)

1. During the past year, how often have you seen your parents?

1. Every day or almost every day
2. About once a week
3. During holidays and/or occasional weekends
4. Only during summer vacation or not at all

2. Could you become so absorbed in some kind of activity that you would lose interest in your family?

1. Definitely not; impossible
2. Extremely unlikely
3. Some probability
4. Quite or very possible

3. Would you agree that a person should generally consider the needs of his parental family as a whole more important than his own needs?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree
4. Would you agree that members of your family should hold fairly similar religious beliefs?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

5. Would you describe your family as:

1. Very closely united
2. Fairly closely united
3. Not particularly united
4. Very disunited

6. Many parents take a great deal of interest in what their sons and daughters do. How important is it to you that you satisfy your parents' wishes?

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Moderately important
4. Not very important

7. Do you feel that in the last year or so you have been growing closer to your family or further away from it?

1. Much closer
2. Slightly closer
3. Slightly away
4. Much further away

8. Do you consult with your parents when you are faced with important personal decisions?

1. I almost always do
2. I usually do
3. I occasionally do
4. I rarely do

9. Do you feel that you should consult with your parents on important personal matters?

1. I feel that I definitely should
2. I feel that I probably should
3. I have no particular feelings one way or the other
4. Generally speaking, no
10. How dependent on or independent of your parents do you consider yourself to be at the present time?

1. Quite dependent
2. Somewhat dependent
3. Fairly independent
4. Very independent

Scale 8. Peer Independence (PI)

1. As you think back over this past academic year, how much of your non-class time per week (including the weekend) would you say you spent in casual conversations with friends or acquaintances?

1. Sixteen or more hours
2. Eleven to fifteen hours
3. Six to ten hours
4. One to five hours

2. Other than on dates or with your spouse, do you generally pursue leisure time and recreational activities (movies, exhibits, hobbies, etc.) with a group of friends or by yourself or with one friend?

1. Almost always with a group of friends
2. Usually with a group of friends
3. Usually by myself or with one friend
4. Almost always by myself or with one friend

3. With regard to the arts, would you say that the preferences and tastes of most of your acquaintances are similar to your own tastes?

1. Yes, their tastes in the arts are very similar to my own
2. Their tastes are fairly similar to mine
3. Mine are different in a number of respects
4. No, their preferences tend to be quite different from mine

4. As a description of yourself, how accurate is the following statement, "I am one in a group of close friends, and we do most things together"?
1. Very accurate
2. Fairly accurate
3. Not particularly accurate
4. Definitely inaccurate

5. How often do you maintain a point of view despite other students losing patience with you?
   1. Rarely
   2. Occasionally
   3. Quite often
   4. Very often

6. Would you say that you often seem to ignore the opinions of other students when trying to accomplish something that is important to you?
   1. No, never
   2. Rarely
   3. Occasionally
   4. Yes, quite frequently

7. Do you generally like to do things in your own way and without regard for what other students around you may think?
   1. Definitely no
   2. No, not usually
   3. Yes, most of the time
   4. Definitely yes

8. Do you generally consult with close friends while you are in the process of making some fairly important decision?
   1. Almost always
   2. Usually I do
   3. Seldom
   4. Almost never

9. Could you become so absorbed in some kind of activity that you would lose interest in what your good friends were doing?
   1. Definitely not; impossible
   2. Extremely unlikely
   3. Some probability
   4. Quite or very possible
10. Before you do something, do you try to consider how your friends will react to it?

1. Yes, I always do
2. Yes, I usually do
3. Sometimes I do
4. No, usually not

Scale 9. Liberalism (L)

1. Do you consider your political point of view to be generally:

1. Quite conservative
2. Fairly conservative
3. Fairly liberal
4. Very liberal

2. Would you agree that the government should have the right to prohibit certain groups of persons who disagree with our form of government from holding peaceable public meetings?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

3. Do you agree that police are unduly hampered in their efforts to apprehend criminals when they have to have a warrant to search a house?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

4. Do you agree or disagree with the belief that capital punishment (the death penalty) should be abolished?

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree, but not strongly
3. Agree, but not strongly
4. Strongly agree

5. Would you agree or disagree that the government should do more than it is presently doing to see that everyone gets adequate medical care?
1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree, but not strongly
3. Agree, but not strongly
4. Strongly agree

6. Would you agree or disagree that legislative committees should not investigate the political beliefs of college or university faculty members?

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree, but not strongly
3. Agree, but not strongly
4. Strongly agree

7. Do you agree or disagree that labor unions these days are doing the country more harm than good?

1. Strongly agree (they are doing the country more harm than good)
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

8. Would you agree or disagree that conscientious objectors should be excused from military service in wartime?

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree, but not strongly
3. Agree, but not strongly
4. Strongly agree

9. Do you agree or disagree with the contention that the welfare state tends to destroy individual initiative?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree

10. Do you agree or disagree with the belief that individual liberties and justice under law are not possible in socialist countries?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree, but not strongly
3. Disagree, but not strongly
4. Strongly disagree
Scale 10. Social Conscience (SC)

1. Do you become indignant when you read that a high government official has taken money or gifts in return for favors?
   1. No
   2. Cannot say
   3. Mildly indignant
   4. Very indignant

2. How strongly do you feel that something must be done soon about the rising tide of juvenile crime in this country?
   1. I do not feel that the "problem" is as serious as the question makes it out to be
   2. I have not given this matter sufficient thought to say
   3. Fairly strongly
   4. Very strongly

3. Are you concerned about the extent to which economic poverty still exists in the United States (e.g., the fact that in 1964 about one-fifth of American families earned under $3000 a year)?
   1. In my opinion this is not a matter for concern
   2. I have not given this matter sufficient thought to say
   3. Mildly concerned
   4. Highly concerned

4. Are you concerned that persons who are not white-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant seem to have somewhat less opportunity in America?
   1. In my opinion this is a phony complaint or for other reason not a matter for concern
   2. I have not given this matter sufficient thought to say
   3. Mildly concerned
   4. Highly concerned

5. Are you disturbed about what appears to be a growing preoccupation with money and material possessions throughout this country accompanied by a declining concern for national aims, spiritual values, and other moral considerations?
   1. No, or the assumption made in this question is mistaken
   2. Cannot say
3. Mildly disturbed
4. Very much disturbed

6. Are you concerned with the many elderly people in the U. S. who are left alone to live "on crumbs of welfare measures"?

1. In my opinion this is a phony problem or for other reason not a matter for concern
2. I have not given this matter sufficient thought to say
3. Mildly concerned
4. Strongly agree

7. Would you be upset at the sight of children looking at obscene printed material at a magazine stand (or elsewhere)?

1. No
2. Cannot say
3. Mildly upset
4. Very much upset

8. Do you feel that the decision to drop an atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima was right or wrong?

1. Strongly feel that the decision was right
2. I think that the decision was right, but my feelings on this matter are not strong
3. I think that the decision was wrong, but my feelings are not strong
4. Strongly feel that the decision was wrong

9. Are you disturbed when you hear of confessions of extensive rigging of bids or rigging or "administering" of prices in some essential industry in the U. S.?

1. I am not disturbed by these activities
2. Don't really understand what is involved
3. Mildly disturbed
4. Greatly disturbed

10. How would you feel (or have you felt) when first hearing about a lynching somewhere in the United States (which happened as recently as 1959—to a man named Parker)?

1. Indifferent, or my reaction would depend on who was lynched
2. I'm not certain
3. Mildly shocked
4. Highly outraged
Scale 11. Cultural Sophistication (CS)

1. Would you (or do you) enjoy participating in, or listening to, a discussion of philosophies of history?
   1. I definitely would not
   2. I probably would not
   3. I probably would
   4. I definitely would

2. How frequently do you discuss foreign films with your acquaintances?
   1. Never
   2. Rarely
   3. Occasionally
   4. Quite frequently

3. How interested are you in modern art?
   1. No interest whatsoever
   2. Slightly interested
   3. Quite interested
   4. Very much interested

4. How many of the following have you read: Joyce, Tolstoy, Mann?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three

5. How much pleasure do you usually experience when listening to good live performances of classical music?
   1. None or very little
   2. A moderate amount
   3. Quite a bit
   4. A great deal

6. Do you enjoy reading poetry?
   1. No, I dislike poetry
   2. Not very much
   3. Yes, to some extent
   4. Yes, very much
7. How much would you say you know about the history of painting?
   1. Almost nothing
   2. A small amount
   3. A moderate amount
   4. A good deal

8. How many times during the past year or so have you gone to an evening lecture on some serious topic (other than required lectures)?
   1. Not at all
   2. Once or twice
   3. Three or four times
   4. Five or more times

9. How many books do you yourself own (not including textbooks for your present courses, but counting serious paperbacks)?
   1. Less than ten
   2. Ten to 30
   3. 31 to 75
   4. More than 75

10. Can you say that in the past year or so you have reacted to some work of art (e.g., a painting, sculpture, musical performance) with deep and intense personal feeling?
    1. No
    2. I don't think so
    3. Yes, several times
    4. Yes, quite a number of times

Scale 12. Motivation for Grades (MG)

1. During your secondary school years did you receive any honors or awards for scholarly achievement?
   1. No
   2. Yes, one or two
   3. Yes, three or four
   4. Five or more

2. Did most of your high school teachers probably think of you as one of their hardest workers even though not necessarily one of the brightest?
1. Definitely not
2. No, by and large
3. Yes, by and large
4. Definitely yes

3. Did other interests (sports, extracurricular activities, or hobbies) prevent you from obtaining an excellent rating or mark for effort in your high school work?

   1. Fairly often
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never, or almost never

4. Compared with most of your classmates, how much would you say you studied during your senior year in high school?

   1. I studied much less than most of my classmates
   2. I studied slightly less than most of them
   3. I studied slightly more than most of them
   4. I studied much more than most of my classmates

5. Do you think your fellow students in high school thought of you as a hard worker?

   1. Definitely not
   2. Generally not
   3. Generally yes
   4. Definitely yes

6. Did you try harder to get on (and stay on) the honor roll or merit list than the average student in your high school class?

   1. Definitely not
   2. Usually not
   3. Usually yes
   4. Definitely yes

7. Do you tend to give up or delay on uninteresting assignments?

   1. Fairly often
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never, or almost never

8. In terms of your own personal satisfaction, how much importance do you attach to getting good grades?

   1. None or not much
   2. A moderate amount
3. Quite a bit
4. A great deal

9. Did you regard yourself as a more consistent and harder worker in your classroom assignments than the typical student in your high school classes?

1. Definitely not
2. Generally not
3. Generally yes
4. Definitely yes

10. How well do you feel you learned how to study in high school?

1. Didn't learn to study at all
2. I learned relatively little about how to study
3. I learned fairly well
4. I learned very well

Scale 13. Family Social Status (FS)

1. Which of the following categories comes closest to your father's occupation? If your father is retired, deceased, or unemployed, indicate his former or customary occupation. (Mark only one)

1. Unskilled worker, laborer, farm worker
2. Semiskilled worker (e.g., machine operator)
3. Service worker (policeman, fireman, barber, military noncommissioned officer, etc.)
4. Skilled worker or craftsman (carpenter, electrician, plumber, etc.)
5. Salesman, bookkeeper, secretary, office worker, etc.
6. Owner, manager, partner of a small business; lower level governmental official; military commissioned officer
7. Profession requiring a bachelor's degree (engineer, elementary or secondary teacher, etc.)
8. Owner, high-level executive—large business or high-level government agency
9. Professional requiring an advanced college degree (doctor, lawyer, college professor, etc.)

2. What is your best estimate of the total income last year of your parental family (not your own family if you are married)? Consider annual income from all sources before taxes.
1. Less than $4,000
2. $4,000 to $5,999
3. $6,000 to $7,999
4. $8,000 to $9,999
5. $10,000 to $13,999
6. $14,000 to $19,999
7. $20,000 to $25,999
8. $26,000 to $31,999
9. Over $32,000

3. How much formal education does (did) your father have? Indicate only the highest level (i.e., mark only one of the nine alternatives).

1. No formal schooling or some grade school only
2. Finished grade school
3. Some high (secondary) school
4. Finished high school
5. Business or trade school
6. Some college
7. Finished college (four years)
8. Attended graduate or professional school (e.g., law or medical school) but did not attain a graduate or professional degree
9. Attained a graduate or professional degree (e.g., MA, PhD, MD)

4. Indicate the extent of your mother's formal education. Use the alternatives in the preceding question. (Mark only one)

5. Which of the categories below comes closest to describing the nationality or ethnic background of your father's ancestors?

1. Native African
2. Native Indian of North or South America
3. Asian
4. Eastern European (Russian, Polish, Hungarian, etc.)
5. Southern European (Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Greek, etc.)
6. French or Belgian
7. Central European (German, Dutch, Swiss, etc.)
8. Scandinavian (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, etc.)
9. British Isles (English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh)
APPENDIX C

SELF DESCRIPTION OF PHILOSOPHY OF HIGHER EDUCATION (PHI)

On every college or university campus students hold a variety of attitudes about their own purposes and goals while at college. Such an attitude might be thought of as a personal philosophy of higher education. Below are descriptive statements of four such "personal philosophies" which there is reason to believe are quite prevalent on American college campuses. As you read the four statements, attempt to determine how close each comes to your own philosophy of higher education.

**Philosophy A:** This philosophy emphasizes education essentially as preparation for an occupational future. Social or purely intellectual phases of campus life are relatively less important, although certainly not ignored. Concern with extracurricular activities and college traditions is relatively small. Persons holding this philosophy are usually quite committed to particular fields of study and are in college primarily to obtain training for careers in their chosen fields.

**Philosophy B:** This philosophy, while it does not ignore career preparation, assigns greatest importance to scholarly pursuit of knowledge and understanding wherever the pursuit may lead. This philosophy entails serious involvement in course work or independent study beyond the minimum required. Social life and organized extracurricular activities are relatively unimportant. Thus, while other aspects of college life are not to be forsaken, this philosophy attaches greatest importance to interest in ideas, pursuit of knowledge, and cultivation of the intellect.
Philosophy C: This philosophy holds that besides occupational training and/or scholarly endeavor an important part of college life exists outside the classroom, laboratory, and library. Extracurricular activities, living-group functions, athletics, social life, rewarding friendships, and loyalty to college traditions are important elements in one's college experience and necessary to the cultivation of the well-rounded person. Thus, while not excluding academic activities, this philosophy emphasizes the importance of the extracurricular side of college life.

Philosophy D: This is a philosophy held by the student who either consciously rejects commonly held value orientations in favor of his own, or who has not really decided what is to be valued and is in a sense searching for meaning in life. There is often deep involvement with ideas and art forms both in the classroom and in sources (often highly original and individualistic) in the wider society. There is little interest in business or professional careers; in fact, there may be a definite rejection of this kind of aspiration. Many facets of the college—organized extracurricular activities, athletics, traditions, the college administration—are ignored or viewed with disdain. In short, this philosophy may emphasize individualistic interests and styles, concern for personal identity and, often, contempt for many aspects of organized society.

The following four questions ask you to rank these four statements according to the accuracy with which each portrays your own point of view. Be sure to assign a different rank to each "philosophy."

1. Philosophy A:

1. Most accurate (i.e., of the four statements, this one is the best description of my point of view)
2. Second most accurate
3. Third most accurate
4. Least accurate
2. Philosophy B:

1. Most accurate (i.e., of the four statements, this one is the best description of my point of view)
2. Second most accurate
3. Third most accurate
4. Least accurate

3. Philosophy C:

1. Most accurate (i.e., of the four statements, this one is the best description of my point of view)
2. Second most accurate
3. Third most accurate
4. Least accurate

4. Philosophy D:

1. Most accurate (i.e., of the four statements, this one is the best description of my point of view)
2. Second most accurate
3. Third most accurate
4. Least accurate
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