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The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of students and student affairs personnel of student affairs services at Andrews University’s main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

A modified questionnaire, based on the work of Selgas and Blocker (1974) and Glenister (1977), was developed for this study. Eleven student services found in the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Program’s guidelines were included.

A random sample of 280 students at Andrews University received surveys, with 165 (59%) responding. The 30 full-time student affairs personnel also received surveys, with 20 (67%) responding.

Students and student affairs personnel rated their perceptions of student services, using 77 statements associated with these services. Services were rated on a 6-point scale in the categories of status of knowledge, relative importance, and effectiveness. Respondents were asked to include additional comments concerning the services and to provide biographical data.
The following are some of the main findings:

Significant differences between students' and student affairs personnel's status of knowledge of student services were found in career planning/employment, commuter programs/services, counseling services/substance abuse education, religious programs/services, student activities, and wellness/health.

Significant differences between the two groups' perceptions of relative importance of student services were found in counseling services/substance abuse education, housing/residential life programs, international student/multicultural services, religious programs/services, student activities, and wellness/health.

Significant differences between the two groups' perceptions of the effectiveness of student services were found in counseling services/substance abuse education, minority student programs/services, religious programs/services, services for students with disabilities, student activities, and wellness/health.

Important information for the improvement of student services has resulted from this study, which provides student insights about student services that go beyond those of the current student affairs personnel. The study also provides a program-evaluation model unique to Andrews University for periodic assessment of the status and progress of student affairs services.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The assessment of educational outcomes resulting from the collegiate or higher education experience is an area that continues to receive significant attention from student affairs professionals in the 1990s (Braxton, Smart, & Thieke, 1991). McDade (1989) stated that, as institutions of higher education attempt to increase their visibility and educational accountability through learning outcomes assessment, job placement of graduates, support of alumni, and endorsement of the community, they realize that efforts must be intensified to improve the quality of learning environments for students already admitted in the colleges or universities, to attract and retain new student groups, and to integrate these students into the academy. According to Upcraft and Barr (1990), the 1970s and 1980s brought an abundance of retention and developmental research, which showed a relationship between student participation in the student services and programs and students' academic and personal development. The presumed benefits of student affairs programs are no longer acts of faith; they are clearly demonstrated outcomes of retention and developmental research.

Miller, Eddy, and Associates (1983) stated that student development is crucial to college student recruitment. O'Brien (1989) wrote that student affairs programs
provide services conducive to the learning environment at institutions of higher education. According to the University of North Texas' Division of Student Affairs (1990), the student affairs program provides a support system to help students stay in school and is also a resource for enhancing personal development. Garland (1985) noted that recognition of the importance of the student affairs program to institutional vitality is growing and that student affairs administrators should assume leadership in formulating and managing institutional responses to changing conditions.

Kitchener (1982) wrote that development and outcomes are a "goal, if not the most important goal for student services" (p. 17). According to T. K. Miller (1982), the primary responsibility of student affairs programs and services is to assist students in their personal growth, social development, and education. "Assessment is the glue that holds the development process together" (p. 11).

Braxton et al. (1991) observed that the student affairs profession traces its concern for student outcomes back to the American colonial colleges. Institutions have always believed that a goal of the college experience is to have an impact on students in more meaningful ways than simply the passing on of facts and intellectual capacities.

O'Brien (1989) stated that the purposes of higher education are clearly multifaceted. If individuals are to profit from the college experience, they must be exposed to ideas that communicate to them the tradition, the history, and the possibilities of the world in which men and women live. But they must also be aware of those educational goals that help them compete and perform in the world of work. Creamer and Shelton (1988) pointed out that the goal of higher education is to foster
total student development in intellectual, aesthetic, physical, and spiritual qualities and also in interpersonal relations and cultural awareness. Non-intellectual dimensions of development need to be integrated with traditional academic intellectual dimensions. Stamatakos and Stamatakos (1980) indicated that "expedient and insidious competitiveness, rampant privatism called 'personal freedom,' and increased tolerance for all but the most heinous felonies have replaced the colleges' and universities' traditional moralism" (p. 58).

Blimling (1990) suggested that colleges and universities should reaffirm their commitment to character development and that student personnel administrators should take the lead by designing programs that facilitate this development. Mortimer et al. (1984) stated that the student affairs profession traditionally has prided itself on the development of the total student. Other educators have been convinced that learning takes place both in the classroom and in out-of-class activities. Therefore, higher education in America should be broadened and deepened so as to provide increased opportunity for the intellectual, cultural, and personal growth of all citizens.

Eddy (1983) developed a model known as the Wholistic Approach to College Student Development. The model focuses on the theory that creative and effective interaction with students will enhance progress toward the improvement of students' cognitive and affective development. The theory is expressed through the following formula:
Murray and Apilado (1989) indicated that the Wellness Model presented by Hettler (1980) provides a broad and inclusive paradigm for nearly all student services areas by focusing on six dimensions of human development: the social, occupational, spiritual, physical, intellectual, and emotional. This model provides a systematic approach for addressing students' needs in all areas of adjustment to college or university life.

Meeting students' needs encompasses much of what the student affairs staff does; therefore, needs should be assessed periodically for staff to determine how best to serve their clientele. Indeed, the importance of assessing students' needs before designing interventions has been underscored many times (Kuh, 1982). Brown (1985a) suggested several steps that should be followed by all professional educators:

1. The current developmental status of all students should be assessed and their developmental needs diagnosed.
2. The students should be helped and counseled to determine appropriate goals and experiences for themselves.
3. Programs should be designed and implemented to foster the desired development.
4. Each student's developmental progress should be evaluated.
5. This attainment should be recorded.
According to Braxton et al. (1991), knowledge in each of these areas would aid the task of encouraging student development. It would allow student affairs professionals to identify the current developmental levels of students, and it would facilitate development of relevant strategies to encourage change in desired directions. Institutions must also be able to identify the particular resources and opportunities they can provide for their students in order to facilitate optimal development.

Hanson (1982a) outlined four important uses of outcome-assessment data: (a) describing the student body so that baseline data for the change process can be established; (b) monitoring the developmental progress of students to begin to identify the ways students change in relation to programmatic efforts; (c) planning for the delivery of services and designing the institutional curriculum by combining both service descriptive data and data on student progress; and (d) evaluating the effects of the educational efforts on the student by examining the effects of specifically designed programs on given changes in measured student development.

O'Banion (1989) cited one of the more recent offerings proposed by the Dallas County Community Colleges in 1983 as having a strong developmental core; it was suggested that adult developmental theories be used to carry out all the basic functions of their programs. O'Banion also proposed the need for a shift in student services to a new "value base," to encourage support for rules and regulations and also to direct institutional assistance to students in the selection of their individual directions.

Carroll and Tarasuk (1991) indicated that the development process of the 1990s will emphasize what O'Banion (1989) calls "quality reformation," in which
expectations from students will be increased and more controls and structure will be provided by the institution, including "assessment and placement, general education curricula, attendance policies, F grades, and policies of suspension and probation" (p. 32). Therefore, there appears to be a change from a more student-centered to a more institution-centered model.

Kimmel (1986), according to the promotion and the achievement of both the quality and the quantity of student personal growth, development, and education are not simple tasks when funding for both public and private higher education is enrollment driven and most institutions show little or no projected increase in enrollment. The resources are not available.

The professional development of student affairs personnel is necessary and crucial to the successful implementation of programs developed and services rendered in the student affairs profession. Creamer and Shelton (1988) indicated that both pre- and in-service education of student affairs personnel will facilitate institutional and staff effectiveness. It is a seemingly logical assumption that an institution will be only as effective as its staff members. In recognizing that the development of both personal and professional aspects of the student affairs staff is important to its effectiveness, student affairs professionals remain true to their profession's guiding principles. In addition, the preservice preparation of entering professionals in the concept of human development theory and the fostering of an attitude of lifelong learning will enhance the continued effectiveness of staff development for all those in the student affairs profession.
Shaffer (1984) and Woodard and Komives (1990) stated that systematic professional development programs and continuous assessment and evaluation of available student development programs and services can greatly enhance the effectiveness of the student affairs profession in meeting students' personal, social, and educational needs. According to the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student/Development Programs (1986a), there must be systematic, regular research and evaluation of the overall institutional student services and development programs and of each functional area to determine whether the educational goals and the needs of students are being met. Although methods of evaluation vary, they should utilize both quantitative and qualitative measures. Data collected should include responses from students and other significant constituencies. Results of these regular evaluations should be used in revising and improving the program goals and implementation.

According to Miller (1986), surveys to determine students' needs or interests and, especially, their perceptions of services and programs can generate much information to be used in enhancing service and expansion. Thurman and Manley (1989) noted that it is important to survey perceptions of the importance and effectiveness of student services. Students, as the major consumers of services, and student affairs personnel, as the developers and implementors of programs and services, should be included in the evaluation process. The student affairs personnel at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan, have the responsibility for organizing and implementing a variety of student programs and services to facilitate the educational and personal-social development of student enrolled at the university. This
study attempts to survey the perceptions of student affairs services held by students and student affairs personnel at Andrews University.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in the study was to identify perceptions students and student affairs personnel held toward student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purposes of the study were the following:

1. To identify and compare perceptions that students and student affairs personnel had concerning student affairs services at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

2. To obtain narrative information from students and student affairs personnel that could be used to evaluate student affairs services on Andrews University's main campus.

Research Questions

The study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the status of knowledge of student affairs services as demonstrated by students?

2. What is the status of knowledge of student affairs services as demonstrated by student affairs personnel?
3. What is the relative importance of student affairs services as reported by students?

4. What is the relative importance of student affairs services as reported by student affairs personnel?

5. How effective are student affairs services as perceived by students?

6. How effective are student affairs services as perceived by student affairs personnel?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between students' and student affairs personnel's perceptions of the status of knowledge of student services and/or programs at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

2. There is no significant difference between students' and student affairs personnel's perceptions of the relative importance of student services and/or programs at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

3. There is no significant difference between students' and student affairs personnel's perceptions of the effectiveness of student services and/or programs at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Significance of the Study

Mines, Gressard, and Daniels (1982) observed that the student services practitioner is faced with a growing demand for accountability through evaluation.
Student services professionals of the 1980s and future decades are faced with the prospect of shrinking budgets, declining enrollments, and an increasing need to demonstrate the effectiveness and utility of their programs for the sake of survival. Satryb (1974) noted that it was once possible to justify student services expenditures on the basis of the invisible return of the services being provided. Higher education has entered a period of fiscal austerity; "invisible returns" are no longer acceptable, and the student services professional must demonstrate accountability through evaluation.

Whereas budgetary problems have contributed to a decline in services because of rising costs and heavily taxed educational dollars, budgetary problems alone do not explain the lack of support for student development programs. Shaffer (1984) and Dannels (1988) identified numerous forces influencing higher education and student affairs, including the arrival of a great diversity of students at a time when the profession (student affairs) was examining its basic assumptions, beliefs, and practices for traditional students during more stable times. Students, the public, the faculty, and some administrative colleagues are questioning the value, or even desirability, of some of the traditional practices and contributions of student affairs services. The work of the student affairs profession is also influenced by a common feeling that most colleges and universities have not been doing and cannot do much about values, desirable lifestyles, life goals, student morale, leadership-skill development, and rewarding behavior patterns.

Another characteristic of contemporary society is that of extensive job and career dislocation and discontinuity. Factories close, offices move, businesses are
bought out, and new technology makes traditional jobs and careers less promising, if not actually obsolete. These events not only create new demands for student services, but also stimulate intense emotions about the future and about educational and vocational planning. Another force that is changing the nature of student affairs is the legalistic relationship with students that emphasizes a seller-consumer posture or, at best, a contractual agreement to provide certain services for an agreed-upon cost and effort. Adulthood for 18-year-olds, the Buckley Privacy Amendments, applications of contract theory to education, and the growth of superficial consumerism are all forces that, if carried to the extreme, infringe on the quality of education. The best education is not prescriptive or contractual; it is a cooperative endeavor based on respect and trust between teacher/educator and learner/student and directed at the progressive ability for self-directed growth in each individual.

Sandeen and Rhatigan (1990) identified some of the most critical social issues that will have particular influence on higher education and student affairs in the 1990s and broadly classified them as ethnic issues, questions of safety and security, health issues, substance abuse, and national political and economic forces.

According to Miller (1986), identifying and serving the needs of both residential and commuter students are challenging tasks to smaller institutions, particularly those that historically have been primarily residential. Small institutions are individually unique. Their uniqueness is often driven from church support or affiliations. The mission and goals of such institutions are as varied as the churches and denominations providing their support. Many smaller institutions are also unique because of their
locations in urban or rural settings. Unlike larger institutions, smaller ones cannot
easily dominate the atmosphere and environment of the community in which they are
placed, and, therefore, they absorb the flavor of their surroundings. Many smaller
institutions are special as a result of their curricular offerings, often focusing on the
liberal arts and sciences or on technical education. They do not generally offer the
same range of courses of study as larger institutions. A primary area of uniqueness is
that smaller institutions generally claim to provide personalized services, with the
ability to attend to the needs and interests of individual students. Classes are generally
smaller, and more favorable faculty-to-student ratios are touted.

As smaller institutions struggle to maintain enrollments, many attempt to recruit
a broader range of students, including those who cannot or who are not likely to choose
to reside on campus. A more difficult task than recruitment is retention of students
who are different from the traditional student population. The most difficult challenge
to which the smaller institution must rise is to retain its unique character and
personalized service while accommodating a more diverse and less accessible student
body.

Murray and Apilado (1989) observed that student personnel professionals in
small colleges and universities are continually faced with the challenge of maintaining a
high level of quality in their programs while remaining within the constraints imposed
by limited financial aid and human resources.

Obviously, additional forces and trends affect higher education. In short, the
complex nature of the problems facing society is reflected in both small and large
institutions of higher learning and amply demonstrates the difficulties facing the student affairs profession. These problems must be systematically confronted with staff development programs and continuous assessment and evaluation.

Considering the ever-increasing institutional focus on enhancing students' educational outcomes, the role of student affairs professionals takes on an even greater significance. According to Braxton et al. (1991), outcomes assessment methodology and the resulting information generated by these assessments will provide student affairs professionals with critical data to develop and direct their programs. At the departmental level, outcome measures will be important to the basic survival of the student affairs division. With budgets that are stable or declining, competition for scarce resources is increasing. Outside of the basic services such as admission, food services, housing, and maintenance, student affairs programs generally exist to provide opportunities for students to grow and mature. One way to measure the effectiveness of these programs is to compare them to outcome measures of the student body. Furthermore, comparisons among peer institutions may provide a relative measure of strength or weakness of a student affairs program.

Braxton et al. (1991) also observed that the virtual neglect of the systematic comparison of institutions based on outcomes measures is especially unfortunate given the 1990s concerns about the quality of undergraduate and graduate education reflected in a number of national reports, such as the National Institute of Education's (1984) Involvement in Learning and Integrity in the College Curriculum (Association of American Colleges, 1985).
Hanson (1990) stated that the future of the student affairs profession depends on researchers and practitioners working in a symbiotic relationship to help students. The strength of the profession will be judged by how well practitioners use information about student growth and development to guide and shape their educational interventions. In the future, the judgment will be made, not only by knowledgeable professionals within higher education, but increasingly also by those outside higher education. The importance of showing that student affairs professionals know when, how, and under what conditions students learn will be superseded only by the importance of knowing that professionals use such information to improve student educational, personal, and social development. Helping students know themselves, improving professional practice, and being accountable to an external public all constitute the new research agenda.

Definition of Terms

The terms in the study were used as follows:

**Student Affairs Services**: Individual and group services sponsored by Andrews University to facilitate students' educational and personal-social development. The following terms are used interchangeably in this study: student services and/or program areas, and functions. The study focused on some of the following services: career planning and placement/student employment; commuter student programs and services; counseling services; substance-abuse education; services for students with disabilities; housing and residential life programs (men and women); international
student/multicultural services; minority student programs and services; recreational sports; religious programs and services; student activities; and student wellness and health.

**Perception:** The process by which individuals, through any of their five senses, become aware of any given meaning to their environment (Stembridge, 1983). Glenister (1977) wrote that perceptions of student affairs services refer to the awareness or understanding of an individual that reflects his or her personal attitudes, feelings, or opinions that may be related to personal experiences, knowledge of, or association with the services intended to be studied.

**Character:** That which constitutes understanding of what is right and acting on what is right (Blimling, 1990).

**Andrews University:** An institution of higher education owned and operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The university is located about two miles north of Berrien Springs, Michigan.

**Seventh-day Adventist Church:** The church organization that worships on Saturday (Sabbath), the seventh day of the week. It is sometimes abbreviated S.D.A. Church. The Seventh-day Adventist Church is a worldwide Christian denomination which, among other functions, operates parochial schools, colleges, and universities (Blanton, 1981).

**Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists:** A group of local conferences that serves the Seventh-day Adventist Church membership in the states of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin (Blanton, 1981). Lake Union Conference,
sometimes abbreviated LUC, was organized in 1901. The headquarters is at 125 College Avenue, Berrien Springs, Michigan (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976).

General Conference: The highest administrative body of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Headquartered in Washington, DC, the major function of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is to coordinate the worldwide work of the Seventh-day Adventists (Stembridge, 1983). The General Conference Committee is the highest ranking committee of the church. When in session, it votes the guiding policies of the church (Beardsell, 1983).

Full-time Student: Any student who was enrolled for 12 credit hours or more (undergraduate); 9 credit hours or more (Master of Divinity); or 8 credit hours or more (graduate) at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, in the 1991-92 autumn quarter was considered a full-time student.

Student Affairs Personnel Member: A person employed by Andrews University, Berrien Springs, to provide services for students who fall within the province of student affairs services as previously stated. The following terms are used interchangeably in this study: student personnel, staff, and student affairs practitioner.

Limitations of the Study

There were two major limitations in the study. First, the sample for the study was from the main campus of Andrews University at Berrien Springs, Michigan, and any inferences or generalizations concerning the student and personnel perceptions of
student affairs services may not apply to any other extension or affiliated campuses of the university or to other institutions of higher education. Second, not all possible fields or functions of student affairs services were included in the study. The study was restricted to fields of student affairs services that were under the jurisdiction of Andrews University Division of Student Affairs and excluded some fields such as admission and records, recruitment of students, and financial aid services. Judicial programs and services, research and evaluation, and student orientation services programs were not investigated in the study.

The student affairs services not investigated in this study are young and have undergone numerous changes in the 1990s. These student services and/or programs have only recently been shaped into a centralized service. These services are performed without benefit of a separate department or budget. These student services are listed as part of student affairs although they operate either independently or within an academic area rather than as student affairs (Criterion Report for Student Affairs, 1989). Judicial programs and research/evaluation are operated within the students affairs division's administrative offices (Andrews University Self-study Report, 1989). This was the rationale for not including such student services and/or program areas in the study.

**Delimitations of the Study**

1. The study was limited to a random sample of 280 full-time students who were enrolled at Andrews University during the autumn quarter of 1991-92 and who
had previously spent at least one regular quarter at the university. The sample was selected from the list of full-time students enrolled at Andrews during the autumn quarter of 1991-92. The names were obtained from the resident assistants who worked in the individual university housing units (dormitories and apartments). Full-time students who were commuters were chosen during an 8-hour period in the university's Campus Center; every 10th full-time student who walked into the building facility was selected and invited to participate in the study.

2. All the 30 full-time student affairs personnel employed by Andrews University for the autumn quarter who had worked at least one previous quarter as employees of the Division of Student Affairs were included in the study. The list of the departments in which those full-time employees worked was obtained from the Secretary/Office Manager for Student Affairs.

3. The student affairs services analyzed in the study were limited to services determined to be offered and administered by the Division of Student Affairs and had existed for a period of at least 3 months.

Basic Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were basic to the study:

1. The perceptions of students and student affairs personnel of student affairs services could be measured with the use of a questionnaire.
2. Students attending Andrews University and student affairs personnel employed by the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University had the opportunity to participate and form perceptions and opinions related to student affairs activities.

3. The responses of students and student affairs personnel to the survey instruments used for the study reflect the perceptions concerning student affairs services at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Characteristics of Andrews University

The following summary of the literature review included (a) the background of Andrews University, (b) the philosophy of the university, (c) the mission of the university and student affairs, (d) the need for personnel development, and (e) the need for evaluation of student affairs services.

Background of Andrews University

Andrews University is the oldest and largest university of the Seventh-day Adventist Church worldwide. The university is regarded as the "mother university" of the denomination. Connelly (1989) stated that Andrews University is unique in having a lifestyle approach, such as including vegetarian-only foods in its food services, and the Criterion Report for Student Affairs (1989) observed that Andrews University provides an environment that is free of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs.

According to the Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989), the university is a Christian institution, with religious educational purposes in harmony with Seventh-day Adventist beliefs; for example, all regular faculty and staff are Seventh-day
Adventist church members in good standing. The university strives to maintain a campus environment favorable to nurturing values and lifestyle choices that the church endorses. A philosophy of education and life, reflected in the mission of the university, is sought throughout the curriculum and campus experiences. Attendance at selected religious services is expected of all full-time undergraduate students, and the campus code includes abstinence from all addictive drugs, including alcohol and tobacco, and conservative social behavior. Non-Seventh-day Adventist students who are willing to live in harmony with the university policies are welcomed and comprise 11.7% of the total student body.

The Andrews University Self-Study Report (1979) noted that two factors in particular characterize the student cultural picture. One of these points to homogeneity, the other toward diversity. The first of these is that, to a very large degree, the students are members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (92%). A high percentage of these students come from parochial schools of the same denomination, which means that they share, in general, a common philosophical, religious, and to a considerable extent, cultural heritage. This causes a homogeneity in financial background, extracurricular interests, vocational preferences, and college and graduate-study goals. The students are strongly service oriented, particularly toward teaching, the ministry, and the medical profession.

Against these factors of homogeneity stands the unusual number of international students on the campus whose presence provides diversity within the institution.
During the 1978-79 school year, 15.6 percent of the student population came from 61 countries other than the United States.

The Chronicle of Higher Education (Fact-File, 1988) shows that, at 16.3%, Andrews' foreign student enrollment was the ninth highest nationally for schools with enrollments of more than 2,000. The Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989) noted that the number of different countries represented in the 1987-88 school year was 89 and that Andrews was involved in offering degrees in affiliated colleges in 11 countries. The Seventh-day Adventist denomination has 85 colleges and universities in 38 countries worldwide.

Moon (1988) reported that, with 89 different countries represented in the 1987-88 enrollment, Andrews University led many other U.S. institutions in diversity. The graduate student population had the highest percentage of international students, with 40.2% in 1986-87. Many married graduate students brought their families to the community; these families might also have needed special help in adjusting to a midwestern rural environment. Another 17.2% during the 1986-87 school year were African-Americans or Hispanics; most of these students came from distant states, many from urban centers. Some of these students may have found adapting to a small midwestern university challenging. Altogether, more than a third of the student body may have brought unique needs to the Andrews University campus.

According to the Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989), the university was founded and still operates as a church-owned institution of higher education. Andrews University is a leadership institution for the Seventh-day Adventist
educational system. It has the only theological seminary for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States and Canada, and it offers several advanced degrees in education and theology not available in other Seventh-day Adventist institutions. The university’s graduate programs prepare church administrators, clergy, and educators, as well as professionals in many fields.

The *Andrews University Self-Study Report* (1972) cited Andrews University and Loma Linda University as the apex of the church educational system in the United States, offering academic and professional programs through the doctoral level. Andrews University emphasizes the business, education, and theological interest of the church, and Loma Linda University emphasizes the health-related areas of church activity. Andrews University, through its business, education, and theology programs, has the wider impact on the world work of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This responsibility includes the training of personnel at Berrien Springs, providing research services for the church, giving guidance to developing institutions, and providing instructional services for continuing education and extension programs.

In some respects, this responsibility places Andrews University in a unique position. The privilege of leading a world system of education has enormous advantages, but it also poses serious educational problems. The university must be sensitive to these needs while keeping its own operations strong and progressive. The church is willing to provide support to Andrews University because of its world responsibilities in Adventist education.
During the past 15 years, at the request of the church's world leadership, Andrews University has extended its educational programs by affiliation with a number of Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher education outside the United States. Since 1957, it has also offered its courses and degrees by extension in a variety of sites both in the United States and abroad. The affiliation and extension programs permit many Seventh-day Adventists to obtain a recognized, high-quality tertiary or graduate education.

In order to achieve the stated objectives, the university utilizes consulting activities, extension courses and programs, various affiliation mechanisms, and appropriate resources of the cooperating institutions. The affiliation and extension programs are expected to be financially self-supporting.

According to Pierson and Coetzee (1989), the university has contractual agreements with 11 institutions outside the U.S., using three affiliation plans. Each agreement has been approved by the NCA and the respective State Department of Education in the U.S. During the 1987-88 school year, 1,241 undergraduate and 353 graduate (masters level) students were enrolled in the affiliated international degree programs, and degrees were awarded to 241 students (208 undergraduate, 33 graduate).

In addition, the university has offered course work toward graduate degrees at a variety of extension sites, using Andrews University's regular or adjunct faculty as instructors. These sites have usually been other Seventh-day Adventist college campuses or health-care institutions. In each case, the university has legal approval from the state as well as from the appropriate accrediting agency to offer such courses.
Among these programs are the following: (a) MS Nursing programs in California, Florida, Illinois, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, and four off-campus sites in Michigan; (b) MA in Pastoral Ministry in California, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington; and (c) D Min in California, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington.

A survey study conducted by Seltzer and Associates (1987) indicated that Andrews University was perceived by many Adventists as a catalyst for upward mobility, facilitating the development of a highly educated middle-class population within the church, whose major growth in North America is now among Hispanic and black populations. Against the backdrop of these unique characteristics and the challenges they present, Andrews University approached the 1990s. The university demonstrated its readiness for achievement of its mission in this decade.

Andrews University consists of five schools: the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Technology, the School of Business, the School of Education, and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. In addition, postbaccalaureate degrees offered by all five schools are supervised by the governing body known as the School of Graduate Studies (College of Technology 1988-89 Bulletin).

The beginning of Andrews University was in 1874 when the Seventh-day Adventist denomination founded Battle Creek College in Battle Creek, Michigan. The school moved to Berrien Springs in 1901 and was known as Emmanuel Missionary College. Accreditation was granted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in 1922. In 1959 the School of Graduate Studies and the Seventh-day
Adventist Theological Seminary transferred to the campus from Washington, DC. They were incorporated with the college in 1960 under one charter, as Andrews University (Andrews Profile, 1982).

According to the Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989), the name Andrews University honors John Nevins Andrews (1829-1883), pioneer Adventist theologian, editor, administrator, and the first official missionary sent by the denomination to serve outside North America. Andrews remains a fitting name for an institution that maintains a vision of service with excellence.

In 1974 the undergraduate division of the university was organized into two colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Technology. The College of Technology was established to consolidate the offerings in technical and job-oriented areas. The Department of Business Administration became the School of Business in July 1980, and houses both undergraduate and graduate studies in business administration. A similar reorganization in July 1983 led to the inauguration of the School of Education. In July 1987, the present reorganizational structure of the School of Graduate Studies was adopted, leaving each of the schools of the university with both undergraduate and graduate entities, except for the SDA Theological Seminary, which houses graduate programs only (College of Technology 1988-89 Bulletin, 1988).

The Philosophy of Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist educational philosophy has its basis in the writings of one of the founders of Andrews University, Ellen G. White (1952), whose classic work
entitled *Education* is relevant for today's educational concerns; three subsequent books have been compiled from her writings on education. White stressed the holistic philosophy of spiritual, mental, and physical development, concepts expressed in the words *spiritus, mens, and corpus,* which appear on the Andrews University seal.

The university regards these ideals as "difficult to attain, but a university must point its students toward them and although the ideal may not always be realized, man is better for having made the effort to reach them" (*Andrews University Self-Study Report*, 1972, pp. 39, 40). These ideals are always included in the university bulletins and are explained as follows:

**Spiritus**—striving for spiritual maturity. Nothing in life is of greater significance than the relationship between human beings and God, the creator and sustainer of life. The individual's behavior in concert with others has demonstrated the folly and tragedy of human existence without reference to God. Therefore, the University proclaims with boldness and vigor that no one can be truly educated without learning to love God and to serve Him.

**Mens**—striving for mental excellence. Learning takes place in various places—a classroom, a library, alone with book in hand, or in the great laboratory of nature. But wherever it happens, learning is the most exciting experience known to humanity. Nothing else can match the thrill of exploring the wisdom of the ages or discovering new truth. A knowledge of the past, the ability to communicate ideas with clarity and precision, the attitude of habitual inquiry, the discipline of orderly thought—these are the rewards of those who pursue knowledge. At Andrews University the pace of intellectual life is swift, rigorous, and challenging. Teachers expect to stretch minds by requiring long hours of thorough scholarship. But it takes more than superior teachers—complementing them must be eager learners. As students accept fully their responsibility to be interested in and curious about knowledge, excellence in mental development results. Then the joy of fulfillment spurs them on to even higher thresholds of achievement.
Corpus--striving for physical well-being. Mens sana in corpore sano—"a sound mind in a sound body" is an ideal as relevant today as it was two thousand years ago. Seventh-day Adventists believe that each man or woman is a unit and that concern for the physical aspect of his or her being is essential to both spiritual maturity and mental excellence. Part of learning how to live is learning to live temperately. Andrews University offers a balanced program of study, physical labor, rest, recreation, and sustenance. (College of Technology, 1989, pp. 2, 3)

Andrews University is of strategic importance to the Seventh-day Adventist Church educational system. The College of Technology 1989-90 Bulletin (1989) stated that the university is committed to equal educational and employment opportunities for men and women and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, weight, height, marital status, or handicap among its students or employees or among applicants for admission or employment.

The university offers a variety of programs leading to vocational certificates and associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. These programs are initiated and maintained, particularly at the graduate level, where sufficient need exists within the church. Along with emphasizing excellence in teaching, the university encourages research in order to enrich the learning process and to benefit the church and society at large (College of Technology, 1988). The university was organized because the denomination felt that it needed an institution of higher education that could be developed as a teaching, research, and service institution for the denomination (Andrews University Self-Study Report, 1979).

Andrews University supports and supplies a large number of the manpower needs of the programs and activities of the church. Staples (1986) wrote that the
leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church come to the university from many parts of the world to meet with one another and to compare notes and experiences. They seek solutions to mutual problems and discuss strategies and models for the future. Andrews University is a place where the Adventist Church does its thinking.

Lesher (1989) reported that, at Andrews University, measures of academic outcome in general education, alumni satisfaction, student satisfaction, and church employment are all highly positive. About half of the undergraduate alumni and 80% of the graduate alumni report employment by the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. Alumni are engaged in significant levels of service in their communities and their church. Globally, the university is preparing the present and future leadership of the church for their tasks. The university has made significant contributions to the field of higher education and to the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States, Canada, the West Indies, Latin America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world through the students who come to acquire education and training at the university (Andrews University Self-Study Report, 1989). Different races and nationalities abound at the university. Students from the United States, Canada, Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia, Latin America, New Zealand, and other parts of the world are attracted to the school. Andrews University is coeducational and has a yearly student population of more than 3,000 (American Universities and Colleges, 1987). The university is located 20 miles north of South Bend, Indiana (Doughty, 1990). Andrews University has a campus of approximately 1,600 acres, which provides a spacious
setting for the development of a modern university (College of Technology 1988-89 Bulletin).

According to the Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989), the university is divided into four major areas of concentration: (a) the Division of Academic Administration, (b) the Division of Advancement and Development, (c) the Division of Student Affairs, and (d) the Division of Financial Administration. Each area is chaired by a vice-president. The focus of this study is student affairs services. Eleven areas are included; they are as follows, in alphabetical order:

1. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
2. Commuter Student Programs and Services
3. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
4. Housing and Residential Life Programs (men and women)
5. International Student/Multicultural Services
6. Minority Student Programs and Services
7. Recreational Sports
8. Religious Programs and Services
9. Services For Students With Disabilities
10. Student Activities
11. Student Wellness and Health

According to the Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989) and the Criterion Report for Student Affairs (1989), several of the services listed earlier are longstanding and have been evaluated, with some certified, in past years. Others are young and have undergone numerous changes within this decade. Some have only recently been shaped into a centralized service. Others are services performed without benefit of a separate department or budget. Two others are listed as part of student affairs although they operate either independently or within an academic area rather than within student affairs.
Mission of the University and Student Affairs

According to the Criterion Report for Student Affairs (1989), because of spiritual understanding, Seventh-day Adventists believe that the work of education and the work of redemption are one. The restoration of man in the image of his Maker is an educational process (Criterion Report, 1989).

Andrews University was established to provide a quality education in the arts and sciences and in technology, pre-professional, and professional education. Among the important functions of a university are academic achievement, intellectualism, and material pursuits, but the ultimate mission of Andrews University is to educate for eternity. As this is done, lifestyle choices and caring communication will reveal this philosophy. Objectives will speak to the understanding and appreciation of the holistic and eternal nature of education. The aims and the objectives of Andrews University and the Division of Student Affairs are consistent in theory with that of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1987).

Student Affairs Services

Because of increasing demand for student affairs services, these services should be continually examined and updated. There is a need for personnel development, as well as adequate evaluation of existing programs.
Personnel Development

Continuous upgrading of personnel traditionally has been an expectation for all professions; however, many institutions of higher learning are faced with financial problems. This has prompted a call for accountability measures for both programs and personnel. Student affairs, especially, is being asked to justify its professional staffing patterns.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (1986a) noted that staff development is an essential activity if staff members are to remain current and effective in an educational setting. Staff-development activities include additional credit courses, seminars, professional conferences, and access to published research and opinion and to other relevant media. Professional, practicum, or intern student staff members should come from academic programs in counseling and guidance, student development, higher education administration, or comparable programs, and they should be appropriately supervised.

According to Creamer and Shelton (1988), literature in college student affairs journals is extensive on the topic of the development of professionals in the field. Most of this literature is not based on data, but, rather, on thoughtful comments by one or more practicing professionals. Taken together, there emerges a picture of regard for the quality of professional preparation and practice and a detailing of ideas about how to conduct staff development. No definitive study of preparation programs in student affairs is available.
Ostroth (1975); Miller and Carpenter (1980); Sandeen (1982); Brown (1985a); Winston and Dagley (1985); Winston, Miller, and Prince (1987); Beatty and Stamatakos (1990); and Woodard and Komives (1990) all emphasized the need to modify and strengthen both undergraduate and graduate college student personnel programs in order to prepare professionals to educate and serve students of the future. Woodard and Komives (1990) stated that attention should be focused on issues such as the recruiting and retraining of professionals and other personnel in student affairs. They advocated continuing education and certification of professionals in the practice of student affairs, regardless of academic preparation.

Evaluation of Student Affairs Services

Concern for adequate evaluation of student services is not a new issue. Kuh (1979) noted that "few writers have offered specific concrete suggestions for applying existing strategies to student affairs evaluation problems, or for designing new, comprehensive evaluation strategies for use in student affairs" (p. 8). The student affairs profession in the 1990s and in the decades ahead will face the need for programs evaluation (Rentz & Saddlemire, 1988).

Articles and books written by prominent personnel workers such as Barr and Upcraft (1990); Brown (1985a); Carroll and Tarasuk (1991); Kuh (1979); O'Banion (1989); Rentz and Saddlemire (1988); Terrell (1989) and Thurman and Manley (1989) have indicated the need for evaluative studies in student affairs services and programs.
Bryan, Eddy, and Rentz (1980) pointed out that, for divisions of student affairs to be effective, it is necessary to assess student needs, to determine a plan of action to meet these needs, and to evaluate the effectiveness of any particular strategy. It is a process of collecting data about what has been accomplished concerning the results of the plans of action. The information collected would help the student affairs staff make appropriate decisions and provide necessary feedback to personnel.

Design of the Study

The design of the study included a review of literature pertaining to students' and student affairs personnel's perceptions of student affairs services. A questionnaire was given to 280 students and 30 student affairs personnel concerning their perceptions of student affairs services at Andrews University. A comparison was made between the two groups' responses.

Population and Sample

Approximately 2,800 full-time students were enrolled at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan, during the 1991-92 autumn quarter. The population was comprised of students who had been enrolled at the university for at least one previous regular quarter. A random sample of 280 students, which represented 10% of the full-time students, was asked to complete a questionnaire that provided evaluative data for the study. One hundred fifty students were needed to complete this study.

Each member of the full-time student affairs staff at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, was asked to complete a questionnaire. It was expected
that 30 student affairs personnel members would complete the questionnaire. The list of full-time students enrolled at the university for the quarter under study was obtained through personal visitation to Andrews University, as was a list of personnel employed by the Division of Student Affairs.

**Questionnaires**

The questionnaire, developed by Selgas and Blocker (1974), modified by Glenister (1977), and updated by the researcher was used to collect the data for the study. Also, personnel and student demographics were collected for the purpose of descriptive statistics only.

Data were not collected on student services and/or program areas that were not under the jurisdiction of the Division of Student Affairs Services at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. Those student affairs services included admissions, registration and records, and financial assistance. Other student services from Glenister's study (1977) were modified to include career planning and placement/student employment, counseling services and substance abuse, housing and residential life programs (men and women), and student wellness and health.

Student affairs services, such as commuter student programs and services, minority student programs and services, services for students with disabilities, religious programs and services, international student/multicultural services, student activities, and recreational sports were included in the study because they were under the
jurisdiction of the Division of Student Affairs Services at Andrews University. The study examined 11 student services whereas Glenister's 1977 study included only 7.

Eleven statements were selected and modified from Glenister's 1977 study to reflect the aims and objectives of the Division of Student Affairs services and programs at Andrews University. After having studied various questionnaires by other researchers that related to studies on student affairs and, after having studied many verbal and written suggestions given by experienced student affairs personnel at the University of North Texas, Denton, and graduate students knowledgeable in student affairs, the researcher constructed other statements and added them to the ones selected from the Glenister study, bringing the total to 77, which were used to assess or evaluate the 11 student services included in the study.

More specifically, he studied the questionnaires that were used by the following researchers in their studies: Rankin, 1966; Johnson, 1968; Cowins, 1974; Moyer, 1974; McIver, 1976; Pinsky, 1978; Goméz, 1979; Barnes, 1981; Byrts, 1983; Lin, 1987; Hocking, 1988; Albert, 1989; Lowe, 1989; Marron, 1989; Edwards, 1990; Piper, 1990; and Thirsk, 1990.

Some of the verbal and written suggestions obtained in order to construct the questionnaire for the study were given by persons working with the Division of Student Affairs at the University of North Texas, Denton. These persons included Joe Stewart, Vice President for Student Affairs; Ray Lewis, Director for Career Planning and Placement Service; Don Bailey, Director of Recreational Sports; Kevin Marbury, Assistant Director of Recreational Sports; William G. Sawyer, Dean of Students; Lisa
Lanham, Assistant Dean of Students; Stephen Pickett, Director of the Office of Disability Accommodations; Tom Overton, Counseling and Testing; Deborah Arnold, Assistant Director for Financial Aid; Tom Hoemeke, Director of the International Studies Office; and several doctoral students enrolled in the 3-hour course EDHE6730, Organization and Administration of Student Services for the fall semester of 1992.

The student questionnaire was divided into sections; each section was concerned with a particular student affairs service. In each section, statements were made about the service, and respondents were asked about their awareness of, their perceptions of, the importance of, and the performance or the effectiveness of student services and/or program areas.

Before the final questionnaires were printed, they were submitted to nine experts in student personnel work and two experts in questionnaire construction at the University of North Texas in Denton for review. For a pilot test of clarity and an assessment of the length of time needed for completion of the final instruments, the final questionnaires were administered to five full-time student affairs staff members and 20 students enrolled in effective study courses at the University of North Texas in Denton.

In the study at Andrews University, the students rated their perceptions in each of the three categories, using a 6-point scale. Each student was asked to include additional comments and to provide self-biodata for the purpose of descriptive statistics only in the concluding section of the questionnaire.
The student affairs personnel were asked to respond to the same statements as the students concerning their awareness of the existence of the services, the importance of and the effectiveness of the student services at the university. In each of the three categories, the personnel were asked to rate the statements, using a 6-point scale. Personnel were asked to include additional comments and to provide self-biodata for the purpose of descriptive statistics only at the end of the questionnaire. A comparison between the responses of the students and the student affairs personnel was made in the categories of awareness, importance, and effectiveness or performance.

Analysis and Treatment of Data

A frequency count, a percentage, and a mean were calculated for each of the 11 student services and/or program areas on both student and student affairs personnel questionnaires. A comparison was made between the student and student affairs personnel groups, and a t-test was used to determine the significance of the results.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

The literature reviewed indicates a lack of research that deals with comprehensive student affairs services in an evaluative manner. Although there are pertinent studies that provide meaningful background data for the study of perceptions, often they include additional factors that serve to distort the perception aspect. Evaluation studies of separate student affairs services, most of which have been completed in the counseling services area, are numerous. Evaluation studies of separate student affairs services and college environmental studies have been excluded from this review of the literature. The review of literature for this study is limited to studies relating to evaluations of the functions of comprehensive student affairs services.

An extensive literature review, which includes books, journals, magazines, dissertations, dissertation abstracts, ERIC documents, and unpublished manuscripts, established the fact that perception studies of comprehensive student affairs services are not plentiful in the research literature. The literature review, however, is by no means exhaustive and is not proposed as such. This review examines early studies of student affairs services (1926-1950), later studies (1951-1970), and those from 1971-1992. The evaluation of students' and student affairs practitioners' perceptions of
comprehensive student affairs services by the questionnaire method is examined throughout.

Evaluations of Student Affairs Services (1926-1950)

Following World War I, student personnel work experienced considerable growth and development. An early study of student affairs services was accomplished in 1926 when L. B. Hopkins visited 14 institutions of higher education to study the organization and extent of student personnel procedures. His study was concerned with discovering organizational patterns of student personnel functions at the selected institutions. By 1926, most colleges had instituted the office of dean of students, although the concept of a centralized office for all student personnel services had not yet materialized at American institutions of higher education. Hopkins rated each institution in five general areas: (a) selection and matriculation, (b) personal services, (c) curriculum and teaching, (d) research, and (e) coordination.

Hopkins' (1926) general conclusion was that the surveyed institutions were providing some forms of personnel services to assist students. He also expressed his theory that student services are concerned with the individual students.

Cowley (1931) developed an evaluative technique by producing a student personnel survey form for use at Ohio State University. A major purpose of this study was to show the need for better coordination of student personnel activities within a single institution.
Katz, Allport, and Jenness (1931) surveyed student reactions to all university functions at Syracuse University. One part of the study focused on student services and provided information from which the following recommendations for change were made: (a) manuals should be developed in all major student personnel services areas to define philosophy and procedures; (b) personnel services administrators and workers should be given faculty rank and salary; and (c) the vice-chancellor should serve as general coordinator for personnel services.

Teacher training institutions became involved in evaluating student services in 1932. Townsend designed an instrument to measure and evaluate administrative practices and techniques used by personnel workers employed at colleges involved in the training of teachers by developing first a checklist of 365 student service procedures that were being used at various colleges. This list was submitted to 50 experts in higher education for their reactions to the desirability of each procedure. Townsend then selected the procedures that the majority agreed were desirable and constructed a survey instrument from these. The completed instrument was sent to 105 presidents of teacher training colleges, who were asked to indicate the procedures used at their institutions. Responses from the college presidents were used to make recommendations concerning the components of adequate student personnel programs in teacher training institutions. Townsend also indicated the need for additional research to supplement these findings.
During the time that Cowley (1931), Katz et al. (1931), and Townsend (1932) were developing instruments to evaluate student personnel functions, Brumbaugh and Smith (1932) developed the Point Scale for Evaluation of Personnel Work in Institutions of Higher Learning for the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Fifty college personnel experts were asked to distribute 1,000 points among functions listed under 10 areas of student personnel services. One hundred points were distributed among functions in each of the following services: (a) vocational counseling; (b) employment and placement; (c) extracurricular activities; (d) records, data, and research; (e) educational counseling; (f) health and recreation; (g) personnel organization; (h) diagnosis and remedial functions; (i) admission and orientation; and (j) personal problems. Results of the survey provided standard scores for functions listed under each of the student personnel areas. College personnel were then able to rate services being provided at the institution where they were employed and then to compare and contrast results with the standard scores.

During the period that Cowley (1931) and Brumbaugh and Smith (1932) were developing evaluation instruments, Gardner (1936) was conducting a survey of student personnel functions in 57 institutions that were members of the North Central Association. Using a checklist form, Gardner rated each of the member institutions on 11 personnel functions. After personally visiting and evaluating each institution, Gardner then had four expert college investigators rank the institutions in order of excellence. Correlations were then calculated between the rankings and between single
service rankings and the total student personnel services rankings. This study, although very subjective in nature, was the basis for the revision of student personnel evaluation standards in the North Central Association.

Gardner (1936) reported that he asked a representative group of students at each institution to complete a questionnaire on the importance and influence of the student personnel services. The results of Gardner's study were used to develop scores for evaluating student personnel services in subsequent years.

Blaesser (1949) reported that the general conclusion from Gardner's (1936) study was that the provision for student personnel services provided a valuable index of overall institutional excellence. By 1936, individual colleges and universities were beginning to show concern about the problems of improving their student personnel services and critically examining their own programs. As a result of this concern, Cowley (1936) directed a student personnel survey at Ohio State University that involved functional and structural analysis of the personnel services. Cowley made a job analysis of each of the 16 personnel functions that were provided at that time at Ohio State, seeking answers to the following questions:

1. Are the functions provided at Ohio State University centralized?

2. Should the functions be centralized?

3. Are functions in need of development?

The answers to these questions supported Cowley's assumptions that the services were not well coordinated. He stated that services should be spread throughout the campus
and recommended a central office. Furthermore, Cowley proposed 16 principles for student personnel workers to use that would enable the college to help young people solve personal problems.

In 1937 the American Council on Education published a report entitled *The Student Personnel Point of View*. This publication described personnel work as a way of considering "the student as a whole," and of focusing on the student's development as a person rather than simply providing intellectual training. The publication of this report marked the end of the period of fluid, individualistic development of college personnel programs. As a result, most college personnel programs were organized or reorganized around the "services approach" to personnel work.

Williamson and Sarbin (1940) published a historical and descriptive analysis of the personnel program at the University of Minnesota, where program effectiveness was determined, and selected aspects of the program could be evaluated fully by the use of their research methods. Blaesser (1949) reported that, from this point in the development of student personnel work, there evolved a growing interest in the evaluation of personnel programs and in the determination of their effectiveness. The Western Personnel Institute sponsored several surveys of student personnel services in the 1940s. The objectives of these surveys were to find out how many of the personnel services were provided by member institutions, how they rated the performance of these services, and how they rated the training and experience of the people performing these services. The results showed that each of the 30 institutions studied provided the
majority of the services that were listed by the American Council on Education in 1937. They also rated themselves above average in both performance and training of student personnel workers.

Concern about the lack of evaluation of student personnel services was emphasized by a committee established to study personnel services by the American Council on Education in 1949. The committee stated as follows:

The principle responsibility of all personnel workers lies in the area of progressive program development. This means each worker must devote a large part of his time to the formulation of new plans and to continuous evaluation and improvement of current programs. (p. 18)

E. G. Williamson, who served as chairman of the committee, suggested that the following information could be used to define adequate criteria for evaluation: (a) student and faculty satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the services, (b) extent of student use of the services, (c) continued improvement in professional training of the staff, and (d) quality of interpersonal relationships and staff cooperation.

According to Goméz (1979/1980), one of the earliest acknowledgments for student input in assessment of student personnel services received support in 1949 when the American Council on Education again published The Student Personnel Point of View (1949a) and made the following declaration:

Students can make significant contributions to the development and maintenance of effective personnel programs through contributing evaluation of the quality of the services, new ideas for changes in the services, and fresh impetus to staff members who may become immersed in techniques and the technicalities of the professional side of personnel work. (p. 17)
The publication further suggested, Goméz continued, that the use of students in evaluation should be part of the following evaluative criteria:

1. Students’ expression of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with services received. These expressions may be informally collected or may be gathered systematically. Obviously such expressions need to be critically evaluated in terms of the total situation.

2. The extent of students' uses of the personnel services. Again, their criterion must be applied with full cognizance of the limitations of financial resources and other institutional factors balanced against the needs of the personnel departments. (p. 18)

According to Kamm (1950), an early attempt to use student reactions as criteria for evaluation of personnel services was made by Wrenn and Kamm (1948). They developed a student reaction form that was used to determine student perceptions of certain program strengths and weaknesses. The form contained 60 questions, 5 each for the 12 commonly accepted student personnel services. Through the study of the responses, the proportions of favorable and unfavorable responses could be determined. Kamm reported that it was felt the research done on this form resulted in a valid instrument for use in obtaining the reaction of students (p. 534).

From the 1950s, attitude research began to take on a new importance in the evaluation of student services. Kamm (1950) devised an Inventory of Student Reaction to Student Personnel Services, wherein the principle used was that, if students are asked several pertinent questions about a particular student personnel service, a valid indication of the worth of that service to these students will be available. Kamm's inventory form consisted of 60 questions to be answered by yes, no, or 2. The 60
items covered 20 student personnel services with five items for each service. Kamm then suggested that an arbitrary percentage, such as 70% yes answers, would indicate that the service was favorable.

Gilbert (1950) indicated that there was no one most desirable way to evaluate student personnel services. He also stated that student personnel services could not be defined neatly and that there were no criteria known to be perfectly valid. According to Gilbert, student personnel services would not continue to be accepted on faith indefinitely; there was need for evidence to show that student personnel services' goals were being obtained. Gilbert also indicated that personnel workers who were sincerely interested in the welfare of students would want to know how effectively and efficiently they were serving the students' needs, and he made the following suggestions for developing evaluation procedures: (a) minimize threatening feelings about the evaluation and secure the acceptance of the staff, (b) appoint an overall evaluation committee, (c) select criteria and specific methods and procedures, (d) examine results of the evaluations and present recommendations, and (e) repeat and improve evaluations at regular intervals.

A review of the 1926-1950 literature points out a definite lack of research dealing with comprehensive college student services programs. Although there were pertinent studies such as those of Hopkins (1926), Brumbaugh and Smith (1932), Williamson and Sarbin (1940), Blaesser (1949), and Rohrer (1949), they included additional factors that served to distort the perception aspect. Although evaluation was
becoming more important in justifying student services as an integrated part of the university program, all the previously cited studies revealed a weakness in the development and use of adequate evaluation instruments. All the instruments were subjective in that they depended on the opinion of a single investigator. Several studies, such as those by Hopkins (1926), Brumbaugh and Smith (1932), and Katz et al. (1931), were too broad in scope, covering academic functions as well as student services.

Wrenn and Bell (1942) reported that much of the literature in the general field of personnel work in both secondary school and college is an analysis of more or less segmented research investigations. Cowins (1974) stated that the contemporary literature that was considered most valid dealt with varying methods used in the evaluation of student personnel services. According to Gilbert (1950), despite these difficulties, evaluation of student personnel services was necessary, but could not be done in "cookbook fashion." He suggested that the way to go about the process of evaluating student services was to "take account of everything that was known about people in general and make full use of good democratic administrative procedures at every step in the process" (p. 527).

Evaluations of Student Affairs Services (1951-1970)

Rackham (1951) indicated concern about the lack of evaluation studies in the student services area. He noted that despite the need for evaluative criteria, studies of total student personnel services were rare. He stated, "Those studies which have been completed are segmental rather than comprehensive" (p. 693).
Techniques to achieve an adequate evaluation of student personnel services continued to receive much attention in the early 1950s. There were three major studies designed to develop evaluation instruments. The first was a study by Rackham (1951) that resulted in the development of the Student Personnel Services Inventory. This inventory consisted of a 225-item rating scale that scored 15 areas of student personnel functions. The areas included admissions, counseling, discipline, extracurricular activities, financial aid, health services, housing and board, organization and administration, orientation, placement, pre-college counseling, records, religion, research, and testing. The rating scale was then submitted to 10 national leaders in college student personnel work who were asked to weight the importance of each service. Weights were then assigned to each item in accordance with the experts' ratings. The inventory was completed by an independent interviewer, and its results gave college officials a suggestion of how their programs compared with an idealistic program as envisioned by student personnel specialists.

One of the major objections to the Rackham (1951) inventory was its length. It consisted of 47 pages of evaluation items, and its scope was such that no one college personnel officer could adequately provide all the information needed to complete the inventory. After completion, Rackham surveyed more than 100 institutions of higher learning. It took the independent observers an average of 3 days to score each inventory.
Wrenn (1951) stated that there was a "need to make objective and quantifiable any survey of faculty or student opinion" (p. 500). Goméz reported in 1979 that although faculty and student opinion about a personnel service might at times seem unacceptable to the personnel worker, he must be able to accept this judgment as an objective valid opinion and realize that it is a basic condition of the success or failure of the service. "The chief value of much judgment," said Wrenn, "when based upon sophisticated and impartial observation, is the highlighting of the strong and weak services in a program" (p. 501). According to Goméz (1979/1980), perceptions of student personnel programs have too often involved the evaluation of the program by specialists or faculty. Furthermore, too often the validity of the evaluation is not possible to determine, and the judgments are not independently obtained. In spite of the fact that student opinion is used even less than the opinion of faculty and specialists in assessing the performance of student personnel services, this opinion "as an index of 'consumer attitude' is more significant," observed Wrenn (1951), "than any expert judgment of what ought to be useful to students. By a study of student reaction, one knows whether the service is accepted and used" (p. 501).

A review of the literature revealed two studies that made use of the Wrenn-Kamm Report Form developed in 1948 at the University of Minnesota and the Evaluation Report Form developed in 1950: Pershing (1952) evaluated the student personnel services at Georgia Institute of Technology, and, according to Blaesser
(1954), Brailey (1953) adapted and used a modified version of the Report Form when he tested the effectiveness of student services at six urban universities.

The major advantage of the Wrenn-Kamm form was its simplicity in use and scoring to obtain an independent rating of the student personnel program on any college campus.

Strang (1953) concluded that evaluation should be an intrinsic part of the process of student personnel service work and listed the following questions that evaluation should seek to answer:

1. What desirable changes are taking place in students' attitudes, interests, and behavior?

2. Have students obtained a clearer picture of the finest kind of person they can become and are they moving in that direction?

3. Are their initiative and energy being increasingly released and used in wholesome constructive activities—in better academic work, in healthful leisure interests, in friendly outgoing relations with old and young?

4. Are the teaching personnel becoming more vital and understanding persons—more interested in people and in life and with increased senses of personal worth?

Daughtrey (1953) developed a study to ascertain the nature of student and faculty reaction to student personnel services at the University of Florida as was then administered under the Office of Student Personnel. Using two selected instruments of measurement with which to obtain data from student and faculty samples, these data were subsequently analyzed to yield percentage, ratio, and chi-square statistical interpretations. The findings showed student reaction as favorable toward the present
program of personnel services with marked intergroup differences. Faculty reaction
was also favorable, but less positive than that of the students. Faculty subgroups in the
sample responded in a generally similar manner, but comparative student-faculty
reaction was marked. The conclusions concerning this study were that student
personnel services are apparently considered as favorable by students and faculty, with
need evidenced, however, for further investigation concerning the programs of
Recruitment and Admissions, Counseling, and Health and Food Services, as well as a
need for better communication as to the services of Placement and Personnel Records.

In a review of the literature, Blaesser (1954) indicated that there had been a lack
of periodic studies undertaken in the evaluation of student services. Similarly, after
reviewing a study of student services in member institutions, the American Association
of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1954 appointed a committee to develop a
statement of minimum standards and evaluative criteria for 18 student personnel
services. The standards were designed for use in identifying specific services that were
in need of improvement or that were outstanding. The criteria to which programs were
compared were (a) basic program principle, (b) administrative organization, (c) records
and forms, and (d) office arrangement.

Researchers are disinclined to place much reliability in student surveys,
according to Jenson (1955); however, some feel differently.

Those who "want to know" argue, and it would seem sensibly so, that
one must be content with using his rough tools until more refined and
dependable ones are available. We are aware of the weaknesses of using
student reactions as evidence; nevertheless, consumer reaction
determines the destiny of most, if not all, professional services. (p. 498)

Mahler (1955) designed a study to ascertain the nature of student and faculty reactions
to student services. This study raised two problems in the evaluation of student
personnel programs in college: To what extent are carefully constructed faculty-
student opinion scales being used to secure estimates of the quality of a given student
personnel service? How effective an opinion scale can be constructed by assessing the
extent to which a faculty and a student body accept the basic tenets of the "student
personnel point of view"?

According to Mahler (1955), the following conclusions with regard to the first
problem would seem to be appropriate: Faculty opinion on the Counseling, Student
Activities, Financial Aids, Health Service, Personnel Administration, and Orientation
scales indicates very high agreement with the independent judgment (Rackham
Inventory) of these same personnel service areas. Two scales, Housing-Board and
Placement, differed markedly from the independent judgment. For the students, the
scales on Counseling, Discipline, Student Activities, Financial Aids, Health Service,
Personnel Administration, and Orientation showed a strong agreement with the
independent judgment, but did not attain the high agreement received by the faculty
groups. Housing-Board and Placement also showed a wide difference for the students
compared with the independent judgment. The faculty groups in their reaction to the
personnel services being performed on their campus gave a significantly higher rating
than did the student groups at all four colleges.
The results obtained on the second problem gave a student point of view scale that was reliable. The faculty and students for the four institutions studied showed no wide differences in acceptance of the "student personnel point of view"; however, there was a much wider variation in the degree of acceptance of this point of view on some campuses than on others.

Barry and Wolf (1957) expressed their concern by saying that "the demands for research and evaluation seem more insistent than ever before... the demand for research and evaluation is today one of the most pressing issues in this field and, for that matter, in education itself" (p. 150).

In 1958, the American Council on Education established a committee to study personnel programs in colleges and universities. The committee, chaired by Daniel Feder, suggested that programs could be evaluated in terms of (a) the degree to which each of the services related to institutional objectives, (b) efficiency of daily operations, (c) attitudes of the college community toward the program, (d) morale of the staff, and (e) a study of student benefits derived from a particular student personnel program.

A survey of the student personnel literature indicates that very little research on student personnel work emanates from the traditional liberal arts college. Because the leadership in advancing the student personnel point of view has not stemmed from colleges of liberal arts, there may be a tendency to assume that such institutions are not concerned with such services. It was the opinion of the writer that a contribution to the
literature of the student personnel field would result from a study of student personnel services as found in liberal arts colleges today.

In a survey of liberal arts colleges, Kauffman (1958) attempted to ascertain the extent to which these schools offered student personnel services programs. Six main areas concerning student personnel work were selected as the scope of the study. They included orientation, housing services, health services, financial aid services, counseling and student problems, and self-government. On the basis of the recommended scope of practices in these areas, as found in the literature, an inquiry form was devised for mail administration.

The inquiry form was pre-tested in the New England area. Personal interviews and visits with the pre-test group resulted in revision of the inquiry form, and the final version was mailed, with covering letter, to the chief student personnel official at the 228 colleges meeting the above criteria. Identifying data to be used for cross-tabulation purposes were added to each inquiry form by Kauffman (1958). These included geographical location, sex differences, size of enrollment, total cost of attendance, faculty-student ratio, an index of "quality" of faculty, and type of control.

Out of a total of 228 colleges of liberal arts which met the criteria set for inclusion in the study, returns were received from 186 colleges. Thus, 84% of the inquiry forms were completed and returned for tabulation and analysis. In addition to summarizing responses to the questions, a chi-square test of statistical significance was
utilized in comparing the colleges on the basis of the various identifying variables.

Among Kauffman's (1958) conclusions were the following:

All the colleges conduct some type of orientation program for new students. Sixty-five percent of the colleges conduct such programs on campus prior to the return of the upper-class students. The average duration for such programs is 4 days to 1 week. Twenty-one percent of the colleges conduct programs that run throughout the first semester of the freshman year. Student representatives appear to be more involved in the planning of orientation activities than do faculty. Evaluation of orientation programs is mainly haphazard and extremely informal.

Residence halls in 90% of the colleges include the presence of a staff person. Most of such staff are expected to fulfill a dual function of keeping order as well as aiding students in difficulty. Sixty percent of the colleges have such residence hall staff on a full-time basis. This practice is more prevalent in coeducational colleges. Seventy percent of the colleges also assist students in finding off-campus housing and inspect and/or approve such housing.

Ninety-six percent of the colleges maintain some kind of a health service, and 75% have an infirmary on campus. The Health Service Director is more often directly responsible to the president than to the chief student personnel officer. Psychiatric service is maintained by only a small minority of the colleges and mostly on a part-time or consultant basis. Only 15% of the college health offices are involved in the physical education programs of the college, and there is little involvement of the health service with nutrition, sanitation, or health education.

Most counseling services are of an unprofessional nature. Administrative staff and faculty perform a variety of part-time counseling functions. In 80% of the colleges, no one person performed personal counseling as a full-time job. There is considerable self-criticism about this situation, and only 19 colleges stated that their present personal counseling program was satisfactory.

Shigley (1958) conducted a study of the student personnel services at Marion College in Indiana, using the Wrenn-Kamm Inventory. The purpose of this study was
to make an evaluation of the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the program of student personnel services in terms of student and faculty opinions of the adequacies and inadequacies of various areas of these services and to derive conclusions from the findings which would bring about a better organized and more functional program.

Findings reveal that the program as a whole was rated as inadequate by both student and faculty respondents, whereas some areas of service were rated as adequate and some as inadequate by each group; three of the 12 areas of service were rated as adequate by the student respondents, and two areas were rated as adequate by the faculty; both student and faculty respondents indicated they had sufficient information relative to five areas and that they needed more information on the other seven areas of student personnel services; significant differences were found between the responses of faculty and students, between divergent faculty groups, and between divergent student groups, relative to their knowledge and opinions of adequacy of various services; greater differences were found between the responses of divergent student groups and between the responses of divergent faculty groups than were found between the responses of students and faculty (Shigley, 1958).

According to the criteria used, Shigley's (1958) appraisal of the findings led to a number of conclusions including the following: The student personnel program as a whole was inadequate, with some areas, including student placement services, student aids, and guidance in student conduct needing special attention. Some student and faculty groups needed attention also, especially working students and new faculty
members. The student services that were available had not been adequately communicated to either faculty or students, and this was more apparent in those areas where there had been least opportunity for direct contact. Those faculty members who were in a position to do most about making improvements in the services were more satisfied than others with the present program.

Parrott (1958) found differences in perceptions of seniors, freshmen, and faculty when he studied the student personnel services programs at six liberal arts church colleges. He concluded that faculty members tend to rate student services higher than seniors, and freshmen mean scores were considerably lower than the senior groups.

In a study by Scott (1959), an attempt was made to determine the patterns and functions of student personnel programs in small liberal arts colleges in Michigan. Sixteen schools were selected as a sample. The investigator visited the institutions and interviewed student personnel workers and administrators. With the exception of special clinics and special services, the student personnel services under study were offered at each of the participating colleges. It was found in most of the colleges that the people performing student personnel functions were teachers or personnel officers who also taught. There was general agreement among the presidents and deans interviewed that student personnel operations were an integral part of the institution. There also seemed to be a trend toward the establishment of separate student personnel departments. Scott concluded that there existed a great need to develop a program to
evaluate the effectiveness of the student personnel services programs at each of the
colleges studied.

In 1959 Fitzgerald developed the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire to
determine the perceptions of student personnel services in higher education by faculty
members at Michigan State University. This questionnaire formed the basis for most
of the perception studies of student personnel services which were to follow. The
questionnaire provided the opportunity to rate the importance of higher education in
each of 40 statements of function of student personnel services. Functions included
admission, registration, and records; counseling and health services; student activities;
financial aid and placement; disciplinary functions; special clinics and special services;
and housing and food functions. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate their
opinions of the quality of the performance of the function, whether or not a specific
campus office was designated for the performance of each function, and the location of
this office.

This study indicated that student personnel services were recognized as having
importance for the achievement of the philosophy and purposes of higher education.
Highest perceptions of importance tended to be placed on those functions relating most
directly to the academic purposes of the institution. Of less importance were the
functions that facilitated student life activities while the individual was engaged in
academic pursuits, and least important were the student personnel functions that dealt
only indirectly with the student in an academic setting. Faculty members without
tenure tended to give responses requiring less definite expressions of opinion or knowledge about student personnel services.

Erickson and Hatch (1959) argued that sometimes student personnel programs become sterile because of their implementation; i.e., in some instances, the consumer, for whom the services were initially intended, is ignored during the developmental stage of the personnel programs. Their suggestion for alleviating this shortcoming was a structured survey that would afford the student the opportunity to indicate his or her perceptions of the services available.

In 1960, Brantley evaluated the student personnel program at Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia. The objectives of that research were (a) to investigate the student personnel program; (b) to investigate the educational programs' objectives; (c) to investigate the social environment, vocational interests of students, and student problems; and (d) to make recommendations for the further development of the student personnel program. Brantley used seven different sources to collect data. They included primary and secondary literature; Wrenn and Kamm's Student Personnel Services Evaluation Forms; Kamm's Student Research Form; conferences with college officials; a social environment questionnaire; a standardized instrument used to ascertain problems faced by students; and the Kuder Vocational Guidance Preference Record.

The results of Brantley's (1960) study indicated that an adequate student personnel program could not be planned until the interests and problems of the students
were known and understood. These recommendations were listed for the student personnel services at Clark:

1. The administration of the college should clarify for the faculty and staff the extent to which each student personnel service was essential to the total program of the institution.

2. The student personnel service program should be coordinated by one person professionally educated in the area of student personnel service work.

3. An organizational chart should be developed showing the student personnel services program and its relationship to the college's educational program.

4. It should be beneficial to the college to specify the relationship of the fiscal operations of the institution to the student personnel services. (pp. 385-387)

Feder (1960) later stated that "the increased awareness of the need for evaluative study of program operations might be a sign of increased security of the student personnel workers in the higher education complex" (p. 365). Feder also indicated that one promising evaluative technique was the effort to gauge perceptions of students and others of student personnel programs. Use of this technique provided standards by which effects of changes in programs or operations could be measured.

Williamson (1961) stated the following:

Personnel workers should be encouraged to learn to develop new forms of utilizing participation by students in the formulation and development of personnel programs. We believe that the presentation of technical personnel problems of program development of responsible students will, in itself, reveal fundamental defects in these programs, from the students' point of view, which might hamper the development of the program if left undetected. (p. 102)
Gómez (1979/1980) maintained that student involvement taps an important source of direct contact. Although this does not mean that student opinion is of itself valid, or the only valid source, it is a necessary means of valid evaluation since (in the West) the consumer's reaction to services is an important commodity. Williamson's argument is further strengthened by those who postulate that the client for whom the evaluation was conducted and who uses the facilities should also be the one who passes judgment and has impact on the results (Alkin & Fitz-Gibbon, 1975; Kohlan, 1972).

Hardee (1962) felt that, because the movement for changing traditional student personnel programs by institutions of higher learning was afoot, the emphasis was on the student as never before; but this emphasis was diminished by the fact that "administrative planners became preoccupied with the shadow rather than the substance of student needs" (p. 134).

Williamson and Cowan (1966) supported Hardee's (1962) contention by saying that administrators sometimes legislate policy without knowing what students really want and thus cause "emotional resentment" on both sides (p. 11).

The American Civil Liberties Union (1963) supported Bundy's (1962) statement that "students are themselves one of the great defining elements in the quality of college life as a whole" (p. 34) when the ACLU stated that students all over the world not only had a greater participation in the political endeavors of their countries, but were also attempting to have a greater impact in formulating college policy. Hence, says Schoen
(1965), "We must ensure students freedom of expression and self government, and . . .
must in addition inform them of their prerogatives freely" (p. 246).

According to Siggelkow (1964), a series of evaluations of various phases of
student personnel services was planned and conducted in 1960-1961 and 1961-1962
through an inter-university visitation program involving Cornell, Rochester, Syracuse,
and Buffalo Universities. Each of the host schools identified three areas of
investigation for the visiting professional staff members. In addition to an actual
evaluation of the personnel program, student reaction to the personnel services was also
obtained. The results indicated that the students in general seemed to have only the
haziest notions of the purposes of the personnel services on their campus. They
seemed to be aware of the numerous services available, but their feelings expressed a
lack of confidence in them.

In a study examining the student personnel service program on the
undergraduate level at the Auburn University School of Education by Beckers (1961),
the following were the more significant conclusions:

1. The faculty respondents, in theory, accepted all or in most
   respects a viewpoint consistent with democratic values for the
   institution as a whole. This viewpoint had not carried over
   completely to the student personnel service program.

2. There was a lack of agreement among the faculty respondents
   with respect to the overall purposes of the student personnel
   service program and what its relationship should be to the teacher
   preparation programs.
3. There was general agreement among the majority of the faculty respondents with respect to the objectives of the individual student personnel service areas.

4. The student personnel service program was well supported by administrative leadership, but was lacking in overall coordination.

5. The availability of the student personnel service had been inadequately communicated to the students as a group and to some of the faculty members from two departments.

6. The student personnel services generally were inadequate in meeting students' needs.

7. The faculty group generally had a more favorable opinion of and were better acquainted with the student personnel services than the student group.

Beckers (1961) sought to make a comprehensive study by using multi-data sources. In this study, data were obtained from observations of the student personnel service programs, interviews with student personnel service staff members, questionnaires completed by students and faculty personnel, and faculty reports.

Gray (1962) conducted an evaluative study of the student personnel program for men at the University of Richmond in Virginia. The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the growth and development of the program; (b) to analyze reactions of students, faculty, administrative officers, and personnel workers to the program; (c) to determine the extent to which students and faculty accepted the student personnel point of view; (d) to collect evidence on the extent of use of the services, on the improvement in professional training and status of staff members, and on the quality of interpersonal relationships; (e) to make recommendations for the further development
and strengthening of the program; and (f) to further efforts to improve the means of evaluation of student personnel programs in general.

Sources of data for Gray's (1962) study included reports of administrative officers, directors, faculty members, and personnel workers; faculty minutes; materials on the history of the university; interviews and group meetings with the officials listed and with selected students and faculty members; and the personal experience of the investigator with the program since 1946. Two evaluative instruments were administered in the spring of 1956: Mahler's *The Student Personnel Services as You See Them*, to obtain the reaction of 640 male students and 80 faculty members in Richmond College and the School of Business Administration, and the *Evaluation Report Form for Student Personnel Services* by Wrenn and Kamm, to obtain the reaction of seven administrative officers and personnel workers. Analysis of the Mahler Inventory was by item and by 11 service areas and a personnel opinion scale, by nine student and nine faculty subgroups, by subgroup comparisons, and by write-in comments on the inventory. Statistical analyses yielded findings in the form of frequency distributions, percentages, ratios, and chi-squares. Descriptive treatment was given to the responses to the Wrenn-Kamm Evaluation Report Form.

The main findings of the study included the following:

1. From the earliest days, a harmonious relationship was found between the instructional program and the program of student personnel services, with general acceptance of the student personnel point of view by students, faculty, and the administrative-personnel group.
2. The reaction of students, faculty, and the administrative-personnel group was generally favorable to the program, with Placement, Orientation, and Discipline the more highly favored services.

3. There was continuing need for improving some services and for providing additional services and facilities. Some dissatisfaction over the specialized counseling services was shown by students and faculty. Unfavorable reaction was shown by students to Housing and Board, by the administrative-personnel group to the Food Service, and by the faculty and some students to admissions.

4. The uncertain responses were difficult to appraise even though they came more frequently from students in the two lower classes and from the faculty. It is not clear whether this revealed a lack of experience with or information about the services or indecision over which category best expressed the attitude of the respondents.

5. The student subgroups differed in their reaction toward the program, as did the student group when compared with the faculty group. The faculty and administrative-personnel groups were more nearly alike in their reactions.

6. A lack of central coordination of the services appeared to be interfering with the maximum effectiveness of the program.

Student perceptions of student personnel services were studied by Zimmerman (1963) at Michigan State University. The students in the study rated selected personnel functions on their importance to college students and on the quality of the performance of these functions at Michigan State. The personnel services were grouped as follows: student activities; admissions, registrar, and records; counseling; financial aid and placement; health service; housing and food service; student conduct; and special services.
The sample used in Zimmerman's (1963) study consisted of 50 seniors. The stratified random sample was grouped in terms of sex, marital status, and place of residence. Data were collected through a personal interview and by use of a questionnaire developed by Fitzgerald (1959). The members of the sample rated the questionnaire statements regarding personnel functions in terms of importance to all students and in terms of quality performance. The following questions were asked in regard to each area of service:

1. What contacts have you had with this area of service?
2. Have you been satisfied with your experience in this area?
3. Has this attitude changed in any way, and if so why?
4. How do other students feel about this area of service?
5. What could be done to improve this area of service?

The following questions were asked at the end of every interview:

1. Do you feel that any of these services are outstanding?
2. Do you feel that any of these services are particularly weak?

The major findings included the following:

1. Personnel services are important to the student in college.
2. The attitudes of the members of the sample toward these services were, in general, very favorable.
3. Student experience with the various personnel services varied widely.
4. The students of the sample were least satisfied with the area of student conduct.
5. The students of the sample were most satisfied with the placement service.

6. The methods of improving the personnel services suggested most often by the students were improving communications between the various personnel services and the students and giving the students more responsibility in the areas of housing and student conduct.

The questionnaire and interview schedule are instruments that are accepted by researchers for the collection of scientific data. It would seem, therefore, that a review of available evidence about the likenesses and differences of these two data-collecting devices might be of value to a researcher prior to the selection of an instrument for a systematic study. Aubry (1964) did such a comparative study of questionnaire and interview responses in an evaluation of the student personnel services at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. The purpose of this study was to compare the questionnaire and interview responses of undergraduate students, graduates, and faculty members in an evaluation of the student personnel services of Xavier University.

Information was sought about the following:

1. Variations that might be detected in the questionnaire and interview responses of undergraduate students, graduates and faculty members in an evaluation of the student personnel services of Xavier University according to (a) incomplete response, (b) detail and number of ideas represented in responses of subjects to open-end items, and (c) quantity of material written as represented by the number of words used in answering open-end items.

2. The degree of consistency of responses noticed in the comparison of questionnaire and interview responses in an evaluation of the student personnel services of Xavier University.
The purpose of Aubry's (1964) evaluation of the student personnel services of Xavier University was to determine the strengths and weaknesses of these services and to devise conclusions that might serve to improve them. This aspect of the study sought information concerning:

- the effective student personnel services of Xavier University,
- the ineffective student personnel services of Xavier University, and
- suggestions for improvement of the student personnel services of Xavier University.

The major areas of student personnel services evaluated included Administration and Organization, Recruitment and Admissions, Coordination of Religious Life, Counseling, Discipline, Extraclass Activities, Financial Aid, Health, Housing and Foods, Orientation, Placement, and Student Records.

The major findings of Aubry's (1964) study were that subjects gave more complete responses to interview items; the questionnaire elicited a greater variety of ideas from subjects in their responses to open-end items; more words were used by subjects in their responses to interview open-end items; and subjects were more inclined to respond consistently to similar questionnaire and interview open-ended items.

Of the 12 major areas of student services evaluated, the undergraduate students indicated in both evaluative situations that they were well satisfied with the Administration and Organization and Coordination of Religious life services. Their
questionnaire responses would seem to indicate that they were also well satisfied with the Counseling services. In both follow-up situations graduates gave well satisfied ratings to the Administration and Organization services, while their interview responses indicated that they were well satisfied with the Coordination of Religious Life services. Discipline services received an unsatisfactory questionnaire rating from the undergraduate students, while the graduates and faculty members gave dissatisfied questionnaire ratings to the Financial Aid services. These subjects judged the remaining student personnel services of Xavier University satisfactory in both evaluative situations.

The conclusions of Aubry's (1964) study were that more complete responses were evoked during the interview process; the interview elicited a greater number of responses to factual and open-end items; the questionnaire elicited a greater variety of ideas in responses to open-end items; percentage means of 55% and 47% were reported for consistent questionnaire and interview responses; the interview and questionnaire methods elicited data that could be utilized in the evaluation of the student personnel services of Xavier University; each of the major areas of student personnel services was found on the campus of Xavier University; and the program and policies had not been communicated in detail to the students and faculty members.

Tamte (1964) developed a study to ascertain how faculty, student personnel workers, and students perceived student personnel services at the University of Denver in Colorado and what differences in perceptions existed between these groups and selected sub-groups. The questionnaire was the method used in assessing the
perceptions of the three groups, and a special type of questionnaire called the 
perceptionnaire was chosen as the appropriate instrument.

Tamte's (1964) Student Personnel Services Perceptionnaire contained 40 
statements concerning functional operations found in most student personnel programs. 
The 40 statements were grouped into eight major divisions of the student personnel 
field, with 5 statements devoted to each of the following areas: admissions, 
registration and records; counseling; health service; housing and food; student 
activities; financial aid and placement; discipline; and special clinics and special 
services. For each of these 40 statements, each respondent was requested to answer 
four questions concerning importance to college education; specific provisions at D. 
U.; adequacy of programs at D. U.; and site where function is performed. The 
returned data permitted only the answer to the first and last questions to be used in the 
study.

Ten of the 14 null hypotheses were not supported. The comparisons between 
the following groups were not supported: faculty and student personnel workers; 
faculty and students; student personnel workers and students; faculty who had earned 
their degree in the west and faculty who had earned their degree elsewhere; students 
who took the larger part of their classwork on the University Park Campus and 
students who took the larger part of their classwork on the Civic Center campus; 
students living in university housing and fraternities and students living in non-
university housing; students with military service and students without military service;
transfer students and native students; students in upper division college and students in lower division college; and male students and female students. The comparisons between perceptions of the following groups were supported: faculty who work with student organizations and faculty who do not work with student organization; faculty with a doctor's degree and faculty without a doctor's degree; faculty who had spent 5 years or less at the University of Denver and faculty who had spent 6 years or more at the University of Denver; and married students and single students.

Among the issues that Kauffman (1964) felt should be on any agenda concerned with the future of student personnel services in higher education were the following: student personnel services and the president's office, proliferation of student personnel associations and the need for greater unity of purpose and function, student administration and the faculty, and the selection and training of student personnel service workers. Kauffman was concerned with the development of the individual and viewed this development as being the goal of all student personnel services.

Kerlinger (1965) also compared the interview and questionnaire methods of soliciting responses, claiming that the interview was a potent and indispensable research tool. However, he felt that the questionnaire method also had some advantages. Because the questionnaire usually made use of the closed-type item, greater uniformity of stimulus, and thus greater reliability, was achieved. A second advantage was that, if the questionnaire is anonymous, honesty and frankness might be encouraged; also, the cost was ordinarily a fraction of that of the interview. Kerlinger
also noted disadvantages of the questionnaire, feeling that the principal one was the problem of obtaining an adequate percentage of returns. A second disadvantage was that two people might interpret the same question in different ways.

In order to identify 1966 Spring Quarter graduating seniors' perceptions of the student personnel services at Colorado State College, Rankin (1966) conducted a study whose main purpose was to aid in the evaluation of the student personnel services at the college. The secondary purpose was to determine whether or not the perceptions of the graduating seniors would differ significantly when they were grouped on the basis of sex, duration of enrollment, and residence status.

Rankin's (1966) study was designed to answer six questions:

1. How important are the student personnel services to graduating seniors?
2. Are graduating seniors aware of the personnel services?
3. Have graduating seniors had direct contact with the personnel services?
4. How satisfied are graduating seniors with the personnel services?
5. Do graduating seniors know the location of the personnel services?
6. What recommendations do graduating seniors have which would help to improve the existing personnel services (p. 3)?

The major conclusions of Rankin's (1966) study were as follows:

1. Graduating seniors perceive the personnel services as being at least "fairly important" to a college education.
2. Graduating seniors are aware of the existence of the personnel services, but are not aware of all the functions provided by these services.

3. Graduating seniors have had contact with each of the personnel services, but did not use all the functions provided.

4. Graduating seniors are generally satisfied with the functions with which they had contact.

5. Graduating seniors perceived the Placement Center as being the most important personnel service.

6. Graduating seniors perceived the supervision of off-campus housing as the most unsatisfactorily accomplished function.

7. The perceptions of the graduating seniors, when compared on the basis of sex, duration of enrollment, and residence status, did not differ significantly. (pp. v-vi)

A pilot project to test procedures that might be used to study student needs and satisfactions was reported by Penney and Buckles (1966). The purposes of the study were to discover the problems and concerns of undergraduates; the comparative seriousness of these problems at two points in academic careers; the resources students use in dealing with problems; and the help and satisfaction they obtain from the resources used. A sample of 58 participated, representing with reasonable appropriateness the categories of class, sex, residence, and college. Each student was asked to complete a Biographical Data Sheet, a Critical Incident Questionnaire, and a Problem Questionnaire.

The findings in Penney and Buckles' (1966) study indicated that financial, academic adjustment, scholastic difficulties, future planning, and emotional adjustment problems were significantly more serious for the students than were problems of a
social nature, health, or administrative difficulties. Most of the variance found was attributed to sex differences. Females found academic adjustment, social, and emotional problems more serious than did males. The findings also indicated that students looked to faculty members for a great deal more guidance than those in the personnel area often realized.

The implications of the study indicated that a thorough reexamination of the functions of university facilities and personnel was needed. It was also indicated that there was a need for an intensified and sustained effort at intercommunication between guidance personnel and teaching faculty.

An evaluative study was undertaken by Arbuckle and Doyle (1966) to determine the full scope of personnel services at a selected number of accredited Bible colleges and to determine student opinions as to the effectiveness of these services. The survey method was chosen for this study. Two inquiry forms were constructed and sent to the chief personnel officer and to a random sample of students at each college. The purpose of the form sent to personnel officers was to elicit facts that would indicate the scope and extent of the personnel services offered by the individual colleges. The inquiry form sent to the students was designed to elicit student reaction concerning the degree of student satisfaction with the services investigated in the study.

The results showed that students were generally satisfied with orientation, counseling, and activities, but were only moderately satisfied with the health service, housing, and financial aids. The majority of the personnel services were provided by
the colleges with one exception: The results indicated that most of the Bible colleges
do not assume responsibility in helping their graduate students find work.

Arbuckle and Doyle (1966) recommended that studies should be undertaken to
ascertain student interest in activities, to find ways to improve the scholarship and
grants-in-aid programs, and to completely reevaluate the student discipline program.
They also recommended that some type of research program be initiated and suggested
that the colleges look into the possibility of initiating an in-service training program
under the direction of a professionally trained researcher.

Robinson (1966) conducted a study to determine student evaluation of the
adequacy of student personnel services in selected institutions of higher education in
Texas. The problem of the study was to develop an inventory of student personnel
services that could be used to examine the extent to which each service met the needs
of university students. Organization, counseling and testing services, new student
orientation services, student housing and dining services, campus parking and traffic
services, and student union services were the areas included in student personnel
services in this study. An analysis was made of the important literature pertaining to
student personnel services in colleges and universities. From this analysis, the
inventory of student personnel services was developed.

According to Robinson (1966), four universities with enrollments in excess of
12,000 students were selected, and 400 students from each university were requested to
evaluate the services. Each service was evaluated by the students in three ways: (a)
extent to which the service was actually needed, (b) extent to which the service was actually received, and (c) extent to which college students should receive the service.

Participants in the study totaled 711 students.

A statistical analysis of the responses to the 30 services was made on the basis of the 50-50 proportion. A significant proportion of the respondents actually needed 21 of the services, actually received 17 of the services, and perceived all 30 services as being needed by college students (Robinson, 1966).

The following conclusions based upon the findings were made: Each student personnel service was perceived by the respondents as being needed for all college students; a greater proportion of students needed the total personnel services than actually received the services; half the students failed to receive adequate new-student orientation; adequate use was not made of test results in counseling students; housing workers did not measure up to the expectations of the students; the student health services were adequate; the causes of misbehavior were not examined adequately by the colleges; and student union governing boards experienced undue interference from the administration.

Recommendations resulting from Robinson's (1966) study included the following:

1. Pre-college orientation programs need further study by the colleges to make their programs more effective.

2. Orientation programs should be given more attention in the specific area of academic counseling.
3. Housing workers' effectiveness should be evaluated with the objective of upgrading the quality of personnel employed.

4. Financial aid programs should be reviewed with the objective of realistically considering the gaps between need and fulfillment.

5. A realistic, cooperative effort of the faculty and administration is needed to improve the total personnel services provided by each institution.

Langston (1968) conducted a study on an evaluation of the student personnel services at Kentucky State College. The problem in this study was to determine through the opinions of faculty, students, and administrators the degree to which the present student personnel program at Kentucky State College was meeting the stated objectives in the fulfillment of student needs consistent with the educational objectives of the college.

Findings from Langston's (1968) study revealed that the students indicated that 3 of the 12 areas of student personnel services were adequate, including New Student Orientation, Extra-Class Activities, and Placement Services. According to the 51% Yes criterion, the faculty approved the following 7 of 12 areas of student personnel services: New Student Orientation, Counseling Services, Extra-Class Activities, Adjustment of Institutional Program to Student Needs, Student Financial Aids and Part-Time Employment; Placement Services; and Student Personnel Records. The areas that achieved the 51% affirmative criterion for approval by the total group were New Student Orientation, Extra-Class Activities, Adjustment of Institutional Program to Student Needs, Student Personnel Records, and Guidance in Student Conduct.
On the basis of the criteria, limitations of the study, and the sample studied, the following conclusions were drawn concerning Langston's (1968) study:

1. A student personnel program does exist in a functional state at Kentucky State College.

2. The existing program of student personnel services was not adequate to meet all of the students' needs.

3. The effectiveness of some of the student personnel services had been limited because they had not been adequately communicated to the students.

4. The faculty indicated that they were less informed concerning the student personnel services than were the students.

5. There were 8 of 12 student personnel services that were recommended for examination.

6. A percentage of negative responses by the student group indicated that the areas of Food Services, Health Services, and Guidance in Student Conduct should receive special attention.

7. Faculty tended to perceive more services as adequate if they knew the service was available and that it had positive potential rather than the functional status and use of the service by students.

8. There was a high degree of faculty-student agreement in the areas that were rated as adequate by both groups and those that were recommended for examination for failing to meet the 51% Yes criterion.

Ross (1968) conducted a study to examine the opinions of the administration, faculty members, and student personnel workers of Ohio University regarding the importance of a set of student personnel functions; their opinions regarding the provision for these functions at Ohio University; and if they believed the functions
were performed, their awareness of how well and in what areas they were being performed. The following null hypotheses were tested in the study:

1. There is no consistent response pattern among the administration, the faculty, and student personnel workers concerning the importance of each of the 40 statements on the Student Personnel Service Questionnaire.

2. There is no consistent response pattern among the faculty members of each of the colleges within the university concerning the importance of each of the 40 statements on the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire.

3. There is no consistent response pattern between faculty who serve as advisors to student organizations and those who do not serve as advisors to student organizations concerning the importance of each of the 40 statements on the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire.

4. There is no consistent response pattern between faculty with tenure and faculty without tenure concerning the importance of each of the 40 statements on the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire.

5. There is no consistent response pattern among student personnel workers in any of the eight areas concerning the importance of each of the 40 statements on the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire as compared to student personnel workers who work in any of the other specific areas.

6. There is no consistent response pattern among student personnel workers concerning the importance of their functions as compared to their opinions on how well their functions are performed (Ross, 1968).

The results of the chi-square tests in Ross's (1968) study revealed that there are discrepancies in the opinions of administrators, faculty members, and student personnel workers on 26 of the student personnel statements. Student personnel workers are
inclined to view these statements as more important than either of the other two groups. There are differences of opinions among faculty members of the colleges, between advisors and non-advisors, and between faculty with and without tenure; however, these differences are not as numerous as the differences for the total sample. Each of the eight student personnel areas contained statements in which these differences occur, but there is no predictable pattern for the responses. All five statements in the areas of Counseling and Student Activities showed significant differences for the total sample. There is an apparent lack of knowledge about whether certain student personnel functions are performed at Ohio University. There is also a lack of knowledge regarding who performs the functions and how well these functions are accomplished. Because of the small number of student personnel workers identified with certain student personnel functions, it was not possible to test hypothesis five. There is an apparent breakdown of intra-area communication among the student personnel workers regarding student personnel functions.

Based on the findings, Ross (1968) made the following recommendations:

1. Communication among administration, faculty members, and student personnel workers should be promoted.

2. Ways to disseminate more information concerning the various student personnel services should be explored.

3. More information about the overall picture of the student personnel services should be given the three of the groups studied.

4. Effort should be made to further involve the faculty in student personnel services.
5. Further research is needed to determine relationships between the student personnel area in which a student personnel worker is most directly involved and his evaluation of the student services.

6. Research is needed to find effective means of accomplishing the purposes of student services.

7. Ongoing research should be done in assure that the student personnel services meet the changing needs of the university.

8. Means should be devised for more effective communication among student personnel workers to ensure that all facets of the student program serve the final goal—that of facilitating the development of the student.

9. There is a need for further development of instruments that can be used in the evaluation of student personnel programs. The Student Personnel Services Questionnaire should be refined and revised. Among the recommendations were the following: (a) substitute the term Importance for student welfare for Importance for Higher Education; (b) include definitions for the terms, all-campus agency, college, department, and other; (c) rewrite some of the statements to clarify the specific area with which they deal.

10. The use of the Cramer statistic would provide a more meaningful interpretation of the data.

T. B. Johnson (1968/1969) conducted a study of student personnel services in selected Illinois 4-year colleges and junior colleges. The study analyzed perceptions of selected student personnel services in nine Illinois 4-year colleges and seven junior colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Questionnaires were mailed to randomly selected faculty members of all ranks, student personnel administrators, and students of all academic classes. Students were categorized further as members of the following groups: resident, Greek-letter, non-affiliated, junior college, 4-year college, and living off campus. The survey
instrument focused on the following student personnel services: (a) admissions and orientation; (b) counseling services; (c) faculty advisement; (d) activities program; (e) housing; (f) residential counseling program; (g) fraternities and sororities; (h) placement services; and (i) financial aids and scholarships.

Respondents in T. B. Johnson's (1968/1969) study were asked to rate the effectiveness of 45 specific student personnel services on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very effective) to 5 (very ineffective). Analysis of the findings revealed the following:

1. Student personnel administrators reported evaluations equivalent to the highest mean scores in 27 (60%) of the questions.

2. Scores of faculty tended to be distributed between the higher scores of student personnel administrators and the lower scores of student groups.

3. Instructors' mean scores tended to coincide more frequently with students' ratings than did faculty or student personnel administrators' scores.

4. Faculty and student personnel administrators' mean evaluations seldom were parallel to students' assessments of the same services.

5. Some freshmen and sophomores were unaware of certain administrative procedures and therefore could not appraise accurately the effectiveness of some services.

6. Mean scores for junior college students were usually not consonant with scores supplied by 4-year college students.

7. Mean scores of junior college students, commuting students, and those living off campus often showed similar appraisals.
Admissions and orientation programs generally were regarded as effective by all groups. From 39% to 45% of all groups reported that specific remedial courses were not available (T. B. Johnson, 1968/1969).

The advisement function was accorded a rating of neither effective nor ineffective by students and by personnel administrators. Faculty judgments of advisement were more favorable and in sharp contrast to the ratings by junior college students, which approached the ineffective category.

According to Johnson (1968/1969), availability of counseling on personal and social problems received ratings of slightly less than effective. Religious counseling generally was regarded as effective by all groups, but counseling for married and foreign students received lower ratings. Sixty percent of the 4-year college students reported that counseling for married students was unavailable.

Availability of a student center to provide for students' social and recreational needs received low ratings from junior college students (2,922) and off-campus students (2,633). Student personnel deans evaluated this service nearly 1,100 higher. Sixty-seven percent of the junior college students reported that fraternities were not available.

The vast majority of junior college students commute. The effectiveness of a residence counseling staff received average ratings of 2,840 from resident students and 2,823 from all 4-year college students. Personnel deans rated this service as effective (2,093). The development of student government and social-cultural programs in the
residence halls and Greek-letter organizations was judged neither effective nor ineffective. The locating of off-campus housing was assigned lowest mean scores by Greek-letter societies (3,278), students living off campus (3,200), and upperclassmen. Placement services and financial aid received ratings of effective from all groups, with junior college students providing a lower evaluation and a substantial percentage indicating that they were uninformed about the service.

Student participation in determining institutional policies which directly affected them was accorded a middle rating by junior college students (3,096), students living off campus and commuting students (3,021), but an effective rating by student personnel administrators (2,147) (T. B. Johnson, 1968/1969).

W. M. Johnson (1969) conducted a study on faculty perception of student personnel services. The problem of this study was to compare the perceptions of student personnel services between the instructional staff and student personnel workers at Colorado State College. Additional comparisons were made between tenured and non-tenured staff, among school or division affiliations, and among the four faculty ranks.

The major purpose of this study was to gather perceptions from full-time instructional staff and student personnel workers that could be used in evaluating student personnel services on the Colorado State College campus. A secondary purpose was to discover if these same perceptions differed significantly when grouped
on the basis of tenure and non-tenure, school or division affiliation, and the four faculty ranks.

The perceptions selected included (a) importance of the service; (b) awareness of existence of the service; (c) effectiveness of the service; and (d) location of the service.

The eight areas of student personnel services were as follows: (a) admissions, registration, and records; (b) counseling services; (c) health services; (d) housing and food services; (e) student activities; (f) financial aid and placement; (g) student conduct; and (h) special services.

The major conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. There is less difference in the perceptions of the importance of student personnel services between instructional staff and personnel workers than is generally thought.

2. Staff members are largely aware of the existence of those student personnel services administered on their campus.

3. Staff members are unwilling or unable to judge the effectiveness of the personnel services offered.

4. Staff members show a tendency to require more information as to the campus location of the various personnel services. (W. M. Johnson, 1969)

Van Cleef (1968) utilized the reactions of students and faculty in his study of the student personnel services at Sul Ross State College in Alpine, Texas, in 1965. Van Cleef chose Mahler's instrument, Student Personnel Services As You See Them, to gather data on 11 areas: housing and food; orientation; health; counseling; curricu-
The major findings of Van Cleef's (1968) study were that students perceived the orientation program and personnel administration scales more favorably than any of the other areas, and they indicated negative responses toward housing and food, student activities, placement, counseling, and curriculum needs. High proportions of uncertain responses were noted in financial aid, counseling, and health services. In general, the results of the study indicated that the student personnel program was not meeting the needs of the students.

Delvin's (1968) study provided a synthesis and compendium of the literature that dealt with the evaluation of student personnel service programs in institutions of higher education. His study summarized and compared two types of evaluation methods, procedure and techniques: those that had been recommended but remained untested and those that had previously been used to evaluate student personnel service programs. Fifty-one sources from the literature were identified, compared, summarized, and used in the study. Thirty-eight of the sources were classified as making recommendation, and 13 were found to report evaluations of student personnel service programs. Delvin made tabulations and presented narrative summaries in comparing the two portions of literature. Summary contrasts between the recommendations and the actual practices were then made and conclusions drawn. Some of the major findings were (a) That the procedures followed in the reported
evaluations differed markedly from those which were recommended; (b) that, where three methods (experimental, developmental, and survey) were recommended, it was found that only the survey method was actually used; and (c) that eight techniques were recommended, but only three of these were used.

Todd (1969) conducted a study of student perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services at a large state university and a small state college. Significant differences were found in every comparison made between groups, with the exception of the comparison made between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Home Economics. The groups are as follows, with the areas for which the evidence permitted rejection of the null hypotheses included in parentheses: university-college total sample (total score, orientation, counseling, housing, financial aid, placement, and student personnel records); university and college lowerclassmen (orientation, counseling, housing, financial aid, placement, and student personnel records); university and college upperclassmen (total score, orientation, financial aid, placement, and student personnel records); university upper- and lowerclassmen (orientation and placement); college upper- and lowerclassmen (orientation, placement, and student personnel records); university men and women (counseling); and college men and women (total score, orientation, housing, extra-class activities, adjustment of institution to student needs, financial aid, and placement).

The significant differences existing among the colleges were as follows: Agriculture-Arts and Sciences (total score, health, adjustment of institution to student
needs, personnel records, and discipline); Agriculture-Business (total score, health, adjustment of institution to student needs, personnel records, and discipline); Agriculture-Business (total score, health, food, personnel records, and discipline); Agriculture-Education (health and personnel records); Agriculture-Engineering (personnel records); Agriculture-Home Economics (health); Arts and Sciences-Business (adjustment of institution to student needs); Arts and Sciences-Education (adjustment of institution to student needs, placement, and discipline); Arts and Sciences-Engineering (health and placement); Business-Education (discipline); Business-Engineering (health); Education-Engineering (health); Business-Home Economics (food); Education-Home Economics (adjustment of institution to student needs); and Engineering-Home Economics (health) (Todd, 1969).

Students from the small college showed a significantly more favorable attitude toward total score, orientation, counseling, financial aid, placement, and student personnel records. Students from the university indicated a more favorable attitude toward the service of housing. Students from both institutions indicated at least a moderately favorable attitude toward all the services tested with the exception of health services. The evidence also supports the proposition that students of certain colleges within a university show more favorable perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services than students of other colleges within the university (Todd, 1969).

Harris (1968) conducted a study of student personnel services at Indiana University. This research was designed to study some of the quantitative and
qualitative aspects of the Division of Student Personnel of Indiana University in Bloomington. The three major purposes of this proposed study were (a) to attempt to determine the perceived needs for student personnel services at Indiana University as expressed by the faculty of that institution; (b) to obtain opinions of the faculty concerning the adequacies and inadequacies of the various areas of student personnel services; and (c) to derive conclusions from the findings that could bring about a better organized and more functional program of student personnel services.

From Harris's (1968) investigation, it was determined that the majority of the participants generally perceived that the students had a great need for all student personnel related functions except for the areas of dental services and religious activities. According to the responses of the faculty members, information concerning the place and function of the Division of Student Personnel had not been made available to the faculty in any manner to insure understanding. The number of 2 responses indicated a definite lack of familiarity with the student personnel policies and the need for better lines of communications.

According to harris (1968) there were no distinct areas with which the faculty expressed dissatisfaction. Faculty members who had been advising student groups were more familiar with the services provided by the Division of Student Personnel than the faculty members who were not advising student groups. Faculty members who had been at Indiana University for 4 or more years seemed to have a more
favorable attitude toward the student personnel program as currently practiced than did the faculty members who had been at Indiana University for 3 years or less.

Troescher (1969) conducted a descriptive study of the perceptions held by students, faculty, and student personnel administrators of the student personnel services at Rock Valley College. The major purpose of the study was to compare the perceptions held by the student personnel staff, by the faculty, and by a random sample of students of the student personnel services at Rock Valley College. The study was designed to answer four basic questions: What was the degree of effectiveness of the student personnel services reported by the student personnel staff at Rock Valley College? What was the degree of effectiveness of the student personnel services as reported by the faculty at Rock Valley College? What was the degree of effectiveness of the student personnel services as reported by a sample of students at Rock Valley College? Were there significant differences in the perceptions held by student personnel staff, faculty, and students toward any of the student personnel services at Rock Valley College?

The findings of Troescher's (1969) study would indicate a consensus among the three groups that services based on student involvement and group participation were implemented effectively. A number of areas showed no significant differences in terms of degree of effectiveness as perceived by the three groups. These areas included pre-college information, health appraisal, intercollegiate athletics, academic regulatory,
scholarship awarding, and cooperative placement. Based on the findings, the following conclusions were made:

1. Results indicated that Raines' instrument was valid to use in rating a student personnel program.

2. Fair to poor ratings of some services may have resulted from the lack of time to develop some aspects of the total program. The relative newness of the college could also have been a factor.

3. The fair to poor student ratings in the areas of student inductive, group orienting, health educative, health clinical, and housing seemed to be related to a lack of publicity of the nature of the services available at Rock Valley College.

4. One could infer from the data the fact that faculty and student personnel staff agreed in their perceptions of many of the services as being implemented effectively giving indications of cooperation and communication between these two groups regarding these services.

5. The large number of high ratings of services by the students indicated that they saw the student personnel services as being a valuable part of the program at Rock Valley College.

6. The agreement of the perceptions of the three groups that a majority of the services were being effectively implemented would indicate that the services are playing a positive role in the total school program.

7. The study, within its limitations, revealed a sound student personnel program at Rock Valley College.

Dunlop (1970) conducted a study of the student personnel services at the University of Wyoming. The students in this study were grouped according to sex, class standing, place of residence, and residence status. Using Fitzgerald's instrument as a guide, Dunlop developed the Student Perception Form. His instrument contained
39 statements, with four questions asked about each statement: How important is this function for higher education? Have provisions for this function been made at the University of Wyoming? Have you had contact with this function? How effectively do you think this function is performed at the institution?

Dunlop's (1970) study revealed the following findings: The majority of the students had not experienced contact with most of the student personnel functions. Generally speaking, students perceived student personnel as an important aspect of higher education. Where students lived was the most influential factor when comparing their reactions to student personnel functions. Student housing and food service received the most diverse student opinion. Students perceived a lack of communication between themselves and student personnel workers. Female students had a more positive perception of the services than male students. On-campus students seemed more positive in their reactions toward student personnel services than off-campus students. The groups of students studied tended to differ in their needs and attitudes toward student personnel services, and in most cases, the specific services appeared to be used by such a limited portion of the student body that their overall effectiveness seemed questionable.

Evaluations of Student Affairs Services (1971-1992)

Brown (1971) examined student services for adult, part-time occupational-technical students in selected Virginia community colleges. Purposes of the study were to determine (a) characteristics of adult part-time students enrolled in occupational-
technical curriculums or courses at Central Virginia, John Tyler, Southwest Virginia, and Virginia Western Community Colleges; (b) student services considered essential by these students; (c) any differences between the expressed needs of occupational and technical, male and female, younger and older, and occupationally experienced and inexperienced respondents; (d) activities related to student services considered appropriate by respondents for occupational-technical instructors to perform; and (e) guidelines for student services designed to meet the expressed needs of the group studied.

The need for the investigation was established through references to related literature in which the following, corresponding to purposes of the study, were described: characteristics of the adult part-time student, services identified as essential, services for female adult students, student services in terms of age groups and employment experience, the student services role of occupational-technical faculty, and guidelines for student services (Brown, 1971).

The conclusions of Brown's (1971) study were as follows:

1. Respondents were busy, practical individuals interested in conservation of time and effort.

2. Occupationally inexperienced students required more extensive student services than experienced respondents.

3. Respondents felt that the student services role of instructors should be limited to instructional and related career development activities.
4. The lack of required courses in the evening was the most serious problem encountered by these students in their educational program.

The faculty perceptions of the student personnel services at the University of Wyoming were analyzed in a subsequent study conducted by Bringhurst (1972). The purpose of this study was to determine if the perceptions of the faculty would differ significantly when subgrouped and if they would differ from the student perceptions obtained in Dunlop's study of 1970. The data were collected by a questionnaire, an adaption of Dunlop's Student Perception Form. Bringhurst reported these findings:

1. The faculty responded more positively about the effectiveness of the student personnel services than did the students studied by Dunlop.

2. The faculty appeared to be less aware of and possibly less concerned about student personnel services than were the students.

3. Faculty who served as advisors to student groups were more aware of student needs and concerns than other faculty. (pp. 104-105).

Stahl (1972) designed a study to investigate whether significant changes took place in freshman student reactions toward student personnel services at the University of Wyoming. Male and female freshmen living in residence halls were studied, and it was conclusioned that freshmen's perceptions of the student personnel services did not change during their first year on campus; there were no significant differences between male and female students' perceptions; and student personnel services were perceived as important aspects of higher education.
The perceptions of faculty, students, and student personnel workers at 10 North Carolina community colleges were studied by Emerson (1971), who found significant differences among colleges in perceived effectiveness of and familiarity with student personnel services. Faculty rated effectiveness significantly lower than did students or student personnel workers, whose ratings coincided. Faculty and students in this study rated their familiarity with student services significantly lower than did student personnel workers.

Galligan (1972) conducted a study of the perceptions of student personnel programs by the professional student personnel workers in Maryland public junior and community colleges. The purpose of this study was to obtain the judgments of the professional student personnel workers in the 14 public 2-year colleges in Maryland in 1971 regarding the adequacy of the student personnel programs and the effectiveness of the student services constituting those programs. A national study coordinated by Raines in 1964-1965 showed that junior college student personnel programs, with few exceptions, were inadequately staffed, funded, and organized to fulfill their stated objectives as based on the responses to the model junior college student personnel program. One of the several recommendations of the 1964-1965 study was that the study be replicated 5 years later. One of the objectives of Galligan's study was to compare the responses of the Maryland group with those of the national study 6 years previous.
The major findings of Galligan's (1972) study were that 32 of the 34 services comprising the national model of 2-year college student personnel programs were recognized by the majority of respondents as services provided in the Maryland institutions; 31 of the services were perceived by the majority of the respondents as necessary; only 16 of the services were rated favorably by the majority as of sufficient scope to serve all students; and only 14 of the 34 services received a favorable rating by the majority as to the quality of performance of the services. An investigation of the professional qualifications of the Maryland subjects revealed that only one-third of the respondents met the academic preparation criterion established by the national study. However, 74% of the chief student personnel administrators in the study were professionally qualified, a considerable improvement over the situation found in 1964-65.

Galligan (1972) concluded that student personnel programs have improved in the development of services for students; implementation of these same services in terms of effectiveness is still lacking; confusion resulting from terminology and semantics remains; staffing patterns indicate increased attention to professional qualifications; and the student personnel profession has not established evaluative procedures to measure the effectiveness of its services.

Recommendations were formulated in two sets: one for the Maryland institutions and one for further research. The need for developing measures for
assessing the effectiveness of student personnel services was identified as most pressing (Galligan, 1972).

Kaplan (1972) conducted a study on graduate students' evaluations of student personnel services available to graduate students at the University of Mississippi. The problem of this study was to identify the expressed needs held by the 1971 spring semester graduate students of the student personnel services available to graduate students of the university.

The purpose of Kaplan's (1972) study was to obtain information from the graduate students that could be used in the evaluation of the student personnel services for graduate students on the University of Mississippi campus and to determine whether the available services met their expressed needs. The study was designed to answer six questions:

1. How important are the student personnel services to graduate students?
2. Are the graduate students aware of the personnel services?
3. Have they made use of the services?
4. How satisfied are graduate students with the personnel services?
5. Do graduate students know the location of the services?
6. What recommendations do graduate students have that would help to improve the existing personnel services?

Kaplan (1972) used a Student Personnel Services Questionnaire composed of three sections. This instrument was a modified form of the questionnaire that
Fitzgerald originated in 1959 for a study on the Michigan State University campus. The first part was to obtain identifying information; the second part was composed of 40 statements representing functions and responsibilities of student personnel services available to graduate students; and the third part contained open-end questions concerning recommendations for the improvement of the personnel services.

The findings in Kaplan's (1972) study indicated that student personnel services available to graduate students were not specifically designed, nor specifically effective, for those students. The following additional conclusions were reached:

1. The student personnel services available to graduate students were not always known to the graduate students at the University of Mississippi.

2. Graduate students were often not taking advantage of the services provided for them because of their unawareness of the services. In each function, the responses followed a definite pattern of indicating a lack of awareness and use of the services provided.

3. The data indicated a lack of knowledge concerning the provisions for the location of the responsibility for the student services functions.

4. The services of major importance as seen by graduate students were found to be in the Financial Aids and Placement areas. The services regarded as being the least important was that pertaining to Religious Life.

5. Student organizations did not exist for the cultivation of social relationships among graduate students and the findings indicated that there was a felt need for social relationships among those students.

6. Because of a marked lack of interest exhibited by some of the staff in the area of student personnel services, a situation existed among the graduate students in the sample of this study in which
the student seemed to be convinced that no one cared enough to help him or to assist him when he needed help.

Jones (1972) conducted a study designed to identify the perceptions of student personnel services at the University of Mississippi by undergraduate students enrolled full-time during the 1971 spring semester at the university. The study reported the perceptions of students about student personnel services regarding the importance of student personnel services to their welfare as undergraduate students; students' awareness of the existence of student personnel services; students' use of student personnel services; students' satisfaction with student personnel services; students' knowledge of the location of student personnel services; and students' recommendations regarding student personnel services.

The findings indicated that all the areas of student personnel services were important to students' welfare as undergraduate students and that students generally knew the location of each of the services (Jones, 1972). The findings revealed that students were not aware of the existence of some of the specific functions of each service and often used only one facet of a particular service. Students indicated that improvement was needed in all areas of student personnel services. The services of admissions, academic records, and student activities were perceived as meeting the needs of students. Students expressed dissatisfaction with orientation, precollege counseling, recruiting, registration, the student health service, disciplinary procedures, the financial aids service, and campus security. The service with which students
expressed the greatest dissatisfaction was housing. Students were the most unaware of the student counseling center and the placement service.

Jones (1972) recommended that, when using the Student Personnel Services Questionnaire for further research, the responses should be limited to bipolar ones. An attempt should be made to refine each of the statements so that the five questions asked would apply more accurately to each statement.

An evaluation instrument was designed by Freeman, Nudd, and O'Donnell (1972) to measure students' perceptions of the student affairs at the University of Houston. Students were asked to complete evaluation forms immediately after they had used one of the services. Results were later discussed between the director of a service area and the staff member. The project was well received by students and staff. The authors concluded that the use of the evaluation instrument was an inexpensive way of obtaining valuable information about the various student personnel services as perceived by students.

Shuman's (1972) study assessed the perceptions of the resident faculty, the faculty administrators, and the student personnel administrators to provide a basis for making recommendations for the improvement of the program of student personnel services at Arizona State University. According to Shuman, there was general agreement among the three groups regarding the student personnel point of view. The faculty administrators appeared to be better informed in all areas of the existing student personnel program than were the resident faculty. The faculty administrators' opinions
concerning the existing student personnel program were more closely aligned with the opinions of the student personnel administrators than were the opinions of the resident faculty.

Shuman's (1972) major recommendations were that an information and interpretation service be initiated by student personnel administrators to inform the members of the resident faculty and the faculty administrators of the student personnel services on the Arizona State University campus. Each service area should have its own advisory committee, with adequate faculty representation, and the chairpersons of these committees should constitute an advisory committee to the vice president for student affairs. Faculty participation on the advisory committees should be rotated each year, with maximum service of 2 years. Faculty members serving as chairpersons of advisory committees should be encouraged to attend national or regional professional meetings of the service they are advising. The university should reduce teaching loads for faculty members serving as chairpersons of advisory committees.

Faculty perceptions of student personnel services at the University of Wyoming were investigated by Bringhurst (1972) using a modification of Fitzgerald's Student Personnel Services Questionnaire. It was found that faculty perceived student personnel services as an important aspect of higher education. Faculty in Health and Biological Sciences, Fine Arts and Humanities, Social Science, and Education were more aware of and had more contact with student personnel services than faculty in Physical Sciences, Commerce, and Industry. Faculty who were older, had been on
campus longer and had more rank had contact with and were more satisfied with the effectiveness of student personnel services than younger and new individuals with less rank. A large number of faculty had very little awareness of and contact with student personnel services on this campus.

An evaluation of the student personnel services at Lewis-Clark State College in Lewinton, Idaho, was conducted by Vickers (1972), who obtained the opinions from the then enrolled students, as well as previously enrolled students, which could be used to appraise student services at the institution. For his instrument, he adapted Dunlop’s Student Perception Form, using 40 statements to evaluate the student services at the college. The instrument was constructed in two parts to ascertain students’ perceptions as they related to the importance, provisions, contact, and effectiveness of each student personnel component. The areas in the instrument included activities, counseling, discipline, financial aid, health services, housing and food services, orientation, placement, registrar and admissions, and special services. The questionnaire also provided the opportunity for students to write comments and/or recommendations concerning the services.

Vickers’ (1972) study revealed the following conclusions: An apathetic or possibly hostile attitude existed on the part of the students toward student personnel services; many students were not aware that student services existed, and many of those who were aware were not familiar with the operation of the services; students were more critical of services than students at other colleges cited in the review of
related research; student personnel services at the college apparently were not meeting the needs of the students; student services were meeting the needs of on-campus students more effectively than of those who lived off campus; and services such as admissions, financial aid, faculty advising, and registration were regarded as being more important than the other services.

Mortvedt (1972) conducted a study of inventoried perceptions of key administrative officers in Illinois community colleges concerning student personnel services. Mortvedt’s belief was that, if student personnel services is an integral part of the community college enterprise, then it is important to know the perceptions of key administrators, which will ultimately affect decision making regarding those services. The purpose of the study was to investigate the perceptions of presidents, chief student personnel officers, and chief academic officers concerning student personnel services at Illinois public community colleges. The main focus was to describe how key administrators viewed the quality and importance of student development functions in their colleges.

In Mortvedt’s (1972) study, the student development functions, where human development is considered essential, were rated low in importance and low in quality by all three populations. However, the functions usually considered to be clerical in nature received high ratings in both importance and quality. Illinois community colleges may be "student centered" but, if so, then in a very narrow sense. In this particular study, "student centered" means getting transcripts out on time, processing
work, admitting and registering students, and other activities that could probably be performed quite adequately by well-trained clerks.

The study by Mortvedt (1972) pointed out large differences among the ratings of key administrators from Illinois community colleges regarding the importance and quality of student development functions in their respective colleges. Student personnel services is not a very strong or forceful administrative area within Illinois public community colleges. Confusion in the aims of education and the lack of an overall theory of education and learning are probably at the root of the problem.

Key administrators in Illinois public community colleges appear to hold narrow views of what is meant by human development. This might mean that "student development specialists" (sometimes referred to as "student development facilitators") should become more active in the development of the philosophical, curricular, and co-curricular experiences and activities of community colleges. It also means that the personal and professional identity which is sorely needed must be established to help make student personnel workers effective (Mortvedt, 1972).

Terenzini (1973) attempted to compare the views of college and university presidents with chief student personnel officers in a study at Syracuse University in New York. Using the Blackburn Student Personnel Purpose Q-Sort, he queried 72 college presidents and 128 chief student personnel officers on the purposes of student personnel programs and found close agreement between the two groups on the traditional functions of student personnel services. Chief personnel officers were more
inclined than presidents to agree that student personnel programs should be involved in academic affairs and that students should be more involved in the governance of their institutions. Research was not found to be among the primary goals of chief personnel officers.

In a 1973 study, Swearingen surveyed faculty, administration, and student leaders at the Big Ten universities to determine attitudes toward student personnel programs. The instrument used sought attitudes on development of the student, the role of student personnel work, and services for students. It was found that the faculty showed stronger positive attitudes toward development of the student in terms of social maturity and value judgment; recognition of a deferred credit plan for financial aid; desirability of civil court processing of civil law violations on campus; and rejection of financial aid regardless of academic record. The student personnel administrators showed strong positive attitudes toward environmental health programs; recognition of student personnel workers as ombudsmen, advocators, and facilitators; and projection of student personnel function into the community outside the university.

Cowins (1974) conducted a study to evaluate the student personnel services at the University of North Florida. In carrying out the study's major purpose of ascertaining perceptual data that could be used in the evaluation, a questionnaire developed by Fitzgerald (1959), modified by Rankin (1966), and updated by Cowins, was used to identify and compare the perceptions of student personnel services held by 29 administrators, 60 faculty members, and 200 students.
Three hypotheses were tested by Cowins (1974); the first was to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in the number of responses between students and faculty to questions pertaining to the eight student personnel services (admissions, registration and records, counseling, financial aid and placement, food services, health services, special services, student activities, and student conduct) based on importance, awareness, effectiveness, and location. The second and third hypotheses were to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in the number of responses between students and administrators and administrators and faculty, respectively, to the eight student personnel services based on four areas of perception.

The questionnaire that Cowins (1974) used consisted of 40 statements relating to the functions and responsibilities of student personnel services on the University of North Florida campus. For each of the 40 statements, four questions were asked regarding the respondents' perceptions of importance, awareness, effectiveness, and location. Questionnaires were mailed to each faculty member and administrator included in the study. It was administered on campus to all students who were included in the study.

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed by the University of Oklahoma's computer center, using a stepwise discriminant analysis program developed by Sampson (1970). Major conclusions resulted in the rejection of all three
hypotheses because of the influence of some particular composite of the variables in each of the four perceptual areas (Cowins, 1974).

Moyer (1975) conducted a study to determine the perceptions and reactions of students and faculty members to the student personnel programs at Memphis State University in Tennessee. Four subproblems were addressed:

How do students perceive the student personnel services?

How do faculty members perceive the student personnel services?

How do student perceptions compare with faculty members' perceptions?

How can student and faculty perceptions be used to evaluate the development and managements of student personnel services? (p. ix)

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Students appeared to be satisfied with health services and food services. Counseling, new student orientation, placement, and academic-social services appeared to be inconclusive and it was felt that students were unfamiliar with these services. These activities apparently need more improved communication lines with the students. On the basis of their low ratings, housing, financial aids, student activities, and student discipline services need to be analyzed further to determine specific reasons for students' dissatisfaction.

2. Although faculty members gave generally favorable responses, there were some areas where faculty members were in agreement that services needed improvements. Student personnel workers should make further appraisals of the student government function, vocational (career) counseling offerings, financial aids information policies, and remedial study and academic advising programs in an effort to determine why faculty members perceived these areas as problems.

3. There appeared to be a uniformity between student and faculty groups in their perceptions of student services; however, there is a need to examine the particular details to determine why faculty members were
rating some services more favorably than students were. Faculty
members could be showing a bias in favor of administration policies.

4. Comparisons by student sub-groups revealed few differences that
would indicate that students thought there was discrimination among
student groups. There seemed to be a need to reevaluate orientation
services as this service received progressively lower perceptions as
students advanced from freshmen to seniors.

5. A certain uniformity among faculty subgroups that tended to indicate
that, with some exceptions, there were no major differences in their
views of student services. Longer tenure apparently helps to improve
faculty knowledge of the services. It was also concluded that older and
more experienced faculty members might have more empathy with
students and recognize student problems more quickly. (Moyer, 1975
[pp. 85-86])

In a study of faculty perceptions of student personnel services at a small liberal
arts college in New York State, Astmann (1975) used a questionnaire and personal
interviews to collect the data. Results indicated that faculty members considered
student personnel services to be important but peripheral to the educational process.
They also viewed the services as being complex and with little defined purpose. Sixty
percent of the faculty indicated that monies should be taken from student personnel
areas and given to areas that would directly benefit the faculty. The overall results of
this study indicated that student personnel administrators needed to convey to the
college community the importance of assisting students outside formal academic areas.

Kennedy (1976) conducted a study to determine the perceptions of student
services maintained by student subcultures at Ohio State University. It was
hypothesized that not all student types were equally aware of these services, believed
them important, used them to the same degree, or found them equally satisfactory.
Information about such perceptions would be valuable to student personnel administrators in their efforts to foster student development.

Chi-square tests revealed that no statistically significant relationships existed between subculture preference and the variables of age, sex, or marital status. A statistically significant relationship did exist between subculture preference and college of enrollment, indicating that different colleges attract students who have different orientations and who are developing differently (Kennedy, 1976).

According to Kennedy (1976), some general conclusions may be drawn from the statistical tests performed on the data. The seniors were generally aware of all student services and believed them to be important. They used some of the services at least occasionally, and others, especially those off campus, much less frequently. Students who used the services generally expressed satisfaction with them.

Analysis of variance showed some statistically significant differences among the subcultures with regard to their perceptions of the services, and strong trends were discernible. The Confirmed Collegiate was most aware of the services and the most likely to think them important, whereas the Closed and Unchanging Person was least generally aware of them or likely to hold them important. The Emerging Person, the Average Student Who Changed, and the Confirmed Collegiate tended to use more services more frequently. Less frequent usage was noted by the More Generally Alienated, the Societally Alienated Materialist, and the Tradition-Bound Vocationalist. The Confirmed Collegiate and the Emotionally Dissonant Intellectual expressed
satisfaction with a greater number of services. Those expressing lower levels of satisfaction were the More Generally Alienated, the Inexperienced Social, and the Closed and Unchanging Person (Kennedy 1976).

Hughes (1975) conducted a study to analyze and appraise student personnel programs in selected public junior colleges in Alabama. Data were gathered initially through a questionnaire distributed to each dean of students or a designate. A structured interview with the person who responded to this questionnaire followed. Questionnaires were also presented to all student personnel staff members and selected students at each college. From an analysis of the data, the following conclusions were drawn: Greater than 50% of the functions that comprise a basic junior college student personnel program were implemented at less than a satisfactory level in three of the six colleges participating in the study; all the student personnel programs studied were understaffed in at least one area in relation to the staffing patterns developed in the 1965 study of student personnel programs by the American Association of Junior Colleges; there was a lack of professional in-service training provided in each college for student personnel staff members; fewer than 52% of the students surveyed indicated they had used the counseling services provided by their college; career information and job placement services were not adequately provided in a majority of the student personnel programs; limited student personnel services were offered to students who attended evening classes; and a possible cause of some of the weaknesses inherent in the student personnel programs was a lack of financial resources. Recommendations
relative to these general conclusions were provided, along with specific
recommendations for each individual college.

Abbott (1976) developed a study of faculty, student, and student affairs staff
perceptions of selected student personnel services at the Medical College of Georgia in
an attempt to answer questions related to two dependent variables: the perceived
importance of the student personnel services to the total educational program at the
college and the perceived adequacy of the student personnel services at the Medical
College of Georgia.

The following differences were revealed in the perceptions of the importance of
the student services: The student affairs staff mean ratings were significantly higher
than the ratings of faculty and students; female student ratings were significantly higher
than male student ratings; faculty without a doctoral degree mean ratings were signifi-
cantly higher than faculty with the M. D. degree; undergraduate student ratings were
significantly higher than graduate/professional student ratings; nonmarried student
ratings were significantly higher than married student ratings; and students living on
campus ratings were significantly higher than ratings by off-campus students. There
were no differences in the perceptions of the adequacy variable except that faculty
without the doctorate rated the adequacy of the services significantly higher than the
faculty with the M. D. degree (Abbott, 1976).

In a study to ascertain whether or not the existing student services were meeting
the needs of undergraduate students 25 years of age and older, Mitchell (1976)
examined the perceived impact of student services upon differential groupings of students in the same age group. A questionnaire was developed to ascertain whether or not students 25 years old and older were aware of the 20 selected student services, had utilized the student services, and if utilized, were satisfied with the student services. The 20 university student services under study were grouped into the following six areas of concentration, each with a major and six minor hypotheses: Counseling services, academic advisement services, academic developmental program services, university publication services, university social organizations, and university special interest services.

The six major hypotheses examined whether or not there were significant differences in the percentage of students 25 years old and older who perceived their needs were being met by the six areas of concentration of university student services, according to their responses as to their awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with university student services. A secondary aspect of the problem entailed the minor hypotheses. This involved the limited procedure of utilizing data generated from the major population sample to compare students' responses as to their awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with student services between the following differentiated, dichotomous groupings of students: Lower college/upper college; full-time/part-time; day/evening; male/female; single/married; and students 25-32 years of age/students 32 years of age and older (Mitchell, 1976).
The following are three general implications of Mitchell's (1976) study. A basic implication must refer to the strategic level of unawareness of specific university student services. It was noted that there were fewer response patterns among the students 32 years old and older, married students, lower college students, part-time students, and evening students concerning awareness of student services, suggesting a potential communication need.

A second implication reflects upon the utilization pattern of student services by the older-than-25 student. Although it seemed evident that the lack of students' awareness contributed to their lack of utilization, under-utilization of several critical student services cannot be attributed totally to unawareness. The applicability of the present organization of student services for this student population should be addressed. Of additional note is the report that under-utilization marked the same student groupings as unawareness.

The third implication reflects upon the critical note, that for those students who utilized university student services, the reports were consistently favorable. The finding of consequence was that the vast majority of older-than-25 students who were aware of and utilized student services reported satisfaction with the experience.

McIver (1976) conducted a study concerned with the following question: What is the relationship among administrators, faculty, and students' perceptions of student personnel services at the University of Oklahoma? The major purposes for conducting this study were to obtain perceptions of student personnel services and to determine
whether or not they would differ significantly when grouped on the basis of importance, awareness, effectiveness, and location. A modification of the questionnaire developed by Fitzgerald (1959), consisting of 40 statements, was used in obtaining perceptions of student personnel services held by 35 administrators, 75 faculty members, and 190 students who were officially affiliated with the university.

The first hypothesis tested in McIver's (1976) study was to determine whether there were any discriminations in the perceptions of student personnel services among administrators, faculty, and students pertaining to eight areas of student personnel services (admissions, registration and records, counseling services, financial aid and placement, housing and food services, health services, special services, student activities, and student conduct) based on importance. To determine whether there were any discriminations in responses among administrators, faculty, and students' perception of student personnel services based on awareness, a second hypothesis was tested. A third hypothesis was tested to determine whether there were any discriminations among the three groups' perceptions of student personnel services based on effectiveness. The fourth hypothesis tested was to determine whether there were any discriminations among the three groups' perceptions of student personnel services based on location. In determining whether there were any discriminations in the perceptions of student personnel services based on importance, awareness, effectiveness, and location among the three groups, a fifth hypothesis was tested. The
conclusion resulted in the rejection of the five hypotheses due to the influences of some particular composite of the variables in each of the four perceptual areas.

McDavis (1976) developed an instrument, A Survey of Student Personnel Objectives, which he stated could be used to evaluate whether a college or university student personnel program was achieving its objectives. The instrument contained 50 questions selected by a group of five student personnel workers as being minimally essential. Respondents were asked to respond to each question in two ways: to indicate whether a specific service was provided for students and to determine whether the service assisted faculty, administrators, and the university community in specific ways.

The instrument was administered to a sample of students, faculty, and staff at the University of Florida. Results indicated that more than 59% of the students and faculty responding did not know what services were being offered, and 21% of the student personnel administrators indicated that they did not know about all the services offered (McDavis, 1976).

Walke (1977) conducted a study to ascertain and compare perceptions of needs for student services at Morehead State University in Morehead, Kentucky, as expressed by students, faculty, student services staff, administrators, and members of the governing board of the institution. The 14 functional student services included in the study were academic advising, admissions, orientation, financial aid, counseling,
Among the major findings in Walke's (1977) study were the following:

1. Significant differences between the actual and ideal means were found on 59 of the 70 items.

2. The average difference between actual and ideal means in the areas of international student services, counseling, and academic advising exceeded 1.00, whereas average differences between means in the other 11 areas ranged from .54 for admissions to .86 for financial aid.

3. Differences between the high and low group means exceeded the criterion for practical significance on 58.6% of the items in the actual response set and on 48.6% of the items in the ideal response set.

4. The highest ratings on the majority of items in the actual response set were given by the governing board, student services staff, and administrators, whereas the lowest ratings on the majority of items in the ideal response set were given by students and faculty.

5. The highest ratings on the majority of items in the ideal response set were given by students and student services staff, while the governing board gave the lowest ratings (on 48 items).

6. A general lack of knowledge was indicated in relation to the student services included in the study.

Based on the finds, Walke (1977) concluded the following: There is a perceived need for improvement in all the functional student service areas included in the study; those student services that have no designated director and/or for which responsibility is spread throughout various administrative and/or academic units of the
institution are perceived to be in need of the most attention; a need for more effective communication and more meaningful dialogue between and among the various groups is indicated in all functional student service areas, both in relation to the existing status of the services and in relation to the degree of importance the institution should place on the services; a need exists for better dissemination of information to the campus community concerning student services provided by the institution.

In 1977 Glenister conducted a study designed to determine and compare students’ and student affairs staff members’ perceptions had concerning student services at the State University of New York's Agricultural and Technical College at Canton, New York (SUNY, Canton). The study reported perceptions regarding the degree of importance of student affairs services as reported by students, the degree of importance of student affairs services as reported by student affairs staff, student ratings of the effectiveness of the student affairs services, staff ratings of the effectiveness of student affairs services, and student perceptions of the importance and performance of services compared with those of the student affairs staff.

Students and staff who participated in the study at SUNY, Canton, indicated a high degree of support for the student service functions recommended by the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs. The findings indicated that all the student service functions studied were considered to be important or very important by more than half the students and staff who responded to the questionnaire. Significant differences were found between
student and staff perceptions concerning the degree of importance in only 3 of the 35 functions studied (Glenister, 1977).

More than 50% of the student respondents in Glenister's (1977) study rated the performance of only 15 of the 35 functions as good or excellent. More than 50% of the student affairs staff rated the performance of 31 of the 35 functions studied as good or excellent. Significant differences were found between student and staff perceptions of the performance of 22 of the 35 functions. In three cases, student perceptions of functions were significantly higher than staff perceptions. In 19 cases, staff perceptions of the performance of functions were significantly higher than student perceptions. Fifty percent or more of the students had used 29 of the 35 service functions one or more times.

Pinsky (1978) conducted a study to examine students, faculty, and administrators' perceptions of existing student personnel services at Iowa State University. The Perceptions Student Personnel Services Questionnaire, a modification of the Fitzgerald (1959) questionnaire, was the instrument used. Pinsky made the following conclusions:

1. All groups agreed that the existing student personnel services were important to Iowa State University.

2. The faculty and administrators perceived that the quality of student personnel services was higher than the students' perceptions.

3. All groups agreed that the services of admission and records, student activities, disciplinary services, financial aid services, and placement services were provided.
4. An analysis of the data indicated that generally students were satisfied with some student personnel services and dissatisfied with others.

Tullar (1980) developed procedures for a study to: (a) develop a comprehensive procedural system that could be used for overall assessment of student services at community colleges; (b) test the system in the field; and (c) assess the worth of the system developed. It was concluded that the "opinionnaire" could identify specific services needing improvement. It was also concluded that student affairs professionals could learn much concerning the effectiveness of their respective programs through application of the system. The study also contained an extensive list of conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Goméz (1979/1980) wrote about the need for research in student services:

Literature is replete with urgings by many of the leading figures in the field of College Student Personnel for more abundant and comprehensive evaluative research in the area of student personnel services. Evaluation is a viable concern, for without research and evaluation, the understanding, knowing, and response to student needs can only be speculative. Because of its importance to higher education and because of the increasing emphasis upon accountability to education as a whole, student personnel services must meet student needs. (p. 2)

To meet the above needs, Goméz (1979/1980) conducted a study to obtain student opinion regarding their knowledge of, contact with, and notions of the quality of selected student services on the Michigan State University campus, and to use this information in the appraisal of these selected services. A secondary purpose was to determine whether or not any significant differences existed when the sample population was grouped according to class standing and place of residence. The selected
student services evaluated in the study included admissions and academic orientation, the university counseling center, general services, the office of the registrar, housing and food services, placement services, student activities, and judicial programs.

The study was designed to address the following questions:

1. Were students aware of the selected student services available to them?

2. How much contact did students have with the different services?

3. How did students perceive the effectiveness of the selected student services?

4. What recommendations or criticisms did students have regarding the selected student services? (Gómez, 1979/1980, p. 3)

It was found that generally, students in this sample were very cognizant of the student services evaluated in the study. Slightly fewer than one half of the students did not exercise contact with the selected student services. Of those students who did evaluate the effectiveness of the selected student services, the majority were satisfied with the performance of the services. On-campus students were more aware of, exercised more contact with, and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than off-campus respondents. On-campus upperclassmen were more aware of, exercised more contact with, and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than on-campus underclassmen. Off-campus upperclassmen were more aware of, exercised more contact with, and viewed the effectiveness of the selected student services more favorably than off-campus underclassmen (Gómez, 1979/1980).
In a study of multidemographic definition of nontraditional students and student affairs services, Kalthoff (1981) investigated eight multidemographic definitions of students to determine which were effective in defining the nontraditional student. The effective definitions were then used to compare traditional and nontraditional students concerning their awareness of, need for, and barriers to each of four services at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC). The eight multidemographic definitions included personal relationships with others at college, college experience, independence from pre-college environment, maturity, convenience of the campus, personal freedom, personal relationships with those away from college, and campus orientation. The four student services were the Career Planning and Placement Center, the Counseling Center, the Student Development Office, and the Student Work and Financial Aid Office.

A survey was developed containing 18 demographic questions and 144 questions on the four services. The surveys were mailed to 2,002 students attending SIUC in the fall semester of 1979. A total of 775 (38.7%) surveys were returned, and 766 (38.3%) of these surveys were usable. The analysis of variance test was used with a .05 level of significance (Kalthoff, 1981).

The study found that only two of the eight multidemographic definitions were effective in defining the nontraditional student: personal relationships with others at college and college experience. Multidemographic definitions relating to activities away from campus, such as maturity, personal relationships with those away from
college, and independence from pre-college environment, were found to be ineffective in defining the nontraditional student. Using the two effective definitions, it was found that traditional students were more aware of all four services than were nontraditional students; traditional students used all four services more than did nontraditional students; traditional students had a greater need for the services offered by all four services than did nontraditional students; and nontraditional students experienced greater barriers to all four of the services than did traditional students (Kalthoff, 1981).

Agler (1982) conducted a study to determine the effectiveness of student services and to identify needs of students in the areas of student services at the three colleges of the University of La Verne in California: the undergraduate college, the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the College of Law. A Survey of Services for Students, adapted from an instrument by McDavis (1976), was developed to measure the perceptions of students with respect to their own needs. The instrument is unique in that it assesses both the objectives of student services and the more specific areas of resources available to students outside the classroom. Section 1 of the questionnaire asked for the importance and effectiveness of 24 objectives of student services. Importance and effectiveness were then combined to determine an index of need. Section 2 asked for helpfulness of 20 resources available to students outside the classroom. This study revealed that most students considered the objective important and that approximately one third of the needs measured in the survey were met in varying degrees for the undergraduate and graduate colleges.
The study indicated the need for increased knowledge about student services because the respondents at the three colleges revealed a lack of knowledge about the resources of college psychologist, campus minister, foreign counselor, and career counselor. They, therefore, were unable to judge the helpfulness of these resources, some of which did not directly affect the majority of students (Agler, 1982).

Student friends and professors were found to be the most helpful resources to all three colleges. The deans' offices that service each of the three colleges were found to be helpful by their own constituents. According to Agler (1982), in the distribution of responses to helpfulness of resources, the largest categories of importance were responses of "don't know," and "not applicable." The "not helpful" responses that appeared were so few in number that they did not qualify for listing in the tables. Agler's final conclusion was that the University of La Verne was faced with the challenge of increasing the publicity of its service to students and encouraging its student body to utilize these services.

One of the purposes of Bettandorff's (1981) study of adult student support services was to make a comparison between the attitudes of continuing education administrators and student personnel administrators at 67 institutions of higher education in the Southeast United States regarding the adequacy of current support services and the importance of having support services available for adult students. A second purpose was to develop two types of profiles: to show the primary demographic characteristics of the study participants and to show the level of priorities
given the availability of support services by administrators. A third purpose was to
determine the methods used by administrators in deciding what support services adult
students need and desire.

A questionnaire was mailed to 134 continuing education and student personnel
administrators for Bettendorff’s (1981) study. This questionnaire was developed from
a comprehensive review of previous studies in which adult students identified support
service needs; it consisted of three parts: (a) interval scales for recording attitudes
toward the current adequacy and importance of the availability of support services,
(b) a list of choices for indicating methods used to determine services adult students
need, and (c) a section for recording individual demographic variables. The major
categories of support services addressed by the study were student personnel and
administrative services, counseling services, auxiliary campus services, and class and
credit provisions.

After two mailings, 122 questionnaires were returned; 112 (83.6%) were
usable. Independent t tests were used to determine statistically significant differences
in the response means of the two groups of administrators toward adequacy of current
support services and importance of the availability of support services. Student
personnel administrators considered student personnel and administrative services,
counseling services, and auxiliary campus services to be more adequate than did
continuing education administrators. Continuing education administrators reported that
availability of student personnel and administrative services and class and credit
provisions were more important than did student personnel administrators (Bettandorff, 1981).

Both student personnel and continuing education administrators indicated that asking students about service needs during special meetings or orientation sessions and establishing services and then determining value of services based on extent of use were primary methods used to determine what services are needed by adult students. Participants' profiles were established to show the primary demographic characteristics of the two groups of administrators. The variables were age, sex, years of work experience, academic rank, academic degree, and size of campus.

According to Bettandorff (1981), within each of the two groups, attitudes of male administrators toward the importance of having support services available were compared and contrasted with those of female administrators. Similar comparisons and contrasts were made for age, years of work experience, academic rank, academic degree and size of campus. All four service categories were most frequently considered to be either important or very important.

Among Bellandorff's (1981) recommendations were the following:

1. Additional research should be conducted to increase knowledge related to the returning adult student and programming needs.

2. Additional research should be conducted involving the applicability for adults of the 40 individual support services that made up the questionnaire.

3. The support services identified by the questionnaire should be used as the basis for determining specific service needs of adult students on individual campuses.

4. Use of needs assessments should be increased to determine adult student services.
5. Additional research should be conducted to determine if off-campus adult students have special support service needs.

6. Both groups of administrators should be required to have formal study in the development of and needs of adult students.

7. Efforts should be made to increase the number of women in student personnel and continuing education administrative positions.

Saffian (1980) conducted a study to determine the relationship among three independent variables: (a) student needs for student services, the measurable discrepancy between individuals' self-perception of what is and their idealized self-perception of what should be; (b) awareness, the knowledge that a potential need for responsive student personnel service exists; (c) self-selection, the characteristics of individuals other than need in which some research settings have been known to separate help-seekers from non help-seekers; and (d) the dependent variable use of one or more of the needs in responsive student services. The primary substantive hypothesis was tested by the following null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between the presence of need, self-selection, and awareness in a student population and use of student services. A secondary hypothesis examining the question of congruence between services' goals and student needs was also tested. The secondary null hypothesis stated that the order of priority between students' self-perceived needs and the service goals of student personnel programs are not the same.

A survey instrument including a needs assessment index, an awareness measure, and a self-selection measure was designed (Saffian, 1980). The need items were a
product of individual student personnel staffs' consensus view of department objectives. These objectives were reworded to read as behavior identification statements. These same items were also used to achieve a staff ranking of department objectives. The awareness measure was based on yes-no questions concerning the respondent's knowledge of student services. The self-selection measure was based on selected demographic characteristics. The survey was administered to a random sample of all University of Wisconsin-Madison students excluding those in law and medicine. There was a 37% return of usable data. A comparison with the U.W.-Madison enrollment report for the fall of 1978 showed the respondent sample to be representative of the student population.

Saffian (1980) used multiple linear regression analysis to test the primary hypothesis. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to test the secondary hypothesis. The probability level for all tests of significance was established at .05.

Fourteen models, each based on a different area of student personnel, were tested. The 14 areas were advocacy, information, personal, emotional problems, co-curricular development, study skills, general academics and relaxation, values and decision making, relationships, sexuality, alcohol and drugs, health, career counseling and placement, and financial aids. The major conclusion of the study was that there is considerable evidence to conclude that level-one awareness is the most important factor in determining student use of student services (Saffian, 1980).
Benton (1981) conducted a study of selected student personnel services to determine the perceptions of students at a liberal arts college and a comprehensive university regarding a select group of student personnel services provided by the central student affairs unit and the academic department. The services investigated included academic advising, career development and placement, student organizations, and enrichment activities. These services were examined from the standpoint of importance, awareness, utilization, source, and quality.

The major findings of Benton's (1981) study were that college students were more aware of the existence of select student personnel services than were university students; college students utilized the select group of services to a greater extent than did university students; the academic department was the most important source sought by college and university students for academic advising, career development and placement, and enrichment activities; students were the most important source of student organizations for college and university students; college students were more satisfied with the quality of the services investigated than were university students; and academic departments in the liberal arts college were more homogeneous than they were in the comprehensive university with respect to the four select student services studied.

A study by Gauntner (1981) was conducted to determine the perceptions of veterans affairs coordinators regarding student personnel services that are needed by veterans, available to veterans, effective for veterans, and most frequently used by veterans at public 4-year colleges and universities in the United States. Also investigated were the differences in perceptions of coordinators based on size of the
institution and on whether the coordinator was a veteran or non veteran of the military service.

The analysis of Gauntner's (1981) data indicated the following:

1. Student services needed by veterans were generally the same for veterans at all institutions, regardless of size. The most pressing needs of veterans were usually veterans office services, financial aid, academic advisement, placement, and testing. Based upon veteran status of the coordinator, those who were veterans perceived a greater number of the needs to be most pressing, while non veterans perceived a greater number of the needs to be average pressing needs.

2. Student services available to veterans were generally available at institutions of varying sizes. The degree of availability of those services varied, based on institutional size, with the smaller schools having fewer services available than larger institutions.

3. Although most services were perceived as effective, some were considered more effective than others. This differed with the size of the school and the status of the veterans affairs coordinator.

4. Student services that were most frequently used by veterans were generally veterans office services, financial aid, and academic advisement.

The conclusions drawn from Gauntner's (1981) study indicated the following:

1. The services and functions of the veterans office were considered the most needed, most effective, most used, and most available.

2. Veterans affairs coordinators who were veterans tended to perceive more of the needs of veterans as most pressing needs, whereas non veteran coordinators perceived more of the needs as average pressing needs.

3. The degree of availability of student services at smaller institutions was not as great as that at larger institutions.
4. Veterans affairs coordinators who were veterans perceived a greater number of student services to be most effective, whereas non veteran coordinators perceived a larger number of services to be average in effectiveness.

In 1981 Coles wrote that the model for student personnel programs most prevalent in higher education today is one that involves the development of a campus environment and the provision of learning experiences designed to help students understand their behavior and integrate knowledge with individual concerns. This model most frequently is found at residential colleges that function more or less as self-contained communities and fit Goffman's "total institution" model.

Little research exists on whether student personnel programs at urban, predominantly commuting colleges differ from those recommended for colleges functioning as total institutions. Also, little is known about the adequacy of this model for meeting the needs of students who attend urban, predominantly commuting colleges. Such students generally represent the first generation in their families to attend college; they are heterogeneous in race, ethnicity, and age, and in their academic preparation for college, degree of motivation, and vocational and personal goals. Recent studies indicate that these students tend to have lower grades when they enter college than students who reside on campus; more than half work at least part-time, and many have significant family responsibilities.

Coles (1981) investigated whether student personnel services at urban, predominantly commuting colleges differ from those services recommended for residential campuses. The study also explored the congruence between student
personal services provided by urban commuting colleges and the needs of students attending such institutions for student services.

To investigate these questions, an exploratory and descriptive study was undertaken of the felt needs of urban students for student personnel services and the student personnel services at a cross-section of urban, predominantly commuting institutions enrolling primarily first-generation college students (Coles, 1981). Data for the study were drawn from the literature on commuting student needs and student personnel programs recommended for residential colleges. On-site investigations of student personnel programs at five institutions in Boston, Massachusetts, included (a) examination of documents, reports, and statistical data produced by the institutions; (b) informal observations of campus activities and facilities; (c) in-depth interviews with students, student personnel staff, faculty, and college administrators; and (d) an investigation of the felt needs of students for student personnel services at these colleges.

Coles' (1981) analysis of the data collected indicated that, in many respects, the student personnel programs at the colleges studied resembled the model for student personnel programs described in the literature for campuses that function as total institutions. The objectives of these programs, the services and activities designed to meet student personnel goals, and the overall organization of these programs were consistent with the patterns of total institutions. The data analysis also revealed both congruence and lack of congruence between student personnel and the felt needs of
urban students for assistance in achieving their educational goals. Congruence exists between the various functional components of student personnel services and the needs identified by the students interviewed. Lack of congruence was indicated by the reported under-utilization of services by commuting students. This lack of congruence may be attributed to the organization patterns of student personnel services, the methodologies utilized in the delivery of such services, and the resources available for the support of services.

The data analysis in Coles' (1981) study suggests several changes that necessary in the organization and delivery of student personnel services at urban institutions in order to make these services more congruent with urban student needs. Also indicated is the need for a conceptual framework for student personnel programs at institutions serving first-generation, commuting students that takes into account the unique circumstances that distinguish their college experiences.

Najafi (1983) conducted a study of university student services to research the degree to which students perceive selected student personnel services as being essential. The instrument used was adopted originally from a study conducted at the University of California at Davis. It was tested for its reliability and content validity and revised to fit Najafi's investigation. Services and programs were divided into eight general areas and were evaluated by 47 questions. These eight broad categories were academic or career planning; health; housing; student organizations activities, governance, and
recreational activities; counseling; financial aid; aesthetics and cultural services; and student specialized services.

The data generated by Najafi's (1983) investigation revealed that, on many of the variables studied, significant differences in mean priority were found among the universities, sexes, colleges of enrollment, academic classifications, and ethnic origin or nationality. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected, and it could be concluded that the priorities of students for the use of student personnel services was related to the investigated variables.

It was revealed that the most essential services rated by the students were all in the areas of financial aid, academic/career planning, health, and housing. Among the least essential services rated by the students were counseling; student organizations, activities, governance, and recreational activities; student aesthetics and cultural services; and student specialized services (Najafi, 1983).

W. C. Kennedy (1983) conducted a study for the purpose of identifying and describing examples of student services programs designed to serve the special needs of older (24 years and older) students by community and junior colleges. The data were collected from a questionnaire and interview with the chief student personnel administrator at each of 18 community and junior colleges in the southeastern United States. Based on a review of the literature, five categories of student services were selected for study. These categories were admissions, counseling, financial aid, career planning and placement, and support services. The questionnaire and interview items were
developed from questionnaires and information found in the literature concerning adults and higher education.

An analysis of the data revealed the following facts:

1. One half of the student personnel administrators surveyed were unable to supply enrollment data by full-time or part-time, male or female students.

2. Services were not offered adults in all five of the categories studied.

3. Of those services offered most often, counseling and financial aid services received the greatest amount of institutional support and emphasis for serving adult learners. Career planning and support services received the least amount.

4. When addressing the needs of older students, community and junior college student services divisions had, on the average, made some attempt to meet those needs. None of them was attempting to meet all of their needs.

5. The chief student personnel officer of each institution perceived the services being offered adults as effective in meeting adults' needs.

6. None of the student personnel administrators could supply institutional research data confirming their positive perceptions of the impact that services had had on increased enrollment and retention of older students.

7. Community and junior colleges generally did not officially differentiate between their traditional and nontraditional students, although the student services staffs normally did. Colleges that do not differentiate are less likely to have special services for older students.

8. Institutions were not making adequate attempts to meet the nonacademic needs of older students in all the service categories studied; therefore, many of the needs for services held by
lifelong learners were not being met by many community and junior college student services divisions. (Kennedy, 1983)

A study was conducted to determine the student services needs of the adult evening students on regional campuses in the Purdue University and Indiana University regional campus systems (Bednar, 1983). A sample of part-time adult evening students from two of the campuses and a sample of student services professionals from all of the regional campuses in the two systems were surveyed.

The study samples were selected from the population of students who were 25 years of age or older and who were enrolled in courses that met after 5:00 p.m. during the fall semester of 1980. The student services professionals sample consisted of all members of student services staffs, as listed by the chief student services officer on the nine regional campuses in the two systems.

The students in Bednar's (1983) study were surveyed with a modified Delphi technique in two rounds. The professionals were surveyed with a Delphi in three rounds. In the first round of each survey, the participants were asked to list services needed by the adult evening students. In the second round, the students were asked to rate the services compiled in the first round on the basis of their intent to use the services. In the second and third rounds, the professionals were asked to rate the same services on the basis of their perceived student need for the services.

The major findings and conclusions of Bednar's (1983) study were as follows:

1. Adult evening students were likely to use services that would help them adjust to the academic milieu or that would aid them in developing personal identity and direction.
2. A minimal program for adult evening students should include services such as academic advising, financial aid counseling, remedial programs and orientation programs that will help the beginning or re-entry student adjust to academic demands.

3. Student services staffs should serve as advocates for adult evening students to obtain convenience services such as evening library and bookstore hours.

4. Student services professionals indicated that they were aware of adult student needs.

5. There was a difference in the student services needs of adult male and female evening students.

In a descriptive study, Larson (1984) assessed student opinions about student services provided at Labette Community College in Kansas. A second purpose was to assess how satisfactory these services were in meeting the needs of students. The survey elicited student responses to 45 student service-related items. The items were grouped into six student service sections designated as follows: registrar services; financial aid and job placement services; guidance and counseling services; student activities services; special student services; and general evaluation. Respondents were grouped by sex and three age groups: traditional (16-24 years); adult (25-44 years); and older adult (older than 44). Respondents were also asked to list three services they considered "most important," along with suggestions for improvement. Additional information as to type of student (i.e., day, evening or both), study-related purposes, dependents, marital status, and employment status was also elicited.

The community college selected for the study was of medium size, was located in a predominately rural area, and served several southeastern Kansas towns. A 20%
sample was randomly selected from each of the three age groups. The three groups were further subdivided by sex, resulting in six groups for the study. A total of 212 responses was received from a total of 350 (61%) returned (Larson, 1984).

Data were analyzed by ANOV (SAS statistical package) designed for unequal sample size. This method allowed testing for differences between age groups, sexes, and interaction between age and sex. Responses to financial aid and job placement services, student activities services, and general evaluation sections were found to be significantly different for both age and sex. Responses to the registrar services and guidance and counseling services sections showed age alone as significant. Special student services responses were significantly different by sex.

Traditional students tended to disagree more on all the survey items than did the adults or older adult students. Females tended to be more in agreement than males on the same survey items. Larson (1984) concluded that services at Labette Community College were better serving females and older population than most other community colleges.

Thon (1983) conducted a study of perceptions of student services for older students. This study examined student services for American college and university students 25 years and older in order to discover (a) which student services were more important and were provided more frequently for adult students; (b) whether the levels of importance and implementation of these services were associated with institutional size, institutional location, the percentage of enrolled older students, the types of
academic programs provided for older students; (c) what impacts of adult presence had on various dimensions of the student affairs profession; and (d) what the hindrances were to providing student services for older students.

The findings of Thon's (1983) study indicated that many institutions, especially smaller schools in rural areas, had yet to experience the presence and/or full impact of older students. The most important student services for adults were counseling-related: career counseling, job placement, marriage counseling, individual needs assessment, and peer support groups. Other services judged important were those aiding the adults' return to campus, such as designated advocates, orientation, financial aid, child care; and those helping to increase institutional awareness of the presence and needs of older students, such as task forces, student surveys, in-service training of faculty and staff. Services perceived as least important included: pro-rated activity fees, user fees, health, housing, intramural/recreational, student publications, and additional staff. The major hindrance indicated was lack of interest and/or time of older students for student services.

Byrts (1983) conducted a study whose purpose was to investigate the perceptions of selected undergraduate students regarding their views of the student personnel services at Florida State University. The data derived from students were used to assess the effectiveness of these student personnel services: orientation and new student programs, the student health center, the student mental health center, resident student development, university student development, university judicial
affairs, the student government association, curricular career information services, student activities and organization, career placement services, and minority student affairs.

Byrts' (1983) study sought answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of student services by male and female students?

2. Is there a significant difference between and among the perceptions of student services by freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students?

3. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of student services by race? (p. 11)

Data were sought from 370 undergraduate students who were enrolled in nine different courses that represented five different colleges and schools at Florida State University and had been enrolled during the fall semester of 1981. The subjects responded to a questionnaire, the Student Services Survey. Data from the questionnaire were tested via a one-way multivariate analysis of variance and a univariate analysis of variance (Byrts, 1983).

Analysis of the data indicated the following:

1. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of undergraduate students regarding their views of student personnel services at Florida State University when analyzed by the variables of sex, class standing, and race.

2. A majority of the respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the majority of the student services investigated in the study.

3. Respondents perceived student services as an important aspect of their education. All classes rated the majority of the services as important to them.
4) Students tended to use and were satisfied with the student services with which they were familiar. (Byrts, 1983)

Lee (1984) conducted a study to evaluate student knowledge about student services at Sheldon State Junior College in Sitka, Alaska, as a first step in program evaluation. Sheldon State's student services were categorized for this study on the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges (AAJCC) list of seven major functions, which include 21 essential student services. Aims of the study were (a) to determine whether or not students understood basic information related to various student services areas and (b) to ascertain whether certain types or categories of students were more knowledgeable about the seven areas of student services than others.

Conclusions were that students learn of student services from the catalog, brochures, and orientation; effort is not made to communicate information about student services to specific demographic groups; results showed statistical differences in knowledge by race, sex, marital status, and quarter of enrollment; there were no significant differences in satisfaction levels; a "halo effect" would seem to affect student satisfaction; and the students accept as adequate the services provided by the institution because of their "blind faith" in the institution. They assume that the college has provided all necessary information, and they are not aware of their insufficient knowledge of student services.

In a study of student services for adults at the City University of New York, Finkelstein (1983) assessed the kinds of services that could be developed to meet the
needs of adults. This study contained an extensive review of the literature on adult students and their need for support services. The literature provided the basis for the development of an interview schedule that was used in a study of the member institutions of the City University of New York (CUNY). Sixteen interviews were conducted with chief student affairs officers or their representatives to determine the types of services available for adults and to describe the operation of some of these services.

Data were gathered on a variety of specific support services and on a series of related campus operations (Finkelstein, 1983). Among the topics covered were pre-admission counseling, admissions procedures, orientation programs, personal and career counseling, financial aid programs, informational publications, campus activities, library services, food service, facility design and maintenance, availability of services in the evenings, staff selection and development, and research and evaluation. The interview schedule contained questions about the planning, staffing, evaluating of programs for adults; problems encountered in providing services for adults; factors related to success of programs; and services most needed by adults.

A suggested program of services for adults based on the literature and incorporating data from CUNY was described. The topics covered were generally the same as those used in the study of CUNY. Rationales taken from the literature were used to indicate the importance of the programs and services described.
Finkelstein (1983) made recommendations about how student affairs professionals could better serve adults through the modification of existing services and the development of new programs and service and discussed implications for the training and professional orientation of student affairs workers. A list of topics for further research was developed and a comprehensive bibliography included.

According to Daugherty (1985), nationally there has been an increasing number of older learners on our nation's community college campuses. This heterogeneous group of students brings with it unique characteristics and needs. Community colleges are faced with the challenge of adequately providing necessary services to insure a successful educational experience for this population. The purpose of Daugherty's study was to investigate the services and programs currently made available to older learners within public community colleges.

Daugherty (1985) concluded that the trends in programs and services offered the older learner had not changed over the last 10 years; institutions with larger student enrollments more adequately provide the necessary services and programs for older learners than institutions with fewer students; community colleges have placed highest priority and emphasis upon traditional services designed for entrance into the institutions with less emphasis on innovative services; although awareness of older students and their unique needs has increased, implementation of appropriate services has been slow to follow; and barriers to full access to community colleges and their services still exist for the older learner.
Farrell (1985) did a study to determine the current level of implementation of adult student services as perceived by student personnel administrators and adult students. Similarities and differences between adult students and student personnel administrators in student services were explored, and new programs or services for adult students were determined.

Major findings were that student personnel administrators and adult students agreed that loans, grants, employment programs, counseling services, academic advisement, and non-credit development programs were important and provided services. Differences between student personnel administrators and older students concerning services that meet the needs of older students are considered important, and, are provided by adult students, not administrators, included additional health services, placement services geared to older students, married and single-parent housing, and intramural programs. Older students differed from administrators in that they considered student government representation, study clubs, social activities for spouses and children, and personal enrichment programs for their spouses as important, but not offered, on their campus (Farrell, 1985).

General conclusions of the study revealed that older students are not informed of the services and activities that are available in the student services area. There is more agreement than diversity between administrators and older students on activities and services required by older students. A major concern of adult students is a lack of services and activities for their families (Farrell, 1985).
Roth (1984) conducted a study to determine the attitude of executive administrators in higher education toward the purpose of student services, and to measure the consistency with which they held the attitude. Three major schools of thought about purpose were identified and defined: administrative, student personnel, and student development perspectives. The population to be studied was defined as the presidents, academic vice presidents, and business vice presidents of 4-year institutions in the western states. A new instrument was designed to measure relative preference for the three perspectives and to measure degrees of congruence. The instrument was constructed so as to provide a measurement of attitude not only toward the purpose of student services in general, but also toward the purpose of 10 specific functions associated with student affairs work.

Roth (1984) found that most administrators were supportive of the student personnel point of view. They preferred that student services programs remain in the extracurriculum, that they provide direct support for students, and that they embrace pragmatic goals consonant with the institutional mission. With a few exceptions, they were not inclined to accept human development theory as a basis for shaping the institutional environment; neither did they desire a minimal level of non-educational "housekeeping" services for students.

Although most administrators were inclined to support the study's personnel perspective, according to Roth (1984), they were not necessarily consistent in their preferences. Their responses often varied depending upon the type of program
described. Only the concept that student services programs should be educational and supportive of the institutional mission was consistently held. Whenever a perspective other than student personnel was perceived to better represent this concept for a specific function, administrators were not reluctant to temporarily abandon their general attitude in favor of a different perspective.

The findings suggested that executive administrators were not inclined to accept a single model to define what student services should do. Instead, they appeared to prefer a flexible, pragmatic approach which attempts to strike a balance between institutional interests and student needs (Roth, 1984).

In a study to compare the perceptions of college and university chief executives and chief student development officers concerning selected student services issues, Ford (1986) directed research toward describing the extent of agreement between chief executives and chief student development officers in colleges and universities in 15 southern states and the District of Columbia. The issues studied were (a) the adequacy of the level of institutional funding, (b) the adequacy of current programming, (c) the competitiveness of on-campus housing with off-campus housing, (d) the primary purpose of job placement services, (e) the accuracy of employment outlook data provided by placement services, and (f) the effectiveness of new student orientation programs in achieving four possible goals.

Ford’s (1986) study concluded, as follows:

1. Chief executives and chief student development officers in this study are in greater agreement in regard to student development
services than similar groups of chief student development officers and student development workers.

2. Chief executive officers and chief student development officers are in greater agreement in regard to student development services than faculty, administrative, student, and/or staff groups in earlier studies.

3. The perceptions of chief student development officers and chief executives in this study differ less in regard to student services than did chief student development officers and chief executives in Mortvedt's 1972 study.

The purpose of Hammill's (1985) study was to determine the use and perceptions that students had of student services in the Mississippi public junior colleges. The independent variables of sex, race, residency, classification, and age were studied in terms of use and perceptions of student services.

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Residency was the most important demographic factor affecting the degree of use of student services. Off-campus students used most services significantly less than on-campus students.

2. Significantly more blacks used financial aid and also indicated this service to be more important than did whites.

3. Race was the most important demographic factor affecting satisfaction, as significantly more blacks were less satisfied with student services than whites.

4. Age was not as significant a demographic factor affecting student satisfaction as one might have thought.

5. A high degree of use did not assure students' satisfaction with student services.

6. The most important demographic factor determining the importance of student services was residency.
7. Demographic factors do affect the use, satisfaction, and importance of student services; however, other factors such as availability, quality, and knowledge of student services have a profound effect as well.

8. The demand for accountability will continue to increase; therefore, studies of this nature and procedures for assessing student needs must be developed. (Hammill, 1986)

In a study to research student and faculty needs for data that could be used to assist in the resolution of problems and development of an effective learning environment at the University Center at Tulsa (UCT), Oklahoma, Buchwald (1986) focused on three major areas: (a) the adult college student’s utilization of existing student services and the usefulness of these services; (b) the services needed but currently not provided; and (c) the faculty’s perceptions of needs and usefulness of the services.

According to the data generated from the questionnaires, the majority of the responding students in Buchwald’s (1986) study were between 25 and 35 years of age, married, and female, with no dependents in the home. A majority of the students were employed full-time, were of graduate academic level, and traveled directly from work to classes at UCT. The responding students indicated a preference for evening classes, a need for academic counseling, a high interest in evening and weekend registration, and a significantly positive interest in a library, bookstore, and student parking. Students responding to the difficulties they had experienced in specific situations revealed enrollment procedures and class scheduling as the major problems.
Paez (1986) conducted a study that focused on the student service related problems of culturally distinct groups of students attending a community college. The groups selected for the study were 60 international students and 60 English as a Second Language (ESL) students. The researcher administered the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory, an instrument that has been widely used to indicate foreign students' problems. Combining the use of naturalistic research methodology, the researcher utilized an in-depth interview to document the problems the students were facing. Patterns and trends among the problems were analyzed and reported. The results indicated that many international students experienced concerns in the area of financial aid, had difficulties with some of the immigration regulations and work restrictions, and experienced forms of racial and social discrimination. The ESL students tended to experience more difficulties in the area of English language functioning, but also experienced problems related to academic functioning and making friends. The student service areas most closely related to the international students' concerns were financial aids, admissions, placement, counseling, and English language services. The problems of ESL students' were most closely related to the areas of English language services, admissions, counseling, and academic advising.

Recommendations generated by the study included the development of a new instrument to include topics generated by the students in the open-ended section of the questionnaire, a translation of the instrument into the major languages of the ESL population, and the need for future research on subgroups of the populations who
indicated a greater number of problems than others. Institutional recommendations focused on how the college could address the problems that the students identified (Paez, 1986).

Horton (1986) did a study to assess the relationship between the expressed needs of adult community college students and their needs as perceived by selected faculty members and student services staff members at a metropolitan community college. Based on the data findings, the following conclusions appeared to be warranted:

1. The Adult Learner Needs Assessment Survey seems to provide useful needs assessment information in a convenient format for large-scale research.

2. The instrument seems to provide a useful tool for gathering data on the perceptions of the needs of adult learners from community college employees.

3. Both faculty and student services staff groups seem to perceive adult students as needing more assistance with educational and personal needs than is reported by adult students.

4. Both faculty and student services staff groups' perceptions of the needs of adult learners, when compared to the needs reported by adult students, appear to be less accurate for those needs for which a lesser degree of assistance is needed and more accurate for those needs for which a greater degree of assistance is needed.

5. The perceptions of the needs of adult learners by both faculty and student services staff groups appear notably similar.

6. This research, using a more rigorous level of significance, validates the general findings of similar research.
The research methodology and the use of analysis of variance and the Scheffé test as statistical procedures proved to be useful in comparing perceptions of adult learner needs by faculty and student services staff groups to the stated needs of adult students.

Dalili (1986) wrote that the migration of students from one country to another for educational purposes is a phenomenon with a long history, but it was not until the 20th century that many of the world’s nations began to push education to the top of the list of national priorities in order to strengthen their chances for economic growth and political stability and to increase their national prestige. Although European nations led the way in hosting ever-increasing numbers of students from other countries in the 19th and early 20th centuries, since the end of World War II the United States has emerged as the major host nation to international students. The assumption by the U.S. of a greater role in the development of an international community via the medium of education has resulted in the expansion of the international dimension of American higher education and the creation of campus service structures to administer the exchange process and to aid international students in the achievement of their educational goals.

Dalili’s (1986) study examined the tradition of student migration for educational purposes, the changes over time in motivation to study abroad, and the reasons behind the increased involvement of American institutions of higher education with students from other countries. The author also studied the corresponding development at colleges and universities in the United States of special services for international
students, and the problems of these students which have created the need for such special services.

Also included in Dalili's (1986) study were the results of empirical research conducted to identify and describe existing administrative and service functions of international student offices at American colleges and universities that have attracted large numbers of international students. The results from both the historical and the empirical studies were used to identify problems associated with the student exchange process and to suggest guidelines and standards of service to international students that could lead to the improvement of institutional service to these students and to the proper discharge of responsibility by American institutions of higher education.

Alonzo (1987) conducted a study to determine whether St. Philip's College, a 2-year institution in San Antonio, Texas, was meeting the needs of adult learners, both from the perspective of the adult learner and the faculty and administrative staff that serve those students. A secondary purpose was to determine whether demographic background of the adult learners was related to their perceptions. Demographic background examined included age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, and part-time or full-time status.

It was found that adult students rated 20 of the 21 services in the adequate to more than adequate range. They ranked all 21 services in the important to somewhat important range in terms of meeting educational goals. Faculty and staff rated only 10 of the 21 services in the adequate to more than adequate range. The other 11 services
were rated in the adequate to less than adequate range. In ranking the services in terms of meeting the educational goals of adult students, faculty and staff ranked 7 of the services in the somewhat important to very important range. The other 14 services were ranked in the important to somewhat important range (Alonzo, 1987).

Even though the findings of the study indicated that adult students were generally satisfied with student services at St. Philip's College, the research also indicated that college administrators should continually strive to improve the delivery of services to an important segment of the student population, the adult learner (Alonzo, 1987). Based on the data collected, this study suggested continued input from students, as well as faculty and staff, in the decision-making process in order to meet the needs of adult learners.

St. John (1987) conducted a study to determine whether the student service structure of the College of Education and Allied Professions of the University of Toledo (in Ohio), which had evolved since the O'Brien study for the college in 1976, had achieved success. St. John's study revealed that the University of Toledo's student services were perceived by students and faculty of the college as achieving 87.2% of the objectives considered to be minimally essential for a satisfactory program of student services in the college. It was therefore concluded that the changes that had taken place in the decentralized approach to student services which had evolved since the O'Brien study had a positive effect.
The author noted statistical differences in the student subgroups relating to age, residence status, full-time/part-time, and transfer students and date entered the university (St. John, 1987). The high degree of "don't know" responses suggested a continuing need to publicize programs and services. For faculty members, there was a high correlation between knowledge of student services programs and the degree of faculty involved in student activities and student counseling.

Based on the study, St. John (1987) recommended programming for student developmental concerns, while pointing out the need for program accountability and evaluation. Further recommendations concerned the relationship of student services to the improvement of instruction, and included a specific discussion of programs for nontraditional students, commuter students, transfer students, and special populations.

In a 1986 study, Thompson examined the dimensions of learning need perceptions of older students in four economically and demographically differentiated community college service regions in Michigan, as well as the perceptions of trustees, administrators, and faculty of the college's effort to be responsive to adult learner needs. The investigation provided a contextual definition of need and development effort score and procedure for measuring institutional effort.

The following results were obtained in Thompson's (1986) study: Patterns of needs are significantly different among age groups (p = <.50). Younger students have a greater need for college services, programs, and functions. No significant differences were found in patterns of student services utilization. Significant
differences (at \( p = < .05 \)) were found in trustee administrative and faculty perceptions of effort. Interviews with college personnel and an examination of institutional materials and procedures revealed no differences in effort based on whether the college was rural or urban.

It was concluded that with changing demographics, more older people may be looking for educational opportunities. The configuration and structure of learning opportunities might need to be examined. Community colleges might need to focus on policies and procedures that promote flexibility, convenience, and individualization of instruction for all students (Thompson, 1986).

In order to determine the effectiveness of two methods of communicating information about student services to older undergraduates, Rodriguez (1989) conducted a study of 30-years-of-age and older undergraduates attending the University of Central Florida for the first time during the spring term of 1986. From this population, a sample of 48 students participated in the study. A three-part questionnaire, the Student Services and Undergraduate Needs Survey and a follow-up questionnaire, the Use and Satisfaction with Student Services Survey, were developed for use in this study. An experimental pre- and posttest control group design was used.

The independent variable was specific information about four selected student services. It was presented to Group 1 in a lecture and tour-of-services format and to Group 2 through interactive, small-group activities. Group 3, the control group, did not receive the specific information about the selected student services; instead, Group
3 received information about student government and the programs and activities council. The dependent variables were the students' (a) knowledge about selected services; (b) needs in academic, career/occupational, and personal areas; (c) perceptions of student services; and (d) awareness, use, and satisfaction with student services 8 weeks after the informational group interventions (Rodriguez, 1989).

One-way analyses of variance, the Duncan Multiple Range Test, and chi-square statistical procedures were used. According to the results, Groups 1 and 2 were equally successful and significantly (p < .05) more successful than Group 3 in raising the students' (a) levels of knowledge about the selected student services and (b) levels of awareness of student services assessed 8 weeks after the interventions. However, Group 1 was significantly more successful than Group 2 or Group 3 in raising the students' levels of agreement with a statement of positive perceptions concerning the efficacy of institutional patterns of communicating information about student services. In addition, a personalized approach and a collegial attitude during the outreach procedures and throughout the group processes appeared to be the deciding factors in persuading older students to attend and participate candidly in the informational groups (Rodriguez, 1989).

Deavers (1988) conducted a study in which the purpose was to analyze the differences that existed in the perceptions of administrators, student development practitioners, faculty, and students as to the effectiveness of selected student services in the public community, junior, and technical colleges in Alabama. The 965 subjects in
this study were proportioned as follows: 113 administrators, 149 student development practitioners, 349 faculty members, and 354 students. The subjects responded to a student development questionnaire. The data derived from the respondents were used to analyze the effectiveness of five student development functions: registrar, financial aid and job placement, guidance and counseling, student activities, and special services.

Scheffe procedures revealed that faculty mean scores were higher (more negative) than administrator, student development practitioner, and student mean scores on the variables of registrar, financial aid and job placement, guidance and counseling, student activities, and special services functions (Deavers, 1988). Administrator mean scores were lower (more positive) than student development practitioner, faculty, and student mean scores on the variables of financial aid and job placement, student activities, and special services functions. Student development practitioner mean scores were lower (more positive) than administrator, faculty, and student mean scores on the variables of registrar and guidance and counseling. Student mean scores for all five functions were higher (more negative) than administrator and student development practitioner mean scores. Students also rated each function lower (more positive) than did faculty.

Kelley (1988) examined the preferences of executive-level administrators in all Comprehensive II colleges and universities in eight upper-midwestern states concerning their institutional goals for student growth and programs in achieving these goals. Specifically, the study sought to examine the level of agreement about these preferred
goals and services expressed by presidents and vice presidents of academic affairs, finance, and student affairs or their equivalents in these institutions.

Major findings indicated disagreement on 8 of the 52 preferred goal statements, and this disagreement existed most clearly between the student affairs and academic vice presidents (Kelley, 1988). In addition, disagreement existed on 3 of the 29 preferred student services/programs, and this disagreement existed most clearly between the academic and student affairs vice presidents. All groups agreed on the five most highly ranked student services/programs—namely, academic advising, admissions, retention, financial aid, and recruitment. Agreement also existed on the eight lowest ranked items, namely intercollegiate athletics, human relations groups, fraternities and sororities, human sexuality courses, religious activities, family life courses, values clarification workshops, and encounter groups.

Kelley (1988) concluded that, although the respondents did not disagree significantly (.05 level or above) on the majority of items, the nature of the disagreement provided important information. Disagreement between academic and student affairs vice presidents might alert practitioners to potential problems and encourage further research in the area of executive level preferences.

In a study of 85 comprehensive community colleges in Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Missouri, Waisanen (1988) focussed on the agreement or disagreement with institutional priorities of student services mid-management personnel. Conclusions of this study supported the premise that headcount enrollment does
influence the presence of certain student service functions, whereas reporting lines for mid-level managers have a limited influence on the presence of basic student service functions. In addition, mid-level managers were generally in agreement about perceived institutional priority for the basic student service functions but had some significant differences in regard to what they felt the priorities should be for selected student service functions. When viewed collectively, the mid-level managers felt that all the basic student service functions were assigned a lower priority by the institution than they thought appropriate. This was verified by utilizing the t-test statistic, which yielded statistically significant differences for all the student service functions.

Hocking (1988/1989) conducted a study of older students' perceptions of student services, stating that part of the mission of colleges and universities is to assure all students a total educational environment, including extracurricular activities for students of all ages. The major purpose of the study was to determine how important student services were to older students at the University of Oklahoma. The study was a comprehensive examination of older students' perceptions of student services based on the combination of the factors of awareness, utilization, and the perceived importance of the services provided. As a descriptive-exploratory study, it was directed toward describing what occurred among the older student population and student services.

The conceptual framework for this study made use of the concepts of student development, particularly adult development, and individualism or recognition of all
students as individuals. The study was guided by four research questions that served to give direction to the analysis of the study.

The population for Hocking's (1988/1989) study was the older graduate and undergraduate students, age 23 or older, enrolled at the University of Oklahoma during the spring semester of 1988—a total of 9,680 students. Data were solicited from 484 students representing a 5% random sample of the population, utilizing a locally constructed questionnaire. The survey instrument called for the demographic/academic characteristics of the respondents, asking them to indicate their awareness of, utilization of, and perceived importance of, 31 student services and programs. A total of 308 usable responses, representing a 63.6% response rate, was returned.

The 10 highest ranking services by utilization were as follows: student newspaper—The Oklahoma Daily, Oklahoma Memorial Union, Goddard Health Center, Academic Support Services, Financial Aid, Recreation Services, Career Planning and Placement, Evening Student Services, Orientation Services, and Off-campus Housing. The 10 highest ranking services by perceived importance were the following: Financial Aid, Career Planning and Placement, Goddard Health Center, student newspaper—The Oklahoma Daily, Academic Support Services, Handicapped Student Services, Oklahoma Memorial Union, Child-care, Evening Student Services, and Personal/Interpersonal Counseling (Hocking, 1988/1989).

In a statewide study of student services and retention in Texas 2-year colleges, Matlock (1989) incorporated a survey of the student services programs in all
community colleges with state enrollment data. The study examined the impact of student services on the retention rate for demographic groups by program area, gender, and minority status. From a base group of approximately 300,000 students entering the community colleges in the fall of 1985, the students were tracked by social security number to determine those who were enrolled in the fall of 1986. Two definitions of retention were used in the study. The first was the more traditional measure of retention—those students still enrolled in the same institution—and second, those who were still enrolled somewhere in Texas at a state-supported institution.

The retention rate was analyzed for each institution by demographic categories to determine the impact on persistence. As was supported in the literature, the student services that provided social integration increased the retention rate in "minority" populations, defined in the study as vocational students, females, and nonwhites. The programs that increased retention for these groups included decentralized counseling, remediation, mandatory academic advising, student input, and faculty advisors. The "majority" students—the academic, male, and white—appeared to benefit from programs that tested their ability or increased standards. The results supported the need for an integrated student services model that combines academic strengthening with social integration measures (Matlock, 1989).

Nathan’s (1989) study is a record of the history and major themes and trends that influenced the development of the student affairs division at a large, diverse, urban, nontraditional, commuter campus, specifically, Indiana University-Purdue
University at Indianapolis (IUPUI). The questions studied related to the effects on the
development of the student affairs division as a result of the 1969 merger of the two
Big Ten universities in Indianapolis, the changes in the institutional organization, the
administrative governance policies, the administrative leaders during the period of the
study (1969-1987), and the inductive or deductive nature of the division development.

Major themes were rapid enrollment growth, inadequate fiscal resources, other
IUPUI priorities, a diverse student body, and the influence of various mergers. These
factors contributed to shaping the organizational structure, the goals and objectives, the
delivery of services, and the status of the student affairs division at IUPUI (Nathan,
1989).

In a study the purpose of which was to examine the perceptions of traditional
and nontraditional students regarding nonacademic student services, findings were that
all 15 nonacademic services studied were being used (Land, 1990). The frequency of
use, however, varied significantly when broken down by total sample, traditional
classification, and nontraditional classification. Eight services were used significantly
more by traditional students and two were used significantly more by nontraditional
students. Those respondents who had used the nonacademic services had an overall
positive attitude toward the service objective statements. A large percentage of those
using the services indicated that they were useful and/or helpful. Attitudes were
significantly different between traditional and nontraditional students for two of the
nonacademic services. Both were viewed more positively by traditional students than by nontraditional students.

H. K. Baker (1990) conducted a study in which the primary purpose was (a) to assess the need for and use of selected university-provided student services by a sample of graduate students at the American University and (b) to determine the extent to which the reported need for and use of these services was independent of gender, age, citizenship, and enrollment status.

The results showed that graduate students had a hierarchy of needs for services. The respondents expressed more need for services that helped them meet their academic, educational, financial, and career-related concerns than for services that met their personal and social concerns. The most needed and used services were academic advising, library services, and computer services. The results of the chi-square tests showed many significant differences in the need for and use of services based on gender, age, citizenship, and enrollment status. In general, females, younger graduate students, non-U.S. citizens, and those enrolled full-time expressed the highest level of need for and use of services.

The major conclusion was that gender, age, citizenship, and enrollment status affected the needs of graduate students for selected services; thus, survey data might be more valuable when used to identify subpopulations with special needs than when used to provide a needs profile for the general student population (H. K. Baker, 1990).
Albert (1990) conducted a study at Pennsylvania State University to (a) identify the organizational structure, availability, and delivery of the programs and assistance for disabled students; (b) to determine the services needs of students with disabilities; and (c) to identify the congruence of the responses of organized disability services to the needs of University Park students.

The study revealed a complex organizational structure composed of three sub-units: the administrative sub-unit, the academic sub-unit, and the external agencies sub-unit. These sub-units were found to have different service priorities and to exhibit diverse styles of operation.

Student service acquisition was found to be affected by the type of disability. Students with manifest and latent physical disabilities were likely to be recipients of assistance from external agencies that either provided for their needs or assisted them in making the proper connections with campus service agencies (Albert, 1989/1990). These students expressed satisfaction with services received. In contrast, students with latent-educational disabilities had problems making service connections and expressed a greater need for information and more adequate disability-related assistance.

The communication problem between system subunits caused by their diverse operations and the extreme spread of the service structure, identified through the interviews, was supported in the student surveys. Concern with campus accessibility, accommodation, and financial assistance was felt by students to be related to the lack of
communication within the system. In particular, the concern about financial assistance was indicative of a broad service delivery problem (Albert, 1989/1990).

Barragan's (1990) study sought to examine the availability and quality of student services offered to adult learners in selected continuing education programs in Dade County, Florida. The following two basic research questions were addressed in this study: What are the student services being provided to adult learners by the selected colleges and universities? and What is the quality of the services being provided as perceived by administrators and adult learners at their institutions?

Two groups comprised the population for this study. One group was the sample of adult learners enrolled in credit courses being offered by the continuing education unit. The second group sample was comprised of administrators in the areas of admissions, financial aid, registration, student services, and continuing education at each of the five colleges and universities in Dade County.

An overview of responses by institutions showed that only the following services received a 100% response as available at one or more institutions: admissions information, convenient hours for registration, assistance in class registration, assistance in planning a class schedule, access to the library during evening and weekend hours, parking and security, food services, bookstore, and access to computers (Barragan, 1990).

Hummel (1991) wrote that models of student services organizations and delivery systems designed for traditional student use have generally been used without modifica-
tion to attempt to meet the needs of adult learners. Even in isolated organizations that have attempted to adapt program delivery to meet adult needs, there has been no quantitative research to document these efforts.

Hummel's (1991) study involved an examination of organizational determinants of change and their impact on changes in program delivery for adult learners. For practitioners, it is critical to know which student services organizations have not adapted to meet the needs of a significant student cohort. This study identified the organizations, reasons for their lack of change, and proposed change strategies. For academics, the study attempted to begin to fill the gap in the student services and organizational change literature in terms of measuring the extent of the impact of certain variables on organizational change, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative research.

The population for the study was the 29 Michigan community colleges. Based on enrollment size, six institutions were matched; one reported having adapted programs, and one reported not having adapted services to meet adult needs.

The study was conducted in two stages. Stage 1 consisted of interviews with key administrators. Stage 2 consisted of two written surveys, one given to student services directors and staff, and the other to nontraditional students. Bivariate analysis of the two survey instruments was done. In comparing high-adapt versus low-adapt organizations, the critical variables were organizational climate, inter-unit rivalry, continuous long-range planning, and reward systems. The variables that were not
significant were (a) education and expertise of staff, (b) goals, and (c) job roles (Hummel, 1991).

The following are the key strategic responses recommended, based on the research from the study: (a) provide professional development opportunities to staff on a regular basis in their area of expertise and in broader educational areas; (b) involve staff in a systematic, continuous planning process; and (c) change organizational climate to help staff recognize a need to change (Hummel, 1991).

Brian (1991) did a comparative study of the functions of student personnel services in eight state-supported colleges and universities in Arkansas from 1969 to 1989. The purposes of this study were to examine the history, purpose, and procedures of student services; to ascertain the direction the student services function has taken in this 20-year period in the areas of admissions, counseling, discipline, extracurricular activities, financial aid, health services, housing and board, organization and administration of student services, orientation, placement, pre-college counseling, records, religious life, research, testing and training, experience, and salary structure of student services administrators; to determine changes in the philosophy of student services; to determine the organizational changes in the structure of student services; and to provide a current survey of student services in Arkansas.

Findings in Brian's (1991) study revealed that, over the 20-year period, the admissions function had become more structured, in part because of legislative mandates; counseling had moved from collective to individual student concerns; there
was a trend toward more standardization in the disciplinary process; extracurricular activities were more choice oriented; financial aid was offered in both periods at the eight institutions, with more attention in 1989 toward assistance for students seeking part-time employment; health services had become more extensive, and there had been a decrease in required physical education programs; a decline in use of campus housing had occurred; organization and administration reflected a move toward decentralization; there was a trend toward more limited use of group testing and more focus on the individual student; career planning and placement became a program beginning in the freshman year rather than the 1969 focus on seniors; the responsibility for pre-college counseling was stressed more heavily in the secondary schools; there was more automated use of records because of technological advances; religion was no longer considered a responsibility of student personnel services; student personnel research activities had been transferred to other university and college offices; and testing services had become more extensive and were handled by professional staff.

Thirsk (1990) conducted a descriptive research study assessing the availability of non-academic support services for older nontraditional students enrolled in the state of Washington's public 4-year college and universities. The results indicated that most of the student services professionals who participated in the study perceived that they were currently meeting the support needs of older students, at least moderately well, in their respective service areas. The data, however, also indicated that little was actually being done to determine, through formal assessment practices, the specific support
service needs of this growing population of students. In addition, only a few student service programs provided relevant training for staff who worked with older nontraditional students. Even fewer programs were staffed with professionals who were designated as the primary service providers for older nontraditional students.

Specifically for older students, few support services were being provided which addressed their unique characteristics and needs. Programs and services designed and implemented for younger traditional students remained the primary focus of student services offered in Washington’s public 4-year college and universities. With few exceptions, older students were expected to adapt to those services (Thirsk, 1990).

This study demonstrated the need for Washington’s public 4-year college and universities to develop institutional strategies for assessing older students’ specific support service needs; develop services and programs that address those needs; and identify and secure funding sources for delivering those services (Thirsk, 1990).

Radisewitz (1992) conducted a study to compare the perceptions of traditional and nontraditional students concerning their student service needs in selected small South Dakota colleges. The study attempted to determine the differences in the selected student service needs of traditional and nontraditional students.

Analysis of the data suggested that nontraditional students differed significantly from traditional students in their views of selected student services. Nontraditional students appeared to consider the hours of the bookstore, financial aid office, and business office, as well as the ease of the registration process, as being more important
than traditional students did. Traditional students appeared to be more concerned about the hours of the snack bar, the food choices available, the job placement office, and campus activities than were nontraditional students.

As a result of the analysis of the data, Radisewitz (1992) recommended that as the number of nontraditional students continues to grow, the student services departments, as well as other higher education-based departments, will have to evolve continually to meet these students' needs. Student service professionals need continually to take into consideration the unique needs of the total student body and to try to limit generic policies.

Haynes (1991) conducted a study that examined graduate students' use and level of satisfaction with selected student personnel offices and services at Ohio University-Athens Campus. The subjects were 500 full-time, American graduate students randomly selected from a pool of approximately 1,888 full-time, American graduate students enrolled at Ohio University during the winter quarter of 1990.

Analysis of the results of Haynes' (1991) study indicated that a number of the respondents had not utilized any of the nine offices selected for evaluation. Data also indicated that respondents were less satisfied with many of the offices and services. There were significant relationships between use of student personnel offices and services based on gender. By a wide margin, women outnumbered men in the use of the specific offices. No significant differences existed between use of student personnel offices and services based on age or marital status. There were significant
relationships between use of the various student personnel offices and services, based
on degree and on whether or not the students had completed their undergraduate degree
at Ohio University. Suggestions for further research included performing a replication
of this study using the existing instrument but changing the population to international
as well as American graduate students.

In a study to compare perceptions by administrators and adult students of needs
for selected student services at public 4-year institutions, Gordon (1991) addressed the
problem of recognizing and meeting the service needs of the growing number of adult
students in public, 4-year higher education institutions. The study population included
all undergraduate students age 25 and over at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville,
the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, and the student services staff and
administrative personnel at both institutions.

According to Gordon (1991), students perceived services that would help them
make better use of their time as most important to them. Administrative personnel,
however, focused on the family aspects of adult students. Students ranked parking,
off-hours access to facilities, and educational programming at convenient times as their
three highest priorities. Administrators ranked child care, tutoring and remedial help,
and financial aid highest.

The study revealed wide differences in the way students and administrators
perceive the service needs of adult students and in the way those needs were being met.
It also pointed out a need for better communication and staff development to make existing resources reach to fill the needs of adult students (Gordon, 1991).

R. W. Baker's (1992) study described the student personnel services currently available at Virginia community colleges to adult students. The author's purpose was to ascertain the services that should be available and to describe the problems experienced in their efforts to provide services.

It was concluded that the services in the categories of admissions, counseling, financial aid, orientation, and registration were adequate to meet the needs of adult students (R. W. Baker, 1992). According to Baker, modifications were needed in the categories of college personnel, business office, student activities, food, and educational support services. Minor differences existed between the services identified as currently available and those that should be available. There were no statistically significant differences in the responses of the two study groups regarding the services identified as currently available during the day and/or evening and the degree of importance of those services. The study suggested that the Virginia Community College System should continually evaluate its current goals and objectives in providing appropriate services for adult students.

Summary

In the research done from 1971 to 1992 and pertaining to the use of students', faculty's, and administrators' perceptions of student affairs programs and services in institutions of higher education, the only study that dealt with students' and student
affairs staff members' perceptions and was used to evaluate a comprehensive student affairs program was Glenister's (1977) study. Glenister agreed that there is a need for continuous evaluation of student affairs services and for program planning and improvement. Numerous evaluation instruments have been developed or modified and adapted to assess and/or evaluate the quality of student affairs services. One of the reasons for this is that, because institutions of higher learning are varied, the scales and instruments have to be adapted to assess or evaluate different programs in student affairs areas.

This literature review has examined studies that date back to the 1920s. On the basis of this review, some generalizations can be made:

There has been progressive interest in and concern for meaningful evaluations of student affairs services. Two basic approaches have been used in the evaluation process—evaluations by experts of persons trained in student affairs work and evaluations using the perceptions and opinions of students or the combined perceptions or opinions of students and student affairs personnel or practitioners.

In comparison to the number of student affairs programs that exist throughout the country, the number of published studies on evaluations using the perceptions and opinions of students (consumers of services) and the combined perceptions or opinions of student affairs personnel (producers of programs and providers of services) is small. There appears to be a wide and varied justification for the institutional evaluation of student affairs programs and services using the questionnaire approach. This procedure can provide comments and opinions that aid in the analysis of existing programs and in
the development of new programs that can provide opportunities for students to gain as much as possible from their collegiate experience.

It seems apparent that, because each institution is unique, each student population is unique and each program of student development and services is unique. Thus, results of studies that examine perceptions of student affairs services within institutions of higher education will differ from institution to institution.

Some commonalities among responses of various groups do exist, however. An examination of students' perceptions of student affairs services in the literature reviewed has shown that most students view student affairs programs and services as being important, valuable parts of total college or university programs. Students generally have been satisfied with some services and dissatisfied with others, and they have shown varying perceptions of awareness of the existence of others. Student affairs personnel or practitioners perceive student affairs programs and services as being important and effective, and they obviously have high awareness of the existence of programs and services.

Some studies that dealt with the levels of importance of student affairs services and programs were conducted with the total student population, including both traditional and older students; with faculty and administrators; with a combination of some or all of the groups; or with all the groups mentioned above combined.

Some of the studies dealt with students' perceptions of importance of student affairs services in both comparative studies and within local institutions (Adair, 1985;

A few studies have analyzed at students' awareness of student affairs programs and services. A basic difference between the previous studies and the present study is a difference in terms. This study asked respondents for their perceptions of the awareness of, importance of, and effectiveness of each of the listed student services/programs.

This review of the literature has revealed the lack of evaluative studies dealing with students and student affairs personnel or practitioners' perceptions of student affairs programs and services in American institutions of higher education. Glenister's study (1977) is one of the few evaluative studies similar to the present study. It seems apparent, therefore, that a study of students and student affairs personnel perceptions of existing student affairs programs and services at Andrews University can reveal existing perceptions prevailing on campus, how they relate to the results of studies elsewhere, and most importantly, how they affect the quality of the total education program of this university.

Apart from the self-study reports of the Andrews University Profile (1982), Andrews University Self-study Report (1972); Andrews University Self-study Report (1979); and Andrews University Self-study Report (1989) some students and student affairs personnel (practitioners) perceptions were conducted and included in those
reports. It can be said, however, that no similar study has been conducted at Andrews University.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Student affairs services have become a major area of study as the demand for such services has increased. Many American colleges and universities have assigned considerable resources to student affairs services in response to student educational and developmental needs. They seem to have a belief in such services per se, and/or in an institutional philosophy that is student-centered and calls for extensive programs and services for students (Selgas & Blocker, 1974).

"As student affairs programs and services grow and take a larger portion of an institutions' resources, they do and probably should come under greater scrutiny" (Richardson, Blocker, & Bender, 1972, p. 1). In many instances, student affairs professionals leave the scrutiny and evaluation to others who are not directly involved in the profession. Student affairs professionals should involve students in the evaluation process because they are the major recipients of the services. Student affairs practitioners, who are the developers and implementors of programs and services should also become actively involved in this process.

Wrenn (1951) stated that there was a "need to make objective and quantifiable surveys of student service personnel and student opinion" (p. 500). Perceptions of
student services have too often involved the evaluation of the program by specialists or faculty. Furthermore, too often, the validity of the evaluation is not possible, and the judgments are not independently obtained. According to Wrenn, in spite of the fact that student opinion is used even less than the opinion of faculty and specialists in assessing the effectiveness of student personnel programs and services, this opinion "as an index of 'consumer attitude' is more significant than any expert judgment of what ought to be useful to students. By a study of student reaction, one knows whether the program service is acceptable and used" (p. 501).

Trembley and Sharf (1975) wrote that it is important to survey perceptions of the effectiveness of student services. Glenister (1977) stated that students, as the major consumers of services, and student affairs practitioners, as the developers and implementors of services, should be included in the evaluation process. Moore (1966) said that to measure perceptions adequately, a formal, ongoing evaluation program should be an essential part of student personnel programs and services. Results of the evaluations can provide the basis for future development and implementation of programs and services. If a program is truly committed to the welfare and development of students, an evaluation process involving students and student affairs practitioners is an inherent part of that program.

The general plan of the present study involved a determination of the status and relationship of the views and perceptions held by Andrews University students and the student affairs personnel or practitioners of the student affairs services provided on
campus. These data could be obtained by interviewing students and student affairs personnel or by sending a questionnaire to a representative sample. Interviewing limits the number of responses obtainable because of the expense involved in terms of time required to collect the data. According to Moyer (1974), the questionnaire gives the investigator flexibility in defining the problem and provides an efficient and timely method for collecting specific data.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design used in the study, including data gathering and analysis. The chapter is divided into six sections: (a) description of the primary purpose of the study, research questions of the study to be answered, and research hypotheses to be tested; (b) design and description of the instrument; (c) pilot study in order to field-test the instrument; (d) population sample; (e) description of data-gathering procedures; and (f) description of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data. A summary of the chapter is also presented.

Purpose of the Study

As outlined in chapter 1, the primary purpose of the study was (a) to identify and compare perceptions that students and student affairs personnel have concerning student services affairs programs at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan; and (b) to obtain information from students and student affairs personnel that can be used as a basis for future evaluation of student affairs services on Andrews University's main campus.
In order to satisfy this primary purpose, the study has attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the status of knowledge of student affairs services as demonstrated by students?

2. What is the status of knowledge of student affairs services as demonstrated by student affairs personnel?

3. What is the relative importance of student affairs services as reported by students?

4. What is the relative importance of student affairs services as reported by student affairs personnel?

5. How effective are student affairs services as perceived by students?

6. How effective are student affairs services as perceived by student affairs personnel?

Research Hypotheses

The following are the hypotheses for this study:

1. There is no significant difference between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of status of knowledge of student affairs services at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.
2. There is no significant difference between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of relative importance of student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

3. There is no significant difference between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of effectiveness of student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Instrument for the Study

The instrument used in this study was the questionnaire. The major advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire technique have been described by Birdie and Anderson (1974), Bradburn and Sudman (1979), and Orlich (1978). The questionnaire is one of the most commonly used methods of descriptive research in the behavioral sciences. It gathers data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time and is concerned with the descriptive statistics that result; thus, the questionnaire is a form of planned collection of data for the purpose of description.

Oppenhiem (1966) described the difference between experimental and survey studies as follows:

Those who favor surveys criticize experiments for being unrepresentative and for dealing with artificial situations. Experimentalists are critical of surveys for their reduced ability to control important variables, for following events rather than making them happen, and for their inability to prove causal relationships. No single approach is always necessarily superior; it all depends on what we need to find out and the type of question to which we seek an answer. (pp. 7, 8)
The questionnaire was chosen as the best means for collecting the responses required to obtain the necessary data needed for this study. It was based on the principle that if several pertinent questions about particular student affairs services are asked of a sufficiently large random sample of the local college or university population, a valid indication of the value of that program or service to those students will be available (Kamm, 1950).

A review of the literature failed to reveal any one instrument that was all-inclusive and that could be used in its original form. Oppenheim (1966) stated as follows:

\[\text{A questionnaire is not just a list of questions or a form to fill out. It is essentially a scientific instrument for measurement and for collection of particular kinds of data. Like all such instruments, it has to be specifically designed according to particular specifications and with specific aims in mind.} \ (p. \ 2)\]

**Design of the Instrument**

The questionnaire method was selected to obtain student and student affairs personnel perceptions of student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus. Several instruments were examined for potential use in the study. A questionnaire entitled Student Services Questionnaire was developed by Selgas and Blocker (1974). It was modified by Glenister (1977) as the Student Affairs Services Questionnaire, and then was updated by the researcher in 1992 as the Student Affairs Services and Programs Questionnaire for Students and the Student Affairs Services and Programs
Questionnaire for Student Affairs Personnel. Also, student and student affairs personnel biographical information was collected for purposes of descriptive statistics.

This study examined the following 11 student service and program areas: career planning and placement/student employment; commuter student programs and services; counseling services and substance education; housing and residential life programs (men and women); international student/multicultural services; minority student programs and services; recreational sports; religious programs and services; services for students with disabilities; student activities; and student wellness and health. These program areas were extracted from CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development Programs (1986a, 1988, 1990); Andrews University Criterion Report for Student Affairs (1989); and Andrews University Self-Study Report (1989).

Instrument Development and Modification

In order to construct the questionnaires for this study, the researcher examined those that had been developed and/or used by the following researchers in their studies: Rankin, 1966; Johnson, 1968; Cowins, 1974; Selgas and Blocker, 1974; Moyer, 1974; McIver, 1976; Glenister, 1977; Pinsky, 1978; Gomez, 1979; Barnes, 1981; Byrts, 1983; Lin, 1987; Hocking, 1988; Albert, 1989; Lowe, 1989; Marron, 1989; Edwards, 1990; Piper, 1990; and Thirk, 1990.

The researcher visited with persons in the Division of Student Affairs at the University of North Texas, Denton, Texas, in September 1992, in order to obtain
verbal or written suggested items that were later used in the construction or design of the questionnaires. These persons were Joe Stewart, Vice President for Student Affairs; Ray Lewis, Director for Career Planning and Placement Services; Don Bailey, Director for Recreational Sports; Kevin Marbury, Assistant Director; William Gregory Sawyer, Dean of Students; Stephen Pickett, Director of the Office of Disability Accommodation; Tom Overton, Director for Counseling and Testing; Deborah Arnold, Assistant Director for Financial Aid; and Tom Hoemeke, Director of International Studies.

Eleven statements were selected and modified from Glenister's 1977 study to reflect the aims and objectives of the Division of Student Affairs services and programs at Andrews University. Copies of the letters from J. W. Selgas and C. E. Glenister granting permission for the use of their questionnaires are included in Appendix B. The remaining 66 statements were selected and modified from the questionnaires developed and/or used by researchers noted earlier, from the verbal and written suggestions of persons working in the Division of Student Affairs at the University of North Texas in Denton, and from students taking courses in Student Services. The total number of statements was 77, and these were used to evaluate the 11 student services and/or program areas included in the study.

The 77 statements included in the questionnaires were submitted to Professors W. Brookshire and J. E. Miller in the Department of Educational Foundations, Research and Special Education, for their judgments and approval of the suitability of
the statements for use in the study. The statements were also submitted to several
doctoral students enrolled in the 3-hour course Organization and Administration of
Student Services (EDHE6730) for the fall semester of 1992. The members of the
doctoral committee for the study were shown the 77 statements contained in the
questionnaires for their consideration.

Description of the Instruments

The instruments designed for the study are as follows: The Student Affairs
Services and/or Programs Questionnaire for Students was designed to measure percep-
tions of students at Andrews University. The second questionnaire, Student Affairs
Services and/or Programs Questionnaire for Student Affairs Personnel, was designed to
measure perceptions of student affairs personnel at Andrews University.

Each of the instruments consists of two parts. Part I of the instrument is
subtitled "Statements Pertaining to Student Affairs Services and Programs at Andrews
University" and is made up of 11 student services and/or programs. Part II of the
second instrument is subtitled "Statements Pertaining to Student Affairs Personnel at
Andrews University" and is made up of 11 student services and/or programs. The first
parts of both instruments includes 77 statements, each to be used in evaluating student
services and/or programs included in the study in the following three categories:
(a) status of knowledge of the student services and/or program areas at Andrews
University by participants, (b) the relative importance of the student services and/or
program areas to students’ education at Andrews University, and (c) the effectiveness
of the student services and/or program areas at Andrews, all on a 6-point scale from low to high.

Part II, Section A of the first instrument, subtitled "Open-ended Statements," includes 11 functions or factors for student respondents to make comments or suggestions where necessary. Similarly, Part II, Section A of the second instrument, subtitled "Open-ended Statements," includes 11 functions or factors for student affairs personnel respondents to make comments or suggestions as deemed necessary. Part II, Section B of the first instrument, subtitled "Student Biodata," includes 25 items or phrases; Part II, Section B of the second instrument, subtitled "Student Affairs Personnel Biodata," includes 17 items or phrases. (See the two instruments in Appendix C.)

The Pilot Instrument

To obtain additional feedback for validation, a pilot study was conducted. With permission from instructors of EDUC 6010 Stats Ed Research, Professors Brookshire and McCallon on October 5 and October 10, 1992, respectively, the researcher gave a total of 20 packages to participants in the pilot study. Each package included an invitation to participate in the study and a two-part instrument to be completed by respondents. On October 6 and October 17, 1992, the researcher received a total return of 12 (60%) completed copies of the questionnaire through the instructors of the two classes.

From the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs at the University of North Texas, Denton, a list was obtained of five members of student affairs personnel,
who were given the appropriate packages on October 5, 1992. Each package contained
the invitation to participate and the two-part instrument to be completed. By October
16, 1992, the five copies of the questionnaire (100%) had been returned and received.
Respondents indicated that time spent on completing the questionnaire was less than 20
minutes.

Respondents' responses, comments, and suggestions were reviewed on October
19, 1992, by Professors Brookshire and Miller from the Department of Educational
Foundations Research and Special Education at the University of North Texas in
Denton; they validated the final instrument as to relevance and comprehensiveness of
topic coverage.

The instrument intended for use in this study was shown to members of the
researcher's committee for their approval. Upon approval, the final copies of the
instruments were printed on 24 and 26 single-sided pages, 8½" x 9" in dimension.
Participants in the study were requested to read the brief directions carefully and to
respond to the statements on the instruments accordingly. Samples of the instruments
are in Appendix C.

Population Sample

Approximately 2,800 full-time students were enrolled at Andrews University
during the autumn quarter of 1991-1992, and approximately 30 full-time employees
worked in the Division of Student Affairs at the same place and time. The population
consisted of students who had been enrolled at the university for at least one previous
regular quarter. A random sample of 280 students, which represented 10% of the full-time students, was asked to complete a questionnaire that provided evaluative data for this study. One hundred fifty students were needed to complete the study.

Each full-time member of the student affairs personnel or practitioners staff at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan, was asked to participate in the study by completing a questionnaire.

Data-gathering Procedures

To conduct the study and administer the questionnaires to participants, the researcher personally went to the Andrews University main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan. Here, he visited the individual university housing units and, from the resident dormitory and apartment assistants, collected a list of names of full-time students who had been enrolled at the university during the autumn quarter of the 1991-92 school year and who had previously spent at least one regular quarter enrolled at the university as full-time students. These students were presumed to have been exposed to student affairs services and services programs provided by the Division of Student Affairs at the university. They had been housed in dormitories (University Towers for men; Meier Hall for men; and Lamson Hall for women) and apartments (Beechwood, Maplewood, and Garland A, B, C, D, and E for both single and married students; and Garland F for single men only). Commuter students invited to participate in the study were contacted in the university’s Campus Center.
From the list of 2,800 possible participants, names were randomly selected of 280 students who were to participate in the study, and the appropriate packages distributed in 9" x 12" brown envelopes on which an assigned code number was written for follow-up purposes, along with a telephone number where the researcher could be contacted. The researcher visited all the major university housing units and placed the appropriate packages in the mailboxes of the selected students. Participants were encouraged to place their completed copies of the instruments in boxes provided for their convenience and confidentiality.

In the case of student affairs personnel or practitioners, the list of 30 possible participants was obtained from the secretary/office manager of the departments in the Division of Student Affairs; each office was visited, and the departmental head was asked to give the appropriate packages to the full-time employees in the department. These packages also included the invitation letter and the instrument in an 8½" x 12" brown envelope with an assigned code number for follow-up purposes and a telephone number where the researcher could be contacted. After a day or two, the departments were revisited and the packets retrieved. A log of returned questionnaires was kept according to the assigned code numbers.

Addai Joseph, who lives in at Berrien Springs, Michigan, visited some departments in the Division of Student Affairs and some of the dormitories, collected more completed copies of the questionnaires, and mailed them to the researcher.
Of the 280 copies of the questionnaire administered to full-time randomly selected students, 165 (58.93%) usable returns were received. Of the 30 copies administered to full-time employees of student affairs personnel or practitioners, 20 (66.67%) usable returns were received.

Analysis of Data

Once the completed questionnaires were returned or were in place, every completed copy of the questionnaire was reviewed and verified. In order to ensure confidentiality, the code numbers were removed or erased.

On June 16, 1993, two of the completed copies of the questionnaires—one from the student group and one from the student personnel group—were taken to the Office of Educational Research and Student Assistance at the University of North Texas, Denton, then to the university's main computer office for the data to be coded and analyzed by computer, using the 1993 Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 4.1 for IBM VM/CMS, 1993).

A comparison was made between the student group and the student affairs personnel group, and a t test was used to analyze the responses in Part 1 of both questionnaires. The two-tailed t test for independent samples was used for comparing two means (Hatch & Farhady, 1982; Thomas & Young, 1986). In order to protect against Type 1 errors, the level of statistical significance selected for the t-test value was the .05 level.
Summary

In this chapter, the design of the study was presented. The study was descriptive in nature and questionnaires were utilized for collecting the data. Part 1 of the instrument included 77 statements that were characteristics of student affairs functions. Part 2 consisted of an open-ended section (Section A), in which comments, suggestions, or recommendations were suggested, and a biodata section (Section B), in which respondents were asked to provide biographical information that would be used to statistically describe the sample.

The instruments were taken to the Andrews University main campus at Berrien Springs, Michigan, for administration. After the list of names of the 2,800 full-time students enrolled at the university during the autumn quarter of 1991-92 was collected, a representative sample of 280 (10%) was selected. The student questionnaire was administered to the sample representatives of the students. A list of the departments under the Division of Student Affairs at the university was obtained from the Office of Student Affairs. Departments were visited and instruments administered to the 30 full-time student affairs staff members employed there during the autumn quarter of the 1991-92 school year.

A total of 165 (58.93%) copies of completed questionnaires was received from student respondents, and 20 (67%) copies from full-time employees of the student services department. The data were statistically analyzed by means of (a) frequency
count, percentages, and group means to determine trends in specific statements/items and (b) by $t$ test to compare the differences in responses between student participants and student affairs personnel participants.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The procedure used in gathering and analyzing the data was described in the preceding chapter. The analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the respondents are presented in this chapter. Demographic characteristics of the student group and the student affairs personnel group for the autumn quarter of 1992 at Andrews University are presented. The results of responses to the survey and a general summary of the total sample are provided in the tables.

Also presented in this chapter are findings relative to differences and similarities that were found to exist between students’ and student affairs personnel’s perceptions of the 11 student affairs services that were investigated in this study. In each of the 11 areas, both groups were invited to include comments and/or suggestions. These comments and suggestions are listed by program and service areas and are included in the appendices.

A total of 280 questionnaires was distributed to students and 30, to student affairs personnel. Table 1 indicates that 165 (58.93%) completed and usable questionnaires were obtained from the student group, and 20 (66.67%) completed and usable questionnaires were obtained from the student affairs personnel group. These results are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

Number of Questionnaires Distributed, Number of Completed, Usable Returns, and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number distributed</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>58.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs personnel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>310 (N)</td>
<td>185 (n)</td>
<td>125.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Biographical Data

Part II, Section B of the questionnaire for students resulted in profiles of the student respondents in the study in terms of their background information. Results are shown in Tables 2 through 28. In summary, the student respondents were asked to identify the following:

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Citizenship
4. Place of residency
5. Ethnic background (national/racial origin)
6. Physical disability
7. Type of physical disability
8. U. S. military veteran status
9. Health insurance coverage
10. Type of health insurance coverage
11. Employment status
12. Employment or career change
13. Marital status
14. Number of dependent children
15. Need for child-care service for dependent children
16. Undergraduate classification
17. Graduate classification
18. Quarter credit-hours enrolled at Andrews during the Autumn Quarter of 1999-92
19. Are you working on a degree program?
20. Are you working on a certification program?
21. Number of years out of school
22. Residence while a student at Andrews University
23. One-way distance from place of residence to Andrews' main campus
24. Means of transportation
25. Hours spent on campus
26. Time of the day student attends classes
27. Major college, school, or department
Results of Student Biographical Data

Results of the biographical characteristics for the student sample are presented in Tables 2 through 28.

Age. Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 42.8% were above the age of 18, with 57.2% reported as age 30 or over. Six respondents, or 3.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Responses From Students Regarding Their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-interval</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under 18 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 18-21 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 22-25 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 26-29 years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30 years or above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender. The proportion of male and female students responding to the survey were about two to one. Table 3 indicates that 103 students, or 66.0%, were male, whereas 53, or 34.0%, were female. This shows that the institution is coeducational and there are more male students than female. Nine respondents, or 4.9%, did not respond to the question.
Table 3

Responses From Total Students Regarding Their Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship. The number of international students who attended the institution was greater than that of U.S. citizens and U.S. permanent resident visa students combined. Eighty students, or 50.6%, were international; 58 students, or 36.7%, were U.S. citizens; and 20 students, or 12.7%, were U.S. permanent visa students. Seven respondents, or 4.2%, did not respond to the question. This is indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Responses From Students Regarding Their Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. U.S. permanent resident visa</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place of residency. Most of the respondents to the survey reside in the state of Michigan. Sixty-seven respondents, or 45.9%, reside in the state of Michigan; 48 respondents, or 32.9%, are nonresidents of Michigan; and 31 respondents, or 21.2%, reside in other areas. Nineteen respondents, or 11.5%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Responses From Students Regarding Their Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residency</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-resident</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic background. Of the 165 total respondents, the majority were Oriental. The ethnic group with the smallest number was Mexican-American. Table 6 indicates that 29 respondents, or 17.7%, were Oriental, whereas 1 respondent, or .6%, was Mexican-American. Seven respondents, or 4.0%, did not respond to the question.
Table 6

Responses From Students Regarding Their Ethnicity (National/racial Origin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic background (National/racial origin)</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. African</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African-American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anglo-American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hispanic-American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mexican-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oriental</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. West Indian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical disability. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 151, or 95.6%, reported having no visible physical disability, whereas 7, or 4.3%, reported that they had visible physical disability. This shows that the institution does not discriminate against the admission of physically challenged persons. Seven respondents, or 4.7% did not respond to the question. These data are indicated in Table 7.
Table 7

Responses From Students Regarding Their Physical Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical disability</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of disability. The proportion of partially handicapped and fully handicapped students responding to the survey was two to one. Table 8 indicates that four students, or 66.7%, were partially handicapped, whereas two students, or 33.3%, were fully handicapped. One respondent, or 14.3%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Responses From Students Regarding Type of Physical Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical disability</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 7</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Partially handicapped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fully handicapped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**U.S. military veteran status.** Of the 165 total responses to the survey, 5, or 3.2%, were U.S. military veterans; 138 respondents, 82.6%, were not veterans at all; and 11 respondents, 7.1%, were veterans but not U.S. military veterans. Eleven respondents, or 7.1%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9**

**Responses From Students Regarding U.S. Military Veteran Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. military veteran status</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health insurance coverage.** Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 143, or 90.5%, had health insurance coverage; 12 respondents, or 7.6%, had no health insurance coverage; and 3 respondents, or 1.9%, had not yet decided whether to have health insurance coverage. Seven respondents, or 4.2%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 10.
Table 10

Responses From Students Regarding Health Insurance Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health insurance coverage</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of health insurance coverage. Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 77, or 56.2%, had group insurance; 34 respondents, or 24.8%, had individual insurance; 26 respondents, or 19.0%, had other types of health insurance coverage; and 28 respondents, or 16.9%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Responses From Students Regarding Type of Health Insurance Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of health insurance coverage</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group insurance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual insurance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment status. Most of the students surveyed worked either full-time or part-time while attending school. Of the 165 respondents to the survey, 56 students, or 33.1%, worked part-time. None of the respondents reported that they had retired from work. Eight respondents, or 4.8%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work full time (40 hrs. or more/week)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work part time (less than 40 hrs./week)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work on campus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work off campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work both on and off campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Homemaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Medical disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unemployed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment or career change. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 82, or 52.2%, were not planning to change career or employment; 32 students, or 20.4%, had planned or were planning to change career or employment; 43, or 27.4%,
were undecided; and 8 students, or 4.3%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Responses From Students Regarding Employment or Career Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment or career change</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital status. Of the 165 total students responding to the survey, 89, or 56.7%, reported that they were married; 52, or 33.1%, were single; and 8 students, or 4.9%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Responses From Students Regarding Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Single</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Married</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divorced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of dependent children. Of the 165 respondents to the survey, 67 students, or 40.9%, reported that they had no dependent children; 32, or 20.9%, had at least one dependent child; 54, or 35.3%, had more than one dependent child; and 12, or 6.7%, did not answer the question. This is presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Responses From Students Regarding Number of Dependent Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dependent children</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. None</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More than one</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need for child-care service for dependent children. Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 116 students, or 76.8%, reported that they did not need child-care services for their dependent child or children; 31 students, or 20.5%, reported that they needed such services; 4 students, or 2.6%, were undecided; and 14 students did not answer the question. This is presented in Table 16.
Table 16

Responses From Students Regarding Need for Child-care Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for child-care service</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate classification. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 9, or 9.7%, were freshmen; 7, or 7.5%, were sophomores; 14, or 15.1%, were juniors; 24, or 25.8%, were seniors; 39, or 41.9%, were in other types of categories; and 72, or 43.3%, did not answer the question. These data are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Responses From Students Regarding Undergraduate Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate classification</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Freshman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sophomore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Senior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Graduate classification.** Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 47 students, or 40.2%, were seminary students; 19, or 16.2%, were transfer students; 51, or 43.6%, were in other classifications; and 48 students, or 28.6%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 18.

### Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate classification</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Seminary student</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transfer student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quarter credit hours enrolled.** Of the 165 total respondents to the survey, 140 students, or 91.0%, were enrolled as full-time students during the autumn quarter 1992; 7, or 4.5%, were enrolled as part-time students; 7, or 4.3%, were special students; and 11, or 6.6%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 19.
Table 19

Responses From Students Regarding Quarter Credit-hours Enrolled at Andrews, Autumn Quarter 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter credit-hours enrolled</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Full-time student</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Part-time student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Special student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working on a degree program. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 150, or 96.2%, were working on degree programs; 4, or 2.6%, were not; 2, or 1.2%, were undecided; and 9 students, or 4.9%, did not answer the question, as presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Responses From Students Regarding Degree Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working on degree program</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undecided</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certification Program. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 21, or 16.5%, were working on their certification programs; 87, or 68.5%, were not; 20, or 15.0%, were undecided; and 37 students, or 22.6%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

Responses From Students Regarding Certification Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working on certification program?</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undecided No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years out of school. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, a majority had enrolled at Andrews University after having been out of previous schools or colleges or universities for less than 4 years. Only a few students, or 13.0%, have been out of previous schools for 10 or more years. This is presented in Table 22.
Table 22

Responses From Students Regarding Period of Time out of School Before Enrolling at Andrews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years out of school</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never in college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Less than one year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1-3 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4-6 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 7-9 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 10 or more years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residence while a student at Andrews University. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, a majority of the students' places of residence are in Andrews University's housing units. Only 15 students, or 10.4%, lived outside the university's housing units. Six students, or 3.1%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Responses From Students Regarding Place of Residence While Attending Andrews University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University dormitory</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University apartment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(table continues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-way distance home to campus. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 29, or 65.9%, traveled fewer than 2 miles one way to the university's main campus; 12 students, or 27.3%, traveled 16 or more miles one way; and 121, or 73.2%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Outside university housing units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commute from out of town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Responses From Students Regarding One-way Distance from Home to Andrews' Main Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-way distance home to campus</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fewer than 2 miles</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2-5 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 6-9 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10-12 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 13-15 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 16 or more miles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means of transportation. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 1, or .6%, used bus service to travel to Andrews University's main campus to attend classes. Five students, or 5.7%, used car-pool service, and none of the students indicated that they used taxi service. Eighty-one students, or 93.1%, used other means, and 78 students, or 47.3%, did not answer the question. These data are presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Responses From Students Regarding Means of Transportation to Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of transportation</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bus service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Car-pool</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hours spent on campus. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 102, or 69.4%, spent more than 10 hours per week on campus other than for class attendance; and 18 students, or 10.9%, did not answer the question, as presented in Table 26.
Table 26

Responses From Students Regarding Hours Spent on Campus per Week Other Than for Class Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours spent on campus</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 2 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2-4 hours</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5-7 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 8-10 hours</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More than 10 hours</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time of day student attends class. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 109, or 71.7%, attended classes in the day time; 43, or 28.3%, attended classes in the evening; none attended classes on the weekends, and 13 students, or 7.3%, did not respond to the question, as presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Responses From Students Regarding Time of Day Attended Most Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of day attends classes</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 165</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evening</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Day</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weekend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major college, school or department. Of the 165 total student respondents to the survey, 39, or 27.3%, were in the College of Arts and Sciences; 14, or 9.1%, were in the College of Technology; 21, or 13.6%, were in the School of Business; 21, or 13.6%, were in the School of Education; 13, or 8.4%, were in the School of Graduate Studies; and 46, or 30.0%, were in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

Eleven students, or 6.1%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Responses From Total Students Regarding Major College, School, or Department at Andrews University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major college, school or department</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. College of Technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School of Business</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School of Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Seventh-day Adventist Seminary</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Students' Biographical Data

1. A majority of student respondents who attended Andrews University were 30 years old or older.
2. More male students than female students attended Andrews University.
3. A majority of student respondents were not U.S. citizens.
4. Most student respondents resided in the state of Michigan.
5. A majority of student respondents were Orientals.
6. A majority of student respondents had no visible physical disability.
7. Most of the student respondents were not U. S. Military veterans.
8. Most of the student respondents had group health insurance coverage.
9. Most of the student respondents worked 40 hours or less per week.
10. Most of the student respondents did not intend to change employment or career.
11. Most of the student respondents were married.
12. A majority of student respondents had no dependent children.
13. Most of the student respondents did not need child-care services for dependent children.
14. Most of the undergraduate student respondents were in some type of classification other than freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior.
15. Most of the graduate student respondents were in some type of classification other than seminarian or transfer student.
16. A majority of student respondents were full-time students at Andrews University.

17. Most of the student respondents were working on degree programs.

18. About 13.0% of the 165 student respondents were working on certification programs.

19. A majority of student respondents had been out of school or college less than 3 years before attending Andrews University.

20. A majority of student respondents lived in the university apartments at Andrews University's main campus.

21. Commuter student respondents traveled 16 miles or more one way from home to Andrews' main campus to attend classes.

22. Most student respondents used means of transportation other than bus service, car pool, or taxi to attend classes at Andrews University's main campus.

23. Most of the student respondents spent more than 10 hours per week on campus for class attendance.

24. Most of the student respondents' major college or school at Andrews was the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary.

Student Affairs Personnel Biographical Data

Part II, Section B of the questionnaire for student affairs personnel resulted in profiles of the student affairs personnel respondents in the study in terms of their
background information. Results are presented in Tables 29 through 45. In summary, the student affairs personnel respondents were asked to provide the following:

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Citizenship
4. Ethnic background (national/racial origin)
5. Highest degree held
6. Major area of concentration or specialization
7. Years of employment at Andrews University
8. Years of employment working in student affairs profession
9. Years of employment in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus
10. Length of time served in current position
11. Type of employment position
12. Administrative title
13. Academic rank
14. Approximate percentage of time devoted to research, teaching, service, other
15. Size of staff in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus
16. Total number of student enrollment at Andrews University during the autumn quarter of the 1991-92 school year
17. Salary range per academic year at Andrews University
Results of Student Affairs Personnel Biographical Data

In Tables 29 through 45, results are presented of the biographical characteristics for the student affairs personnel sample.

**Age.** Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 18, or 90.0%, were 30 years of age or over, with one, or 5.0%, in the 26-29 years age range. One student affairs personnel member, or 5.1%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age interval</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under 18 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 18-21 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 22-25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 26-29 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30 years or older</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender.** Of the 20 total student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 10, or 50%, were female, and 8, or 40%, male. Two staff members, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 30.
Table 30

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Their Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship. Of the 20 total student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 15, or 78.9%, were U.S. citizens; 4, or 20%, were U.S. permanent resident visa holders; and 1, or 5.0%, did not respond to the question. There were no non-U.S. citizens as personnel in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University. This is shown in Table 31.

Table 31

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Their Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. U.S. permanent resident visa</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnic background. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 9, or 45.0%, were Anglo-Americans; 4, or 20.0%, were African Americans; and 3, or 15.7%, were West Indians. Hispanic-American, Native American, and "other" were each represented by one staff member, or 5.0% each. None of the personnel respondents were Africans or Oriental, even though a substantial number of students were Oriental. One staff member did not respond. These data are presented in Table 32.

Table 32

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Their Ethnic Background (National/racial Origin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic background (National/racial origin)</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. African</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African-American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anglo-American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hispanic-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mexican-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oriental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. West Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest degree held. Table 33 shows the highest degree held by student affairs personnel in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus.
Respondents could choose from six degree choices: associate, bachelor's, master's, specialist's, doctorate, and "other." Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 2, or 10.5%, held associate degrees; 1, or 5.3%, held a bachelor's degree; 6, or 31.6%, held a masters degree; 1, or 5.3%, held specialist's degrees (MAT/M.Ed); 5, or 26.3%, held doctorates; 4, or 21.0%, chose the category "other"; and 1, or 5.0%, did not respond to the question.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree held</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BA/BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MA/MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MAT/M.Ed (specialist's)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PhD/EdD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major area of concentration. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 6, or 33.3%, specialized in counseling, whereas none specialized in psychology or sociology; 1, or 5.6%, specialized in medicine; 11, or 61.1%, chose the category of "other;" and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question, as presented in Table 34.
Table 34

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Major Area of Concentration or Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major area of concentration</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of employment. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 6, or 33.3%, had employment at Andrews University less than 5 years; 5, or 27.7%, had employment at Andrews between 5 and 9 years; 3, or 16.7%, had employment at Andrews between 10 and 14 years; 3, or 16.7%, had employment at Andrews between 15 and 19 years; 1, or 5.6%, had employment at Andrews for 20 years or more; and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 35.
Table 35

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Years of Employment at Andrews University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of employment at Andrews</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10-14 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 15-19 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 20 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of employment in student affairs field. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 7, or 38.9%, had worked in the student affairs profession less than 5 years; 4, or 22.2%, had worked in the profession between 5 and 9 years; 5, or 27.8%, had worked in the profession between 10 and 14 years; 1, or 5.6%, had worked in the profession between 15 and 19 years; 1, or 5.6%, had worked in the profession for 20 years or more; and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 36.
Table 36

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Years of Employment in Student Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of employment in student affairs</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10-14 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 15-19 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 20 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of employment in student affairs at Andrews University. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 8, or 44.4%, had worked in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus less than 5 years; 6, or 33.3% had worked there between 5 and 9 years; 3, or 16.7%, had worked there between 10 and 14 years; 1, or 5.6%, had worked there between 15 and 19 years; and 1, or 5.6%, had worked there 20 years or more. Two participants did not answer the question. These data are presented in Table 37.
Table 37

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Years of Employment in Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's Main Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of student affairs employment at Andrews</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-9 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10-14 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 15-19 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 20 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of time in current position. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 1, or 5.6%, had served in the current position for less than a year; 9, or 50.5%, had served between 1 and 4 years; 5, or 27.7%, had been serving there between 5 and 9 years; and 3, or 16.7%, had served between 10 and 14 years. None of the personnel indicated they had served in their current position between 15 and 19 years, nor for 20 years or more. Two respondents, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 38.
Table 38

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Length of Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in current position</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1-4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5-9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10-14 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 15-19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 20 years or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of employment position. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 15, or 83.3%, worked full-time in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus; and 3, or 16.7%, worked there part-time. None of the personnel members indicated "other," and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 39.

Table 39

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Type of Employment Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment position</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Full-time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(table continues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative titles. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, none responded to the title of vice president of student affairs; 1, or 5.9%, responded as assistant vice president; none responded as dean of students; 2, or 11.8%, responded as associate/assistant dean of students; 1, or 5.9%, responded as director of department; and 1, or 5.9%, responded to associate director. Two staff members, or 11.8%, responded as secretary (at the divisional level); 2, or 11.8%, responded as counselor; none responded as psychologist or physician; and 1 each responded as health worker/nurse, and clerical staff (at departmental level). Five personnel, or 28.3%, responded to the title of "other"; and 3, or 15.0% did not respond to the question. These data are presented in Table 40.
Table 40

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Their Administrative Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative title</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vice president of student affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assistant vice president of student affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dean of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Associate/assistant dean of students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director of department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assistant director of department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Associate director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Secretary (at divisional level)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Counselor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Health worker/nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Clerical staff (at departmental level)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic rank. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 1, or 5.0%, was an instructor; 1 was an assistant professor; 1 an associate professor; none were professors; and 5, or 25.0% listed their ranks as "other." Twelve staff members, or 60%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 41.
Table 41

Responses Obtained from Total Student Affairs Personnel Respondents Regarding Their Academic Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic rank</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assistant professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of time. Regarding data in Table 42, 1 staff member, or 5.9%, devoted more than half the time to research; 1 devoted more than half the time to teaching job-related courses; 12, or 60.0%, devoted nearly all their time to service in their jobs; and 3, or 17.7%, devoted more than 80% of their time to "other." Three respondents, or 15.0%, did not respond to the question.

Table 42

Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Expenditure of Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate time spent on job facets</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Size of student affairs staff. In Table 43, 11 of the staff members, or 61.1%, indicated that the Division of Student Affairs personnel numbered fewer than 5 members; 6 respondents, or 33.3%, indicated that there were between 5 and 9 staff members; 1, or 5.6%, indicated that the staff size was between 10 and 14; and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question.

Table 43
Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Size of Staff in Their Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of student affairs staff at Andrews</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fewer than 5 staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-9 staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10-14 staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated student enrollment. Of the 20 student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 1, or 5.6%, estimated Andrews' student enrollment as fewer than 1,000;
none estimated between 1,000 and 1,999 students; 13, or 72.2%, estimated the enrollment at between 2,000 and 2,999, which was the correct estimate at that time. Four staff members, or 22.2%, estimated the enrollment as being between 3,000 and 3,999; and 2, or 10.0%, did not respond to the question. This is presented in Table 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students enrolled</th>
<th>Total number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fewer than 1,000 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1,000-1,999 students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2,000-2,999 students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3,000-3,999 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4,000-4,999 students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5,000 or more students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary range per academic year. Salary ranges are shown in Table 45. Of the 20 total student affairs personnel respondents to the survey, 2, or 12.5%, were in the range of less than $15,000 per academic year; 3 respondents, or 18.8%, were in the $15,000-$19,000 range; 2, or 12.5%, were in the $20,000-$24,000 range; 5, or 31.2%, were in the $25,000-$29,000 range; 4, or 25.0%, were in the $30,000 or more category; and 4 respondents, or 20.0%, did not respond to the question.
### Table 45

**Responses From Student Affairs Personnel Regarding Salary Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary range per academic year</th>
<th>Total number surveyed 20</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than $15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $15,000-$19,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $20,000-$24,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $25,000-$29,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $30,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Student Affairs Personnel Biographical Data

1. A majority of student affairs personnel who worked in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus were 30 years of age or older.

2. The number of female student affairs personnel was about the same as the number of male student affairs personnel who worked in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University.

3. A majority of student affairs personnel who worked in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University were U.S. citizens.

4. A majority of student affairs personnel were Anglo-Americans.

5. Most of the student affairs personnel held graduate degrees.

6. Most of the student affairs personnel had degrees in fields other than counseling.
7. Most of the student affairs personnel had worked less than 12 years at Andrews University.

8. Most of the student affairs personnel had worked less than 10 years in the field of student affairs.

9. A majority of student affairs personnel had worked less than 10 years in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University.

10. Most of the student affairs personnel had held their current positions less than five years.

11. Most of the student affairs personnel who worked in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University were full-time employees.

12. Most of the student affairs personnel spent a greater percentage of time providing services to students than in other activities since the student affairs profession is service-oriented.

13. Most of the student affairs personnel knew the correct estimate of students who were enrolled at Andrews University during the autumn quarter of 1992.

14. The salary range per academic year for student affairs personnel was fairly reasonable.

Comparison of Student and Student Affairs Personnel Perceptions of Student Affairs Services at Andrews University's Main Campus

The main focus of this section of the study was the identification and comparison of the differences and similarities of perceptions held by students and student affairs
personnel toward student services at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Tables 46 through 84 present statistical data concerning the 11 student services and/or program areas.

**Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment**

Regarding Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, student affairs personnel respondents reported a higher status of knowledge than did the student respondents. This may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that student affairs personnel, who are the providers and implementors of the function, had more knowledge of it than did student respondents. As illustrated in Table 46, significant difference was found between student and student affairs personnel ratings of the status of knowledge of the function at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan. Since $t$ value equaled -2.04, the null hypothesis 1 was rejected at the .05 level of significance. The $f$ value (testing of $f$ is due to the variance differences) was 1.32; the $P$ value .043*.

**Table 46**

| Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment in the Category of Status of Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number surveyed | Frequency | % | M | SD | SE | $f$ | 1 | $P$ |
| Students | 165 | 145 | 87.8 | 2.3747 | 1.173 | .097 | | |
| Personnel | 20 | 16 | 80.0 | 3.0139 | 1.348 | .337 | | |

1.32 -2.04 .043*
Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Commuter Student Programs and Services

Regarding Commuter Student Programs and Services, students reported a greater degree of status of knowledge of the function than did student affairs personnel, as presented in Table 47. Both groups showed low mean ratings for the student services and programs, though students reported a greater status of knowledge of the function than did student affairs personnel. Both groups rated their status of knowledge of the function at the lower scales of the questionnaires; however, students reported a higher status of knowledge of the function than did student affairs personnel. Both groups' ratings were found to be significant at the .05 level. The \( t \) value was 2.21. For this function, the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) should be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The \( t \) value was 1.67, and the \( P \) value was .028*.

Table 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>1.8189</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1.1059</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Counseling Services and Substance Education

Regarding Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, student affairs personnel reported a greater status of knowledge of the function, as presented in Table 48. Students rated their status of knowledge of the function at the lower end of the scale, whereas student affairs personnel rated their status of knowledge of the function at the higher end, with the difference being highly significant. The $t$ value was -3.84. For this function, the null hypothesis 1 should be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The $t$ value was 1.82. The $P$ value was .000*.

Table 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>2.3608</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>3.5159</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

In regard to Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 49. For this function, both groups reported equal degrees of status of knowledge, with no
significant difference between them. The $t$ value was -.85. The null hypothesis 1 was accepted at the .05 level of significance. The conclusion can be drawn that this service was not significant. The $f$ value was 1.35. The $P$ value was .395.

Table 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>3.5268</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

International Student/Multicultural Services

Regarding International Student/Multicultural Services, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 50. Although the ratings of student affairs personnel were slightly higher than those of the students, there was no significant difference between them. The $t$ value was -1.67, which was not significant at the .05 degree level of confidence. Under these circumstances, the null hypothesis 1 was accepted. The $f$ value was 1.10. The $P$ value was .098.
Table 50

Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of International Student/Multicultural Services in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>2.9556</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.5391</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Minority Student Programs and Services

Regarding Minority Student Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 51. Students reported a greater degree of status of knowledge of this function than did student affairs personnel, although there was no significant difference. The t value was 1.90, and the level of significance was not at .05. The conclusion can be drawn that this function was not highly significant. The null hypothesis was accepted. The f value was 1.15. The P value was .059.
Table 51

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Minority Student Programs and Services in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>2.0355</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1.2353</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Recreational Sports

Regarding Recreational Sports, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 52. The two groups reported equal degrees of status of knowledge of this function, with no significant difference between them. The t value was .26. Because this function was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, the null hypothesis was accepted. The t value was 1.02. The P value was .793.

Table 52

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Recreational Sports in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>2.5481</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>2.4559</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
**Religious Programs and Services**

Regarding Religious Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 53. There was a significant difference between the two groups, with student affairs personnel reporting a greater degree of status of knowledge than did the students. On this function, the $t$ value was -3.18, which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Under these circumstances, null hypothesis 1 was rejected. The $t$ value was 1.09. The $P$ value was 002*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>3.0099</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>3.9265</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates significance at .05 level.

**Services for Students with Disabilities**

Regarding Services for Students with Disabilities, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 54. The two groups equally rated and reported their status of knowledge of this function at the lower end of the scale on the questionnaires. The difference between the groups' ratings is not
significant at the .05 level. The $t$ value equaled 1.00, and the null hypothesis 1 was accepted. The $f$ value was 2.93. The $P$ value was .319.

Table 54

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Services for Students with Disabilities in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>1.7618</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates significance at .05 level.

Student Activities

Regarding Student Activities, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 55. There was a significant difference at the .04 level of confidence, with student affairs personnel rating the function higher. The $t$ value was -2.02. The null hypothesis 1 was rejected. The $f$ value was 1.20. The $P$ value was .045*. 
Table 55

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Student Activities in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>2.6867</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>3.2569</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Student Wellness and Health

Regarding Student Wellness and Health, results for both groups in the category of status of knowledge are presented in Table 56. Student affairs personnel reported a significantly higher degree of status of knowledge than did the students. The t value was -2.27. The null hypothesis 1 was rejected at the .05 level of significance. The f value was 1.22. The P value was .025*.

Table 56

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Student Wellness and Health in the Category of Status of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>2.5141</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>3.2421</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

In the category of relative importance, results for both groups regarding Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment are presented in Table 57. Both groups rated the relative importance of this function at the higher end of the scale, but student affairs personnel reported a greater degree of relative importance than did the students. There was not a significant difference between the groups, however. The $t$ value was -1.05, and the level of significance was not at .05. Null hypothesis 2 was, therefore, accepted. The $t$ value was 1.19. The $P$ value was .297.

Table 57

Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>3.5338</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.8194</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Commuter Student Programs and Services

Regarding Commuter Student Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 58. The two groups were
similar in the category of relative importance of Commuter Student Programs and Services. The $t$ value was -.24, and significance was not at the .05 confidence level. The null hypothesis 2 was therefore accepted. The $f$ value was 1.07. The $P$ value was .810.

Table 58

| Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Commuter Student Programs and Services in the Category of Relative Importance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number surveyed | Fre- quency | %  | $M$  | $SD$  | $SE$  | $f$  | $t$  | $P$  |
| Students       | 165 | 151  | 91.5 | 2.8424 | 1.389 | .113 | \  | 1.07 | -.24 | .810 |
| Personnel      | 20  | 15   | 75.0 | 2.9333 | 1.440 | .372 | \  | \  | \  | \  |

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education

In regard to Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 59. Student affairs personnel reported a significantly greater degree of relative importance of the function than did students. The $t$ value was -2.78, and significance was at the .05 confidence level. The null hypothesis 2 was, therefore, rejected. The $f$ value was 3.04. The $P$ value was .006*.
Table 59
Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>3.4145</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>4.2143</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

In regard to Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), results for both groups in the category of relative importance are indicated in Table 60. Both rate the relative importance of this function at the higher end of the scale; however, student affairs personnel still reported a greater degree of relative importance than did students. There was a significant difference between the groups' perceptions. The $t$ value was -2.33, and significance was at the .05 confidence level. The null hypothesis $\beta$ was rejected. The $f$ value was 2.45. The $P$ value was .021*.
Table 60

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>3.9189</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>4.3977</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

International Student/Multicultural Services

Regarding International Student/Multicultural Services, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are indicated in Table 61. The ratings of this function indicated a highly significant difference between the groups, with student affairs personnel rating the function higher than did the students. The t value was -2.97, and significance was at the .05 level of confidence. Null hypothesis 2 on this function was rejected. The t value was 9.60. The P value was .003*.
Table 61

Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of International Student/Multicultural Services in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>3.5315</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>4.4141</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Minority Student Programs and Services

Regarding Minority Student Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are shown in Table 62. The ratings reported no significant difference of relative importance between the two groups. The $t$ value was - .48, and significance was at the .05 degree level of confidence; therefore, the null hypothesis 2 was accepted. The $f$ value was 1.21. The $P$ value was .633.

Table 62

Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of Minority Student Programs and Services in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>3.0855</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.2813</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Recreational Sports

Regarding Recreational Sports, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 63. Ratings indicated no significant difference between the groups with regard to relative importance. The $t$ value was -1.20, and significance was not at the .05 degree level of confidence; consequently, null hypothesis 2 was accepted. The $f$ value was 1.29. The $P$ value was .234.

Table 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>3.3560</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.7422</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Religious Programs and Services

Regarding Religious Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 64. There was a highly significant difference between the two groups, with student affairs personnel rating the function higher than did the students. The $t$ value was -3.08, and significance was at the .05 degree level of confidence; consequently, null hypothesis 2 on this function was rejected. The $f$ value was 3.17. The $P$ value was .002*. 
Table 64

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Religious Programs and Services in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>4.5735</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Services for Students with Disabilities

Regarding Services for Students with Disabilities, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 65. There was no significant difference between the groups' ratings. The t value was -.48, and significance was not at the .05 level; consequently, null hypothesis 2 was accepted on the function. The t value was 1.14. The P value was .631.

Table 65

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Services for Students with Disabilities in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>3.1506</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>3.3529</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Student Activities

Regarding Student Activities, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 66. There was a highly significant difference in the ratings here, with student affairs personnel considering this function more important. The $t$ value was -2.96, and significance was at the .05 level. As a result, null hypothesis 2 was rejected. The $t$ value was 2.99. The $P$ value was .004*.

Table 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>3.4145</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Student Wellness and Health

Regarding Student Wellness and Health, results for both groups in the category of relative importance are presented in Table 67. Student affairs personnel rated the function at a highly significant greater level than did the students. The $t$ value was -2.63, and significance was at the .05 level. As a result, null hypothesis 2 was rejected. The $t$ value was 4.15. The $P$ value was .009*.
Table 67

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Wellness and Health in the Category of Relative Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>3.5563</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>4.3263</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

In the category of effectiveness, results for both groups regarding Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment are indicated in Table 68. There was no significant difference in the ratings, and both groups' perceptions of effectiveness were at the center of the scale. The t value was -.78, with significance at the .05 confidence level. Null hypothesis 3 was accepted. The f value was 1.08. The P value was .438.

Table 68

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment in the Category of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>2.1079</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2.3778</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Commuter Student Programs and Services

Regarding Commuter Student Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 69. Although there was no significant difference, student affairs personnel reported a greater degree of effectiveness than did the students. The $t$ value was 0.098, and significance was not at the .05 confidence level. As a result, null hypothesis 3 was accepted on the function. The $t$ value was 1.34. The $P$ value was .122.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>1.6653</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.1467</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education

Regarding Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 70. There was a
significant difference between the groups' ratings, with student affairs personnel's being higher. The $t$ value was $-2.78$, and significance was at the .05 level; consequently, null hypothesis 3 was rejected. The $f$ value was $1.43$. The $P$ value was $.006^*$. 

Table 70

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education in the Category of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>1.9917</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>2.9328</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

Regarding Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 71. There was no significant difference between the ratings. The $t$ value was $-68$, and significance was not at the .05 confidence level, so null hypothesis 3 was accepted on the function. The $f$ value was $1.73$. The $P$ value was $.496$. 
Table 71

**Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>2.9558</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.1364</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

**International Student/Multicultural Services**

Regarding International Student/Multicultural Services, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 72. There was no significant difference between the students and student affairs personnel’s ratings. The t value was -1.96, and significance was not at the .05 level. Under these circumstances, null hypothesis 3 was accepted. The f value was 1.10. The P value was .051.

Table 72

**Students’ and Student Affairs Personnel’s Perceptions of International Student/Multicultural Services in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>2.5170</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Minority Student Programs and Services

Regarding Minority Student Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 73. Student respondents rated the effectiveness of this service higher than did student affairs personnel. The lower rating by student affairs personnel may in part account for the fact that they want to bring minority students into the mainstream of the student population rather than encouraging minority complexity. Nevertheless, students still rated the effectiveness of the function higher than did the staff, although the difference was not significant. The t value was 1.00, and significance was at the .05 confidence level. The null hypothesis 3 was rejected on the function. The t value was 1.38. The P value was .049*.

Table 73

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Minority Student Programs and Services in the Category of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1.6990</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>.9219</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.
Recreational Sports

Regarding Recreational Sports, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 74. The difference between the two groups' ratings was not significant. Since the \( t \) value equaled \(-.23\) and the significance was at the .05 level, null hypothesis 3 was accepted on this function. The \( t \) value was 1.34. The \( P \) value was .820.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( E )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>2.2334</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2.3167</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Religious Programs and Services

Regarding Religious Programs and Services, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 75. There was a significant difference between the two groups' rating, with student affairs personnel's being higher than students' ratings. The \( t \) value was -2.42, and significance was at the .05 level, so the null hypothesis 3 was therefore rejected. The \( t \) value was 1.35. The \( P \) value was \(.017^*\).
Table 75

**Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Religious Programs and Services in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>2.6630</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.4531</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** * indicates significance at .05 level.

**Services for Students With Disabilities**

Regarding Services for Students with Disabilities, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 76. There was a significant difference in the ratings, with students' ratings higher than student affairs personnel's. The t value was 2.03, with significance at the .05 level of confidence; null hypothesis 3 was therefore rejected. The t value was 2.43. The P value was .044*.

Table 76

**Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Services for Students with Disabilities in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>1.4516</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>.7765</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** * indicates significance at .05 level.
**Student Activities**

Regarding Student Activities, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 77. With all the respondents rating this function at the center of the scale, there was no significant difference in this category of effectiveness. The t value was -1.67, with no significance at the .05 level. Null hypothesis 3 was therefore rejected. The f value was 1.01. The P value was .097.

**Table 77**

**Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Student Activities in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>2.2334</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>2.6985</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates significance at .05 level.

**Student Wellness and Health**

Regarding Student Wellness and Health, results for both groups in the category of effectiveness are presented in Table 78. Student affairs personnel rated this function significantly higher than did the students. The t value was -3.33, and significance was at the .05 level. The null hypothesis 3 was rejected. The f value was 1.23, and the P value was .001.
Table 78

Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Student Wellness and Health in the Category of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number surveyed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>2.0693</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>3.0947</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates significance at .05 level.

Ranking of Student Affairs Services By Students and Students Affairs Personnel

The following six tables show the 11 services rank-ordered in the categories of status of knowledge, relative importance, and effectiveness. See questionnaires and the scale in Appendix C.

In Table 79, the first six (1 through 6) services received a status of knowledge mean rating of 2.87 or higher, indicating that student respondents as a group had moderate status of knowledge of these programs. The remaining five service areas (7 through 11) received a status of knowledge mean rating of 2.10 or lower, indicating that they, as a group, had limited status of knowledge of the services. The three highest ranking services in status of knowledge were Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women); Religious Programs and Services, and International Student/Multicultural Services. These three areas were also ranked among the first five
program areas in the rankings by relative importance and were the first three areas in the ranking of effectiveness.

Table 79

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Students' Perceptions in the Category of Status of Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>3.5268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.9556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Activities - (7 statements)</td>
<td>2.6867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recreational Sports - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.5481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student Wellness and Health - (5 statements)</td>
<td>2.5141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment - (9 statements)</td>
<td>2.3747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Counseling Services and Subsistence Abuse Education - (7 statements)</td>
<td>2.3608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services - (4 statements)</td>
<td>2.0355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.8189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.7618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80 indicates the services as rank-ordered by the student respondents regarding their relative importance. The highest 10 areas were perceived as having substantial relative importance, and the remaining service was perceived as having moderate relative importance. The first five services here were also ranked in the first seven when ranked by effectiveness.

Table 80

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Students' Perceptions in the Category of Relative Importance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>3.9189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.7331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
In Table 81, the service areas are rank-ordered by students in the category of effectiveness. The seven highest-ranked areas were of the *fair effectiveness* caliber, and the last four were perceived as *poor effectiveness* functions.

**Table 81**

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Students’ Perceptions in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>2.9558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.6630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.5170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recreational Sports - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Activities - (7 statements)</td>
<td>2.2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment - (9 statements)</td>
<td>2.1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student Wellness and Health - (5 statements)</td>
<td>2.0693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education - (7 statements)</td>
<td>1.9917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services - (4 statements)</td>
<td>1.6990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.6653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.4516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 82, student affairs personnel indicated that they had a substantial status of knowledge of the first seven functions, moderate status of knowledge of the eighth, and limited status of knowledge or less of the remaining three functions. The four highest-ranked services were also ranked among the first six by relative importance and were the highest four ranked by effectiveness.

Table 82

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions in the Category of Status of Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.9265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.5391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education - (7 statements)</td>
<td>3.5159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Activities - (7 statements)</td>
<td>3.2569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student Wellness and Health - (5 statements)</td>
<td>3.2421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment - (9 statements)</td>
<td>3.0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recreational Sports - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.4559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services - (4 statements)</td>
<td>1.2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services - (5 statements)</td>
<td>1.1059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 83 indicates the services rank-ordered by student affairs personnel in the category of relative importance. The highest six functions were perceived as being of substantial relative importance to student education at Andrews University's main campus. The next four services were shown to be of moderate relative importance, and the lowest-ranking service of limited relative importance. The four highest-ranking services on this table were also the highest ranked in the category of effectiveness.
### Table 83

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions in the Category of Relative Importance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>4.5735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>4.4141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>4.3977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Wellness and Health - (5 statements)</td>
<td>4.3263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Activities - (7 statements)</td>
<td>4.3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education - (7 statements)</td>
<td>4.2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment - (9 statements)</td>
<td>3.8194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recreational Sports - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.7422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities - (5 statements)</td>
<td>3.7422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services - (4 statements)</td>
<td>3.2813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services - (5 statements)</td>
<td>2.9333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 84, program areas are ranked by student affairs personnel in the category of effectiveness. The four highest were perceived as being of **average in effectiveness**, the next four as of **fairly effective**, and the last three as of **poorly effective**.

### Table 84

**Student Affairs Services Rank-ordered by Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions in the Category of Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Student affairs services</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Programs and Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.4531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services - (8 statements)</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women) - (11 statements)</td>
<td>3.1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Wellness and Health - (5 statements)</td>
<td>3.0947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Activities - (7 statements)</td>
<td>2.9328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education - (7 statements)</td>
<td>2.9328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment - (9 statements)</td>
<td>2.6985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recreational Sports - (8 statements)</td>
<td>2.3778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities - (5 statements)</td>
<td>2.3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services - (4 statements)</td>
<td>1.1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services - (5 statements)</td>
<td>.7765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the 11 Student Services and/or Program Areas Rank-ordered by Students and Student Affairs Personnel

Students' Perceptions of Status of Knowledge

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of status of knowledge in the following descending order:

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
2. Religious Programs and Services
3. International Student/Multicultural Services
4. Student Activities
5. Recreational Sports
6. Student Wellness and Health
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
9. Minority Student Programs and Services
10. Commuter Student Programs and Services
11. Services for Students with Disabilities

Students' Perceptions of Relative Importance

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of relative importance in the following descending order:

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
2. Religious Programs and Services

3. Student Wellness and Health

4. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

5. International Student/Multicultural Services

6. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education

7. Student Activities

8. Recreational Sports

9. Services for Students with Disabilities

10. Minority Student Programs and Services

11. Commuter Student Programs and Services

Students' Perceptions of Effectiveness

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of effectiveness in the following descending order:

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

2. Religious Programs and Services

3. International Student/Multicultural Services

4. Recreational Sports

5. Student Activities

6. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

7. Student Wellness and Health

8. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
Students Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Status of Knowledge

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of status of knowledge in the following descending order:

1. Religious Programs and Services
2. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
3. International Student/Multicultural Services
4. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
5. Student Activities
6. Student Wellness and Health
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports
9. Services for Students with Disabilities
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Commuter Student Programs and Services

Students Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Relative Importance

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of status of relative importance in the following descending order:
1. Religious Programs and Services
2. International Student/Multicultural Services
3. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
4. Student Wellness and Health
5. Student Activities
6. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports
9. Services for Students with Disabilities
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Commuter Student Programs and Services

Students Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Effectiveness

The 11 student services and/or program areas were ranked from 1st through 11th in the category of effectiveness in the following descending order:

1. Religious Programs and Services
2. International Student/Multicultural Services
3. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
4. Student Wellness and Health
5. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
6. Student Activities
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports

9. Commuter Student Programs and Services

10. Minority Student Programs and Services

11. Services for Students with Disabilities
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of students and student affairs personnel concerning student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan. This chapter concludes the study, with a summary of the findings, observations, recommendations, and implications of the study.

Summary of the Findings of the Study

The summary of the findings of the study is divided into the following sections:

The first section includes biographical data for student respondents and biographical data for student affairs personnel respondents.

The second section includes (a) the status of knowledge of student services and/or programs as reported by students and student affairs personnel respondents at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan; (b) the relative importance of student services and/or programs to student education as reported by students and student affairs personnel respondents at Andrews University's main campus; and (c) the effectiveness of student services and/or programs as reported by students and student affairs personnel at Andrews University's main campus.
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The third section of the summary included the results of the tested null hypotheses, and the fourth section includes (a) for the ranking, the use of the means for student respondent ratings of the 11 student services in the categories of students' perceptions of status of knowledge of the provision of the student services at Andrews University's main campus; the relative importance of the student services to student education at Andrews University's main campus; and the effectiveness of the student services at Andrews University's main campus; and (b) for the rankings, the use of the means for student affairs personnel ratings of the 11 student services in the categories of student affairs personnel's perceptions of status of knowledge of the student services at Andrews University's main campus; the relative importance of student services to student education at Andrews University's main campus; and the effectiveness of the student services at Andrews University's main campus.

Students' Biographical Data

Part 2, Section B of the student biographical data of the survey indicated that, although Andrews University is a coeducational institution, male students who participated in the study outnumbered the females, 103 to 53. More than 76% of the students who participated in the study were over the age of 26. This suggests that students at Andrews University were mature adults who were serious about their academic pursuits and that the university need not concern itself with the problems generally associated with teenagers. In comparison with the size of other institutions of higher education in the United States, Andrews has the largest number of international
students, who made up 50.6% of the total student population at Andrews during the
autumn quarter of the 1991-92 school year.

The majority of international students who responded to the survey were
Oriental, and most of the students surveyed resided in Michigan, where Andrews is
located. Ninety-one percent of the students surveyed did not have physical disabilities;
however, the university made some effort to cater to the needs of the 7% or so who
were physically challenged. The majority of students were not veterans, and more than
90% of the students surveyed had some form of health insurance coverage. More than
80% of the students indicated that they worked either full- or part-time. This promotes
the work-study program of the university. More than half the students surveyed failed
to indicate that they planned to change career or employment; this suggests that the
students had made a career choice and were working toward that goal at Andrews
University.

The majority of students who participated in the study were married or had had
some form of marriage in their lifetime; however, more than 40% of these students had
no dependent children. Seventy-seven percent indicated that they did not need child
care service for dependent children.

More than 40% of the student respondents attended the Seventh-day Adventist
Seminary at Andrews. More than 90% were full-time students (taking 12 credit hours
for undergraduate and 6 credit hours for graduate students) during the autumn quarter
of the 1991-92 school year, and more than 96% were working toward a degree in their
fields of study. About 55% of the students had spent between 1 and 3 years not
enrolled as students before enrolling at Andrews; 90.6% lived in the university's housing units located on the main campus; and 65.9% commuted less than two miles one way to attend classes on the main campus. More than 93% of the respondents used means of transportation other than bus, carpool, or taxi—a probable reason why the university did not see the necessity to provide bus service as a regular means of transportation to and from the campus.

As many as 69.4% of the students surveyed spent 10 hours or more weekly on campus apart from their regular class attendance hours, and more than 71% attended classes in the daytime only. About 30% of the group attended the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary on campus. The next highest percentage included students who were in the College of Arts and Sciences, and who made up 27.3% of those participating in the study.

**Student Affairs Personnel Biographical Data**

The majority of student affairs personnel who participated in the study, or 94.7%, were 30 years old or older. More than half, or 55.6%, were female, and 44.4% were male. Nearly all the student affairs personnel members who participated were either U.S. citizens or had U.S. permanent resident visas. This suggests that the university is in compliance with the immigration laws that discourage employment of persons without legal or appropriate documents to work in the United States. There were no Oriental student affairs personnel at Andrews in the Student Affairs Division.
during the 1991-92 school year despite the fact that a majority of student participants in the study were Oriental.

The majority of student affairs personnel members who participated in the study had either masters' or doctoral degrees. Generally speaking, the major work of student affairs professionals was to facilitate student development in the university environment. A majority of college student developers' major areas of emphasis should be in either counseling or psychology, but this was not the case with the staff at Andrews. Only 30% of the student affairs personnel held degrees in counseling, and the remaining 70% held degrees in other professions or areas of study. Only one student affairs personnel member had been employed at Andrews for 20 years or more. Andrews University is a fairly old institution of higher education, and many employees should have been there for 10 years or more. A majority—70%—of student affairs personnel at Andrews had served in their current positions less than 10 years, although 75% were full-time employees.

Like many institutions of higher education, Andrews University does not give administrative titles commonly found in the student affairs professional literature; hence, those personnel who participated in the study chose not to identify their individual administrative titles with the administrative titles they were asked to respond to in the questionnaire. No student affairs personnel members in the study were professors. Because the profession is service oriented, a majority of student affairs personnel, or 60%, mainly provided services to the students.
The majority of student affairs personnel, or 17 respondents (85%), indicated that there were fewer than 10 staff members in their department; however, an accurate estimate would be between 20 and 30. The number of full-time students at Andrews at that time was between 2,000 and 2,999. Thirteen student affairs personnel members, or 65%, gave the correct estimate. This suggests that student affairs personnel in the Student Affairs Division knew the correct number of full-time students they were to serve during the autumn quarter of the 1991-92 school year.

About 50% of the Andrews' student affairs personnel at that time earned between $25,000 and $30,000 per academic year. This range is reasonable when one takes into account other factors concerning church-sponsored or related institution such as Andrews University.

Status of Knowledge of Student Services and/or Programs at Andrews University's Main Campus as Reported by Students and Student Affairs Personnel

Student respondents reported a greater status of knowledge than did personnel of two of the services: Commuter Student Programs and Services, and Minority Student Programs and Services. Personnel reported a greater degree of status of knowledge than did students of six of the services: Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, International Student/Multicultural Services, Religious Programs and Services, Student Activities, and Student Wellness and Health. The two groups reported an equal status
of knowledge of three of the services: Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities.

Relative Importance of Student Services and/or Programs at Andrews University's Main Campus as Reported by Students and Student Affairs Personnel

Student affairs respondents reported a greater degree of relative importance of seven services than did students: Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), International Student/Multicultural Services, Student Activities, and Student Wellness and Health. The two groups reported the same degrees of relative importance of four services: Commuter Student Programs and Services, Minority Student Programs and Services, Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities.

Effectiveness of Student Services and/or Programs at Andrews University's Main Campus as Reported by Students and Student Affairs Personnel

Student respondents were very critical of the effectiveness of most of the 11 student services and/or program areas included in the study; however, they rated 2 services higher than did student affairs personnel: Minority Student Programs and Services, and Services for Students with Disabilities. Student affairs personnel rated 5 of the services higher than did students, including: Commuter Student Programs and Services, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Housing and
Results of the Tested Null Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis was that there is no significant difference between students and student affairs personnel perceptions of the status of knowledge of student services and/or programs at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

The main purpose of this hypothesis was to determine whether or not significant differences existed between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of status of knowledge of student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus. The P-value in 6 of the 11 student services and/or programs in the status of knowledge category indicated significance at the .05 level. These student services and/or programs included Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, Commuter Student Programs and Services, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Religious Programs and Services, Student Activities, and Student Wellness and Health. As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Because no significant differences were found between students and student affairs personnel perceptions of 5 of the services, the "status of student services" was retained. These services include Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), Religious Programs and Services, and Student Wellness and Health.

Both groups rated the following four services as being effective: Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, International Student/Multicultural Services, Recreational Sports, and Student Activities.
Women), International Student/Multicultural Services, Minority Student Programs and Services, Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities.

Table 85

**Significant and Nonsignificant Differences Between Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Status of Knowledge of Student Services and/or Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs and Services</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wellness and Health</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shows significant differences between students and student affairs personnel.

**Results of the Tested Null Hypothesis 2**

The hypothesis was that there is no significant difference between students and student affairs personnel perceptions of relative importance of student services and/or program areas at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

The main purpose of this hypothesis was to determine whether or not differences existed between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of status of knowledge of student affairs services at Andrews University's main campus. The P-value indicated that 6 of the 11 student services and/or programs in the relative importance category were significant at the .05 level. These functions included
Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), International Student/Multicultural Services, Religious Programs and Services, Student Activities, and Student Wellness and Health.

Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null hypothesis 2 was retained for the remaining five student services and/or programs, because there was no significant difference between students' and student affairs personnel's perceptions of them. These student services and/or programs were as follows: Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, Commuter Student Programs and Services, Minority Student Programs and Services, Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 86</th>
<th>Significant and Nonsignificant Differences Between Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of Relative Importance of Student Services and/or Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs and Services</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wellness and Health</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shows significant differences between students and student affairs personnel
Results of the Tested Null Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 was that there is no significant difference between students and student affairs personnel perceptions of effectiveness of student services and/or program areas at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

The main purpose of this hypothesis was to determine whether or not differences existed between student and student affairs personnel perceptions of effectiveness of student affairs services at Andrews University’s main campus. The P-value indicated that 6 of the 11 student services and/or programs in the effectiveness category were significant at the .05 level. These student services and/or programs included Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Minority Student Programs and Services, Religious Programs and Services, Services for Students with Disabilities, Student Activities, and Student Wellness and Health. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Because no significant differences were found between the two groups' perceptions of five of the services, the null hypothesis is retained. These services were Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, Commuter Student Programs and Services, Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), International Student/Multicultural Services, and Recreational Sports.
Table 87
Significant and Nonsignificant Differences Between Students' and Student Affairs Personnel's Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Student Services and/or Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Student Programs and Services</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs and Services</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wellness and Health</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Student Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student/Multicultural Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shows significant differences between students and student affairs personnel

**Student Rankings of the 11 Student Services and/or Programs**

There were close similarities of students' rankings of the 11 student services and/or programs in the following three categories: status of knowledge, relative importance, and effectiveness. In descending order of rankings, student services and/or programs that were placed first in the ranking orders through the 11th rank in status of knowledge were also placed in similar ranks in the categories of relative importance and effectiveness, respectively.

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
2. Religious Programs and Services
3. International Student/Multicultural Services
4. Student Activities
5. Recreational Sports
6. Student Wellness and Health
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
9. Minority Student Programs and Services
10. Commuter Student Programs and Services
11. Services for Students with Disabilities

**Student Rankings of the 11 Student Services and/or Programs Regarding Relative Importance**

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
2. Religious Programs and Services
3. Student Wellness and Health
4. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
5. International Student/Multicultural Services
6. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
7. Student Activities
8. Recreational Sports
9. Services for Students with Disabilities
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Commuter Student Programs and Services
Student Rankings of the 11 Student Services and/or Programs Regarding Effectiveness

1. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
2. Religious Programs and Services
3. International Student/Multicultural Services
4. Recreational Sports
5. Student Activities
6. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
7. Student Wellness and Health
8. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
9. Minority Student Programs and Services
10. Commuter Student Programs and Services
11. Services for Students with Disabilities

Student Affairs Personnel Rankings of the 11 Student Services and/or Programs

There were close similarities of students affairs personnel rankings of the 11 student services and/or program areas in the following three categories: status of knowledge, relative importance, and effectiveness. In descending order of rankings, student services and/or programs that were placed first in the ranking orders through the 11th rank in status of knowledge were also placed in similar ranks in the categories of relative importance and effectiveness, respectively.
Student Affairs Personnel Perceptions of Status of Knowledge of Student Services and/or Programs

1. Religious Programs and Services
2. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
3. International Student/Multicultural Services
4. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
5. Student Activities
6. Student Wellness and Health
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports
9. Services for Students with Disabilities
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Commuter Student Programs and Services

Rank Order of Student Affairs Personnel Perceptions of Relative Importance of Student Services and/or Programs

1. Religious Programs and Services
2. International Student/Multicultural Services
3. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
4. Student Wellness and Health
5. Student Activities
6. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports
9. Services for Students with Disabilities
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Commuter Student Programs and Services

Rank Order of Student Affairs Personnel Perceptions of Effectiveness of Student Services and/or Program Areas

1. Religious Programs and Services
2. International Student/Multicultural Services
3. Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
4. Student Wellness and Health
5. Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education
6. Student Activities
7. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment
8. Recreational Sports
9. Commuter Student Programs and Services
10. Minority Student Programs and Services
11. Services for Students with Disabilities

Observations

The findings of this study were based upon the perceptions of students and student affairs personnel at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. The following
observations are based on these findings and the researcher's perceptions of what these findings indicate:

The review of the related literature indicates that there is no single universally accepted instrument(s) that has been designed for the evaluation of comprehensive student affairs services and/or programs. Instead, in order to utilize instruments available for study, they must be adjusted or modified for the study.

Students and student affairs personnel who participated in the study indicated a high degree of support for CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development programs instituted by the Consortium of Student Affairs Professional Organization in April of 1986 and updated in 1988 and 1990.

The responses obtained from the student affairs personnel suggest that the rate of turnover in their division is high or that there is an administrative policy for constant redeployment of staff from the Division of Student Affairs to other areas of the institution where more workers or instructors are needed. Judging from the age of Andrews University, the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus in Berrien Springs needs more stable, knowledgeable, and experienced practitioners who can serve as resource and provide leadership and assistance to inexperienced student affairs personnel in the division.

In the history of the development of the field of student affairs in higher education in the United States, there has been an increasing need to establish professional status. According to Leihheit (1985) and Rickard (1990), educators consider those who work in this profession as colleagues and professional educators, yet in order to maintain a
professional outlook for the profession, it is necessary that there be some consistent
definitions and job titles among student affairs professionals (Stamatakos, 1981). In
1949 Wrenn and Darley found that student affairs departments had made little progress
toward the definition of job titles and functions because institutions of higher education
in the United States vary in terms of philosophical influence in administrative and
management styles.

Leihheit (1985) stated that in universities—public, private, or community colleges
— regardless of size, there is a great disparity between titles and job function among
student affairs officials. The student affairs profession has developed a large repertory
of titles, such as vice president, dean, director of student life, and director of student
development, to describe similar functions, and Andrews University is no exception.
Because of overlaps in titles and descriptions of job functions, personnel at Andrews
could have held positions commonly found in the literature, but they did not respond to
the survey accordingly, because they are not addressed by such titles at Andrews.

Student respondents reported a greater degree of status of knowledge of
Commuter Student Programs and Services and Minority Student Programs and Services
than did the student affairs personnel respondents. More work needs to be done by
personnel to increase students' status of knowledge of the remaining programs.

Student affairs personnel reported a greater degree of status of knowledge than did
students concerning the following functions: Career Planning and Placement/Student
Employment, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, International
Student/Multicultural Services, Religious Programs and Services, Student Activities,
and Student Wellness and Health. It is understandable that student affairs personnel reported greater degrees of status of knowledge in these areas than students because they are providers and implementors of the services, whereas students are consumers. Student affairs personnel need to intensify their efforts by encouraging students to increase their status of knowledge of the services available on campus.

Two groups reported equal degrees of status of knowledge of Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities, which was encouraging to a certain extent. Student respondents reported equal or less relative importance on all 11 services than did student affairs personnel, which is understandable because personnel are more knowledgeable of the benefits usually attached to these services in a university setting. The equal ratings were in Commuter Student Programs and Services, Minority Student Programs and Services, Recreational Sports, and Services for Students with Disabilities, which was encouraging since both groups were knowledgeable and appreciative of the importance of these services. Student affairs personnel need to intensify efforts in explaining the importance and benefits to students of student services and program areas so as to help students become more knowledgeable.

In the category of effectiveness, students rated only Minority Student Programs and Services and Services for Students with Disabilities higher than did student affairs personnel. Student affairs personnel rated five services as effective: Commuter Student Programs and Services, Counseling Services and Substance Abuse Education, Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women), Religious Programs and
Services, and Student Wellness and Health. Both groups rated 4 of the services as being effective; these were Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment, International Student/Multicultural Services, Recreational Sports, and Student Activities.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and observations of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Student affairs personnel in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, in planning future student affairs programs, should consider the results of this study, which indicate that students regard the programs as less effective than do student affairs personnel.

2. For Andrews University to realize uniform effectiveness of its student affairs programs, student affairs personnel should review the programs that were rated unfavorably by students, and efforts should be made to improve these services.

3. Services in which there were significant differences between student and personnel perceptions in the three categories should be carefully studied, and attempts should be made to determine reasons for such perceptual differences so that further improvement in these programs can be made.

4. Student affairs personnel should develop effective and creative strategic planning based on goals that are measured by the questionnaires used in this study. The questionnaire should be administered on a periodic basis to assess the status and
progress of student affairs services and programs in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Implications

From the findings and observations of this study, the following implications can be derived: As a result of this study, the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University's main campus has valuable information for the improvement of student affairs services and programs, as well as a model program for the evaluation of these services for further monitoring of program effectiveness. The division also has been provided evaluative information based on students' perceptions that go beyond personnel's perceptions of their programs and services.

It is suggested that this study be replicated periodically in order to assess the status and progress of student affairs services and/or programs in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.
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LETTERS GRANTING PERMISSION FOR RESEARCH
July 7, 1989

Dr. W. Richard Lesher  
Office of the President  
Andrews University  
Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104

Dear Dr. Lesher:

This is a letter to endorse the study by Hosea D. Akos of the following topic: "Andrews University and its Educational Activities in Michigan, 1974-88." This study uses the historical method of research which requires receiving basic primary documents from your university.

Sincerely,

W.A. Miller
Chair
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August 9, 1989

Professor W. A. Miller
University of North Texas
Department of Higher and Adult Education
College of Education
P. O. Box 13857
Denton, Texas 76203-3857

Dear Professor Miller:

This is to confirm that when Mr. Hosea D. Akos visits this campus to do research we will be willing to make available documents relating to his dissertation: "Andrews University and Its Educational Activities in Michigan, 1974-88."

Yours very sincerely,

Arthur O. Coetzee, Vice President
Academic Administration

xc: W. Richard Lesher
October 8, 1991

Dr. Newton W. Hoilette
Vice President for Student Affairs
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104

Dear Dr. Hoilette:

Enclosed is the instrument we are considering for use in the study that has been discussed with Dr. Coetzee. This instrument was used by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1989 and the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs in 1986-90 for student services evaluation in higher education.

The title of the study has been changed to "Perceptions of Student Affairs Services by Students and Student Affairs Staff at Andrews University." We would appreciate your written approval of these changes to the original proposal after your clearing it with the appropriate academic and student affairs leaders.

Thank you for your help over the years. We want to do the very best in evaluating your institution of higher education.

Sincerely,

Hosea D. Akos, Ph.D. Student

Hosea D. Akos, Ph.D. Student

John P. Eddy, Ph.D., Professor of Higher Education and Advisor for Mr. Akos

W.A. Miller, Chair
Department of Higher Education

cc: Dr. Arthur O. Coetzee
Dr. W. Richard Lesher
February 11, 1982

Hosea Akos
Doctoral Student

John P. Eddy, Ph.D.
Professor of Higher Education and Adviser to Mr. Akos

W. A. Miller, Chair
Department of Higher Education

Gentlemen:

This letter serves to confirm permission granted verbally to Mr. Hosea Akos, doctoral student in your university to pursue a study entitled "Perceptions of Student Affairs Services by Students and Student Affairs Staff at Andrews University."

We look forward to a cooperative effort that will enhance the program of the institution here at Andrews as articulated in the design of the instrument and the research process.

I would appreciate a typewritten document that is the final proposal approved by the committee so that I can review that once more. I must note that I have been impressed with the review of the literature that has been provided to this point in the hand-written document received.

Please also note that I am interested in an instrument that would be designed particularly to the Andrews University situation and that the CSA standards and guidelines for student services and development programs referred to student services might not be an appropriate instrument as discussed with Hosea. Further, that the CSA standards and guidelines for student services/development programs might serve partially inasmuch as we do have at our call a substance abuse program here.

Hopefully, an original instrument might serve our purposes better where we can focus in on the particular design of Student Affairs services that we have here at the university. I refer to the fact that there are some institutions that have different departments under their Student Affairs Division. As stated in consultation with Mr. Akos, I would like us to list only those departments that we have on our campus in order to be specific both to the dissertation needs and our situation here.

I apologize for the lateness in terms of providing written permission. Wishing you every success.

Sincerely yours,

Newton W. Hollette, Vice President for Student Affairs

xc: Dr. W. Richard Lesher
    Dr. Arthur Coetzee
February 14, 1992

Dear Dr. Eddy:

Pursuant to my conversation with Hosea Akos a few moments ago, please be advised that we will accept the modified instrument used by Glenister in 1977 for Hosea's dissertation research.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Newton W. Hoilette, Vice President for Student Affairs
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April 9, 1992

Hosea Dodo Akos
8620 Park Lane Apt. #407
Dallas, TX  75231

Dear Mr. Akos:

Your proposal entitled "Perception of Student Affairs Services By Students and Student Affairs Personnel at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan," has been approved by the IRB and is exempt from further review under 45 CFR 46.101.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 565-3946.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

Peter Witt, Chair
Institutional Review Board
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June 9, 1992

To: Dr. Russ Teeter
From: Bill Miller
Re: Hosea Akos

This letter is to confirm that Hosea Akos successfully completed his dissertation proposal seminar on June 9, 1992.

The following revisions need to be made:

1. Rework purposes; and
2. A minimum of 150 student responses will be required.
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LETTERS FROM C. E. GLENISTER AND J. W. SELGAS GRANTING

PERMISSION TO USE THEIR INSTRUMENTS
October 8, 1991

Dear Mr. Akos,

LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION

I have authorized you to make use of the modified questionnaire from my doctoral dissertation of 1977 entitled "Perceptions of Student Affairs Services by Students and Student Affairs Staff at The State University of New York at Canton."

Sincerely

[Signature]

Dr. Carl Edward Glenister

R R I Box 92 C Morrisville, New York 13408 (35) 684 - 3969
December 11, 1991

Hosea Dodo Akos
8620 Park Lane #407
Dallas, Texas 75231

Dear Mr. Akos:

You have permission to use any part of our studies on student services. There were two such studies published at HACC.

I would point out that the instrument we used was adopted from the work of Dr. Donald Mortvedt as per preface to our study. I have no copies of either study. You will have to get them through the ERIC Clearinghouse.

Good Luck with your research.

Best Regards,

James W. Selgas, Ed.D.
Senior Professor of Psychology
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COVER LETTERS AND DATA COLLECTING INSTRUMENTS
Dear Student:

The Student Affairs Division at Andrews University has consented to cooperate in a doctoral research study focusing on student personnel services at Andrews University. We invite your cooperation in completing the brief enclosed questionnaire.

About 10% of the student body has been randomly selected, and the entire student affairs personnel is encouraged to participate. Perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the student personnel services of the two groups will be statistically correlated to determine similarities or differences. The results of the study will not identify individuals by name.

Please return the completed questionnaire to the person who gave it to you or place it in a box that is provided for your convenience.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Hosea D. Akos
Researcher
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Enclosure

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. John P. Eddy
Dr. Frank Halstead
Dr. Bill Miller
Dr. Bill Richardson
COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONSIDERED YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

STUDENT AFFAIRS SERVICES AND PROGRAMS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your perceptions of the student affairs services and programs on the Andrews University main campus. The first part (I) of this questionnaire consists of 77 statements relating to the functions and responsibilities of each of the services and programs. The second part (II) is provided so that you may (a) make suggestions for the improvement of each of these services and programs and (b) give your personal biodata.

This questionnaire is numbered for follow-up purposes only. The identity of persons responding to this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

PART I

STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO STUDENT AFFAIRS SERVICES AND PROGRAMS AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

DIRECTIONS:

In this section, please rate each of the 77 statements as to (a) your awareness of the existence of the service or function at Andrews University, (b) the importance of the service or function to Andrews University students' education, and (c) the performance of the service or function at Andrews University. You will be using the six-point scale shown
below. Please mark an "X" through the circle with the number that accurately reflects your response. A sample item using the scale is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment CATEGORIES

Sample Statement

1. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment provides students with information about job availability on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment CATEGORIES

Statements

1. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment service members make presentations to classes and/or student organizations to share with students the services and programs the function provides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment provides seniors or graduating students with assistance in regard to conducting job search strategies, resume preparation, and development of interview skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment</td>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Importance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schedules campus interviews with recruiters.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offers mini-workshops to seniors or graduating students.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides a literature resource center.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Operates a credential referral service.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Posts job opportunities.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides assistance to students who need to work while in school.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assists students in obtaining employment upon graduation.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commuter Student Programs and Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th><strong>Awareness</strong></th>
<th><strong>Importance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Performance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides a centralized information center for mail, telephone contact, and campus news.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides a coordinator for commuter student services.</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
<td>![1-5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commuter Student Programs and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Counseling Services and Substance Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Counseling services are extended to non-university persons in the community on a fee basis.</td>
<td>Low: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 High: 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>Low: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 High: 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>Low: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 High: 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Awareness of Service</td>
<td>2 - Importance of Service</td>
<td>3 - Performance of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counseling Services and Substance Abuse

**Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Interviews are conducted with students desiring to withdraw from school to find the best solution commensurate with student's aspirations and the university's welfare.

19. Provides information and/or education through university resource material/literature concerning the university's philosophy of abstinence from all mood-altering substances including nicotine and caffeine.

20. Provides substance-abuse assessment, referral, personal counseling, and support groups for recovering students.

21. Provides student assistance programs for abusers and those in recovery.

**Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)**

22. Andrews University provides well-maintained living quarters (residence halls, apartments).
### Awareness of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness of Service</th>
<th></th>
<th>Importance of Service</th>
<th></th>
<th>Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don't know/No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don't know/No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don't know/No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited importance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate importance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Substantial importance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extreme importance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. The residence halls are directed and coordinated by deans, along with student residence assistants.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The university has a well-defined policy regarding standards of student behavior in the living quarters.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The regulations of student conduct (in the living units) utilize the disciplinary situation as a rehabilitative and educative experience.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Housing accommodations with study facilities are provided.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The living units contribute to the development of responsible group members, leadership, and sound morale.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Privacy is assured in the university living units.</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

#### Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Well-balanced meals are available to students through campus facilities (the campus cafeteria, snack shop, The Gazebo).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Campus security police are provided for protection of persons and property.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Residence halls and university apartments provide students with a wide variety of social/educational/recreational programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Provision is made for on-campus driving and parking of students vehicles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### International Student/Multicultural Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>The International Student Office seeks to assist international students in orientation to the United States and the university community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Assists students with legal procedures required by Immigration and Naturalization.</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The International Student/Multicultural Services provide a central office for international affairs.</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The International Student Office encourages students to participate in one or more of the many international clubs available on campus.</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The International Student Office provides a staff to coordinate minority student needs and serves as a resource person in the development of minority programs.</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sponsors are available to give advice and to coordinate the international student clubs on campus.</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![Low](1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ![High](1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Student/Multicultural Services

39. The International Student Office encourages the international clubs to present special programs and events during the annual International Student Week on campus.

CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Awareness of Service</td>
<td>2 - Importance of Service</td>
<td>3 - Performance of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority Student Programs and Services

41. The Minority Student Programs and Services provide a communication network for the dissemination of information to minority students on campus.

42. The Minority Student Programs and Services promote and encourage integration of minority students into the mainstream of the university community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minority Student Programs and Services

**CATEGORIES**

#### Statements

43. The Minority Student Programs and Services assist in the retention of minority students on campus.

44. The Minority Student Programs and Services provide for the educational and social needs of minority students.

### Recreational Sports

45. The Recreational Sports set aside appropriate facilities and equipment at appropriate times for students to participate in the activity of their choice.

46. A schedule of the facility hours for open recreation is printed by the Recreational Sports at the beginning of each quarter.

47. Recreation equipment for various sports such as basketball, volleyball, and racquetball is available for checkout and locks are provided to secure belongings during use of facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recreational Sports

#### Statements

48. The Recreational Sports provide encouragement, guidance, and supervision for groups such as residence-hall health clubs.

49. The Intramural Program provides opportunities and facilities for a majority of students to participate in a variety of intramural sports.

50. An intramural director is available to coordinate the intramural sport program.

51. The Intramural Program offers various skill levels for beginning, intermediate, and advanced players for participation in the available sports.

52. The Intramural Program provides homogeneous activities grouping such as men's, women's, and co-rec divisions in most activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Service</th>
<th>Importance of Service</th>
<th>Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Programs and Services

Statements

53. The university cooperates with religious units and/or religious groups which provide religious activities for students.

54. A task force is organized by these religious units to develop short-range and long-range plans to coordinate activities for effectiveness.

55. The Church and the Division of Student Affairs cooperate in sponsoring guest speakers who appeal to both the student body and the wider university community on spiritual matters.

56. Clergy are available in Campus Ministries to counsel students on religious matters and to provide leadership for weekend religious services.

57. Religious Programs and Services organize a corps of seminarians in Pastoral Care Formation to provide visitation and small group ministry to married and community students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Service</th>
<th>Importance of Service</th>
<th>Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Programs and Services**

**Statements**

58. Residence halls provide daily devotional programs for the spiritual development of students.

59. Building facilities such as the residence hall chapels and Memorial Church are available to students interested in personal or group meditation.

60. Weekend religious services including divine worship service are provided to students for spiritual growth.

**Services for Students with Disabilities**

61. Provides a coordinator who interviews prospective students with impairments and functions as information resource and liaison between the students and the university.
### Services for Students with Disabilities

#### Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Provides for physical needs of disabled students, such as the modification or removal of architectural barriers from buildings and other facilities for campus accessibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Refers students with sight –, hearing –, mobility –, and &quot;hidden&quot; disabilities off-campus community centers for rehabilitation services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Refers students who need physical, occupational, and language/communications therapy to outside agencies and therapeutic rehabilitation centers for services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Provides a center for disabled students where personal counseling for prospective students, intake interviews, and coordination of students needs to campus services and external resources are facilitated.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Awareness of Service</td>
<td>2 - Importance of Service</td>
<td>3 - Performance of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Activities**

**Statements**

66. The Office of Student Activities has a director who sponsors various monthly recreational activities, and provides guidance to the Student Association recreation chair as well as other campus clubs.

67. For balance in the total program, student activities are centrally scheduled and coordinated and are adequately publicized.

68. A center is provided for the social and recreational needs of students.

69. Student organizations provide for learning democratic process and citizenship responsibilities.

70. The Student Government Association seeks to know the issues and concerns of the student body.
### Student Activities

#### CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. The Student Government Association effectively communicates student opinion to the university administration and provides a variety of programs and services for the student body.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The student newspaper (Student Movement) is informative and generally reflects student opinion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Wellness and Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. The University Health Center provides preventive medicine, including regular medical examinations, programs of inoculations, and health education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Andrews University Health Center provides medical care for ill or injured students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of Service</td>
<td>Importance of Service</td>
<td>Performance of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don't know/</td>
<td>Don't know/</td>
<td>Don't know/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No awareness</td>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited awareness</td>
<td>Limited importance</td>
<td>Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate awareness</td>
<td>Moderate importance</td>
<td>Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Substantial awareness</td>
<td>Substantial importance</td>
<td>Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extreme awareness</td>
<td>Extreme importance</td>
<td>Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Wellness and Health Statements

75. The Health Center assists students in obtaining hospitalization when they are too sick to be cared for by the Center itself.

76. The university health program is coordinated with community health agencies.

77. The Health Center provides audiovisual presentations for students in order to promote health and safety habits.

After finishing Part I, please go on to Part II.
PART II
OPEN-ENDED STATEMENTS

DIRECTIONS:

A. Please feel free to comment and/or give suggestions on any or all of the student affairs services and programs listed below. Use the spaces provided. You may use an additional sheet(s) if needed for your comments and/or suggestions.

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

Commuter Student Programs and Services

Counseling Services and Substance-Abuse

Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
International Student/Multicultural Services

Minority Student Programs and Services

Recreational Sports

Religious Programs and Services

Services for Students with Disabilities

Student Activities

Student Wellness and Health
STUDENT BIODATA

DIRECTIONS:

B. For purposes of determining the needs of various groups of students on campus, please read the various items listed in each section and respond by putting "X" in the blank line (only one) that most applies to you.

General Information

1. Your age interval
   ___ 1. under 18 years
   ___ 2. 18-21 years
   ___ 3. 22-25 years
   ___ 4. 26-29 years
   ___ 5. 30 years or above

2. Gender
   ___ 1. Female
   ___ 2. Male

3. Citizenship
   ___ 1. U.S. citizen
   ___ 2. U.S. permanent resident visa
   ___ 3. Other (specify) ______________________________

4. Residency for tuition purposes
   ___ 1. Michigan
   ___ 2. Non-resident
   ___ 3. Other (specify) ______________________________
5. Ethnic background (National/racial origin)

   ____  1. African
   ____  2. African-American
   ____  3. Anglo-American
   ____  4. Hispanic-American
   ____  5. Mexican-American
   ____  6. Native American
   ____  7. Oriental
   ____  8. West-Indian
   ____  9. Other (specify) __________________________

6. Physically handicapped

   ____  1. Yes
   ____  2. No

(If yes):

   ____  1. Partial
   ____  2. Fully

7. U.S. Military veteran

   ____  1. Yes
   ____  2. No
   ____  3. Other (specify) __________________________
8. Health insurance coverage
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No
   ___ 3. Undecided
   (If yes):
   ___ 1. Group insurance
   ___ 2. Individual insurance
   ___ 3. Other (specify) ____________________________

9. Employment status
   ___ 1. Work full-time (40 hours or more per week)
   ___ 2. Work part-time (less than 40 hours per week)
   ___ 3. Work on campus
   ___ 4. Work off campus
   ___ 5. Work both on and off campus
   ___ 6. Homemaker
   ___ 7. Retired
   ___ 8. Medical disability
   ___ 9. Unemployed
   ___ 10. Other (specify) __________________________

10. Are you seeking employment change or career change?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No
    ___ 3. Undecided
11. Marital status
   ____ 1. Single
   ____ 2. Married
   ____ 3. Divorced
   ____ 4. Separated
   ____ 5. Widowed
   ____ 6. Other (specify) ____________________

12. Number of dependent children
   ____ 1. None
   ____ 2. One
   ____ 3. More than one

13. Do you require child-care services for any dependent children?
   ____ 1. Yes
   ____ 2. No
   ____ 3. Undecided

14. Undergraduate classification
   ____ 1. Freshman
   ____ 2. Sophomore
   ____ 3. Junior
   ____ 4. Senior
   ____ 5. Other (specify) ____________________
15. Graduate classification
   ____  1. Seminary student
   ____  2. Transfer student
   ____  3. Other (specify) _______________________

16. Number of credit hours taking this quarter;
   ____  1. Full-time (12 credit hours or more undergraduate; 9 credit hours or more Master of Divinity; or 8 credit hours or more graduate)
   ____  2. Part-time (fewer than 12 credit hours undergraduate; or fewer than 9 credit hours Master of Divinity; or fewer than 8 credit hours graduate)
   ____  3. Special student status

17. Are you presently working toward a degree?
   ____  1. Yes
   ____  2. No
   ____  3. Undecided

18. Are you presently working toward certification (principal, superintendent, etc.)?
   ____  1. Yes
   ____  2. No
   ____  3. Undecided

19. Before enrolling at Andrews University, how long had you been out of college?
   ____  1. Never in college
   ____  2. Less than one year
   ____  3. 1-3 years
   ____  4. 4-6 years
5. 7-9 years

6. 10 or more years

20. Residency

1. Live in residence hall (e.g., Burman Hall, Meier Hall, Lamson Hall, etc.)
2. Live in university apartment (e.g., Beechwood Apts., Garland Apts., Maplewood Apts., etc.)
3. Live off campus (e.g., unattached to the university housing units in private homes, apartments, etc., in Berrien Springs)
4. Commute from out-of-town
5. Other (specify) __________________________

21. If commuter, what distance, one-way, do you travel to attend classes?

1. Fewer than 2 miles
2. 2-5 miles
3. 6-9 miles
4. 10-12 miles
5. 13-15 miles
6. 16 or more miles

22. Constant means of transportation to and from the campus during regular school time

1. Bus service
2. Car pool service
3. Taxi service
4. Other (specify) __________________________
23. Average number of out-of class hours you spend on campus weekly
   _____ 1. Less than 2 hours
   _____ 2. 2-4 hours
   _____ 3. 5-7 hours
   _____ 4. 8-10 hours
   _____ 5. More than 10 hours

24. Time you attend class (check the one that applies to you most)
   _____ 1. Evening
   _____ 2. Daytime
   _____ 3. Weekend

25. Major college or school
   _____ 1. College of Arts and Science
   _____ 2. College of Technology
   _____ 3. School of Business
   _____ 4. School of Education
   _____ 5. School of Graduate Studies
   _____ 6. Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Dear Student Affairs Personnel:

The Student Affairs Division at Andrews University has consented to cooperate in a doctoral research study focusing on student personnel services at Andrews University. We invite your cooperation in completing the brief enclosed questionnaire.

About 10% of the student body has been randomly selected, and the entire student affairs personnel is encouraged to participate. Perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the student personnel services of the two groups will be statistically correlated to determine similarities or differences. The results of the study will not identify individuals by name.

Please return the completed questionnaire to the person who gave it to you or place it in a box that is provided for your convenience.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Hosea D. Akos
Researcher

HDA:In

Enclosure

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. John P. Eddy
Dr. Frank Halstead
Dr. Bill Miller
Dr. Bill Richardson
COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONSIDERED YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

STUDENT AFFAIRS SERVICES AND PROGRAMS QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your perceptions of the student affairs services and programs on the Andrews University main campus. The first part (I) of this questionnaire consists of 77 statements relating to the functions and responsibilities of each of the services and programs. The second part (II) is provided so that you may (a) make suggestions for the improvement of each of these services and programs and (b) give your personal biodata.

This questionnaire is numbered for follow-up purposes only. The identity of persons responding to this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

PART I

STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO STUDENT AFFAIRS SERVICES AND PROGRAMS AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

DIRECTIONS:

In this section, please rate each of the 77 statements as to (a) your awareness of the existence of the service or function at Andrews University, (b) the importance of the service or function to Andrews University students' education, and (c) the performance of the service or function at Andrews University. You will be using the six-point scale shown
below. Please mark an "X" through the circle with the number that accurately reflects your response. A sample item using the scale is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment CATEGORIES

Sample Statement

1. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment provides students with information about job availability on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment CATEGORIES

Statements

1. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment service members make presentations to classes and/or student organizations to share with students the services and programs the function provides.

2. Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment provides seniors or graduating students with assistance in regard to conducting job search strategies, resume preparation, and development of interview skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Schedules campus interviews with recruiters.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offers mini-workshops to seniors or graduating students.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides a literature resource center.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Operates a credential referral service.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Posts job opportunities.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides assistance to students who need to work while in school.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assists students in obtaining employment upon graduation.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commuter Student Programs and Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides a centralized information center for mail, telephone contact, and campus news.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides a coordinator for commuter student services.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides more access hours in administrative offices for evening students.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provides on-campus driving and parking for commuter vehicles.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Provides contract meal plans tailored to commuters’ needs and schedules.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Services and Substance Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provides academic and psychological testing and assessment, personal counseling, and some group counseling.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Counseling is available for students to assist them in overcoming personality problems that interfere with their personal happiness.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Counseling services are extended to non-university persons in the community on a fee basis.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Options" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Service</td>
<td>Importance of Service</td>
<td>Performance of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Fair performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Average performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Counseling Services and Substance Abuse

#### Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Interviews are conducted with students desiring to withdraw from school to find the best solution commensurate with student's aspirations and the university's welfare.</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Provides information and/or education through university resource material/literature concerning the university's philosophy of abstinence from all mood-altering substances including nicotine and caffeine.</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Provides substance-abuse assessment, referral, personal counseling, and support groups for recovering students.</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Provides student assistance programs for abusers and those in recovery.</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Andrews University provides well-maintained living quarters (residence halls, apartments).</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
<td>📣unci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)  

Statements

23. The residence halls are directed and coordinated by deans, along with student residence assistants.

24. The university has a well-defined policy regarding standards of student behavior in the living quarters.

25. The regulations of student conduct (in the living units) utilize the disciplinary situation as a rehabilitative and educative experience.

26. Housing accommodations with study facilities are provided.

27. The living units contribute to the development of responsible group members, leadership, and sound morale.

28. Privacy is assured in the university living units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Well-balanced meals are available to students through campus facilities (the campus cafeteria, snack shop, The Gazebo).</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Categories" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Campus security police are provided for protection of persons and property.</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Categories" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Residence halls and university apartments provide students with a wide variety of social/educational/recreational programs.</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Categories" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Provision is made for on-campus driving and parking of students vehicles.</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Categories" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International Student/Multicultural Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. The International Student Office seeks to assist international students in orientation to the United States and the university community.</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Categories" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Categories" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Assists students with legal procedures required by Immigration and Naturalization.</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="0" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The International Student/Multicultural Services provide a central office for international affairs.</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="0" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The International Student Office encourages students to participate in one or more of the many international clubs available on campus.</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="0" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The International Student Office provides a staff to coordinate minority student needs and serves as a resource person in the development of minority programs.</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="0" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sponsors are available to give advice and to coordinate the international student clubs on campus.</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="1" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
<td><img src="Low" alt="0" /> 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Awareness of Service</td>
<td>2 - Importance of Service</td>
<td>3 - Performance of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = No basis for opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Fair performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Average performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 =Good performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Student/Multicultural Services**

**Statements**

39. The International Student Office encourages the international clubs to present special programs and events during the annual International Student Week on campus.

40. The International Student Office provides a resource center for the exhibition of various international arts and culture.

**Minority Student Programs and Services**

41. The Minority Student Programs and Services provide a communication network for the dissemination of information to minority students on campus.

42. The Minority Student Programs and Services promote and encourage integration of minority students into the mainstream of the university community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Awareness of Service</th>
<th>2 - Importance of Service</th>
<th>3 - Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
<td>No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minority Student Programs and Services**

**Statements**

43. The Minority Student Programs and Services assist in the retention of minority students on campus.

44. The Minority Student Programs and Services provide for the educational and social needs of minority students.

**Recreational Sports**

45. The Recreational Sports set aside appropriate facilities and equipment at appropriate times for students to participate in the activity of their choice.

46. A schedule of the facility hours for open recreation is printed by the Recreational Sports at the beginning of each quarter.

47. Recreation equipment for various sports such as basketball, volleyball, and racquetball is available for checkout and locks are provided to secure belongings during use of facilities.
Recreational Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. The Recreation Sports provide encouragement, guidance, and supervision for groups such as residence-hall health clubs.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The Intramural Program provides opportunities and facilities for a majority of students to participate in a variety of intramural sports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. An intramural director is available to coordinate the intramural sport program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The Intramural Program offers various skill levels for beginning, intermediate, and advanced players for participation in the available sports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The Intramural Program provides homogeneous activities grouping such as men's, women's, and co-rec divisions in most activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Programs and Services

Statements

1. The university cooperates with religious units and/or religious groups which provide religious activities for students.

2. A task force is organized by these religious units to develop short-range and long-range plans to coordinate activities for effectiveness.

3. The Church and the Division of Student Affairs cooperate in sponsoring guest speakers who appeal to both the student body and the wider university community on spiritual matters.

4. Clergy are available in Campus Ministries to counsel students on religious matters and to provide leadership for weekend religious services.

5. Religious Programs and Services organize a corps of seminarians in Pastoral Care Formation to provide visitation and small group ministry to married and community students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - <strong>Awareness of Service</strong></th>
<th>2 - <strong>Importance of Service</strong></th>
<th>3 - <strong>Performance of Service</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don’t know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Programs and Services**

**Statements**

58. Residence halls provide daily devotional programs for the spiritual development of students.

59. Building facilities such as the residence hall chapels and Memorial Church are available to students interested in personal or group meditation.

60. Weekend religious services including divine worship service are provided to students for spiritual growth.

**Services for Students with Disabilities**

61. Provides a coordinator who interviews prospective students with impairments and functions as information resource and liaison between the students and the university.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Service</th>
<th>Importance of Service</th>
<th>Performance of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
<td>0 = Don't know/ No basis for opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = No awareness</td>
<td>1 = No importance</td>
<td>1 = Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Limited awareness</td>
<td>2 = Limited importance</td>
<td>2 = Fair performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate awareness</td>
<td>3 = Moderate importance</td>
<td>3 = Average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Substantial awareness</td>
<td>4 = Substantial importance</td>
<td>4 = Good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Extreme awareness</td>
<td>5 = Extreme importance</td>
<td>5 = Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services for Students with Disabilities**

**Statements**

**62.** Provides for physical needs of disabled students, such as the modification or removal of architectural barriers from buildings and other facilities for campus accessibility.

**63.** Refers students with sight -, hearing -, mobility -, and "hidden" disabilities off-campus community centers for rehabilitation services.

**64.** Refers students who need physical, occupational, and language/communications therapy to outside agencies and therapeutic rehabilitation centers for services.

**65.** Provides a center for disabled students where personal counseling for prospective students, intake interviews, and coordination of students needs to campus services and external resources are facilitated.
### Student Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>66.</strong> The Office of Student Activities has a director who sponsors various monthly recreational activities, and provides guidance to the Student Association recreation chair as well as other campus clubs.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>67.</strong> For balance in the total program, student activities are centrally scheduled and coordinated and are adequately publicized.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>68.</strong> A center is provided for the social and recreational needs of students.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>69.</strong> Student organizations provide for learning democratic process and citizenship responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>70.</strong> The Student Government Association seeks to know the issues and concerns of the student body.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 - Awareness of Service
0 = Don't know/
   No basis for opinion
1 = No awareness
2 = Limited awareness
3 = Moderate awareness
4 = Substantial awareness
5 = Extreme awareness

2 - Importance of Service
0 = Don't know/
   No basis for opinion
1 = No importance
2 = Limited importance
3 = Moderate importance
4 = Substantial importance
5 = Extreme importance

3 - Performance of Service
0 = Don't know/
   No basis for opinion
1 = Poor performance
2 = Fair performance
3 = Average performance
4 = Good performance
5 = Excellent performance

Student Activities

Statements

71. The Student Government Association effectively communicates student opinion to the university administration and provides a variety of programs and services for the student body.

72. The student newspaper (Student Movement) is informative and generally reflects student opinion.

Student Wellness and Health

73. The University Health Center provides preventive medicine, including regular medical examinations, programs of inoculations, and health education.

74. Andrews University Health Center provides medical care for ill or injured students.
### Student Wellness and Health

**Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>75. The Health Center assists students in obtaining hospitalization when they are too sick to be cared for by the Center itself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76. The university health program is coordinated with community health agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. The Health Center provides audiovisual presentations for students in order to promote health and safety habits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**After finishing Part I, please go on to Part II.**
PART II

OPEN ENDED STATEMENTS

DIRECTIONS:

A. Please feel free to comment and/or give suggestions on any or all of the student affairs services and programs listed below. Use the spaces provided. You may use an additional sheet(s) if needed for your comments and/or suggestions.

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

Commuter Student Programs and Services

Counseling Services and Substance-Abuse

Housing and Residential Life Programs (Men and Women)
International Student/Multicultural Services

Minority Student Programs and Services

Recreational Sports

Religious Programs and Services

Services for Students with Disabilities

Student Activities

Student Wellness and Health
STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL BIODATA

DIRECTIONS:

B. Please read the various statements or items listed in each section and respond by putting "X" in the blank line (only one) that most applies to you.

General Information

1. Your age interval
   ___  1. under 18 years
   ___  2. 18-21 years
   ___  3. 22-25 years
   ___  4. 26-29 years
   ___  5. 30 years or above

2. Gender
   ___  1. Female
   ___  2. Male

3. Citizenship
   ___  1. U.S. citizen
   ___  2. U.S. permanent resident visa
   ___  3. Other (specify) __________________________

4. Ethnic background (National/racial origin)
   ___  1. African
   ___  2. African-American
   ___  3. Anglo-American
4. Hispanic-American
5. Mexican-American
6. Native American
7. Oriental
8. West-Indian
9. Other (specify) _______________________

Credential or Academic Information

5. Highest degree earned
   1. Associate
   2. B.A./B.S.
   3. M.A./M.S.
   4. MAT/M.Ed.
   5. Ph.D./Ed.D
   6. Other (specify) _______________________

6. What is the major area of your specialization?
   1. Counseling
   2. Psychology
   3. Sociology
   4. Medicine
   5. Other (specify) _______________________
7. Years of employment at Andrews University
   ____ 1. Under 5 years
   ____ 2. 5-9 years
   ____ 3. 10-14 years
   ____ 4. 15-19 years
   ____ 5. 20 years or more

8. Years of employment in student affairs profession
   ____ 1. Under 5 years
   ____ 2. 5-9 years
   ____ 3. 10-14 years
   ____ 4. 15-19 years
   ____ 5. 20 years or more

9. How long have you served in the Division of Student Affairs at Andrews University?
   ____ 1. Under 5 years
   ____ 2. 5-9 years
   ____ 3. 10-14 years
   ____ 4. 15-19 years
   ____ 5. 20 years or more

10. How long have you held your present position?
    ____ 1. Less than 1 year
    ____ 2. 1-4 years
    ____ 3. 5-9 years
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___ 4. 10-14 years
___ 5. 15-19 years
___ 6. 20 years or more

11. Employment position

___ 1. Full-time
___ 2. Part-time
___ 3. Other (specify) ____________________________

12. Administrative title

___ 1. Vice President
___ 2. Assistant Vice President
___ 3. Dean
___ 4. Associate/Assistant Dean
___ 5. Director of Department
___ 6. Assistant Director of Department
___ 7. Associate/Director
___ 8. Secretary (Departmental Level)
___ 9. Counselor
___ 10. Psychologist
___ 11. Physician
___ 12. Health Worker/Nurse
___ 13. Clerical (Administrative Clerical Staff)
___ 14. Other (specify) ________

13. Academic rank

___ 1. Instructor
___ 2. Assistant professor
___ 3. Associate professor
___ 4. Professor
___ 5. Other (specify) ____________________________
14. Approximate percentage of time devoted to each of the following relating to student affairs services or programs at Andrews University

   ___ 1. ________ % Research
   ___ 2. ________ % Teaching
   ___ 3. ________ % Service
   ___ 4. ________ % Other (specify) ____________________________

15. What is the size of your staff in the Division of Student Affairs?

   ___ 1. Fewer than 5 staff
   ___ 2. 5-9 staff
   ___ 3. 10-14 staff
   ___ 4. 15 staff or more

16. Number of both part-time and full-time students enrolled this autumn quarter (1992) at your university

   ___ 1. Fewer than 1,000
   ___ 2. 1,000-1,999 students
   ___ 3. 2,000-2,999 students
   ___ 4. 3,000-3,999 students
   ___ 5. 4,000-4,999 students
   ___ 6. 5,000 or more students

17. Salary earned (per academic year) from the institution

   ___ 1. Under $15,000
   ___ 2. $15,000-$19,999
   ___ 3. $20,000-$24,999
   ___ 4. $25,000-$29,999
   ___ 5. $30,000 or more
APPENDIX D

PART II, SECTION A

OPEN-ENDED STATEMENTS BY

STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL
Comments made by students in response to the Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Perhaps the aspect of the university may need to be extended to every culture bearing in mind the diversity of international students we have at Andrews University.

2. Not applicable (2).

3. Not well advertised; don't exactly know what they do.

4. Good (4).

5. I don't have much knowledge about it.

6. Invite employers to visit the campus.

7. Very poor in some areas—in that there is limited awareness of, even myself, a grad and a married student—maybe they need to include information in the Student Movement.

8. Should provide seniors and graduates with timely information of career and employments on and off campus.

9. Need more objectivity—caring (more) is wanted.

10. Contacting the organizations outside of church is not enough.

11. Does not meet the needs of international students. Staff needs to be more helpful and courteous.
12. I wish all jobs in each department were equally publicized in a central location or publication. New students have a disadvantage in securing a job because there is no place that gives information on all available jobs.

13. I feel that more effort should be made to find employment for students with odd hours. Also, all jobs should be advertised to give a chance for all interested to apply.

14. The CPP and SE seem to cater primarily to American students. More specifically, there is a racial bias in employment on campus.

15. I am not sure if this is available in the university, but I do strongly feel its importance for students—especially for those who are not sponsored or can't decide what job or line to take up in life.

16. Should actively pursue jobs for graduate students.

17. Could be more helpful.

18. The Vice President of Student Affairs seeks only his personal interests. He does not care.


20. Need to diversify not only to seniors but to juniors and under.

21. Workshops could be used to direct the young people in their career planning.

22. Not satisfactory.

23. They are not doing a good job. They do not take the time to talk to you; they don't post up job opportunities in time. No help in getting a job—you must do what you need by yourself.
24. Foreign students need more information on work opportunities.

25. I think they are informative and adequate.

26. Needs to be geared toward all schools (business, technology, arts and sciences) as far as job placement is concerned.

27. I would like them to open more jobs to students instead of limiting those jobs to spouses or non-students.

28. Substantial provision is made to help students in their career planning.

29. Married students in apartments don't receive any circulation of information from this department. It seems that they deal only with those in resident halls. Need more output of their work to all students. There should be a booklet for students who live in university apartments or to give out booklets to all new students explaining what their department is all about.

30. Provided excellent and valuable services for me ten years ago when I finished my B.S. I expect the same quality of service this time around.

Comments by students in response to the Commuter Student Programs and Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. This service is extremely important and has been of extreme benefit to the spouses of students and their children.

2. Need improvements.

3. Don't know about this.

4. Good (3).

5. Not much knowledge.
6. Have a courtesy bus for the campus.

7. Very poor. When your car breaks down, you are left with no option but to ride a bus to Berrien Springs, St Joseph or Benton Harbor or even Niles ($12.00 one way). Need a commuter van or bus within campus for those who have no cars. Very expensive if they take you by car-transport department (4).

8. Needs more vision, cooperation, and tolerance, especially from administrators.

9. Concern of them much more.

10. I'm not aware of any services in this area.

11. Student does not know what Commuter Student Programs and Services are. The student asked, "What are these services/programs all about?"

12. No adequate knowledge in this area.

13. I do feel that some need but I think the university is doing okay in this area.

14. I feel that there needs to be a van for the nursing students to drive them to and from clinicals instead of having to find your own way!!

15. Needs a degree of improvement.

16. Know nothing about this function.

17. Unknown.

18. Does not apply.


20. Perhaps coverage in regular monthly service for students to go shopping.


22. Needs more advertising and publicity.
23. In fact, I am not very aware of such a program but I do know that quite a lot of students commute to and from school.

Comments by students in response to the Counseling and Substance-Abuse Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. There are many students who abuse substances and alcohol and these directors don't even know it.

2. These services are not working in my point of view because I have been here for two years, but I don't see their activities.

3. Anonymous available.

4. This caring service has brought great dividends to our university. We do not have problems of substance abuse.

5. I don't know.

6. Good (5).

7. I have seen the office while doing some job around there, and it was functioning.

8. No problem.

9. Need more awareness of this service to the students and their function. Also make it easily accessible to everyone in school (2).

10. In this/these situations it's not a give and take. I'd like to see a more give, give, give program.

11. Extend to school apartments and off-campus area.
12. I have used the counseling service on campus and have found it to be an important part of my educational process, helping with the personal parts of my life.

13. My impression is that these services are provided by graduate students. It doesn’t sound very professional. I am very selective in what kind of person would "counsel" me (3).

14. Excellent. Need more hours for counseling and maybe another substance-abuse counselor on staff.

15. The university has this program, but I am not too sure as to its effectiveness. I have my doubts (2).

16. Need additional staff and must be made aware to student body—graduate and undergrad.

17. I think they are poorly handled. No awareness for student having difficulties.

18. Interesting to find there is S.A. program.


20. Understaffed at the moment.

21. The university should look for "new ways" in approaching young people with problems of substance abuse. I mean "new ways"—out of the formality, being creative to motivate them.

22. These two services are done by two different bodies. It would be good if they came under the direction of centralized administration.

23. This seems adequate to my knowledge.

24. There is excellent help and provision with regard to this.
25. Not accessible at all times, especially during school vacations for students who are still on campus for summer school.

Comments by students in response to the Housing and Residential Life Program section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Suitable to life styles of Andrews University.

2. The person in charge of housing makes differences. When you are known as a married student from the third world (Africa) you are not treated in the same way as the one from the U.S.A., Europe, or Canada. There are many differences, e.g. furniture, apartments, location of the apartments, replacement of old furniture.

3. Good programs and leadership. Rules and regulations very rigid.

4. Doing well.

5. The Department of Housing is very helpful to the students. The only complaint we have is that the rent is too high and must be radically reduced, especially for many of us who come from the Third World countries (3).

6. Provided with fairly high standard of accommodation at a fairly low price. Housing Department has been very helpful (5).

7. Excellent.

8. I had to wait for two months before I got my apartment. Long waiting list (2).

9. Prepare the study room in houses (apartments).

10. Need to have more programs geared to married students living in university housing. Most of the time, they are neglected. There is no visitation from any
pastor of the church we regularly attend and give tithe etc. to. There are no programs geared to married students and their children, especially at the graduate level.

11. Student Housing should keep the apartment more clean, provide more room facilities such as nice refrigerator and chairs.

12. Of course there are great needs to be met and might better be met not necessarily in targeting groups but in the whole programming of general respectability of persons (3).

13. It's okay! (3).

14. Apartments should be kept in better condition with furniture being replaced, walls painted, etc. (4).

15. There is no problem with that issue on campus.

16. More facilities for children, especially sheltered facilities to allow for activities during bad weather.

17. Decent; could be more centralized.

18. The university should improve the housing for students, especially in Garland and University Manor Apartment.


20. Residential services for married couples must be more developed.

21. Keep housing prices constant!! I should not have to pay more each year to stay in the same place. It saves the university money when I stay year after year.
22. Not aware that housing and residential life programs are carried out.

23. No housing for singles aside from the dorm. As an MBA student who is single and in my mid-twenties, I find living in a dormitory noisy and restrictive. They should provide cheaper rents for singles who want to share an apartment. An efficiency apartment is too expensive for living alone.

24. Need to have activities at various times and open up more programs between the sexes. There is a need for more social interaction between the groups.

25. There is none for married student families. Our children need someone (coordinator) to help organize some programs for them at least in the weekends. It will make our children feel more happy being at Andrews University. Is this too much to ask? I'll appreciate it very much—it eases parents' time for study.

Comments by students in response to the International Student/Multicultural Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. International students at this campus are not assisted as it was supposed to be, especially when it comes to the area of employment for practical training in the working plan program they are not provided jobs in different services.

2. Good work (5).

3. This service needs to extend its services to real and tangible personal needs rather than the present general needs.

4. Should be more advisory than act like immigration official.
5. A great deal of emphasis seems to be given to this area by the university. It is well grounded—the attention, that is. It helps students learn to live in a multi-cultural society in harmony.

6. Since I am new, I don't have much information about this.

7. Need to have more info in Student Movement of activities, etc. and any new info that international students like us need.

8. Need more emphasis and possible integration.

9. It's great at all.

10. There is a need for an on-going international student awareness rather than push everything in one week—International Student Week.

11. What they have is satisfactory.

12. Fair.

13. Don't know enough.

14. I have had no problems.

15. Excellent job.

16. International students who have never been to the U.S.A. and Andrews should be provided with a checklist, what items are useful to have as to bring, what certificates, bank accounts, credit cards, etc.

17. Excellent service.

18. Endeavor to bring the students together rather than to annual specific cultural activities.
19. A.U. should give more attention to minorities—promote more social and cultural activities to get acquainted with each other.

20. They have programs quite often, but are they really helpful for foreign students? Maybe not. They seem to hold those meetings and programs to show that we are doing this.


22. An excellent service is provided.

23. I am not aware of any services they provide, but I would like to know what they have apart from checking visas.

Comments by students in response to the Minority Students Programs and Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Improving.

2. In as much as we want to safeguard our various cultures, there must be a guide from these groups becoming racist or sectionist.

3. Need attention.

4. Don't know of.

5. I was unaware that we had this program because my country has yet to benefit (use) their services. It may be because of an extremely small representation of students from my country.

6. Good (2).

7. More consideration of their outside culture in grading.
8. I am a minority student and I'm not even aware of any programs existing to help those from the southern Pacific islands.

9. More support is required.

10. I am not sure such a department is in the university. Yes such a program is necessary for those concerned.

11. No reason for its existence.

12. I don't think this school is concerned about minorities. There is no program available to students having academic difficulty.

13. Is there any?

14. Urgent need to initiate on campus.

15. I have seen them in action.

16. Unknown (3).

17. Could receive some more attention.

18. More information ought to be correlated.

19. Promote representatives being selected to regularly represent these groups.

Representative to spend some time with students (people).

20. Unsatisfactory.

21. The university needs to provide support both financially and attendance of administration at minority programs.

22. Needs higher visibility, not just for blacks, but also especially for Asians.

23. I am not aware of such a program, but I do believe there exists such a program.
24. The majority of students here seems to be the minority from overseas and American minorities. But I'm not aware of any service apart from our own South Pacific Division Student Club.

Comments by students in response to the Recreational Sports Programs and Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. I feel that of all the sports, basketball seemed to be more played. What about other sports?
2. Gives opportunity to many.
3. This area is wonderful though we don't have much time to participate as we would like due to our studies.
4. More promotion needed.
5. Excellent.
6. I have seen people participating, but I don't have time to do it.
7. Very limited time for swimming. Need to have a better schedule for those who are married and have school children.
8. More year-round activities that are scheduled that aren't necessarily done with equipment. I think we won't have adequate facilities if everyone participates; thus, structure and availability of various activities are very needed.
9. Provide some more sound recreational sports, especially during the vacation, weekends, etc.
10. Spasmodic.
11. To give more time for soccer game during autumn and winter time.
12. The university has adequate facilities for this.
14. When and where?
15. There are few.
16. Developed.
17. A.U. should not just offer the favorite games in the U.S.A. such as football, basketball or baseball, but also other kinds of sport such as soccer. Most of the minorities play soccer, and there is not much support for this sport.
18. I don’t know.
19. Needs to incorporate a swimming team for the school (just like the football and softball teams).
20. Answers social and recreational needs of the students but we do not have time to enjoy these advantages.
21. Need more hours open; gym and health should be open until midnight and in the early morning.
22. Can be improved.
23. There are good recreational sports on campus (6).

Comments by students in response to the Religious Programs and Services section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. I feel that there should be no chapel and assemblies, but if there is, they shouldn’t force it on students. That’s forcing students in the religion. Plus their rates are too high.
2. Excellent (3).

3. Doing well.

4. Here again the services must be such that they meet the taste of diverse societies reflected at Andrews University, instead of all programs fashioned to "white tastes."

5. Okay.

6. I have attended some and they are very good.

7. Need religious programs for graduate married students and families.

8. Spiritual food is available, but there's still a great need for diversity and oneness at the same time.

9. Centering on personal conversion and devotion!

10. Studying should never be allowed in religious services. Reverence for God's sanctuary/presence is not enforced. Worships by some RAs are excellent; others are a joke! Why is one credit given to a five-minute scripture/prayer and the same to one-hour Vespers?

11. Good programs are in operation. Need more special needs oriented programs.

12. Basically, I am happy, but the church should also send her ministers to visit the homes of the student housing. So far I have not seen anything being done from this.

13. The campus Church (PMC) should give more opportunity for seminary professor to preach on sabbath services. I don't agree with the monopoly of the pulpit by the senior pastor and some of his colleagues.
14. Excellent.

15. Aren't enough of interest or depth.

16. No problem with this one.

17. Excellent.

18. Good (4).

19. If there were devotional facility (or room) in each on-campus apartment, it will be good.

20. Satisfactory.

21. Need more programs for married couples.

22. Addresses the needs of white middle class. In terms of preparation of ministerial students who will be going back into minority communities the training is not provided.

23. Regular and appealing services. Clergy could try, at least once, to pay personal visit to members of the church.

24. Needs to be more choices of speakers who the students select, which would also yield a larger turn out.

25. This is excellent here at Andrews University.

26. Well-planned religious programs.

27. Need to publicize their activities, and provide witnessing programs for students.

28. The University Church (PMC) allots the 11:20 a.m. Divine Service for the student body beginning this fall '92. It's a great move and long overdue. But the service is adapted to college students which is even better. However, they
should now start to appoint students as elder and deacons for their own service time.

Comments by students in response to the Services for Students with Disabilities section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Needs improvement.

2. Andrews is very particular in this area. For example, parking lots and roads are safely guided by the University Campus Safety in conjunction with the County Police Department.

3. I'm not what happening.

4. Non-existent (2).

5. Good (2).

6. I have seen some notices by university asking for help for these students as in work program.

7. Improvement is needed, saved for those students that are sensitive to the needs of others and particularly other students with disabilities.

8. Every effort must be made to make our campus handicap accessible regardless of the number of handicapped students or persons on campus.

9. More recently there has been an awareness created. Physical plant changes are beginning to reflect this.

10. I think they need. But I can't say whether anything is being done for such students.

11. Poor!!!
12. Need more for wheelchair students or persons.

13. Scarce.

14. Moderate awareness.

15. Drastic changes to the buildings need to be made urgently to accommodate the student with disabilities.

16. Appoint assistants for wheelchair students.

17. Little is done in this area.

18. There are some.

19. Students with disabilities that call for a lot of standing and going from building to building especially during registration should have first priority in lines and another method for obtaining signatures.

20. Buildings to be more compatible.

21. Not very aware of this.

22. I'm not aware, but I don't think special services is provided for such students.

23. The main problem I notice is the existence of standard height curbs were sidewalks intersect with streets. There are not enough ramps at these sidewalks or streets intersections.

Comments by students in response to the Student Activities section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Organized well.

2. Andrews University students are taught many activities besides our regular academic courses. This is commendable!
3. O.K.

4. Good (6).

5. They have quite a number of them and I see ads on weekends always.


7. Need student activities and wholesome in Adventist perspective rather than worldly perspective.

8. Needs more celebration.

9. It seems there is a gap between undergraduate student and graduate student, graduate student with seminarians.

10. Student Activities seem to plan programs with only one group of students in mind—single, 18-22 year olds. That is not the whole student body.

11. I feel strongly that the ideal/morals of the SDA Church be upheld at SDA educational institutions. Some of the activities that my money pays for are not activities that I would want to attend.

12. It's fine as it is.

13. Need to get more in touch with the student body.

14. Too limited, not enough, not interesting so kids go off-campus for entertainment.

15. Some.

16. Great leadership.

17. A.U.'s students should be more involved in showing their customs among them and in the community through organized event by A.U.
18. Need on-line computer so students know up to the minute what's going on.
19. Graduate students are not informed or included in much of the activities.
20. Need to present more programs geared toward BSCF students.
21. More of them both on the weekends and during the week.
22. O.K.
23. They are doing their best.

Comments by students in response to the Student Wellness and Health section of the questionnaire (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

1. Insurance for the students is not helping them, because the students are limited to certain illness. This doesn't look good or fair.
2. Encouraged to all students.
3. This area is very very sensitive and very welcome. However, the present Health Insurance Compulsory of every student and spouse and children is not good. I think insurance should be optional.
4. O.K.
5. Good (5).
6. I was asked to sign for an insurance, and I know there is a Health Center.
7. P.M. hours needed on campus.
8. Need more preventive programs in health. Need to have students be aware on the health/lifestyle such as food, etc.
9. General awareness, yet reminders are helpful.
10. Aware of alcoholic and drug problem as the non-Christian or non-SDA students are increasing. How to help the Christian to be an example to them.

11. Only caters to the dorm students. Students who live in the apartments need to pay at least $20.00 to see the doctor at the Un. Med. Center, whereas those in the dorm need not pay anything to see the doctor at the Health Center. Should cater to all students on campus—dorm or uni-housing.

12. That department needs to be improved on.

13. Student awareness is needed. For example, services available—and for whom?

14. Few are interested on campus.

15. Good; could be improved.

16. I used twice the health center on campus but there were too many regulations and red tapes.

17. Need a tape back-up for their computers. They have no back up. Could very easily lose all data base records.

18. Not well known.

19. The University Health Care and Berrien General Hospital take care of that. Unfortunately, the insurance policy is not good. The terms need to be changed.

20. My children have been sick for a whole month but we couldn't see a doctor for them for lack of insurance or Medicare/Medicaid. Is there any chance to have some free help for families at Andrews?
Following are comments by Student Affairs personnel on some of the 11 functions provided by the Student Affairs program at Andrews University (numbers in parentheses denote number of responses):

Career Planning and Placement/Student Employment

1. Have great pride in what they’re doing; needs to target students earlier in college experience.

2. Need more staff.

3. Fine.

4. Needs to take on a better multicultural perspective.

5. It discriminates against whites and these students feel uncomfortable going there to ask for assistance.

Commuter Student Programs and Services

1. Currently—no established programs.

2. Awareness of this service could be heightened, though there is probably not a need for separate office.

Counseling Services and Substance-abuse

1. Doing an excellent job, but needs another counselor in order to keep up.

2. Appears to be strong.

3. Fair.

4. Excellent.

5. The entity should be fully staffed.

Housing and Residential Life Program (Men and Women)
1. Co-ed study area can be useful.

2. Appears adequate (2).

3. Conditions are horrible for apartment tenants.

4. Many complaints; could go on forever.

5. They need (a) professional management; (b) customer relations; (c) efficient maintenance personnel, (d) decorating committee, etc., etc.

International Student/Multicultural Services

1. We need a multicultural center to make (take) advantage of our diversity.

2. Need additional programs/staff.

3. Need adequate facilities.

4. More staff.

Minority Students Programs and Services

1. Currently no program (2).

2. A proposal is currently on the table for implementation.

Recreational Sports

1. I tried to respond to questions on the facilities we have. We are serving all who wish to participate in intramurals but that is because academic schedules restrict opportunities for students to participate. Our facility is also shared in the academic program thus reducing opportunity. Because of insurance liability restrictions and lack of funds to provide adequate supervision, time during the day when the facility is available it is not open for recreation because there is no supervision.
2. The recreation/intramural services are lacking due to the size of the facility and the population we are asked to serve. We need more space in order to offer a well-rounded program which meets our American and international students.

Religious Programs and Services
1. Seem adequate (2).
2. Campus Ministries, which coordinates religious development on campus (excluding worships in the residence halls), is a function of both Pioneer Memorial Church and Student Affairs.

Services for Students with Disabilities
1. Need more awareness programs. Need to be inclusive, make them a vibrant point of our community.
2. Inadequate (2).
3. Because there are so few students with visible disabilities, we've developed customized services for individual students.
4. This is growing.
5. This has greatly improved over the past two years. Still a lot of room for improvement.

Student Activities
1. Keep bringing wholesome programs without jeopardizing talent.
3. Lacks organization and professionalism.
Student Wellness and Health

1. Services and programs are lacking which would enable them to have the impact that is necessary.

2. Needs more staff (3).

3. Dormitories students may receive medical care at no charge except laboratory services and x-ray are charged.

Comment on some or most of the 11 functions provided at Andrews University:

I feel that each of these departments are doing their jobs, never forgetting that there is always room for improvement. They labour under budget and personnel limitations which has its negative effects. Nevertheless, it appears to me that the end product (students around the world in service) testifies to jobs performed with dedication. There is always room for improvement. I do not include Minority Student Programs and Services in these comments.
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