To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by William M. McDonald entitled "The College and University Community Inventory: Assessing Student Perceptions of Community in Higher Education." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Leadership Studies in Education.

E. Grady Bogue, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Mary Jane Connelly

David A. Johnson

J. C. Miller

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn Winkel

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY INVENTORY: ASSESSING STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

William M. McDonald

December 1996

Copyright © William Moore McDonald, 1996
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife

Laurie Anne Mealor McDonald

who has taught me the true value and meaning of community,

and without whom this work would not have been possible

and my parents

Mrs. Hilda Moore McDonald

who taught me the value of balancing faith, competence

and a sense of humor

and

Mr. A. William McDonald

who taught me the value of perseverance to rise above other's

expectations in order to accomplish your goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. E. Grady Bogue for his inspiration, guidance and continual support. I would like to thank the other committee members, Dr. Mary Jane Connelly, Mr. Joseph M. Prochaska and Dr. Gerald C. Ubben for their comments over the past four years. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. David A. Johnson for standing in for absent committee members at my defense. I cannot begin to express enough appreciation to Anne, Marty and Hannah for their continual love and support. I would like to express my thanks to extended family: my parents, Hilda and Bill McDonald; my sisters and their families, Betty and Jack Allison, Barbara and Tracy Wilkerson, and Marian and Marion Lytle; my inlaws, Margie and Jim Mealor, Lynn and Tim East, Kathy and Harold Davies, Jim Mealor, and Brenda and Rick Tatum and their families for their support; my aunt, Susie Cheek for her "special" support; my uncle, Chris Lambert for his supportive phone calls. I would also like to thank my extended "family" at Carson-Newman College who supported my efforts. Barbara McDougal Cathy Brown, Jimmy Hodges, Robby Littleton, Andrew Johnston, Kathy Dampier, Jim

Wilson, Nenette Measels, Ricke Hester, Diana Seavers, Ross Brummett, Laura Trainer and others gave encouragement that went way beyond the call of friendship. I want to particularly recognize three Carson-Newman friends. All three provided invaluable assistance: Vicki Smith for countless proof readings; Carey Herring for statistical and database support; and Greg Bailey for additional computer support.

Finally, I especially want to thank Ronald J. Kovach. Ron and I began our research into community in April, 1989. Since then, we both have pursued our degrees and given countless presentations and papers on the subject of community. The search for community with Ron continues to prove to be both rewarding and fun.

ABSTRACT

This research accomplished the following objectives:

1. to develop an instrument designed to measure the extent and degree of "community" within colleges and universities for students.
2. to establish validity and ascertain reliability indices for the instrument.
3. to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions.

A pilot questionnaire was developed to assess students' perceptions of community. The validity of the instrument was established through a combination of undergraduate student focus groups, the Doctoral Committee, a national panel of experts, and a pre-pilot test of 400 undergraduate students at four different institutions in a specific geographical area. Each institution represented one of four different 1987 Carnegie Classifications. The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot test of 1600 college and university students from the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest and West, in clusters of four institutions, each representing one of the

same four 1987 Carnegie Classifications. Further, the internal consistency of the instrument was established through the administration of the Cronbach Alpha test.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.	1
	INTRODUCTION	1
	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	11
	PURPOSE OF STUDY	12
	QUESTIONS	13
	INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	13
	IMPORTANCE OF STUDY	18
	ASSUMPTIONS	19
	DELIMITATIONS	19
	LIMITATION	20
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	20
	OVERVIEW OF STUDY	22
2.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	24
	INTRODUCTION	24
	THE QUEST FOR CAMPUS COMMUNITY . .	25
	SURVEY RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT . . .	40
	CONCLUSION	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

CHAPTER		PAGE
3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	56
	INTRODUCTION	56
	INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	58
4.	CUCI © FIELD TEST RESULTS	78
	INTRODUCTION	78
	DATA ANALYSIS	79
	FIELD TEST RESULTS	80
	FIELD TEST CONCLUSIONS	116
5.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	127
	INTRODUCTION	127
	PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF STUDY . .	128
	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	134
	CONCLUSION	137
	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .	138
	SUMMARY	148
BIBLIOGRAPHY		153

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIXES	162
APPENDIX A. PRE-PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE .	163
APPENDIX B. PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE . .	170
VITA	174

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Intercorrelations and Coefficient Alpha Reliability Estimates for the CUCI ©	73
2.	CUCI © Institutional Regional Mean Scores . .	81
3.	CUCI © Institutional Size Mean Scores . . .	84
4.	CUCI © Institutional Carnegie Classification Mean Scores	87
5.	Regional Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences	93
6.	Size Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences	94
7.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences . .	95
8.	Regional Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences .	98
9.	Size Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences .	98

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE		PAGE
10.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences	100
11.	Regional Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality Significant Differences	101
12.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality Significant Differences	103
13.	Regional Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences	106
14.	Size Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences	107
15.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences	107
16.	Regional Institutional Service to both Students and Community Significant Differences	109

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE		PAGE
17.	Size Institutional Service to both Students and Community Significant Differences . .	110
18.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Service to both Students and Community Significant Differences	112
19.	Regional Institutional Rituals and Celebrations Significant Differences	114
20.	Carnegie Classification Institutional Rituals and Celebrations Significant Differences .	117
21.	CUCI © Institutional Regional Scale Scores . .	120
22.	CUCI © Institutional Size Scale Scores . . .	120
23.	CUCI © Institutional Carnegie Classification Scale Scores	122

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

By the mid-1980's, Bellah, et al., (1985) stated that "there is a widespread feeling that the promise of the modern era is slipping away from us" (p.277). Chronic problems such as increasing levels of crime that have led to new legislation for gun control; increasing homelessness that has taxed financial resources; and continued racial disharmony that has resulted in riots that have raised the nation's consciousness that we, as a society, have lost an awareness of our shared interdependence. Martin Luther King, Jr., (1983) summarized this fundamental component of community when he stated,

> All [people] are interdependent. Every nation is an heir of a vast treasury of ideas and labor to which both the living and the dead of all nations have contributed. Whether we realize it or not, each of us lives eternally 'in the red.' We are everlasting debtors to known and unknown men and women (p.18).

With the onset of the 1990s, the nation's lack of optimism and lost sense of shared interdependence could have hardly been more

extreme. Daniel Yankelovich (1993), President of the Public Agenda Foundation, stated,

> the general mood of the country from the period following the Gulf War through the presidential election was one of deep pessimism. Eighty (80) percent of the public felt the country was on the wrong track. Seventy-five (75) percent felt that we were losing the competitive battle with Japan. Two-thirds of the public felt our kids would grow up to be worse off than we were. Seventy (70) percent of the public were worried about their jobs, about the rising costs of health care, in education, and their retirement, and about a frustrated and - it seemed to them - unresponsive leadership both in the White House and in the Congress.
>
> So we had a period of a mood of anxiety, frustration, pessimism and above all a feeling that things were out of control, both in one's own personal life and also in the economic life of the nation as a whole (p.3).

Amitai Etzioni, leader of the "communitarians," (a group that believes individual rights must be balanced by social responsibilities) believes that excessive individualism has undermined our nation's concern for the common good. Etzioni elaborates in an interview with Timothy Willard and David Fields (1991) that "[special-interest] groups are eating up almost any capacity to worry about the public interest - to the point that some people deny the very concept of public interest" (p.37).

Consequently, Bellah, et al., (1985) stated that, "...ours is a society in which the language of individualism allows people to develop loyalties to others in the context of families, small communities, religious congregations, and what we have termed lifestyle enclaves" (p.250). Lifestyle enclaves invoke a sense of shared meaning in a narrow context with people that have very similar values, goals, and belief structures. However, enclaves do not allow for interaction with people that have different outlooks or different shared practices that may invoke a different meaning for life which is a key aspect of community. Bellah, et al., described this openness to different outlooks and practices as civic practices which " ...establish a web of interconnection by creating trust, ...and [make] each individual aware of his reliance on the larger society" (p.251). Therefore, lifestyle enclaves are in contrast to community.

Etzioni (1993), spoke directly to the individual's civic responsibilities for being a member of a community. Specifically, Etzioni believed that we must reawaken our moral voice to ensure that common needs are addressed through shared responsibility and commitment of all individuals. He stated,

...to object to the moral voice of the community and to

> the moral encouragement it provides, is to oppose the social glue that helps hold the moral order together. It is unrealistic to rely on individuals' inner voices and to expect that people will invariably do what is right completely on their own. Such a radical individualistic view disregards our social moorings and the important role that communities play in sustaining moral commitments (p.36).

Such concerns have been a part of the social fabric of our nation since its founding. Frances Fitzgerald (1986) pointed out that in crossing the Atlantic with his Puritan company to establish the Massachusetts Bay Colony, John Winthrop challenged them to "consider that we shall be a City Upon a Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us" (p.24). Bellah, et al., (1987) quote Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address. He challenged us to "... unite in common efforts for the common good ... with one heart and one mind ... to restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things" (p.28).

Approximately four decades later, however, Alexis de Tocqueville (1945), warned us that our need for individualism, which he defined as a tendency toward personal separation from the society at large, was very similar to egoism, which he defined as an exaggerated love of self at the expense of others. He further stated

that, "individualism, at first, only saps the virtues of public life; but in the long run it attacks and destroys all others and is at length absorbed in downright selfishness" (p.98).

Now, approximately 165 years after Tocqueville landed in America, the "exaggerated love of self" that he first warned us about is alive and well. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. (1992) described its most recent embodiment as the "cult of ethnicity." (p.15). In The Disuniting of America, Schlesinger described the emergence of ethnicity as having good consequences for the nation. For example, the rise of ethnicity has fostered an environment that has begun to give long overdue recognition to minority people's contribution to the vision of America. Yet, when taken too far, he identified negative consequences as well.

> The new ethnic gospel rejects the unifying vision of individuals from all nations melted into a new race. Its underlying philosophy is that America is not a nation of individuals at all but a nation of groups, that ethnicity is the defining experience for most Americans, that ethnic ties are permanent and indelible, and that division into ethnic communities establishes the basic structure of American society and the basic meaning of American history (p.16).

Consequently, Schlesinger is concerned that the "cult of ethnicity" is causing our nation to lose its historic identity. He further states

that in "... no arena is the rejection of an overriding national identity more crucial than in our system of education" (p.17).

Historically, the college and university campus has been misperceived as an "ivory tower," a place immunized from societal illnesses; as institutions of society, however, colleges and universities have wrestled with these same societal concerns. Ernest L. Boyer (1987), President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, for example, has repeatedly expressed concern that higher education must balance the needs of students and the needs of the institution. In his book, College: the Undergraduate Experience in America, he emphasizes "a commitment to community ...because our democratic life and perhaps our survival as a people rest on whether we can move beyond self-interest and begin to understand better the realities of our dependence on each other" (p.8). Scott Peck (1987) agrees and states that, "in and through community lies the salvation of the world...yet it is virtually impossible to describe community meaningfully to someone who has never experienced it..." (p.17).

Parker Palmer (1987) recognizes that establishing community will be a difficult process. He states that "I learned, of course, that community is vital and important, but is also terribly difficult work for which we are not well prepared..." (p.20). He further illustrates the difficulty of creating community by defining community as "that place where the person you least want to live with always lives, ...when that person moves away, someone else arises immediately to take his or her place" (p.20).

Other sources echo similar concerns about the difficulty of creating community. In a recent volume of Policy Perspectives, a publication of the Pew Higher Education Roundtable, Robert Zemsky (1993), states that the most consistent challenge voiced by colleges and universities was the loss of campus community. Specifically,

> regardless of their institution's size, control, or mission, the most consistent lament of the roundtables was the loss of a sense of community. The larger institutions talked about a need to shrink their psychological size, about providing more intimate academic as well as co-curricular environments. Smaller institutions focused on ways to increase intellectual and social interactions outside the classroom (p.5A).

Thus, as educators, higher education must address the challenge of creating and nurturing community. As Faith Gabelnick, et al., (1990) state, higher education helps "... shape the behaviors that shape public behavior. Teaching is a political act[,] regardless of our disciplines[.] [W]hatever we teach, and whatever our individual political points of view, our overriding obligation is to educate a citizenry" (p.92). Furthermore, Suzanne Morse (1989) states that "what higher education offers to the process is a setting, a curriculum, and an established community, all aimed at developing human beings for living in a public world" (p.2).

In order to meet the challenge of creating and nurturing community on the campus, higher education must accomplish two goals. First, a working definition of community must be created that reflects the uniqueness of the collegiate environment. Consequently, a collegiate community is the set of policies and practices that mark the distinctive mission of a collegiate institution and that accents the shared values and commitments held in common by institutional constituents.

The second challenge for creating community will be higher education's ability to establish assessment strategies that will assess the effectiveness of an institution's efforts to create community for students. Dary Erwin (1991), believes that assessment will have significant impact on faculty and staff involved in the process. He states that, "assessment results are best used for program improvement when the source and the audience are the same. Therefore, to encourage the use of the results ... the respective faculty or student affairs personnel should compose the assessment report" (p.134). He further states that, "when assessment data are reported back to students after scoring, they learn from the assessment experience ... and ... are likely to take assessment more seriously" (p.150).

Currently, there are many different instruments that are available to higher education professionals to assess a myriad of student satisfaction and developmental issues. For example, the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) (Winston, 1987), proposes to "help students look at themselves objectively and to use that information to make plans in order that

they can get the most from their college experience and have more meaningful lives during and after college" (p.1). The SDTLI accomplishes this goal through a series of questions that represent behaviors, attitudes, and activities that are common to college students.

Another example is the College Student Experiences Questionnaire, which was developed by C. Robert Pace (1990). Commonly referred to as the "Pace Inventory," this instrument proposes to learn more about how college students spend their time. Specifically, the instrument tests how much time students will allot for "course work, [time] in the library, in contacts with faculty, in extracurricular activities, in various social and cultural activities, and in using other facilities and opportunities that exist on the college campus" (p.1).

The information gathered from both instruments will give valuable feedback to college administrators and faculty on how to provide better resources and services to meet the needs of students. However, these instruments, as well as others, do not assess students' perceptions of, or needs for community. Thus, the lack of

an instrument to assess student perceptions of community is a part of the increasing concern and awareness of the lack of community on campus.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In 1990, the Carnegie Foundation published a special report entitled Campus Life: In search of community. This report addressed the increasing concern for the declining state of community in higher education. Examples of the declining state of community included increasing problems resulting from inappropriate student behavior, competing interests, ideologies and purposes, combined with an increasing transient student population in which academic pursuits were not the key focus of their lives. While the Carnegie report began a dialogue about community among faculty and administration constituents, students were not actively part of the debate. Likewise, student perceptions of the state of community on the college campus were not solicited in a systematic way.

To date, no instrument has been designed to assess college and university students' perceptions of community. Consequently, any discussion of community without student input is at best problematic in that it does not represent key constituents effected by the declining state of community in higher education.

III. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of the study is divided into the following objectives:

1. to develop an instrument designed to measure the extent and degree of "community" within colleges and universities for students.
2. to establish validity and ascertain reliability indices for the instrument.
3. to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions.

IV. QUESTIONS

1. From other instruments, commentary in the literature, and expert panelists, what item descriptors are seen as useful operational expressions of community?
2. Will the developed instrument meet standards of validity and reliability?
3. Will the developed instrument reveal the power to discriminate among types and sizes of institutions?

V. INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Most discussion for the need to build community on the campus, has focused primarily on the faculty and staff. Although faculty and staff are key members of the campus community, and obviously serve as potential leaders to initiate community, community will not be accomplished without having students actively engaged in the community process.

Thus, the original concept of this study focused on the need to create an assessment instrument designed to assess students' perceptions of community on the college campus. Then, once

designed, determine whether the would discriminate differential students' perceptions of community based upon the institutional variables of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification.

Once the study was conceived, the literature identified four steps that must be implemented when conducting survey research. These steps will be supported in the literature review of Chapter 2; however, as a brief overview, the following steps were implemented to develop the instrument.

Instrument Construction and Design

As a preliminary step to constructing the instrument, Dr. Michael K. Smith, former Director of the Clearing House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments, was consulted to ensure that a similar instrument had not already been created. The Student Services & Student Development Assessment Instruments and Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Instruments, compiled by the Clearing House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments was reviewed. The review failed to produce an instrument that assesses student perceptions of community in higher education.

Next, to gather data for the creation of the instrument, a literature review was conducted. Primary sources were Bellah (1985), Boyer (1987) (1990), and Palmer (1993). Items that described community and matched the study's definition of community, were extracted for inclusion in a pilot test questionnaire. Individual questions were drafted and grouped into factors or sections. Answer scales that served as a logical extension of the instrument were considered. A final pilot test questionnaire was created. The questionnaire was divided into six factors, each containing approximately 7 questions. A Likert scale was chosen from which students could represent their perceptions by choosing the appropriate response.

Once the pilot test questionnaire was created, the next step of the process was to establish the validity of the instrument.

Instrument Validity

To establish validity, the draft questionnaire was submitted to the following student groups and expert panelists for review.

1. Four institutions within a specific geographic area were selected. Each institution represented a different Carnegie

Classification. The selected Carnegie Classifications are described later in this chapter in the Definition of Terms section. A student focus group was conducted on each campus to review the questionnaire.

2. The graduate committee guiding this study reviewed the instrument. Their identities and responses are discussed in Chapter 3.

3. A panel of national experts in their respective field reviewed the instrument. Their identities and responses are discussed in Chapter 3.

These groups interpreted the meaning of each question to ensure all questions were explicit and elicited the appropriate response. Each group recommended modifications such as additions to, or deletions of, existing questions and categories in the instrument.

A modified pilot questionnaire was created based upon the responses elicited from the student focus groups and expert panelists. The pilot questionnaire was presented to a final focus group of ten students at Carson-Newman College. Additionally, a pilot test was conducted with a random sample from each of the

aforementioned institutions within the specific geographical area. In both the final focus group and the pilot test, students' responses indicated that the revised instrument was easily read, understood and completed.

Once the validity of the instrument was established, the next step was to begin establishing the reliability of the instrument.

Instrument Reliability

To establish internal consistency, the extent to which individual questions within a factor or section correlate with one another, the Cronbach Alpha test (1951) was administered. Cronbach Alpha was attractive for several reasons as described in Chapter 3. Most importantly, however, the Cronbach Alpha test was specifically designed to administer with questionnaires utilizing a Likert scale.

Once the test for reliability had been chosen, in order to gather data to establish instrument reliability and to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions, a field test was conducted. The different institutional categories or variables chosen for this study were institutional regional location, size and Carnegie Classification.

Instrument Field Test

To conduct the field test, clusters of four institutions in the following geographical regions - Northeast, Southeast, Midwest and West - representing four different 1987 Carnegie Classifications, and representing either small or large institutions, were selected to participate in the study. The purpose of the field test was to gather data for establishing instrument reliability and to discover whether the instrument would gather discriminating data from students' responses representing different institutional regional locations, size and Carnegie Classifications.

VI. IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

As Boyer (1990) suggested, the increasing inappropriate student behavior, and the resulting increases in student attrition rates demonstrate that students must be involved in the college's revitalization efforts for creating and nurturing community on the campus. Likewise, an increased awareness by colleges and universities on how their variables of size, purpose and regional location impact students' perceptions of community on the campus,

will allow campus leaders to better respond to the students' needs to be engaged in the community process. Consequently, an instrument must be created to address these concerns.

VII. ASSUMPTIONS

1. It is assumed that each institution under study will be unique in purpose, size, and geographic regional location of the country. Consequently, research conclusions should apply for similar type institutions.
2. It is assumed that each respondent will be aware of his/her perceptions and describe them honestly and forthrightly to the researcher.

VII. DELIMITATIONS

1. The population under study will be limited to students at the following types of institutions: 2 year institution, Comprehensive College/University I & II, and Research Universities I & II.

2. Selected institutions will represent the following regions: Northeast, Southeast, Midwest and West to ensure that the instrument is not regionally biased.

VIII. LIMITATION

1. The results of this study may only apply to the similar institutions as identified by the 1987 Carnegie Foundation Classification.

IX. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Cocurricular Activities/Programs - Institutional sponsored activities and programs for students that provide opportunities for learning outside of the classroom. Examples include, but are not limited to: leadership development, wellness programs, residence life programs and involvement in organizations that support the mission and purpose of the institution.

Community - The set of policies and practices that mark the distinctive mission of a collegiate institution and that accent the shared values and commitments held in common by institutional constituents. In the case of this study, community will include the

extent to which students share perceptions on the following factors: Mission and Curriculum; Membership Rights and Responsibilities; Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Standards and Regulations; Service to Both Students; and Institutional Community and Rituals and Celebrations.

1987 Carnegie Classifications - a report that groups colleges and universities in the United States into categories based upon the range of prebaccalaureate to doctorate degrees offered and the comprehensiveness of the institutional mission. The following categories apply to the institutions under study for this proposed dissertation.

Research University I & II: An institution that offers a full range of baccalaureate programs, is committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and places a high priority on research. Also, the institution usually receives federal support between $12.5 million to $33.5 million and awards at least 50 Ph.D. degrees a year.

Comprehensive University & College I: An institution that offers baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions,

graduate degrees at the master's level. Greater than half of the baccalaureate degrees are in two or more occupational or professional disciplines and enrolls at least 2,500 students.

Comprehensive University & College II: An institution that awards more than half of its baccalaureate degrees in two or more occupational or professional disciplines, such as business or education, and may offer the master's degree. Student enrollment populations normally range in size from 1,500 to 2,500.

2-Year Community, Junior and Technical Colleges: An institution that provides either certificates or degree programs through associate of arts degree.

OVERVIEW OF STUDY

As a brief overview of the study, this chapter introduced the current concern for creating and nurturing community at both the national and collegiate levels. Additionally, this chapter accented the importance of engaging students in the community process by assessing their perceptions of community on the campus. Chapter 2

will further explore community concerns at the national and collegiate levels. Examples of societal community models that have applications for higher education will be introduced. Further, because of the uniqueness of the academy, two community models for higher education, designed by two prominent educators will be reviewed. Finally, instrument development techniques will be extracted from the literature. Chapter 3 will explore the methodology for creating the instrument designed to assess students' perceptions of community. Further, this chapter will review the process for establishing validity, reliability and internal consistency indices for the instrument. Chapter 4 will review the national survey that was conducted in four regions of the country. Finally, Chapter 5 will provide a summary of the study's conclusions and suggestions for further development of the instrument.

CHAPTER 2.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 1, a review of Bellah (1985), King (1983), Etzioni (1993) and others has demonstrated the need to create and nurture community is as important today for our nation as it was in the days of John Winthrop (1986) and Thomas Jefferson (1987) when the nation began. Likewise, a review of Boyer (1987), Zemsky (1993) and others within the ranks of the academy has identified a similar concern to create and nurture community on the collegiate campus.

This chapter further explores community concerns at the collegiate level. Examples of societal community models that have potential applications for higher education will be introduced. Further, because of the uniqueness of the academy, two community models designed for higher education will be introduced. Since most of the discussion for the need to build community on the campus has focused primarily on the faculty and staff, the need to engage students in the community process will be addressed. The

increasing destructive student behavior and the resulting increases in student attrition rates demonstrate that students must be involved in the college's revitalization efforts for creating and nurturing community on the campus. Consequently, campus leaders must assess students' perceptions of campus community to better respond to the community needs of students.

Finally, this chapter further explores the steps for building the instrument to assess students' perceptions of community. Techniqes to develop the instrument will be extracted from the literature.

II. THE QUEST FOR CAMPUS COMMUNITY

Throughout the nation's history, the American society has mantained many expectations of its colleges and universities. In their book An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education, the Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993) stated "above all, [the society expects from higher education] a commitment to the American promise - the idea that all Americans have the opportunity to develop their talents to the fullest" (p. 2).

Thus, it is not surprising that American higher education evokes strong responses among social observers across the political spectrum. Voices of both praise and condemnation can be heard assessing the health of the college and university system.

Ernest Boyer (1987), states that our "system of higher education with its openness, diversity, and scholarly achievement, is the envy of the world. Unencumbered by suffocating ideology, the vitality and integrity of the American college and university are unmatched" (p.2). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), recognize that a special relationship exists between our nation and its colleges and universities. The relationship involves not only financial support, but espoused virtues of loyalty, faithfulness and love for one's alma mater. Pascarella and Terenzini state "that a social institution can engender such fervent and magnanimous support attests to the generally high regard in which Americans hold post-secondary institutions in this country. And, indeed, we do often expect our colleges and universities to accomplish great things" (p.1).

However, in 1990, the Carnegie Foundation published a special report (with a foreword by Boyer) that addressed an increasing

concern for the declining state of campus community. Specifically, inappropriate student behavior, competing interests, ideologies and purposes, combined with an increasing transient student population had fostered a sense of transience within the academy.

The current state of transience had been forecast for many years prior to Carnegie Foundation (1990) work. Approximately twenty years ago, Vance Packard (1972), in his book A Nation of Strangers, characterized colleges as "breeding grounds for transients." This allegation is easily affirmed. During recent decades, many colleges relaxed residential requirements because they have experienced rapid growth without having adequate resources or proper planning. For example, during the mid-seventies to the mid-eighties, many large, public universities implemented a lottery registration system that only allowed a small percentage of returning upper-class students' access to the residence halls. This procedure ensured that adequate space would be available for large classes of incoming students. Small, private colleges, that normally depend on student tuition revenues, were not exempt from making

similar mistakes. Residence hall rooms were often overbooked which resulted in excessive student attrition.

Other institutional policies that protected shared campus experiences of the past, such as weekly convocation, have either been decreased or discontinued altogether. As a consequence, clear distinctions have been created, or at worse, complete separation between curriculum and cocurriculum experiences in student lives, as well as the working relationships between faculty and staff. A sense of isolation and fragmentation in students as a consequence of specialization in academic pursuits, as well as the clear distinctions between their experiences inside and outside the classroom, have fostered disjointed and disconnected lifestyles.

Finally, some colleges have been accused of bowing to constituent pressure for becoming an institution of credentials as opposed to higher learning, particularly in the case of student athletes, which has resulted in some highly publicized allegations of misconduct. Such was the case with the Memphis State University basketball star of the early eighties, who accused the institution of giving him passing grades for work that he did not, or could not do.

Given these conditions, it is fair to ask how well colleges and universities have met the needs of the greater society. Have colleges and universities been slow to adapt to societal changes and therefore contributed to the nation's pessimism that Yankelovich (1993) spoke about to the American Association of Higher Education? Further, as the Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993) has asked "... how well [have] our educational institutions .... [transmitted] an understanding of good and bad, right and wrong, and [the] compelling core of values that any society needs to sustain itself" (p.4)[?]

Increasingly, higher education institutions have recognized there is a problem. The national dialogue has begun through numerous publications and conferences. Boyer's (1990), Campus Life: In Search of Community serves as a premier example. Another illustration is the American Association of Higher Education's 1993 annual conference entitled, "Reinventing Community: Sustaining Improvement During Hard Times."

The ensuing debate, in the six years since the 1990 Carnegie report, has led higher education to reevaluate its priorities and

practices. Consequently, there is a renewed recognition that a balance must be struck between individual independence and shared interdependence through the integrated visions and contributions from all constituents of the past, present, and future. In short, community must be rebuilt on the campus.

John Miller (1994) stated that in both the real world and the Ivory Tower, "the need for community is one of the primary challenges of our time" (p.336). He further stated "that the future of the world depends on our ability to renew ... [a] sense of community ... [and] each of us will live a better life if we move beyond our own individual needs and act ... [for] the welfare of the entire community ... "(p.336).

Parker Palmer (1993), Senior Associate of the American Association of Higher Education, believes that we are called to community in troubled times and consequently take a short sighted approach that results in a "quick fix" for current problems as opposed to long range solutions. To combat the "quick fix" approach Palmer (1993) identifies 3 examples of societal community models in the next subsection that may have some implications for higher

education. Then, in the following subsection two community models for the collegiate environment, one by Palmer and one by Boyer will be discussed. The final subsection will explore the need to create student community assessment strategies.

Societal Models of Community

The first model of community involves a therapeutic model that is built upon creating a high level of trust among participants, which will then facilitate a high level of sharing and interaction that often times may be quite painful. Palmer characterized this practice as "share or die" (p.3). An example of such a model was created by Scott Peck (1987), in his work The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace. Peck's model involves four stages that a group must work through to become a community. The first two stages involve observing societal pleasantries and the beginnings of group power struggles and resulting conflict. Then, the final two stages witness the group moving toward community through a sense of hopelessness and shared pain that ultimately leads toward group acceptance and shared support that serves as the foundation for community development.

The second model of community identified by Palmer (1993), is provided by the business community. New management and leadership philosophies, as well as the latest trends for establishing an effective organization, are examples of building business community. Such models include utilizing strategies of participative management, shared responsibility and authority, as well as shared ownership. Jim Autry (1991), in his work, Love and Profit: the Art of Caring Leadership, serves as an illustration of the second model. Autry believes that managers have the opportunity to establish a sense of community in the work place by creating a bond of common enterprise, based upon friendship, personal connections and a sense of neighborhood. Autry summarized by stating, "if you're not creating community, you're not managing" (p.145).

The third model of community identified by Palmer (1993), involves civic responsibility. Civic responsibility is a realization that there must be a balance between meeting the needs of the individual with meeting the needs of the community. Such a balance creates a tension between individual freedom and collective responsibility and is one of the hallmarks of American democracy.

John Gardner (1990), in his book On Leadership, describes such a community as a place where "... individuals develop integrity and a sense of belonging. It is in communities that values are generated and regenerated. It is community ... that [holds] the individual in a framework of values ... " (p.113).

Collegiate Models of Community

The societal models as identified by Palmer (1993), if adopted either singularly or in a combination, may not assist higher education in establishing a unique model that will meet its corresponding needs. Palmer (1987) elaborates,

> We need a way of thinking about community in higher education that relates it to the central mission of the academy-the generation and transmission of knowledge. The way we think about community in settings of higher learning, ... must be different from the way we think about community in other settings, like civil society, the neighborhood, the church, or the workplace" (p.20).

In contrast to societal models, higher education must generate community models that are sustainable and mutually supportive. Suzanne Morse (1989) describes

> ...in the context of higher education, [community] means that living, organic, environment where faculty, students administrators and townspeople live, work, and act together. In the ideal, it is a community of learners bonded together by common goals" (p.92).

Palmer (1993) views a sustainable model of higher education community as the quest of knowledge in "the grace of great things." In this community model he stated,

> we are centered on knowing the great things of the world-great not because they are noble but because they are real, great because they reveal the world in its wonders and its terrors and its ordinariness, great as seen through the lenses of many methods and disciplines. This knowing, drawn forward in both need and mystery by the compelling quality of 'great things.' It is a form of community that we must name and claim and protect, sometimes against very powerful enemies of ignorance, banality, and hate, enemies without and within the camp. It is a unique and priceless form of community in which our human interactions are both animated and disciplined by the demands of our relation to great things (p.6).

Palmer defines great things as the pursuit of knowledge in the respective disciplines of the humanities, sciences, fine arts, and the social sciences, as well as others. He further stated, "great things" define higher education as a community at its best. "Great things" evoke the communal virtues that make academic life a life worth living and contribute to the health of the larger world.

Palmer stresses the importance of beginning a dialogue involving all constituents of the campus to minimize competing or conflicting interests as well as preventing individual isolation.

Historically, professionals within the Academy have expressed more loyalty to an individual discipline or department than to the institution. As Blenda Wilson (1993), President of California State University, Northridge, pointed out, "...one seriously missing dimension of community in our contemporary universities is the sense of a shared commitment to the institution and its mission" (p.3). She views the dialogue as a key component for creating a community where experimentation, risk and collaboration are accepted and promoted. Therefore, the prevalent sense of isolation and fragmentation among faculty and administrators will be diminished.

Ernest Boyer (1990), in Campus Life: In Search of Community, offers the most comprehensive model of community available for higher education. Boyer embraces a collaborative approach involving all constituents of the institution. Boyer identified two distinct current needs of higher education: the need to begin a national dialogue on community-building; and the need to challenge higher education to define its role in finding ways to build and strengthen the campus community. Specifically, Boyer identified six principles

of community that colleges and universities should implement to define the campus community. The six principles called for ...

> a larger, more integrative vision of community in higher education, one that focuses not on the length of time students spend on campus, but on the quality of the encounter, and relates not only to social activities, but to the classroom, too. The goal as we see it is to clarify both academic and civic standards, and above all, to define with some precision the enduring values that undergird a community of learning (p.7).

The six principles, that a college or university should strive to create are as follows:

1. an educational purposeful community that strives to strengthen teaching and learning on the campus as a result of collaboration among faculty and students.
2. an open community that uncompromisingly protects freedom of expression and strongly encourages civility.
3. a just community, where diversity is pursued aggressively, as well as the individual honored.
4. a disciplined community, where governance procedures clearly define expected behavior for the common good and the individual accepts personal obligations for membership.

5. a caring community that is sensitive to the needs of the individual through mutual support and shared services.

6. a celebrative community that remembers the heritage of the institution and through widely shared rituals and practices respects both tradition and change.

As stated earlier, as a result of both Palmer and Boyer, the national dialogue on community building has begun, and institutions are beginning to look at ways that they may provide leadership in re-establishing community on the campus.

Assessing Campus Community

Eric Dey (1993) states that "most people interested in higher education sense a need to improve community life at our colleges and universities because both students and faculty are fragmenting" (p. 34). Dey notes, however, that some cynics would argue that the concern has generated more talk than action. Michael V. Carter (1996) warns us that "human communities do not just occur. If communities are to be valued as positive and good, by most participants, they require careful planning and implementation. Desirable, positive, and livable communities are created" (p.1-2).

Alexander Astin (1991), believes that higher education institutions maintain assessment practices as a reflection of the values the institution holds. Specifically, he stated that "the role of assessment is to enhance the ... educational program" (p. 130), to better meet the needs of students. Palmer (1987) stated the vital mission and purpose of the academy is to generate and transmit knowledge, which cannot be realized without student participation.

The lack of an instrument to assess students' perceptions of community has numerous implications for higher education. First, given the new increasing external pressure for educational accountability, researchers and college leaders alike, need new tools to assess students' perceptions about their connectedness to the campus. For example, in writing about his department's efforts to recapture community, Robert Secor (1995), states today's media report that ...

> the public is not getting what it thought it was from its investment in higher education. Half of our states have at some level called for closer supervision of higher education, and the others are sure to follow. "Accountability" is the buzzword of the day. External pressures are passed from the media to the public to the state legislators to boards of regents and trustees, and on to the university's high administrators. Those administrators must be responsive... (p.5).

In the spirit of responsiveness, Secor's department had begun to revise its curriculum. His department quickly discovered that they could not agree on what they wanted to provide students. Further, and not surprisingly, the department discovered that because of their differences, they had no idea what students were learning from their curriculum, not to mention, how the students' perceived the curriculum was meeting their needs.

Alexander Astin (1993) warns us that "... there is a significant price to be paid, in terms of the student's affective and cognitive development, when there is a low level of student community on the campus" (p.13). Much like Secor's department, colleges and universities do not currently have enough resources to intentionally assess what they want their students to receive from an increased sense of community on the campus.

If we value community on the campus, then students must become participants in the dialogue because they are key campus constituents affected by the declining state of community on the campus. Otherwise, true campus community will not be created in higher education. We must establish assessment strategies that

will assess the effectiveness of an institution's efforts to create community for students. Consequently, it is appropriate that an instrument to assess students' perceptions of community should be created and field tested. Techniques to develop the instrument are discussed in the next section.

III. SURVEY RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

Fred Kerlinger (1967), in his book Foundations of Behavioral Research stated that survey research follows a flow plan that guides the work of the researcher The plan starts with the researcher identifying and stating the problem as clearly as possible. In the case of this study, the lack of an assessment instrument to assess students' perceptions of community is problematic. Therefore, survey research will be conducted to accomplish 3 objectives:

1. to develop an instrument designed to measure the extent and degree of "community" within colleges and universities for students.
2. to develop validity and reliability indices for the instrument.

3. to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions.

Once the problem and objectives have been identified, as indicated in Chapter 1, there are four steps that must be implemented when conducting survey research.

Instrument Construction and Design

After stating the problem and objectives, the next step in survey research is to conduct a literature review to gather data for the creation of the instrument. Kerlinger (1967) stated "the main task [of the literature review] is to translate the research question into a [questionnaire that may be] ... pre-tested on a small representative sample ... revised and [then] put in final form" (p. 416). Through the literature review, the researcher identifies essential subject items that relate both to the statement of the problem and the study's objectives. Then, these items are formatted as potential questions for the questionnaire.

Earl Babbie (1990) in his book Survey Research Methods, provided 9 steps that serve as a researcher's guide to question construction. Those steps are as follows:

1. formalize each concept into a brief question, and then ask for a response.
2. ask questions that are either open- or close-ended. As scaling techniques, open-ended questions ask respondents to provide their own answers. Likewise, close-ended questions provide respondents with a preset list of answers from which they are to select an answer.
3. make questions clear and unambiguous.
4. avoid asking double-barreled questions, or questions that ask more than one question at a time.
5. ensure that participants are able to respond reliably.
6. ask relevant questions. Ideally, the respondents would care about the answers that the questionnaire has elicited. This concern is controlled by carefully selecting an appropriate sample for the study.
7. ensure that all vocabulary and terms are easily understood by the respondents.
8. avoid negative items, or ensure that negation is used appropriately to prevent questions from being misunderstood.

9. avoid "biased" items and terms. Do not attempt to sway a respondent's selection one way or the other. For example, do not ask respondents to agree with or disagree with a famous person. The respondents' answer may be biased by his/her opinion of the famous person and opposed to responding to the question.

After the questions have been identified, Babbie (1990) identifies 3 other concerns for the construction of the instrument before it is ready to be used in a survey. First, each questionnaire must have clear and explict instructions. Usually, there are general instructions that occur at the beginning of a questionnaire as well as at the beginning of each section or factor of a questionnaire. Often, specific questions require specific instructions for the respondent to accurately select their response. Usually questionnaires' have corresponding cover letters that explain the purpose of the study in greater detail.

The next concern that Babbie (1990) identifies, involves the ordering of questions within the questionnaire. Ideally, initial questions will not frighten the respondent and therefore prevent

him/her from completing the questionnaire. Further, most questionnaires divide into smaller factors, or sections of questions that are grouped around specific content, topic or scaling techniques.

Finally, Babbie (1990) stresses the importance of the questionnaire format. The questionnaire should be arranged in such a format that it is spacious and uncluttered, allowing adequate spacing for the respondent to easily read the questions. Adequate spacing should be provided in the response scale of the instrument.

As discussed previously, there are a number of scaling techniques. One technique is to let the respondent self select his/her answers. In this method, respondents usually answer questions with long or short written responses to the questions. Another technique involves giving the respondent a preset list of answers as previously identified. In this method, respondents usually answer questions by checking a box, or circling a number that reflects the degree they agree or disagree with the question. The scaling technique that is chosen for the questionnaire will impact the tests that are later used to measure the reliability of the

instrument. One of the more popular scaling techniques utilized in questionnaires is the Likert Scale.

Pamela L. Alreck and Robert B. Settle (1985) stated that "Likert scaling is very popular with researchers because of the power and simplicity of the format. The principal advantages of this type of scale include flexibility, economy and ease of composition (p. 134.). Ralph L. Rosnow and Robert Rosenthal (1996), described the steps to create a Likert scale for respondents' answers.

> The first step in developing a Likert scale is to gather a large number of statements on the topic of interest. We give these to a sample of subjects from the target population, who indicate their evaluations, usually by means of a 5-point rating scale. This sorting consists of finding out the extent to which all of the responses to individual statements are correlated with the total score (the sum of the scores for all the items). Statements that correlate well with (i.e., show a strong relationship to) the total score are then chosen for the final scale. The rationale is that statements that have low correlations with the total score will not discriminate those respondents with positive attitudes from those with negative attitudes (p.105).

Once the questionnaire has been created the next step in process is to establish the validity of the questionnaire.

Instrument Validity

Validity is a test of whether a question or an instrument measures the construct the question or test is addressing. Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996) identity 3 types of validity that apply to constructing a questionnaire. These types include content validity, criterion validity and construct validity.

Content validity addresses the extent to which the questionnaire represents the subject matter that it is supposed to represent. Thus, content validity is a basic consideration during the construction phase of an instrument. There are a number of ways to establish content validity. For example, researchers often conduct focus groups with representatives from the population that the questionnaire is designed to survey. At the focus group, the researcher gathers comments from the participants concerning the instrument's design, content and relevance to the population for study. Another and more popular way to establish content validity is to utilize expert representatives from the field of study to review the questionnaire. Like the focus groups, the experts will make

subjective decisions concerning the questionnaire's relevance and appropriateness for the content area.

Criterion validity allows the researcher to test the extent that the questionnaire correlates to one or more outside criteria for which the questionnaire should correlate. For example, a college may develop a satisfaction survey to test the level of satisfaction its students have with the institution. Once the survey results have been tabulated, the institution would compare those results with other correlated variables such as student graduation and retention rates; student occupancy rates in the residence halls; student participation in cocurricular activities; and finally, student overall grade point average. In either case, whether a student is satisfied or not with his/her experience at the institution, there should be a high correlation between the survey scores and these outside outcomes.

Construct validity, like criterion validity, requires the researcher to be concerned with the correlation between the questionnaire and appropriate outside criteria. However, construct validity requires the researcher to be concerned with the correlation

between the questionnaire and inappropriate criteria as well. For example, returning to the illustration utilized for criterion validity, the college may discover that the students that were most satisfied had the highest grade point average. Consequently, the college may conclude that high levels of student satisfaction will guarantee a high student grade point average. However, without further measure, the college cannot be confident about its conclusion. The satisfaction survey was intended to measure student satisfaction, not student grade point avearage. Construct validity allows the researcher to discriminate between the two.

Once validity has been established the next step for the researcher is to estalish instrument reliability.

Instrument Reliability

Reliability is a test of rather a question or an instrument will yield consistent responses among participants in multiple test administrations. Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996) identity 2 types of reliability that apply to constructing a questionnaire. These types include test-retest reliability and internal consistency reliability.

Test-retest reliabilty allows the researcher to discover the degree of fluctuation between the respondents' answers to multiple administrations of the same questionnaire. In order to establish test-retest reliability, the researcher must administer a questionnaire to a group of participants; then, some time later, the researcher would test the same group of participants with the same questionnaire to observe the stability of the instrument. A positive correlation would likely indicate that the instrument is reliable or dependable.

Another method for establishing reliability is to study the internal consistency of the questionnaire. Internal consistency is the degree that the questions within the questionnaire or a section of the questionnaire relate to one another. Internal consistency measures are used when a questionnaire is only administered once. There are two types of internal consistency measures. When a questionnaire answer scale utilizes dichotomous answers: right or wrong, 1 or 2, the Kuder Richardson formula is used. When a questionnaire answer scale utilizes multiple answers: disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, the Cronbach Alpha

formula is utilized. Both formulas test for the correlation among questions within a section - a higher correlation indicates a more reliable questionnaire. The Kuder Richardson and the Cronbach Alpha will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

To obtain data for reliability indices, a field test of the instrument must be implemented. In the next sections, techniques for conducting a field test will be discussed.

Instrument Field Test

The next consideration for survey research is to administer a field test questionnaire to a random sample of the population. Kerlinger (1967) defines the random sample as "the method of drawing a portion (or sample) of a population or universe so that all possible samples of fixed size ['n'] have the same probability of being selected" (p. 118). Therefore, the researcher must follow and provide specific instruction for how the random sample is to be drawn. Once the sample is determined, then data collection procedures may begin.

Data collection methods such as personal, telephone and panel interviews are often effective strategies for survey research. Such

interviews allow for a wide variety of topics to be covered between the respondent and the researcher. However, if a large sample population is utilized, then interview data collection methods may become less effective when compared to other alternatives. One such alternative is to conduct a questionnaire survey with the random samples.

There are many advantages to a survey. The researcher usually maintains more control with a survey as opposed to interviewing. For example, all respondents receive the same instructions for completing the questionnaire. Additionally, surveys are normally less intimidating to the potential respondent. Perhaps the best advantage that a survey provides is the ability to reach a widely dispersed sampling population (either through focus groups or the mail) in an affordable manner.

The survey method is not without some disadvantages. Surveys can take longer to collect data than interview data collection procedures. Different respondents take different amounts of time to respond to the survey. Multiple mailings or meetings may be required to accomplish return rate goals. Some respondents may not

respond at all. As Alreck and Settle (1995) indicated, "... surveys with response rates over 30% are rare. Response rates are often only about 5 or 10 percent" (p. 45). Consequently, the responding sample may have a bias from an over-represented or underrepresented population. This concern will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

The next and final concern in the field test is to analyze the data and report findings. As discussed earlier, the researcher must construct the questionnaire in such a maner that the answer scales may be coded and tabulated.

Alreck and Settle (1985) indicated the Likert scale is a popular way to structure the answer scale. When a field test questionnaire utilizes a Likert scale, reliability may be established through the Cronbach Alpha test. This test establishes the internal consistency of the instrument. In other words, the Cronbach Alpha measures the extent to which individual questions within a scale or section correlate with one another. Correlation scale scores of .70 or higher are normally considered acceptable. Correlation scale scores will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

The Cronbach Alpha test is attractive for several reasons. It does not require a re-test that may be difficult if sampling populations cannot be controlled easily. More importantly, the Cronbach Alpha test was specifically designed for the Likert scale because of the multiple scored responses. Its origins come from the Kuder-Richardson formula that was only designed to be administered with tests whose responses are scored as either right or wrong, or all or nothing.

When processing other data, such as the response averages to individual questions or scales, other analytical techniques are required. For individual questions, measures of central tendency are normally calculated. Once the means are identified, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) measures any significant differences among responses to each question. Once significant differences are identified, further ANOVAs will determine the specific variables where those differences are located. Finally, once the gathered data from the field test is analysized, it is ready to be shared with interested constituents.

As previously indicated, Chapter 3 will explore the specific steps for creating the pilot test questionnaire for this study.

III. CONCLUSION

Colleges and universities must assume leadership for creating, nurturing and assessing community on the college campus. George Kuh (1991), in his article, "Snapshots of Campus Community," expressed the belief that,

> ...faculty, administrators, and students can use the characteristics of [a] healthy [community] as a framework within which to consider how the mission, philosophy, policies, and practices of their own institution contribute to a feeling of community (p.44).

Ernest Boyer (1987) stated "...students must see the connection between what they learn and how they live [in community], looking for the deeper significance, for the moral dilemmas and the ethical responses..." (p.296). Kovach and McDonald (1990), agree and state, "likewise, colleges and universities must begin lessening the distinctions, such as separate and unintergrated lives ..." (p.9). To accomplish this, Boyer (1987) stated that,

> colleges ... should help students become independent, self-reliant human beings, yet also [colleges] should give priority to community. In implementing these two priorities, a balance

> must be struck ... and in so doing, help students move from competence to commitment and be of service to their neighborhoods, the nation, and the world" (pp.296-7).

If Boyer's, as well as other's, goals are to be obtained, new strategies for assessing student perceptions of, and needs for, community are a necessity. Otherwise as, B. F. Skinner (1976) stated in Walden Two Revisited, "either we do nothing and allow a ... catastrophic future to overtake us, or we use our knowledge about human behavior to create a social environment in which we shall live productive and creative lives ..." (p.xvi).

CHAPTER 3.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

Educators must face the challenge of creating and nurturing community in a dynamic campus environment. It may be difficult, however, for educators to meet the challenge as a result of the competing, in some cases conflicting, campus ideologies. For example, two competing campus movements of late, the need to build community among campus constituents and the need to celebrate the ethnicity of campus constituents, may be mutually supportive and destructive. For example, Palmer called us to rekindle our connection with the mission and purpose of our institutions while reestablishing our shared interdependence among faculty, staff and students. Palmer recognized the need to create and nurture community on the campus. Likewise, Schlesinger called us to respect the importance of ethnic recognition. Schlesinger recognized the historical lack of appreciation for minorities' contributions to the society and higher education.

Yet, both Palmer and Schlesinger realized the challenge higher education faced when grappling with these issues. Palmer warned us that community building was difficult. Schlesinger warned us that "ethnic cults" will fragment the nation and the campus. Further, at the heart of these challenges for higher education will be our ability to create strategies for assessing our effectiveness to engage students into community.

Essentially, the purpose of this study was to design the College and University Community Inventory (CUCI) © that will assess students' perceptions of community. Then, a field test of the CUCI © was conducted to establish validity and reliability indices for the instrument; and ascertain if there were discriminating differences among students' responses from different categories of institutions. The CUCI ©, will assist colleges and universities by gathering data based upon students' perceptions of community on the campus. Consequently, an institution will be better prepared to meet the needs and interests of its students. As Erwin (1991) has previously stated, assessment results are best utilized when the source and the audience are the same. Therefore, representatives

from the ranks of students should have an active role in the development of the instrument and the sharing of gathered data.

This chapter presents detailed information on the methodology for designing and constructing the CUCI ©. Also, this chapter presents detailed information on the methodology for acquiring data to establish the validity, reliability and to determine if the CUCI © has discriminating ability among students' responses from different categories.

II. INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Most discussion for the need to build community on the campus, has focused primarily on the faculty and staff. Although faculty and staff are key members of the campus community, and obviously serve as potential leaders to initiate community, community will not be accomplished without having students actively engaged in the community process.

Thus, the original concept of this study focused on the need to create an assessment instrument designed to assess students' perceptions of community on the college campus. Further, once

designed, determine if the instrument would discriminate differential student perceptions of community based upon the institutional variables of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. The remainder of this section will discuss the steps to design and construct the instrument, establish its validity and reliability, and implement the field test.

Instrument Construction and Design

As a preliminary step to constructing the CUCI ©, Dr. Michael K. Smith, former Director of the Clearing House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments, was consulted to ensure that a similar instrument had not already been created. The Student Services & Student Development Assessment Instruments and Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Instruments, compiled by the Clearing House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments was reviewed. The review failed to produce an instrument that assesses student perceptions of community in higher education.

Next, to gather data for the creation of the CUCI ©, a literature review was conducted. Primary sources were Bellah (1985), Boyer (1987) (1990), and Palmer (1993). Further, instrument development

techniques were extracted from the literature. Primary resources were Alreck and Settle (1985), Babbie (1990), Kerlinger (1973) and Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996).

Items that described community and matched the study's definition of community, were extracted for inclusion in a pilot test questionnaire. Individual questions were drafted and grouped into factors. Answer scales that served as a logical extension of the instrument were considered. A final pilot test questionnaire was created. To review the first version of the CUCI ©, please see Appendix I.

The first section of the questionnaire requested demographic data for purposes of potential comparisons among the students participating in the study. The second section contained six categories, with a total of forty questions requesting information to assess students' perceptions of community. The selected categories were labeled "Indicators of Community." Categories included were: Institutional Mission and Curriculum; Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities; Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Institutional Standards and Regulations; Institutional

Service to both Students and Community; and Institutional Rituals and Celebrations. Each category contained approximately seven questions in which students could represent their perceptions by choosing the appropriate response from the Likert Scale. The Likert Scale contained responses ranging from "Not Descriptive" to "Very Descriptive." Finally, questions were alternately referenced positively or negatively in an attempt to minimize students' reading the questionnaire quickly without processing the requested data.

A cover letter accompanied the CUCI ©. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and also further addressed concerns for meeting the University of Tennessee Human Subjects Review Board requirements. For example, the cover letter clearly stated that participation in the study was solely at the discretion of the student. Additionally, the cover letter indicated the author's address, phone numbers, and the name of an institutional contact to address any questions from participants.

Once the pilot test questionnaire was created, the next step of the process was to establish the validity of the instrument.

Instrument Validity

To establish content validity, as described in Chapter 2, the CUCI © questionnaire was submitted to a combination of student focus groups and expert panelists for review. These groups interpreted the meaning of each question to ensure all questions were explicit and elicited the appropriate response. Each group recommended modifications such as additions to, or deletions of, existing questions and categories in the instrument.

At four representative campuses within a specific geographical area, a focus group was conducted with a dozen students. Total participation numbered fifty students. The identities of these institutions are confidential and kept on file with the author. The students were instructed to review the cover letter and the instrument and address the following clusters of questions.

1. Did the cover letter encourage participation? Did the letter clarify participation was optional? Did the letter present information in a clear, concise manner?

Did the students have suggestions for improving the cover letter?

2. Did the instrument's structure make sense? Were the instructions of each section and category clear? Were questions easy to read and logical? Were all terms understandable? Were all questions understandable? Did the students have suggestions for improving the questionnaire?

During the focus group, after completing the demographic section, students wrote comments on the instrument. Individual comments are on file with the author. In general, 8% of students indicated that the CUCI © was too lengthy. Additionally, 8% of students indicated difficulty with both vocabulary and question style. Finally, 18% of students indicated difficulty with the alternating positive and negative responses. Student responses to the cover letter were generally positive. Some students expressed concerns about the length of the letter.

As to individual questions, students varied in their understanding. On many questions, students clearly understood the

question and could make the appropriate response representing their perception. On other questions, students did not understand what was being asked of them. The following questions presented the greatest difficulty: 3, 5, 7, 11, 19 and 22. One-third of these questions had a negative reference.

The most frequent student concern pertained to either vocabulary or the perception that two questions were combined into one. For example, students consistently did not know the meaning of cocurricular in question 5. Additionally, participants consistently identified question 11 as containing two questions.

Two expert panels reviewed the CUCI ©. The first panel consisted of University of Tennessee faculty serving on the committee guiding this study. Data gathered from both panels' feedback was incorporated into the instrument.

The first panel of experts consisted of the Doctoral Committee guiding the study. Committee members at that time were Grady Bogue, Mary Jane Connelly, Joseph Prochaska, Michael Smith and Gerald Ubben. The second panel consisted of national experts in their respective fields. Proposed members for the national expert

panel included: Parker Palmer, Senior Associate for the American Association of Higher Education; Robert Bellah, Ford Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley; Amitai Etzioni, the first University Professor at George Washington University; Jack Schuster, Professor of Education and Public Policy and Head of the Higher Education Program at the Claremont Graduate School; Alexander Astin, Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California-Los Angeles; Marvin Peterson, Professor of Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan; Cameron Fincher, Regents Professor of Higher Education and Psychology and Director of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia; and George Kuh, Professor of Higher Education at Indiana University, Bloomington; and Ernest Boyer, President of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. All national panelists except for Etzioni, Kuh, Palmer and Schuster responded with critiques of the instrument.

Generally, comments made by both groups of panelists mirrored the student comments. All letters are on file with the author. The graduate committee expressed concerns about the length of the CUCI © and the alternate positive and negative reference for questions. Additionally, they indicated that question 11 was two questions combined. However, they did indicate that the CUCI © would measure students' perceptions of community and potentially discriminate among students' responses from different categories of institutions.

The national experts expressed similar concerns. Alexander W. Astin (1994, May) did not understand the author's definition of community. He indicated that some questions were relevant to community while others were not. He indicated that students may have difficulty in the alternate positive and negative responses. He encouraged a consistent positive reference. Finally, he felt that the CUCI © should have two separate measures. He felt that some questions referred to factual or behavioral events or circumstances that were verifiable. Other questions were highly subjective.

However, he acknowledged that all questions addressed student perceptions.

Robert N. Bellah (1994, May) felt the CUCI © covered the relevant dimensions. However, he felt the occasional negative wording of questions was jarring. Although he recognized the sound methodological reasons for alternating positive and negative references, he preferred the positive reference.

Ernest L. Boyer (1994, May) supported the CUCI © and perceived the questions as worth asking. He further stated, "'Community' was once so significant, and like you, I would like to see it regain its rightful place of respect" (pg. 1). He suggested the instrument be shortened and personalized. Further, he suggested choosing different responses for the Likert Scale. He suggested the following responses: Very Well, Well, Somewhat, Not at all.

Carolyn Griswold (1994, May) responded for Dr. Cameron Fincher from the University of Georgia. Ms. Griswold emphasized that the study would be an interesting one. However, she encouraged to make adjustments in the CUCI's © use of jargon and "educationese." For example, she cautioned against vocabulary such

as "common ground" and "cocurricular." She indicated students would not understand the meaning of such terms. Additionally, she strongly emphasized careful use of alternate positive and negative reference in questions. Again, she felt students would not read the questions carefully. Finally, she recommended "Undecided" as an additional response in the Likert Scale. She felt students may not know the answer and need a category to respond accordingly.

Marvin W. Peterson (1994, June) submitted the final response. Dr. Peterson indicated the CUCI © was well conceived and well organized.

The responses from both student focus groups and expert panelists were incorporated into a modified pilot questionnaire. In general, the CUCI was shortened from six pages of vertical text on just the front, to two pages front and back of horizontal text. Questions were shortened without changing the original intent. Finally, the instructions were simplified. The Likert Scale was expanded to five responses ranging from "disagree" to "agree." Also, the instrument's format changed in order to make it more attractive

and easily understood by potential participants. A copy of the CUCI © may be reviewed in Appendix II.

The CUCI © still contained the six aforementioned categories which may be divided into two groups. The first group requested information about the practices of community the institution establishes among its members. This section included the following sections: Institutional Mission and Curriculum; and Institutional Rituals and Celebrations. Such practices demonstrated the institution's commitment to articulating a vision of institutional mission and purpose and the ceremonies reinforcing shared purpose among its members. The second group requested information about the relationships of community the institution establishes among its members. This group included the following sections: Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities; Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Institutional Standards and Regulations; and Institutional Service to both the Students and Community.

The CUCI © was presented to a final focus group of ten students at Carson-Newman College. Additionally, a pilot test was

conducted with a random sample from each of the aforementioned institutions within the specific geographical area. In both the final focus group and the pilot test, students' responses indicated that the revised CUCI © was easily read, understood and completed.

Once the validity of the CUCI © was established, the next step is to begin establishing the reliability of the instrument.

Instrument Reliability

To establish internal consistency, the extent to which individual questions within a factor or section correlate with one another, the Cronbach Alpha test (1951) was administered after data from field test respondents had been collected. Although the field test will not be discussed until the next section, for organizational clarity, the data for testing the reliability of the CUCI © will be presented in this section.

Cronbach Alpha was attractive for several reasons. There was not time to administer a test-retest approach to establish instrument reliability because the sheer volume of participants and sixteen institutions were not easily controlled. For example, some

student participants were graduating and could not be contacted for a retest.

More importantly, the CUCI © used a Likert Scale with several possible selections per question. Thus, the Kuder-Richardson, a test described by Anne Anastasi (1988) as the most common procedure for establishing internal consistency when an instrument is only administered once, is not applicable. In her book, Psychological Testing, Anastasi stated that

> the Kuder-Richardson formula is applicable to tests whose items are scored as right or wrong, or according to some other all-or-none system. Some other tests, however, may have multiple-scored items .... [where] the respondent may [select] a different numerical score on an item ... For such tests, a generalized formula has been derived, known as coefficient alpha (p.124).

Coefficient alpha is found by finding the variance of all responses for each item and then adding these variances across all items in the scale. Coefficient reliability estimates for each scale exceeded .70, ranging from .78 to .90. Writing in his book, Psychometric Theory, Jum C. Nunnally (1978) indicated for scales used in research, a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is acceptable. Reliability coefficients of less than .70 are generally

inadequate. Upon further discussion with Dr. Donald J. Dessart, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Tennessee, he indicated that the obtained coefficient alphas for the CUCI © were considered "reasonably high scores." Consequently, individual questions within each scale of the CUCI © were found to have an acceptable-to-high correlation with one another as are reported in Table 1. Thus, the internal consistency of the instrument was found to be reliable.

Now that the reliability of the CUCI © has been determined, the next section will review the remaining steps for conducting the field test.

Instrument Field Test

The purpose of the field test was to gather data for establishing instrument reliability and to discover whether the instrument would gather discriminating data from students' responses representing different institutional regional locations, size and Carnegie Classifications. Student participants for the purpose of this study were restricted to students, regardless of classification, that have attended their respective institution for at

Table 1. Intercorrelations and Coefficient Alpha Reliability Estimates for the CUCI ©

Instrument Section	Number of Questions	Total Variance	Sum of Var. of Ind. Items	Reliability
Mission & Curriculum (1-7)	7	96.075	31.782	.781
Membership Rights & Resp. (8-13)	6	26.255	8.657	.804
Respect for Diversity & Individual. (14-19)	6	27.506	9.444	.788
Standards & Regulations (20-26)	7	39.362	10.547	.854
Service to Students & Community (27-32)	6	37.969	9.391	.903
Rituals & Celebration. (33-37)	5	83.690	28.080	.831

least one semester. Sample size was set at 100 students.

Clusters of four institutions in the following geographical regions - Northeast, Southeast, Midwest and West - were selected to field test the CUCI ©. Each institution represented one of the aforementioned Carnegie Classifications - Research University I & II., Comprehensive University I & II., Comprehensive College I & II.,

and 2 - year schools were selected to participate. Finally, each institution represented either a large institution (4,000 and above), or a small institution (3,999 or below) as defined by the author.

Participating institutions had the opportunity to maintain their identity in confidence. The names of all institutions are kept on file by the author. In either case, participating institutions did not endorse or sponsor the work of this study. Participating institutions included:

1. Research University I & II:

   Requested Confidence, Northeast.

   Requested Confidence, Midwest.

   Requested Confidence, West.

   University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

2. Comprehensive University I & II:

   Bowling Green State University, Ohio.

   Plymouth State College, Maine.

   Seattle University, Washington.

   University of North Alabama.

3. Comprehensive College I & II:

Evergreen State College, Washington.

Illinois Benedictine College, Illinois.

Lenoir-Rhyne College, North Carolina.

Requested Confidence, Northeast.

4. 2-year Junior, Community or Technical Institute:

Edmonds Community College, Washington.

Joliet Junior College, Illinois.

NH Technical College, New Hampshire.

Truett-McConnell College, Georgia.

Each institution was contacted about conducting the study. In every case, an institutional human subject review was submitted and accepted. Each institution received specific guidelines for drawing a random sample of students from their campus. Ninety-four percent of participating institutions forwarded student addresses for the study. One institution maintained its random sample confidentially. In that case, the institution processed the initial and subsequent mailings.

The initial mailings began in February, 1995. Sixteen hundred surveys were distributed to the students that were selected by the host institutions. Two follow-up mailings occurred, one in late March and one in early May. As agreed upon with the doctoral committee chair, a 25% return rate was the target goal for this study. By the beginning of June, 28% (n=445) of the students had participated in the national pilot test by returning a completed instrument. The pilot test surpassed the 25% return rate goal during the second mailing in May.

Students from the Southeast (30%) and West (30%) participated at greater levels than the Midwest and Northeast whose return rates were 25%. Students from the Research Universities, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges, on average had a 30% return rate. Responses from two-year institutions averaged 22%. Finally, 49% of the students attended a large institution, while 51% attended a small institution.

Chapter 4 will summarize the significant differences among students' responses to the CUCI © field test in greater detail. In retrospect, however, this field test would have been enhanced if

other data had been considered. Chapter 5 will address this concern in greater detail in the Recommendations for Future Research section.

CHAPTER 4.

CUCI © FIELD TEST RESULTS

I. INTRODUCTION

For purposes of gathering data for establishing reliability of the CUCI ©, and to gather data about the CUCI's © ability to discriminate between students' responses from different categories of institutions, a field test was conducted. This chapter presents the findings from the national field test of the instrument.

In review, the CUCI © contains the six aforementioned categories as initially described on pages 60 - 61. Generally, the categories may be divided into two groups. The first group requests information about the practices of community the institution establishes among its members. Such practices demonstrate the institution's commitment to articulating a vision of institutional mission and purpose and the ceremonies celebrated to reinforce shared purpose among its members. This group includes: Institutional Mission and Curriculum; and Institutional Rituals and Celebrations.

The second group requests information about the relationships of community the institution establishes among its members. Such relationships demonstrate the individual's level of engagement with the institution as well as other institution constituents. This group includes: Institutional Membership and Responsibilities; Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Institutional Standards and Regulations; and Institutional Service to both the Students and Community.

Selected institutions represented one of the aforementioned Carnegie Classifications and regional locations. Further, selected institutions were categorized as either large (4,000 and above), or small (3999 and below).

II. DATA ANALYSIS

There were three measurements implemented in analyzing the data gathered from the CUCI © field test. First, central tendency measures were calculated to determine students' responses to all 37 questions in the instrument. Then, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) measured any significant differences among students'

responses for each question based upon their institutional characteristics of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. Finally, once significant differences were identified, additional ANOVAs were run to determine the specific institutions where those differences were located.

III. FIELD TEST RESULTS

There were a number of significant differences among students from institutions representing different regions of the country, different sizes and different Carnegie Classifications. As a general overview, the region of the country in which the institution was located caused the greatest level of significant differences with 81% of the questions identifying significant differences among student responses. These differences may be viewed in Table 2. The institution's size caused the least impact with only 27% of the questions identifying significant differences among students' responses as Table 3 indicates. Finally, Table 4 indicates that the institution's Carnegie Classification caused the second highest level

Table 2. CUCI © Institutional Region Mean Scores

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
1	Academic Excellence	4.24	4.36	4.21	4.03	4.21	2.69	*
2	Creative Teaching	3.57	3.85	3.31	3.80	3.63	5.87	* *
3	Supportive Environment	3.89	3.85	3.78	3.95	3.90	0.74	
4	Community Activities	3.21	3.45	2.90	2.99	3.14	4.49	* *
5	Connective Learning	3.41	3.48	3.32	3.20	3.35	1.19	
6	Core Curriculum	3.81	4.11	3.62	3.76	3.83	4.70	* *
7	Core Values	3.83	3.96	3.57	3.78	3.79	2,12	
8	Freedom of Speech	3.39	3.82	3.62	3.91	3.69	4.04	* *
9	Speak & Listen Well	3.81	3.88	3.63	4.06	3.85	2.64	*
10	Trusting Environment	3.62	3.79	3.23	3.57	3.55	4.42	* *
11	Language/ Behavior	2.07	2.17	2.33	2.37	2.24	1.60	
12	Acceptance of Differences	3.35	3.99	3.31	3.94	3.65	12.61	* *
13	Climate of Civility	3.86	4.06	3.35	3.95	3.81	8.89	* *

Table 2.
(cont.)

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
14	Fair Environment	3.77	3.85	3.37	3.84	3.71	4.00	* *
15	Stated Goals	3.12	3.38	3.00	3.33	3.21	2.27	
16	Encourages Programming	3.67	3.90	3.53	3.83	3.73	2.06	
17	Defines Responsibility	3.53	3.75	3.25	3.47	3.50	3.41	*
18	Exclusive Organizations	2.82	3.27	3.08	2.82	3.00	3.37	*
19	Societal Model	2.84	3.53	3.14	3.67	3.30	11.01	* *
20	Standards for Conduct	3.96	4.12	3.64	3.50	3.81	7.18	* *
21	Addresses Crime	3.77	3.86	3.23	3.09	3.49	12.61	* *
22	Decision Making	3.88	4.04	3.59	3.68	3.80	3.75	*
23	Student Review Board	3.19	3.65	2.90	3.39	3.28	6.56	* *
24	Investigation Procedures	3.37	3.89	3.08	3.15	3.37	10.70	* *
25	Acknowledge Obligations	3.51	3.78	3.18	3.28	3.43	6.35	

Table 2.
(cont.)

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
26	Faculty Model Values	3.59	3.72	3.24	3.28	3.47	4.51	* *
27	Supportive Relationships	3.75	3.93	3.30	3.75	3.68	5.48	* *
28	Academic Services	4.03	3.99	3.69	3.75	3.87	2.27	
29	Balanced Loyalty	3.52	3.66	3.13	3.12	3.36	6.59	* *
30	Connects to Life	3.49	3.78	3.23	3.85	3.59	5.98	* *
31	Community Service	3.66	3.65	3.11	3.56	3.50	4.48	* *
32	Concern for Students	3.70	3.88	3.18	3.62	3.60	5.88	* *
33	Shares History	3.42	4.10	3.15	3.56	3.56	11.08	* *
34	Institutional Heritage	3.16	4.06	3.06	3.18	3.37	15.77	* *
35	Accomplish-ments	3.56	4.20	3.48	3.52	3.69	8.69	* *
36	Students Know Alumni	3.23	3.96	3.13	2.91	3.31	15.41	* *
37	Students' Heritage	2.98	3.82	3.59	3.79	3.55	10.86	* *

Notes: * represents .05 significance level
* * represents .01 significance level

Table 3. CUCI © Institutional Size Mean Scores

Question	Description	Large	Small	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
1	Academic Excellence	4.15	4.24	4.20	1.02	
2	Creative Teaching	3.41	3.81	3.61	14.20	* *
3	Supportive Environment	3.82	3.95	3.89	1.67	
4	Community Activities	3.04	3.26	3.15	3.27	
5	Connective Learning	3.53	3.19	3.36	8.01	* *
6	Core Curriculum	3.71	3.91	3.81	3.26	
7	Core Values	3.54	3.98	3.76	14.41	* *
8	Freedom of Speech	3.91	3.56	3.73	7.65	* *
9	Speak & Listen Well	3.94	3.80	3.87	1.56	
10	Trusting Environment	3.45	3.66	3.56	3.46	
11	Language/ Behavior	2.30	2.23	2.26	0.30	
12	Acceptance of Differences	3.73	3.63	3.68	0.77	
13	Climate of Civility	3.82	3.78	3.80	0.17	
14	Fair Environment	3.63	3.78	3.71	1.57	
15	Stated Goals	3.27	3.17	3.22	0.66	

Table 3
(continued)

Question	Description	Large	Small	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
16	Encourages Programming	3.76	3.73	3.74	0.08	
17	Defines Responsibility	3.43	3.59	3.51	2.08	
18	Exclusive Organizations	3.06	2.99	3.02	0.33	
19	Societal Model	3.33	3.30	3.32	0.04	
20	Standards for Conduct	3.70	3.85	3.77	1.75	
21	Addresses Crime	3.51	3.42	3.47	0.60	
22	Effective Decision Making	3.71	3.86	3.79	1.84	
23	Student Review Board	3.24	3.37	3.31	0.98	
24	Investigation Procedures	3.40	3.34	3.37	0.24	
25	Acknowledge Obligations	3.33	3.55	3.44	3.71	*
26	Faculty Model Values	3.27	3.58	3.43	6.66	* *
27	Supportive Relationships	3.46	3.87	3.67	11.25	* *

Table 3
(continued)

Question	Description	Large	Small	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
28	Academic Services	3.40	3.95	3.83	4.22	*
29	Balanced Loyalty	3.32	3.39	3.36	0.43	
30	Connects Academics to Life	3.37	3.79	3.59	11.60	*
31	Community Service	3.36	3.55	3.46	2.04	
32	Concern for Students	3.30	3.83	3.57	18.05	* *
33	Shares History	3.43	3.62	3.53	1.96	
34	Institutional Heritage	3.31	3.38	3.35	0.32	
35	Accomplish-ments	3.78	3.63	3.70	1.38	
36	Students to Alumni	3.29	3.33	3.31	0.07	
37	Students' Heritage	3.67	3.48	3.57	1.92	

Notes: * represents .05 significance level
* * represents .01 significance level

Table 4. CUCI © Institutional Carnegie Classification Mean Scores

Question	Description	Research University I & II.	Comp. University I & II.	Comp. College I & II.	2-yr School	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
1	Academic Excellence	4.16	4.19	4.35	4.08	4.21	1.66	
2	Creative Teaching	3.43	3.52	4.02	3.55	3.64	7.99	* *
3	Supportive Environment	3.74	3.96	4.06	3.86	3.91	2.00	
4	Community Activities	2.80	3.35	3.16	3.35	3.15	5.31	* *
5	Connective Learning	3.45	3.57	3.19	3.19	3.35	2.90	*
6	Core Curriculum	3.59	3.97	4.12	3.60	3.84	6.69	* *
7	Core Values	3.38	3.87	4.23	3.62	3.79	13.44	* *
8	Freedom of Speech	4.03	3.83	3.32	3.56	3.69	7.81	* *
9	Speak & Listen Well	3.99	3.89	3.79	3.70	3.85	1.27	
10	Trusting Environment	3.46	3.56	3.65	3.61	3.57	0.61	
11	Language/ Behavior	2.23	2.35	2.22	23.09	2.23	0.81	
12	Acceptance of Differences	3.77	3.67	3.63	3.55	3.66	0.65	
13	Climate of Civility	3.77	3.99	3.71	3.84	3.83	1.39	

Table 4. (cont.)

Question	Description	Research University I & II.	Comp. University I & II.	Comp. College I & II.	2-yr School	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
14	Fair Environment	3.55	3.83	3.70	3.83	3.72	1.49	
15	Stated Goals	3.31	3.18	3.28	3.06	3.22	0.93	*
16	Encourages Programming	3.56	3.95	3.87	3.53	3.74	3.41	*
17	Defines Responsibility	3.23	3.69	3.68	3.43	3.51	4.55	*
18	Exclusive Organizations	2.94	3.23	2.96	2.79	2.99	2.07	
19	Societal Model	3.19	3.52	3.28	3.18	3.30	1.79	
20	Standards for Conduct	3.63	3.86	3.98	3.72	3.81	2.13	
21	Addresses Crime	3.53	3.59	3.35	3.56	3.50	0.96	
22	Decision Making	3.56	4.00	3.87	3.75	3.80	3.43	*
23	Student Review Board	3.29	3.31	3.28	3.34	3.30	0.03	
24	Investigation Procedures	3.47	3.44	3.33	3.26	3.38	0.68	
25	Acknowledge Obligations	3.32	3.52	3.48	3.48	3.44	0.67	
26	Faculty Model Values	3.20	3.55	3.63	3.48	3.46	3.06	*

Table 4. (cont.)

Question	Description	Research University I & II.	Comp. University I & II.	Comp. College I & II.	2 - yr School	Grand Mean	F Value	Significance
27	Supportive Relationships	3.25	3.85	4.04	3.69	3.70	10.74	* *
28	Academic Services	3.67	3.85	4.06	3.89	3.87	2.25	
29	Balanced Loyalty	3.16	3.48	3.47	3.31	3.36	2.11	
30	Connects to Life	3.16	3.74	3.87	3.63	3.60	8.36	* *
31	Community Service	3.16	3.67	3.79	3.35	3.51	6.68	* *
32	Concern for Students	3.16	3.64	3.99	3.64	3.61	9.51	* *
33	Shares History	3.47	3.47	3.91	3.37	3.58	4.16	* *
34	Institutional Heritage	3.36	3.37	3.71	3.95	3.38	5.90	* *
35	Accomplish-ments	3.73	3.86	3.82	3.30	3.71	3.92	* *
36	Students to Alumni	3.25	3.38	3.51	3.00	3.31	2.76	*
37	Students' Heritage	3.58	3.69	3.49	3.36	3.54	1.14	

Notes: * represents .05 significance level
* * represents .01 significance level

of significant differences with 51% of the questions identifying significant differences among students' responses.

When selecting a response to individual questions, students usually selected either "neutral" or "somewhat agree" as their choice. An apparent exception was students' responses to question 11 in which they generally selected "somewhat disagree." Question 11, however, addressed the students' perceptions of their institution's stance on allowing offensive language or behavior that inhibits student learning. Ideally, institutions that intend to build a sense of community on the campus would not allow such behavior. Students' responses to this question seem to support this assumption.

The remainder of this chapter will identify the specific location of the significant differences among student responses within each variable, institutional regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. Due to the extensive significant findings among student responses, the remaining data will be arranged and analyzed per each of the six instrument scales for presentation. Only questions that solicited significant differences among student

responses will be identified. Consequently, the reader will notice the omission of questions in the remaining tables that did not solicit significant differences among student responses. The same will apply to omissions among specific institutional variable scales that did solicit significant differences among student responses. Finally, to further simplify the data presentation, each table will represent only one of the institutional characteristics of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. For example, the first scale, Institutional Mission and Curriculum solicited significant differences among student responses for each of the institutional characteristics: regional location, size and Carnegie Classification as indicated on pages 93 - 95. A review of the table on page 93 will reveal that there was a significant difference between student responses from the Southeast and the West for question 1. Likewise, for question 2, there were significant differences between student responses from the Northeast and the Southeast, Southeast and the Midwest, Midwest and the West. Question 3 did not solicit significant differences among student responses from

institutions in different regions of the country. Therefore, question 3 was omitted from the table.

Institutional Mission and Curriculum

Generally, students' responses indicated that their colleges were committed to academic excellence, that faculty engaged students through creative teaching and the college created a supportive environment for student learning. Also, students responded positively that their institution had a well-planned core curriculum, stated philosophy and a set of core values. Student perceptions were neutral concerning the institution's ability to provide opportunities to bring the entire campus together and connect student experiences inside and outside of the class through cocurricular programs and support services.

Table 5 indicates the significant differences among students from the four regions. Students' responses from the Southeast regions scored consistently higher on every question than students from the other regions. Questions 3 and 5 were omitted because there were no significant differences among any students' responses; however, students still affirmed their institution's efforts to create a supportive learning environment. Students'

Table 5. Regional Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
1	Academic Excellence		4.36		4.03	P.010
2	Creative Teaching	3.57	3.85			P.029
			3.85	3.31		P.000
				3.31	3.80	P.001
4	Community Activities	3.21		2.90		P.058
			3.45	2.90		P.001
			3.45		2.99	P.005
6	Core Curriculum	3.81	4.11			P.009
			4.11	3.62		P.000
			4.11		3.76	P.009
7	Core Values		3.96	3.57		P.009

responses, including those from the Southeast, were more neutral to their institution's efforts to connect student learning experiences inside and outside of class.

Table 6 indicates the significant differences from student responses at small and large institutions. Students at small institutions perceived that their institution did a better job of engaging students through creative teaching and better defined a set of core values. However, students at large institutions perceive that their institution provides better programs to connect in-class and out-of-class experiences. This is not surprising, since large

Table 6. Size Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences

Question	Description	Large	Small	P Value
2	Creative Teaching	3.41	3.81	P.000
5	Connects Students' Learning Experiences	3.53	3.19	P.005
7	Core Values	3.54	3.98	P.000

institutions usually have more resources with which to meet students' needs outside of the classroom.

Questions 1, 3, 4 and 6 were omitted since students' responses did not indicate any significant differences based upon the size of the institution. Students at both small and large institutions affirmed their institutions' efforts to commit to academic excellence and create a supportive environment for student learning. These students were neutral about their institutions' efforts to provide opportunities to bring the entire campus together. However, small school students' responses still scored higher than their large school counterparts.

The Carnegie Classification variable facilitated the greatest variance for this section. Table 7 indicates the significant differences from students at institutions representing different Carnegie Classifications. Students at a Comprehensive University

and Comprehensive College, consistently gave higher responses than students at either a Research University or a 2-year Institution. All students affirmed that their institution is committed to academic excellence. From there, opinions vary as to the effectiveness of engaging students and creating supportive environments. For example, Comprehensive College students responded that their

Table 7. Carnegie Classification Institutional Mission and Curriculum Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
1	Academic Excellence			4.35	4.09	P.047
2	Creative Teaching	3.43		4.02		P.000
			3.52	4.02		P.000
				4.02	3.55	P.000
3	Supportive Environment	3.74		4.06		P.000
4	Community Activities	2.80	3.36			P.000
		2.80		3.16		P.018
		2.80			3.35	P.002
5	Connects Students' Learning Experiences		3.57	3.19		P.011
			3.57		3.19	P.039
6	Core Curriculum	3.59	3.98			P.006
		3.59		4.12		P.000
			3.98		3.61	P.028
				4.12	3.61	P.002
7	Core Values	3.38	3.87			P.001
		3.38		4.23		P.000
			3.87	4.23		P.000
				4.23	3.62	P.000

institution engages students through creative teaching and intellectual activities with faculty. Students' responses from Research Universities, Comprehensive Universities and 2-year institutions were neutral concerning their institutions' faculty engaging students through creative teaching. Likewise, students' responses from comprehensive colleges were higher when addressing questions about their institutions' core curriculum and core values. Comprehensive University students' responses, however, were higher when addressing questions concerning their institutions' efforts to provide opportunities to bring the entire campus together and connect students' learning experiences inside and outside of class. Overall, student responses from Comprehensive colleges were higher and more affirming than students' responses from the remaining institutions.

Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities

Students' responses affirmed that their institution encourages and values freedom of speech, students speaking and listening to one another and creates an environment where students, faculty and staff trust one another. Students' responses indicated that their

institution does not allow offensive language or behavior that inhibits student learning. Further, students' responses affirmed that their institution encourages students to develop an understanding and acceptance of individual differences. Also, students' responses affirm that their institution creates a climate of civility on campus and protects the dignity of students, staff and faculty.

Students' responses based upon regional location are displayed in Table 8. Once again, students from the Southeast generally gave higher responses and indicated that they more strongly accepted the expectations that their institutions placed upon students. Conversely, students from the Midwest consistently gave lower responses than the other regions and are more neutral about their institution's expectations for students. Students' responses from the West and the Northeast were very similar and fell between students' responses from the Southeast and those from the Midwest respectively.

Question 11 was omitted because it did not solicit significant differences among student responses. However,

Table 8. Regional Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
8	Freedom of Speech	3.39	3.82			P.007
		3.39			3.91	P.002
9	Speak & Listen Well			3.63	4.06	P.008
10	Trusting Environment	3.62		3.23		P.009
			3.79	3.23		P.000
				3.23	3.57	P.041
12	Acceptance of Differences	3.35	3.99			P.000
		3.35			3.94	P.000
			3.99	3.31		P.000
				3.31	3.94	P.000
13	Climate of Civility	3.86		3.35		P.001
			4.06	3.35		P.000
				3.35	3.95	P.000

students' responses in every region disagreed that their institution allows offensive language or behavior that inhibits student learning. The students from the Northeast scored the strongest opposition to this question.

Table 9 indicates the significant differences among responses

Table 9. Size Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences

Question	Description	Large	Small	P Value
8	Freedom of Speech	3.91	3.57	P.006

from large and small institutions. Institutional size had minimal impact on students' responses for this section. Students at both size institutions affirm that their institutions encourage freedom of speech and written expressions as an example of institutional values. However, student responses from large institutions were generally higher than their counterparts at smaller institutions. For example, students' responses from large institutions more highly affirm their institution's efforts to encourage freedom of speech, effective communication, acceptance of individual differences and a climate of civility, than those responses from smaller institutions. However, students' responses from small institutions more highly affirm their institution's efforts to create an environment where faculty, staff and students trust one another.

Like institutional size, Carnegie Classification had little impact on students' responses for this section. Table 10 indicates the significant differences from students at institutions representing different Carnegie Classifications. Students at Comprehensive Colleges were the only students who felt neutral concerning their institution's ability to encourage freedom of speech

Table 10. Carnegie Classification Institutional Membership Rights and Responsibilities Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
8	Freedom of Speech	4.03		3.32		P.000
		4.03			3.56	P.005
			3.83	3.32		P.002
13	Climate of Civility		3.99	3.72		P.058

as an institutional value. Students' responses from the Research Universities affirm their institution's efforts to promote freedom of speech. Likewise, students at Comprehensive Universities felt the strongest about their institution's ability to create a climate of civility on campus. Additionally, students' responses from Research Universities and Comprehensive Universities scored higher than students' responses from the Comprehensive College and 2-year institutions.

Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality

Responses to diversity issues were both positive and neutral. Students affirm that their college rejects prejudicial practices and judgments; and maintains an environment that is both equitable and fair. Additionally, students somewhat agree that their college

encourages social and educational programming for all students and defines student responsibilities for creating a civil environment. However, students were neutral when understanding the institution's goals for minority recruitment, pursuing diversity as a model for society, or the institutional role in supporting organizations that are exclusive in membership.

Table 11. Regional Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
14	Fair Environment	3.77		3.37		P.008
			3.85	3.37		P.003
				3.37	3.84	P.007
15	Stated Goals		3.38	3.01		P.021
16	Encourages Programming		3.90	3.53		P.026
17	Defines Responsibility		3.57	3.26		P.002
18	Supports Exclusive Organizations	2.82	3.27			P.007
			3.27		2.82	P.011
19	Societal Model	2.84	3.53			P.000
		2.84			3.67	P.000
			3.53	3.14		P.024
				3.14	3.67	P.002

Table 11 indicates the significant student regional differences for the Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality section. Midwest student responses continue be more neutral than the

remaining regions. The only response that Midwest students affirmed pertained to the institution's ability to encourage social and educational programming for all students. The Southeast continues to score higher than the other regions. However, the students' responses from the West were very similar to the responses from the Southeast. The only differences between these two regions were on questions 18 and 19. The Southeast students were more likely to feel that their institution supported organizations that were exclusive in membership. Generally, students from the West, more than students from the Southeast, felt their institutions did a good job of pursuing institutional diversity as a model for the nation. However, these differences were not large enough to be significant.

Institutional size did not make a significant difference in student responses for the Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality section. Students' responses from both types of institutions were very similar. Students affirmed their institution's efforts to have a fair environment and provide social and educational programming. Likewise, students' responses were

neutral concerning their institution's efforts to set goals for minority enrollment, support of exclusive organizations and ability to serve as a societal role model for diversity. As to their institution's abilities to define student responsibility for creating a civil environment, students' responses from large institutions were neutral, while students' responses from small institutions affirmed their institution's efforts. Again, this difference was not significant.

Carnegie Classification did impact student responses in this section. As Table 12 indicates there were a number of significant

Table 12. Carnegie Classification Institutional Respect for Diversity and Individuality Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
14	Fair Environment	3.55	3.83			P.058
16	Encourages Programming	3.57	3.95			P.009
		3.57		3.87		P.046
			3.95		3.53	P.015
17	Defines Responsibility	3.23	3.69			P.001
		3.23		3.68		P.002
18	Supports Exclusive Organizations		3.23		2.79	P.015
19	Societal Model	3.19	3.52			P.036
			3.52		3.18	P.041

differences. Generally, students at Comprehensive Universities affirmed their institution's abilities to address the needs and goals of all students, particularly in the areas of creating a fair environment, encouraging social and educational programming for all students and defining student responsibility for creating a civil environment. Likewise, students' responses from Comprehensive Colleges affirmed their institution's efforts for creating a fair environment and defining students' responsibilities for creating a civil environment. Students' responses from the remaining institutions were more neutral in their responses.

Institutional Standards and Regulations

Students affirmed that their institution expects high standards of conduct both inside and outside the classroom. Also, students agree that their institution encourages students to adopt effective decision making skills and accept the responsibility for those decisions. However, students were neutral about the institution addressing student criminal acts and involving students in creating and evaluating policies, procedures and codes of student conduct. Likewise, student responses were more neutral about the

institution's ability to: provide appropriate investigation procedures and review boards to prosecute alleged student infractions; encourage students to acknowledge their obligations to the campus community; and finally, encourage faculty and staff to effectively model institutional values and standards in their professional lives.

Southeast students continue to be an exception. Their mean score responses were more positive and they affirm every question within the section. Notable differences were their institution's ability to involve students in the creation and evaluation of policies as well as provide appropriate investigation procedures for alleged student infractions. Table 13 indicates the significant student regional differences for Institutional Standards and Regulations.

Once again, institutional size had little impact on student responses as Table 14 indicates. Students at small institutions were stronger in their convictions that their institutions encourage students to acknowledge their obligation to the campus community for which they are a member. Likewise, students at small institutions were stronger in their convictions that their institutions encourage faculty and staff to effectively model

Table 13. Regional Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
20	High Standards for Student Conduct	3.96		3.64		P.045
		3.96			3.50	P.004
			4.12	3.64		P.001
			4.12		3.50	P.000
21	Addressess Criminal Activities	3.77		3.23		P.001
		3.77			3.09	P.000
			3.86	3.23		P.000
			3.86		3.09	P.000
22	Effective Decision Making Skills	3.88		3.59		P.040
			4.04	3.59		P.003
			4.04		3.68	P.017
23	Involves Students in Code of Conduct	3.19	3.65			P.007
			3.65	2.90		P.000
				2.90	3.39	P.006
24	Appropriate Investigation Procedures	3.37	3.89			P.001
			3.89	3.08		P.000
			3.89		3.15	P.000
25	Students Acknowledge Obligations	3.51		3.18		P.034
			3.78	3.18		P.000
			3.78		3.28	P.001
26	Faculty Model Institutional Values	3.59		3.24		P.014
		3.59			3.28	P.043
			3.72	3.24		P.003
			3.72		3.28	P.009

Table 14. Size Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences

Question	Description	Large	Small	P Value
25	Students Acknowledge Obligations	3.33	3.55	P.055
26	Faculty Model Institutional Values	3.27	3.58	P.010

institutional values and standards in their professional and personal lives.

Table 15 indicates the significant differences from students at different Carnegie Classifications. Where there were differences, students at Comprehensive Universities or Colleges usually scored the highest, 2- year institutions were third, with Research Universities scoring last. Students at Research Universities consistently scored in last place for this section.

Table 15. Carnegie Classification Institutional Standards and Regulations Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
20	High Standards for Student Conduct	3.64		3.98		P.016
22	Effective Decision Making	3.57	4.00			P.001
		3.57		3.88		P.025
26	Faculty Model Institutional Values	3.20	3.55			P.020
		3.20		3.63		P.006

Institutional Service to both Students and Community

Overall, students feel that their college provides for the well being of students and surrounding community. Students affirm that their college encourages faculty and students to build supportive relationships; and addresses student needs through academic support programs, extended office hours and facility access. Also, students affirm that their college encourages faculty to exhibit a personal concern for students; and encourages students to connect academic pursuits to everyday life in order to make a contribution to society. Student responses were neutral as to their college's abilities to encourage students to maintain a proper balance of loyalty between student organizations and the college's mission. Student responses were also neutral about their college's abilities to encourage students and faculty to provide service to the community.

Midwest students continue to score lower than the other regions. For example, Midwest students were neutral concerning their institution's efforts to encourage students to connect academic pursuits to everyday life as well as provide service to the

community. Table 16 indicates the significant student regional responses to Institutional Service to both Students and Community. Southeast students continue to score higher than students from other regions.

Institutional size did impact students' responses in the Institutional Service to Both Students and Community section. Generally, students at smaller institutions affirmed that their

Table 16. Regional Institutional Service to both Students and Community Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
27	Supportive Relationships	3.75		3.30		P.004
			3.93	3.30		P.000
				3.30	3.75	P.010
28	Academic Support Programs	4.03		3.69		P.039
		4.03			3.75	P.058
29	Balanced Loyalty	3.52		3.13		P.007
		3.52			3.12	P.007
			3.66	3.13		P.001
			3.66		3.12	P.001
30	Connects Academics to Life	3.49			3.85	P.019
			3.78	3.23		P.001
				3.23	3.85	P.000
31	Provides Community Service	3.66		3.11		P.001
			3.65	3.11		P.002
				3.11	3.56	P.010
32	Personal Concerns for Students	3.70		3.18		P.002
			3.88	3.18		P.000
				3.18	3.62	P.016

institutions provide for the well being of students and the surrounding community. Students at larger institutions were more neutral in their responses. Like midwestern students, large school students' responses were neutral concerning their institution's efforts to connect classroom learning to everyday life. Additionally, large school students' responses were neutral concerning the institution's ability to encourage students and faculty to provide service to the community and ability to encourage faculty to exhibit personal concerns for students. Students at both large and small institutions affirmed their institution's efforts to address student needs through academic support programs. Likewise, students at both types of institutions were neutral concerning the institution's efforts to have students maintain a balance of loyalty between student organizations and the institution's mission. Table 17

Table 17. Size Institutional Service To Both Students and Community Significant Differences

Question	Description	Large	Small	P Value
27	Supportive Relationships	3.47	3.87	P.001
28	Academic Support Programs	3.70	3.95	P.041
30	Connects Academics to Life	3.38	3.79	P.001
32	Personal Concerns for Students	3.30	3.84	P.000

indicates the significant differences among student responses from large and small institutions.

Institutional Carnegie Classification did have an impact on students' responses to each question in this section. Once again, students at Comprehensive Colleges and Comprehensive Universities continue to score higher than students at Research Universities and 2-year schools. In fact, the only question that students' responses from Research Universities affirmed pertained to the institution's ability to address student needs through academic support programs. All other students' responses from Research Universities were neutral. While students' responses from 2-year institutions were not as strong as those from students at Comprehensive Colleges and Universities, they still affirmed their institution's efforts to provide for the well being of students and the surrounding community. Table 18 indicates the significant difference from students at institutions representing the Carnegie Classifications.

Institutional Rituals and Celebrations

Finally, students' responses indicated that their institution attempts to maintain traditional ceremonies, as well as create new

Table 18. Carnegie Classification Institutional Service to both Students and Community Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
27	Supportive Relationships	3.26	3.85			P.000
		3.26		4.04		P.000
		3.26			3.60	P.057
				4.04	3.60	
28	Academic Support Programs	3.67		4.07		P.008
29	Balanced Loyalty	3.16	3.48			P.020
		3.16		3.47		P.029
30	Connects Academics to Life	3.16	3.74			P.000
		3.16		3.88		P.000
		3.16			3.63	P.009
31	Provides Community Service	3.16	3.68			P.002
		3.16		3.80		P.000
				3.80	3.35	P.010
32	Personal Concern for Students	3.16	3.65			P.003
		3.16		3.99		P.000
		3.16			3.64	P.009
			3.65	3.99		P.023
				3.99	3.640	P.045

activities to reinforce the shared purpose among members. The institution accomplishes this by: sharing its history and purpose with students; and celebrating both the academic accomplishments of the institution, as well as accomplishments of faculty, staff and students. Students' responses affirm that their college respects the

heritage of all students and incorporates a variety of celebrations exhibiting a commitment to diversity. Responses were neutral pertaining to the college activities that celebrate its heritage. Student responses were also neutral to the college's ability to connect students to alumni, benefactors and retirees of the institution.

In this section, Southeast students continue to be more affirming of their institutions when compared with students from other regions. Further, with few exceptions, Southeast students' responses were the only ones that indicated agreement when answering the question. Those exceptions included the following: Northeast students affirmed their institution's efforts to celebrate the academic accomplishments of faculty, staff and students; Midwest students affirmed their institution's efforts to respect the heritage of all students through celebrations that exhibit a commitment to diversity; and finally, Western students affirmed their institution's efforts to share the institution's history, celebrate academic accomplishments and respect the heritage of all students. However, unlike their Southeast counterparts, students

from the West were neutral about their institution's efforts to celebrate the academic accomplishments of all campus members and the institution's ability to connect students to the benefactors of the college. Table 19 indicates the significant student regional findings.

Table 19. Regional Institutional Rituals and Celebrations Significant Differences

Question	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	P Value
33	Shares History	3.42	4.10			P.000
			4.10	3.15		P.000
			4.10		3.56	P.001
34	Celebrates Institutional Heritage	3.16	4.06			P.000
			4.06	3.06		P.000
			4.06		3.18	P.000
35	Celebrates Academic Accomplish-ments	3.60	4.20			P.000
			4.20	3.48		P.000
			4.20		3.52	P.000
36	Connects Students to Alumni	3.23	3.96			P.000
		3.23			2.91	P.053
			3.96	3.13		P.000
			3.96		2.91	P.000
37	Celebrates Students' Heritage	2.98	3.82			P.000
		2.98		3.59		P.000
		2.98			3.79	P.000

Institutional size did not make a significant difference for the Institutional Rituals and Celebration section. Students' responses from both small and large institutions were very similar. For example, both student populations were neutral about their institution's efforts to provide activities to celebrate the institution's heritage, as well as their institution's efforts to have ceremonies that connect students to benefactors of the institution. Likewise, both student populations affirmed their institution's efforts to celebrate academic accomplishment. However, large and small institution students' responses differed on their institution's efforts to share its history. Students at large schools scored neutral while those at small schools affirmed their institution's efforts. These students' responses differed also on their institution's efforts to celebrate the heritage of all students. Students at small schools were neutral while those at large schools affirmed their institution's efforts.

Carnegie Classification impacted students' responses with regard to their institution's efforts to maintain traditional ceremonies, as well as create new activities to reinforce the shared

purpose among its members. In fact, only students from Comprehensive Colleges affirmed all of their institution's efforts in this section. The 2-year school students scored the lowest of all institutions by responding neutral to all questions for this section. All students, except those at 2-year schools, felt that the institution celebrated the academic accomplishments of both students and faculty. Students at 2-year schools were neutral. On the other hand, only students at Comprehensive Colleges affirmed that their institution shares it history and purpose, provides activities to celebrate its history and conducts activities to connect students with benefactors of the institution; the other students' responses were neutral to all these questions. Table 20 indicates the significant differences from students at institutions representing different Carnegie Classifications.

V. FIELD TEST CONCLUSIONS

As previously described, the CUCI © was designed to solicit students' perceptions about their institution's community practices and relationships. Specifically, did students' responses reflect an

Table 20. Carnegie Classification Institutional Rituals and Celebrations Significant Differences

Question	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2-yr School	P Value
33	Shares History	3.47		3.91		P.008
			3.47	3.91		P.008
				3.91	3.37	P.003
34	Celebrates Institutional Heritage	3.36		3.72		P.040
		3.36			2.96	P.039
			3.33	3.72		P.014
			3.33		2.96	P.035
				3.72	2.96	P.000
35	Celebrates Academic Accomplishments	3.73			3.30	P.021
			3.86		3.30	P.002
				3.82	3.30	P.005
36	Connects Students to Alumni		3.38		2.91	P.038
				3.51	2.91	P.007

institutional commitment to articulating a vison of institutional mission and purpose among all members? Further, did students' responses reflect the institutional commitment to engage students with the institution, as well as with other institutional constituents?

The data gathered from the CUCI © field test has demonstrated that institutional characteristics such as regional location, size and Carnegie Classification can, and will impact students' perceptions of community with the institution they are attending. This study

made the following findings concerning the participants and institutions under study.

When considering institutional regional location, students' responses from the Southeast consistently scored higher than the other regions. Southeast students' responses affirmed that their institutions' community practices included articulating a shared vision of institutional mission and purpose that impacted their daily lives. Further, Southeast students' responses demonstrated that their institutions maintained traditional ceremonies, as well as created new activities that reinforced the shared institutional purpose among institutional constituents. As to community relationships, Southeast students' responses indicated that their institution set high standards for their involvement and afforded them responsibilities and rights as community members. Additionally, Southeast students' responses indicated that their institutions addressed the needs and goals of all students and provided for the well being of students and the surrounding community.

On the other hand, students' responses from the Midwest scored the lowest of all regions on all but one section. With few exceptions, Midwest students' responses were consistently neutral concerning their institution's efforts to establish community practices or relationships. Thus, it would appear that students from the Midwest at this time could not affirm their institution's efforts to build community on campus through the appropriate practices and relationships.

Finally, depending on the section of the CUCI ©, students' responses from the Northeast and West alternated between second and third highest as indicated in Table 21. However, the scores from these two regions varied little. Overall, these students' responses were not as affirming as the students' responses from the Southeast. Yet they did support their institution's community practices and relationships more than the students' responses from the Midwest.

When considering institutional size, as Table 22 indicates, students' responses from large and small institutions alternated between high and low depending on the section of the CUCI ©.

Table 21. CUCI © Institutional Region Scale Scores

Scale	Description	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West	Significance
1.	Mission & Curriculum		27.26	24.72		P.000
			27.26		25.53	P.028
2.	Rights & Responsibilities	21.96	23.38			P.014
		21.96		20.80		P.058
			23.38	20.80		P.000
				20.80	23.05	P.001
3.	Diversity & Individuality	19.77	21.68			P.002
			21.68	19.39		P.001
				19.39	20.95	P.035
4.	Standards & Regulations	25.27	27.06			P.017
		25.27		22.86		P.002
		25.27			23.36	P.015
			27.06	22.86		P.000
			27.06		23.36	P.000
5.	Service to Students & Community	22.15		19.63		P.001
			22.88	19.63		P.000
				19.63	21.64	P.022
6.	Rituals & Celebrations	16.39	20.14			P.000
			20.14	16.40		P.000
			20.14		16.97	P.000

Table 22. CUCI © Institutional Size Scale Scores

Scale	Description	Large	Small	Significance
1.	Mission & Curriculum	25.20	26.35	P.004
5.	Service to Students & Community	20.52	22.39	P.002

Overall, however, students' responses from small institutions scored higher on the majority of the instrument. Small school's students' responses affirmed their institution's mission and purpose impacted them daily. Students' responses from large schools were neutral and did not indicate such an impact in their lives. Likewise, students' responses from small institutions affirmed their institution's efforts to provide for the well being of students and the surrounding community. Students' responses from large institutions remained neutral.

Students' responses from both size institutions were very similar for the remaining sections. As to the institution's abilities to provide students community rights and responsibilities, to meet the needs of all students, provide clear expectations, and provide activities that reinforce the shared purpose among institutional members, students' responses from both size institutions were generally neutral.

Finally, when considering institutional Carnegie Classification, as Table 23 indicates, students' responses from Comprehensive Universities and Colleges scored highest on the

Table 23. CUCI © Institutional Carnegie Classification Scale Scores

Scale	Description	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Comp. College	2 - yr. School	Significance
1.	Mission & Curriculum	24.56	26.44			P.005
		24.56		27.14		P.000
				27.14	25.27	P.025
3.	Diversity & Individuality	19.80	21.41			P.008
			21.41		19.81	P.029
5.	Service to Students & Community	19.58	22.25			P.000
		19.58		23.25		P.000
		19.58			21.42	P.039
				23.25	21.42	P.029
6.	Rituals & Celebrations		17.73		15.99	P.022
				18.44	15.99	P.001

majority of the test. Students' responses from both types of institutions consistently affirmed their institution's efforts to establish community practices and relationships. The mission and purpose of these institutions impacted the lives of their students daily. Likewise, these students' responses affirmed that Comprehensive Universities and Colleges afforded students rights and responsibilities, addressed the needs and goals of all students, placed expectations on students, provided for the well being of students and surrounding community, and maintained traditional ceremonies and activities to reinforce a shared purpose among all members.

Students' responses from Research Universities scored third highest while those from 2-year institutions scored the lowest. Students' responses from these institutions were more neutral when describing the community practices and relationships on campus.

In conclusion, it was reasonable to anticipate that there may be differences among students' responses to campus community practices and relationships based upon institutional variables such as the regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. However,

the amount and degree of differences among the students' responses were not reasonably anticipated. For example, when considering regional location, it was interesting to observe students' responses from the Southeast consistently scoring higher than students from other regions. Likewise, it was interesting to see students' responses from the Midwest consistently scoring lower than the other regions. One reason for this may be the actual physical location of the participating institution. For example, institutions from the Southeast were located in more rural and small town locations. Institutions from the Midwest were located in more small city, suburban and urban areas. Additionally, the institutions from the Southeast had more involved and known athletic programs than the institutions from other regional locations. Students may identify athletic events with a sense of connectedness with the institution.

When considering size, it was interesting to see students' responses from small schools not score significantly higher than their large school counterparts. Most small college's recruiting materials claim that small schools are more effective than large

schools at establishing community relationships and practices. The results from this national survey do not support such a generalization.

Finally, when considering Carnegie Classification, it was not surprising that comprehensive universities and colleges scored higher than research universities and 2-year schools. Comprehensive Universities and Colleges usually place more emphasis on undergraduate teaching than research universities. Students at 2-year schools consistently scored the lowest of all other classifications. Reasons may entail outside variables in these students' lives such as work, family and other factors that may require more time than attending class at a 2-year school. Additionally, students at 2-year schools are generally commuter students that do not participate in cocurricular activities.

Finally, there are a host of other variables that may impact the students' perceptions of community within their institution. These variables are more individual demographic in nature. For example, individual differences such as students' classification, years enrolled, residence status, age, gender, academic major and

ethnicity have as much potential to impact students' perceptions of community as the institutional variables of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. The correlation of these variables in influencing students' perceptions of community requires further study.

These variables, institutional or individual demographics, are not inherently community promoters or detractors. These characteristics, however, are factors that a college or university must consider carefully if it is intentionally attempting to increase the effectiveness of its community practices and relationships in order to strengthen the students' sense of connectedness with the institution.

CHAPTER 5.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

I. INTRODUCTION

The need to develop community on the collegiate campus is as essential today as it was six years ago when Ernest L. Boyer (1990) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published Campus life: In search of community. That national study of college and university presidents documented their concerns of the declining state of campus community. Specifically, inappropriate student behavior, competing interests, ideologies and purposes, combined with an increasing transient student population had fostered a sense of transience within the academy. Yet, because of the minimal amount of research assessing the importance of community to students, the role of the student in the debate is at best not widely known.

This final chapter will provide a brief summary of the study. The summary will include a review of the study purpose and methodology. Also, a review of the study's findings and conclusions

will be provided. Finally, recommendations for further research will be covered as well.

II. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

Community, for the purpose of this study, was defined as the set of policies and practices that mark the distinctive mission of a collegiate institution and that accent the shared values and commitments held in common by institutional constituents. In the case of this study, community will include the following constructs: Mission and Curriculum; Membership Rights and Responsibilities; Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Standards and Regulations; Service to Both Students and Community; and Institutional Rituals and Celebrations. Whether the student characterizes the sense of community on his/her campus as strong or weak, the resulting perception is formed from a wide variety of factors that impact the student's sense of connectedness to the campus. Many of these factors are easily anticipated by the institution. For example, the relationship that the student develops with the mission and purpose of the institution; as well as the relationships developed among

fellow students, staff and faculty will have a significant impact on the student's personal development and well being while in college. Further, the degree that the student understands the institution's traditional and celebrative activities, as well as future visions and developments, will directly impact the student's satisfaction with their sense of connectedness to the institution over time.

The purpose of the study was divided into the following objectives:

1. to develop an instrument designed to measure the extent and degree of "community" within colleges and universities for students.
2. to establish validity and ascertain reliability indices for the instrument.
3. to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions.

To accomplish these objectives, the following steps were implemented. These steps were reviewed in depth in Chapter 2.

Instrument Construction and Design

As a preliminary step to constructing the instrument, Dr. Michael K. Smith, former Director of the Clearning House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments, was consulted to ensure that a similar instrument had not already been created. The Student Services & Student Development Assessment Instruments and Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Instruments, compiled by the Clearing House for Higher Education Assessment Instruments was reviewed. The review failed to produce an instrument that assesses student perceptions of community in higher education.

Next, to gather data for the creation of the instrument, a literature review was conducted. Primary sources were Bellah (1985), Boyer (1987) (1990), and Palmer (1993). Items that described community and matched the study's definition of community, were extracted for inclusion in a pilot test questionnaire. Individual questions were drafted and grouped into factors. Answer scales that served as a logical extension of the instrument were considered. The College and University Community Inventory (CUCI) © was created. The CUCI © was divided into six

factors, each containing approximately 7 questions, for a total of 40 questions. A Likert scale was chosen from which students could represent their perceptions by choosing the appropriate response. To review the first version of the CUCI ©, please see Appendix I.

Once the CUCI © was created, the next step of the process was to establish the validity of the instrument.

Instrument Validity

To establish validity, CUCI © was submitted to the following student groups and expert panelists for review.

1. Four institutions within a specific geographic area were selected. Each institution represented a different Carnegie Classification. The selected Carnegie Classifications are described in Chapter 2 in the Definition of Terms section. A student focus group was conducted on each campus to review the CUCI ©. Their responses were discussed in Chapter 3.
2. The graduate committee guiding this study reviewed the CUCI ©. Their identities and responses were discussed in Chapter 3.

3. A panel of national experts in their respective field reviewed the CUCI ©. Their identities and responses were discussed in Chapter 3.

These groups interpreted the meaning of each question to ensure all questions were explicit and elicited the appropriate response. Each group recommended modifidations such as additions to, or deletions of, existing questions and categories in the CUCI ©.

A modified CUCI © was created based upon the responses elicited from the student focus groups and expert panelists. Chapter 3 reviewed the specific modifications in the final version of the CUCI ©. To review the final version of the CUCI ©, please see Appendix II. The CUCI © was presented to a final focus group of ten students at Carson-Newman College. Additionally, a pilot test was conducted with a random sample from each of the aforementioned institutions within the specific geographical area. In both the final focus group and the pilot test, students' responses indicated that the CUCI © was easily read, understood and completed.

Once the validity of the CUCI © was established, the next step is to begin establishing the instrument's reliability.

Instrument Reliability

To establish internal consistency, the extent to which individual questions within a factor or section correlate with one another, the Cronbach Alpha test (1951) was administered. Cronbach Alpha was attractive for several reasons as described in Chapter 3. Most importantly, however, the Cronbach Alpha test was specifically designed to administer with questionnaires utilizing a Likert scale.

Once the test for reliability had been chosen, in order to gather data to establish instrument reliability and to explore patterns of student responses among different categories of institutions, a field test was conducted. The different institutional categories or variables chosen for this study were institutional regional location, size and Carnegie Classification.

The CUCI © was found to be reliable. Coefficient reliability estimates for each scale exceeded .70, ranging from .78 to .90. Specific results from the Cronbach Alpha were reviewed in Chapter 3.

Instrument Field Test

To conduct the field test, clusters of four institutions in the following geographical regions - Northeast, Southeast, Midwest and West - representing four different 1987 Carnegie Classifications, and representing either small or large institutions, were selected to participate in the study. The purpose of the field test was to gather data for establishing instrument reliability and to discover whether the CUCI © would gather discriminating data from students' responses representing different institutional regional locations, size and Carnegie Classifications.

Chapter 4 reviewed the specific findings of the field test. However, the next section will cover the major findings of the study.

III. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This study demonstrated that institutional characteristics such as regional location, size and Carnegie Classification can, and will impact students' perceptions of community within the institution they are attending.

Institutional Regional Location

When considering regional location, it was interesting to observe students' responses from the Southeast consistently scoring higher than students from other regions. Likewise, it was surprising to see students' responses from the Midwest consistently scoring lower than the other regions. One reason for this may be the actual physical location of the participating institution. For example, institutions from the Southeast were located in more rural and small town locations. Institutions from the Midwest were located in more small city, suburban and urban areas. Additionally, the institutions from the Southeast had more involved and better known athletic programs than the institutions from other regional locations. Students from the Southeast may identify athletic events as well as athletic reputation with a sense of connectedness with the institution.

Institutional Size

When considering size, it was interesting to see students' responses from small schools not score significantly higher than their large school counterparts. Most small colleges' recruiting

materials claim that small schools are more effective than large schools at establishing community relationships and practices. The results from this national survey do not support such a generalization.

Institutional Carnegie Classification

Finally, when considering Carnegie Classification, it was not surprising that comprehensive universities and colleges scored higher than research universities and 2-year schools. Comprehensive universities and colleges usually place more emphasis on undergraduate teaching than research universities. Students at 2-year schools consistently scored the lowest of all other classifications. Reasons may entail outside variables in these students' lives such as work, family and other factors that may require more time than attending class at a 2-year school. Additionally, students at 2-year schools are generally commuter students that do not participate in cocurricular activities.

In conclusion, in addition to institutional variables, there are a host of other variables that may impact the students' perceptions of community with their institution. These variables are more

individual demographic in nature. For example, individual differences such as students' classification, years enrolled, housing status, age, gender, academic major and ethnicity have as much potential to impact students' perceptions of community as the institutional variables of regional location, size and Carnegie Classification. The correlation of these variables in influencing students' perceptions of community requires further study.

These variables, institutional or individual demographics, are not inherently community promoters or detractors. These characteristics, however, are factors that a college or university must consider carefully if it is intentionally attempting to increase the effectiveness of its community practices and relationships and thereby strengthen the students' sense of connectedness with the institution.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that there are common descriptors of community among college and university students. From the original focus groups used to build the initial instrument,

through the field test, students have been able to identify their perceptions of community on their campus. The importance of a sense of connectedness with the institution, its practices, its relationships, potentially varied from student to student representing different institutions. For example, at a focus group with a research institution, when responding to the meaning of the questions, one student wrote in the margins "how are students to know what faculty and staff do in their personal life." This student's question is an important one for campus constituents to answer if the institution intends to foster a sense of connectedness among all community members.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As indicated in the previous section, the CUCI © has a number of potential implications for higher education. Future applications will produce more information about students' perceptions of community on their campus which colleges and universities may use to provide better learning experiences and services. However, in

the design of this study there were a number of omissions that need to be addressed in future research involving the CUCI ©.

1. A definition for community of the college campus was provided in Chapter 1. As a review, community was defined as the set of policies and practices that mark the distinctive mission of a collegiate institution and that accent the shared values and commitments held in common by institutional constituents. In the case of this study, community included the following constructs: Mission and Curriculum; Membership Rights and Responsibilities; Respect for Diversity and Individuality; Standards and Regulations; Service to Both Students and Community; and Rituals and Celebrations. Yet, as discovered in Chapter 5, the physical location of the campus may impact both institutional and individual demographic variables that could influence students' perceptions of community. Consequently, a new scale must be created and added to the instrument. The scale, entitled, Institutional Physical Location and Interaction. This scale should contain questions that address institutional variables such as whether

the institution is located in a rural, small town, small city, suburban or urban setting. Additional questions should relate to the physical layout of the campus and its impact on students' perceptions of community. For example, are their spaces within the buildings and on the grounds that allow for both formal and informal gatherings of faculty, staff and students? Are there barriers such as major streets, railways or waterways that detract from the physical attributes of the community? Finally, are curricular and cocurricular facilities designed in a manner to engage students with other constituents of the campus?

2. CUCI ©, as previously described, was originally intended to assess undergraduate students' perceptions of community. Yet, even after institutions received specific instructions for establishing the sampling population, graduate students' responses still appeared in the final data collection. This was due largely to graduate students enrolling in one or more undergraduate classes. Consequently, a "graduate" selection should be added to the classification question in section one.

3. The Likert scale described in Part II of the CUCI © should be modified. The original placement of the "Neutral" response did not produce beneficial information. Further, forcing students to choose stronger responses will provide institutions more powerful information for study. A new response, "Not Observed," placed at the first of the scale, and given the value of zero, will yield a wider variety of answers. The new scale would appear as following:

0	1	2	3	4
Not Observed	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. As described in Chapter 3, the Likert scale allows for an effective manner to quantify students' responses to survey questions. While this information is beneficial, the usefulness of the collected data may increase with the addition of qualitative measures. Consequently, in addition to the new Institutional Physical Location and Interaction, the following two qualitative questions should be added at the end of the CUCI ©:

a. What is the most important campus attribute for creating and nurturing community on this campus?

b. What is the greatest detractor for creating and nurturing community on this campus?

5. The next logical step for future study would be a larger field test involving more institutions and different geographical regions. The field test involved only four types of institutions as identified by the 1987 Carnegie Classifications. Those classifications, however, were modified and expanded in 1994 by the Carnegie Foundation. In addition to adding new categories to represent an increasing number of higher education institutions, some of the categories were renamed to provide clarity to institutional differences. According to Jean Evangelauf (1994), "institutions [were] classified according to the highest level of degree they award, the number of degrees conferred by discipline, and, in some cases, the amount of federal research support they receive and the selectivity of their admission" (p. A17). These new categories

offer a wider variety of institutions to be surveyed to evaluate how different types of institutions impact students.

With regard to this study, there is one notable distinction between the old and new Carnegie Classifications. In 1987, many classifications made either direct or indirect reference to the size of the institution. For example, both Research Universities classifications made reference to the number of doctorates conferred and the amount of federal support. The Comprehensive Universities and Colleges classification made reference to enrollment size. Under the 1994 classifications, however, references to the enrollment of the institution were deleted. References to federal support and number of degrees conferred are still included while. This may have implications if studies are made concerning the impact of institutional size on students' perceptions of community. As this study demonstrated, however, institutional size (at least when the difference between large and small is arbitrarily set) is not often a significant variable.

In the larger field test there are other considerations that must be addressed that were omitted from this study.

a. Most institutions are experiencing rapid changes in technological advances. The creation of computer networks such as the Internet and campus e-mail; multimedia class rooms including tele-conferences and phone conferences; establishing remote sites to engage new populations of students all have a strong potential to impact students' perceptions of community. Some of these concerns may be addressed in the new scale, Institutional Physical Location and Interaction. As technology continues to rapidly advance, future CUCI © scales to measure technologies' impact may be required.

b. In addition to the three institutional variables for this field test, there are other institutional variables that may be researched to identify further significant differences among students' responses at different types of institutions. For example, institutional affiliation was not considered as a variable for the pilot test. In

future studies, it may prove useful to evaluate differences among students' responses attending either public or private institutions. Likewise, it may prove useful to evaluate differences among students' responses attending either independent or religiously affiliated institutions.

c. The CUCI © contains a number of individual demographic variables that may directly impact the students' perceptions of community on the campus. For example, it is logical to assume that residential students have more potential to be engaged with campus activities when contrasted to commuter students. The CUCI © has the potential to identify if those differences are significant or not. Likewise, ethnicity may increase or decrease students' perceptions of community on the campus. Further research is required to address the discriminating possibilities of individual demographic variables.

d. As mentioned in Chapter 3, a direct mail survey was selected to administer the CUCI ©. The direct survey has many advantages and disadvantages. It allows the researcher to better control a wider sample population in a cost effective way. However, it usually takes more time. Further, as pointed out, response rates rarely surpass 30 percent. Often the response rates are much lower and range between 5 and 10 percent. While this study had a 28 percent response rate, the non-response rate may indicate that there is bias within the respondents to the survey. To combat non-response bias, additional surveys techniques may be required. One method that may prove effective would be interview data collection as a followup to the survey.

e. An expanded field test may allow for other measures to be taken on the instrument. For example, a factor analysis may strengthen the relationship between the questions. Through factor analysis, questions that address the same subject matter will be identified.

Consequently, the amount of questions may be reduced. Remaining questions may have more meaning and therefore, potentially further validate the structure of the instrument.

f. Finally, an expanded field test may provide additional information for purposes of correlating the instrument. Potential measurement variables may include the following: campus crime rates, retention rates, and graduation rates. Other variables may include the number of student clubs and organizations, recreation and intramural activities, and the percentage of students that participate in these programs. With the onset of accountability, future college students have more resources than ever from which to gather information about the institution they are considering for matriculation. Examples include: crime reports from state and federal governments; special magazine articles outlining comparative data such as U. S. News and World Reports' "Best College List," or Money Magazine's "Best

Buy List;" as well as a host of special interest groups that provide information to help students make an informed decision about their college selection. In addition to correlating the instrument, colleges and universities that compare this data with the data gathered from a CUCI © survey will yield a more complete description about their students' experiences while pursuing a degree.

VI. SUMMARY

The national debate concerning the need to develop community on campus is as essential today as it was six years ago when Boyer (1990) and the Carnegie Foundation published their national survey of college presidents. Yet, because of the minimal amount of research assessing the importance of community to students, the role of the student in the debate is at best not widely known. Is a sense of community on campus important to students? Do students desire to feel a sense of connectedness among the many different campus constituents? If so, does a lack of a sense of community

affect their actions? Is it important to students to feel a sense of connectedness to the institutional mission and purpose? Finally, does a student's sense of community, or lack thereof, impact the effectiveness and work of the faculty? Two recent studies by Alexander Astin (1993) and the University of California at Los Angeles' Higher Education Research Institute may provide further evidence for the importance of researching students' perceptions of community.

The first study surveyed the faculties of 445 institutions. Faculty responses varied greatly when answering questions related to the priority their institution gives to building community among faculty and students. Further, of the data collected from the 50 institutions giving the highest priority to developing community, 47 were privately controlled and none were classified as research institutions. By contrast, among the 50 institutions that gave the least priority to community development, 44 institutions were public and 35 of the institutions were classified as research institutions. While this study seems to corroborate some of the findings of this CUCI © study, Astin quickly points out that

institutional size and classification may have some impact on community development; however, by no means are they the most important factors. The most important factor, in Astin's opinion, is the student orientation of the faculty. A student-focused faculty will direct more attention to teaching, learning and student development. This may be one way for the institution to develop a real sense of community on the campus.

In the second national study of 217 institutions, Astin (1993), created an environmental measure called "Lack of Student Community." This scale was defined as "infrequent socializing among students, little student interaction outside of class, and a high degree of student apathy" (p. 13). This study identified a number of negative student outcomes resulting from a "Lack of Student Community." The largest outcome was the negative effect on the student's overall satisfaction with their college experience. Further, a "Lack of Student Community" facilitated low student satisfaction rates with the faculty and their quality of instruction. Also, students expressing a "Lack of Student Community" were dissatisfied with the general education requirements, the quality of

student life, and generally, expressed a lack of trust between fellow students and administrators. Obviously, these feelings may impact the student's academic development, emotional well-being and their ability to matriculate and ultimately graduate from the institution.

Both of these studies speak to the importance of developing a sense of community among students. A priority for building community will empower colleges and universities to develop assessment instruments to survey their students' perceptions and reactions to the community relationships and practices on campus. In that spirit, the CUCI © offers such a format that may be easily implemented within an institution's student body.

In closing, the study returns to the original statement of the problem - for years there has been a national debate concerning the perceived declining state of community on campus. Still prevalent on today's campuses are increasing problems resulting from inappropriate student behavior, competing interests, ideologies and purposes and a transient student population. As this study has demonstrated, students' overall perceptions of community on campus will be impacted by institutional characteristics such as

size, geographical location and Carnegie Classification. Further, as previously suggested, individual student differences may have an impact on the student's overall perceptions of community on campus; however, further research is required. In either case, students must be brought into the debate. The CUCI © allows colleges and universities to explore student's perceptions on all of these issues. For institutions striving to build community, student responses to the CUCI © will provide an additional assessment of the institution's effectiveness in developing meaningful community relationships and activities for all campus constituents. Parker Palmer (1981) would remind us that the institution should "teach [all of us] to be supportive of and accountable to one another; to deal creatively with competing interests; and understand [after all], that we are all in this together ..." (p. 79).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alreck, P. L., Settle, R. B. (1985). The Survey Research Handbook. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin.

Anastasi, Anne (1988). Psychological Testing. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Astin, A. W. (1991). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education. New York: American Council on Education/MacMillian Publishing Company.

Astin, A. W. (1993, October). "Higher Education and the Concept of Community." Fifteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Astin, A. W. (1994, May). [personal letter to author]. McDonald: 1411 Clinch View Circle, Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Autry, J. A. (1991). Love and profit: The art of caring leadership. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Babbie, E. (1990). Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bellah, R. N.. (1994). [personal letter to author]. McDonald: 1411 Clinch View Circle, Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., Tipton, S. M. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1994, May). [personal letter to author]. McDonald: 1411 Clinch View Circle, Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Campus life: In search of community. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Carter, M. V. (1996, May). "Toward an understanding of planned social change: A sociocultural synthesis for community change agents." An invited paper delivered at Joonkyoun Sanup University. Daejeon, Korea.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, pp. 297-334.

de Tocqueville, A. (1945). "Of individualism in democratic counties" from Democracy in America. vol. 2, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Dey, E. (1993, Spring). "What Kind of Community on Campus?" Planning for Higher Education, pp. 34 -35.

Erwin, T. D. (1991). Assessing student learning and development. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers.

Etzioni, A. (1993). The spirit of community. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Evangelauf, J. (1994, April 6). "A new 'Carnegie Classification'" in The Chronical of Higher Education. (XL), 31, pp. A17 - A26.

Fitzgerald, F. (1986). Cities on a hill. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., Smith, B. L. (1990, Spring). "Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines" in New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 41, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers: San Francisco. pp. 89 - 93.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Griswold, C. (1994, May). [personal letter to author]. McDonald: 1411 Clinch View Circle, Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Jefferson, T. (1987). "First inaugural address" in Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., Tipton, S. M. (Eds), Individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper and Row.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

King, C.S. (1983), The words of Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Newmarket Press.

Kovach, R.J., McDonald, W. M. (1990). " A practitioner's guide for community development in the 21st Century", E.D. 321213, The George Washington University, Washington, DC: ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education.

Kuh, G. D. (1991, Winter). "Snapshots of campus community" in Educational Record, 71, pp. 40 - 44.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. and associates (1991). Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning

and development outside the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Levine, A. (1993). "Student expectations of college" in Change. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Marchese, T. J. (1990). "A New Conversation About Undergraduate Teaching: An Interview with Prof. Richard J. Light, Convener of the Harvard Assessment Seminars" in AAHE Bullentin, 42 (9), 3-8.

Miller, J. E. (1993). "The continuing search for community in higher education: One of the primary challenges of our times" in Vital Speeches of the Day. Vol. 59, Issue 11, pp 334 - 336.

Morse, S. W., (1989). "Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship" in 1989 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 8.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp 29-30.

Pace, C. R. (1990). College student experiences questionnaire. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education.

Packard, V. (1972). A nation of strangers. New York: David McKay.

Palmer, P. J. (1981). The company of strangers: Christians and the renewal of America's public life. New York: Crossroad.

Palmer, P. J. (1986, September/October). "Community, conflict, and ways of knowing" in Change, 18, pp 40-45.

Palmer, P. J. (1993). "Remembering the heart of higher education." from AAHE's 1993 National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T. (1991) How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., Blimling, G. S. (1994) "The Impact of Residential Life on Students," in Schroeder, C. C., Mable, P.., (1994) Realizing the Educational Potential of Residence Halls. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peck, M. S. (1987). The different drum: Community making and Peace. New York: Touchstone of Simon & Schuster Inc.

Peterson, M. W. (1994, June). [personal letter to author]. McDonald: 1411 Clinch View Circle, Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Rosnow, R. L., Rosenthal, R. (1996). Beginning Behavioral Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Schlesinger, Jr., A. M. (1992). The Disuniting of America. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Secor, R. (1995, February). "Recapturing Departmental Community" in AAHE Bulletin, 47 (6), 3-6.

Skinner, B. F. (1976). Walden Two. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Smith, M. K., Bradley, J. L., Draper, G. F. (1993). Student services & student development assessment instruments and institutional effectiveness assessment instruments. Knoxville, Tn: Clearinghouse for Higher Education Assessment Instruments at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Strenski, I. (1993, June 23). "Recapturing the values that promote civility on the campus" in The chronicle of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T. (1994, January/February). "Living with myths: Undergraduate education in America" in Change. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). An American imperative. Racine, Wisconsin: The Johnson Foundation, Inc.

Willard, T., Fields, D. M. (1991/May-June). "The community in an age of individualism; An interview with Amitai Etzioni" in The Futurist. (25), 3, pp.35-39

Wilson, B. J. (1993). "Reinventing community: Where do we go from here". from AAHE's 1993 National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Winston, Jr., R. B., Miller, T. K. (1987). Understanding and using the SDTLI: A guide for students. Athens, Ga.: Student Development Associates, Inc.

Yankelovich, D. (1993). "The new public mood and what it means for higher education: A Conversation with Daniel Yankelovich." from AAHE's 1993 National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Zemsky, R. (Sr. Ed.) (1993, November) Policy perspectives, 5, pp. 1A-12A.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY INVENTORY ©

The *College and University Community Inventory* [CUCI] is designed to assess individual student perceptions of community with his/her institution of attendance. The inventory consists of two sections. The first section requests general demographic information from the participant for the purpose of comparison with other participants under study. The second section is based upon indicators of community to assess student perceptions of community. From this information, colleges and universities will be better able to meet the needs of students attending their institutions.

Participants under study and their responses are maintained in complete confidentiality. It will require approximately thirty minutes to complete the instrument.

PART I. INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Please share personal information that applies to you by either circling the appropriate response or filling in the corresponding blank.

---

1. My current classification is: a.) freshmen b.) sophomore
   c.) junior d.) senior
   e.) other: (Please specify: _____).

2. The number of years I have attended this institution is:
   a.) 0-1 b.) 2-3 c.) 4-5 d.) 6 or more.

3. My housing status with the institution is:
   a.) on campus institutionally owned residence
   b.) off campus privately owned residence
   c.) other: (Please Specify: _____).

4. My gender is: a.) female b.) male.

5. My age is: a.) under 20 b.) 20-29 c.) 30-39 d.) over 40

6. My academic major is:

a.) Business (Please Specify: _____).
b.) Education (Please Specify: _____).
c.) Engineering (Please Specify: _____).
d.) Humanities (Please Specify: _____).
e.) Physical Sciences (Please Specify: _____).
f.) Social Science (Please Specify: _____).
g.) Other (Please Specify: _____).

7. I am from the following ethnic background:

a.) African-American
b.) American Indian
c.) Asian
d.) Caucasian
e.) Hispanic
f.) Other(Please specify: _____).

PART II. INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY.

Please read the following statements for each section. Consider each statement carefully, but do not spend an excessive amount of time deliberating a single response. For each statement, choose the appropriate response and then circle the corresponding number. Following are the responses:

1.	2.	3.	4.
Not Descriptive	Somewhat Descriptive	Descriptive	Very Descriptive

---

INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSE AND CURRICULUM:

Consider the purpose and mission of the institution and how it impacts students on a daily basis.

The institution:

1. is committed to academic excellence in education.
   1 2 3 4
2. does not engage students through creative teaching and intellectual activities with faculty.
   1 2 3 4
3. does not create a common ground for student learning.
   1 2 3 4

4. provides special events that offer the opportunity of bringing the entire campus community together.
   1 2 3 4
5. connects the cocurricular and curricular lives of the student through programs in the residence halls, student activities and other support services.
   1 2 3 4
6. does not have a well planned general education sequence, nor a core curriculum with coherence and publicly stated philosophy.
   1 2 3 4
7. does not have a set of core value commitments to which the institution commits and that constitutes an agenda of common caring.
   1 2 3 4

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Consider the rights and responsibilities afforded individual members.

The institution:

8. encourages the public freedom of written and oral expression as essential to the learning process.
   1 2 3 4
9. does not encourage students to speak and listen to one another carefully.
   1 2 3 4
10. balances the individual's right of freedom of expression with the institutional need of creating an environment built upon mutual trust.
   1 2 3 4
11. allows offensive language and does not encourage open communication as an expression of the institutional values.
   1 2 3 4
12. provides opportunities for open communication that leads to a deeper understanding and acceptance of individual differences.
   1 2 3 4

13. does not provide a climate of civility on the campus and does not protect the dignity of both student and faculty because of lack of respect exhibited by the institution.

1 2 3 4

INSTITUTIONAL RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY AND INDIVIDUALITY

Consider how the institution addresses the needs and goals of all ethnic student constituents that the institution serves.

The institution:

14. rejects prejudicial practices and judgments, and maintains an environment that is both equitable and fair.

1 2 3 4

15. does not provide leadership in the drive for equality of opportunity.

1 2 3 4

16. has stated goals for minority student enrollment, including a timetable to accomplish goals.

1 2 3 4

17. prevents racial and cultural understanding by encouraging separate social and educational programming for separate races.

1 2 3 4

18. clearly defines student responsibility for creating a civil environment.

1 2 3 4

19. does not support organizations that are avowedly exclusive in their membership.

1 2 3 4

20. aggressively pursues institutional diversity as a model for society.

1 2 3 4

21. has supported or conducted special studies aimed at improving the campus climate for minority students.

1 2 3 4

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS:

Consider the institutional expectations that are places upon students.

The institution:

22. clearly delineates high standards of conduct for acceptable student behavior both within and outside the classroom.
    1 2 3 4
23. does not effectively address criminal acts committed by students.
    1 2 3 4
24. encourages students through programming and presentations to adopt effective decision making skills that include an awareness of individual responsibility for actions.
    1 2 3 4
25. does not involve students in the creation and evaluation of institutional values, policies and procedures, and codes of conduct.
    1 2 3 4
26. provides appropriate investigation procedures and review boards to adjudicate alleged student academic dishonesty.
    1 2 3 4
27. does not encourage faculty and staff to effectively model and practice institutional values and standards in their professional and personal lives.
    1 2 3 4
28. encourages students to acknowledge their obligations to the campus community for which they belong.
    1 2 3 4

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE TO BOTH STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY

Consider the institution's efforts to provide for the well being of students; also, consider the institution's efforts to provide service for the surrounding community.

The institution:

29. encourages faculty, staff and students to establish connections with the campus community .

1 2 3 4

30. does not make a genuine effort to address student needs through academic support programs, extended office hours and facility access.

1 2 3 4

31. encourages students to balance personal loyalties to subgroups (Greek system, honor & social organizations, residence halls, athletic teams, etc.) with loyalty to the overall mission of the institution.

1 2 3 4

32. does not encourage students to connect what is learned in academic pursuits to every day life in order to make a personal contribution of service to, and personal responsibility for, the larger society.

1 2 3 4

33. encourages students to reach out to one another in a spirit of interdependence and collaboration.

1 2 3 4

34. does not encourage faculty to exhibit a personal concern for students.

1 2 3 4

INSTITUTIONAL RITUALS AND CELEBRATIONS:

Consider the institution's efforts to maintain traditional rituals as well as to create new activities that reinforce the shared purpose among members.

The institution:

35. students have ample opportunities to learn how and why the institution was founded, during student orientation, or other similar activities/courses.

1 2 3 4

36. does not provide special activities for faculty, staff and students that celebrate the traditions and heritage of the institution.

1 2 3 4

37. publicizes and celebrates academic accomplishments such as institutional ranking, awards and reputation, as well as the individual accomplishment of the faculty and students.
1 2 3 4

38. does not conduct rituals and ceremonies that connect students to alumni, benefactors and retirees of the institution.
1 2 3 4

39. respects the cultural heritage of all students and incorporates a wide variety of national and regional holidays and celebrations that represent the institution's commitment to the cultural diversity of all students.
1 2 3 4

40. does not allocate financial resources appropriately for student curricular activities, cocurricular activities and athletics that involve the surrounding community.
1 2 3 4

Thank you for participating is this study. Remember, the information that you provided on this questionnaire will be maintained in a completely confidential manner. Please return the completed questionnaire in the provided self-addressed envelope. If that envelope has been lost, please return the completed questionnaire to the following address:

Bill McDonald,
1411 Clinch View Circle
Jefferson City, Tennessee 37760

#_____

College and University Community Inventory ©

CUCI © is designed to assess individual student perceptions of community with his/her college or university. From this information, institutions will obtain a better understanding of their students perceptions and opinions. Participants under study and their responses are maintained in confidence.

PART I. Please share information that applies to you by circling the appropriate response and when appropriate, fill in corresponding blank.

1. My classification is: a.) freshman b.) sophomore c.) junior d.)senior
2. Years I have attended: a.) 0-1 b.) 2-3 c.) 4-5 d.) 6 or more
3. My housing status: a.) on campus residence b.) off campus residence
4. My age is: a.) 15-19 b.) 20-29 c.) 30-39 d.) 40-50
5. My gender is: a.) female b.) male
6. My academic major:
   a. Business (Specify:_____).
   b. Education (Specify:_____).
   c. Engineering (Specify:_____).
   d. Humanities (Specify:_____).
   e. Physical Science (Specify:_____).
   f. Social Science (Specify:_____).
   g. Other (Specify:_____).
7. My ethnicity:
   a.) African-American
   b.) American Indian
   c.) Asian
   d.) Caucasian
   e.) Hispanic
   f.) Other (Specify:_____).

PART II. Please read the description for each section. For each statement, choose a response for your institution and circle the corresponding number. Following are the responses:

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree (D)	Somewhat Disagree (SD)	Neutral (N)	Somewhat Agree (SA)	Agree (A)

Copyright © 1995 by William M. McDonald. All rights reserved.

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND CURRICULUM: Consider the purpose and mission of your institution and how it impacts students on a daily basis. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	commits to academic excellence in education?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	engages students through creative teaching and intellectual activities with faculty?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	creates a supportive environment for student learning?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	provides opportunities bringing entire campus community together?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	connects student experiences inside and outside of class through programs in the residence halls, student activities and commuter support services?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	has a well planned core curriculum with coherence and publicly stated philosophy?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	has a well defined and published set of core values?	1	2	3	4	5

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Consider the rights and responsibilities your institution affords students. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	encourages freedom of speech and written expression as an example of institutional values?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	encourages students to speak and listen to one another carefully?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	creates an environment where students, faculty and staff trust one another?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	allows offensive language/behavior that inhibits student learning?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	encourages students to develop an understanding and acceptance of individual differences?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	creates a climate of civility on the campus and protects the dignity of students, staff and faculty?	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright © 1995 by William M. McDonald. All rights reserved.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY AND INDIVIDUALITY: Consider how your institution addresses the needs and goals of all students. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	rejects prejudicial practices and judgements, and maintains an environment that is both equitable and fair?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	has stated goals for minority student enrollment, including a timetable to accomplish goals?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	encourages social and educational programming for all students?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	defines student responsibility for creating a civil environment?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	supports organizations that are exclusive in membership?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	aggressively pursues institutional diversity as a model for society?	1	2	3	4	5

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS: Consider expectations that your institution places upon students. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	expects high standards of conduct for student behavior both inside and outside the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	effectively addresses criminal acts committed by students?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	encourages students to adopt effective decision making skills and responsibility for the decisions?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	involves students in creation and evaluation of policies and procedures, and codes of student conduct?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	provides appropriate investigation procedures and review boards to prosecute alleged student infractions?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	encourages students to acknowledge their obligations to the campus community for which they are a member?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	encourages faculty and staff to effectively model institutional values and standards in their professional and personal lives?	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright © 1995 by William M. McDonald. All rights reserved.

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE TO BOTH STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY: Consider your institution's efforts to provide for the well being of students and surrounding community. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	encourages faculty and students to build supportive relationships?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	addresses student needs through academic support programs, extended office hours and facility access?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	encourages students to maintain a proper balance of loyalty between student organizations and the institution's mission?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	encourages students to connect academic pursuits to every day life in order to make a contribution to society?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	encourages students and faculty to provide service to the community?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	encourages faculty to exhibit a personal concern for students?	1	2	3	4	5

INSTITUTIONAL RITUALS AND CELEBRATIONS: Consider your institution's efforts to maintain traditional ceremonies, as well as create new activities to reinforce the shared purpose among members. My college:

		D	SD	N	SA	A
1.	shares its history and purpose with students?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	provides activities to celebrate its heritage?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	celebrates academic accomplishments of the institution, as well as accomplishments of faculty, staff and students?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	conducts ceremonies or activities that connect students to alumni, benefactors and retirees of the institution?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	respects heritage of all students and incorporates a variety of celebrations exhibiting a commitment to diversity?	1	2	3	4	5

Please return to: Bill McDonald, Division of Student Affairs, Carson-Newman College, 1646 Russell Avenue, Jefferson City, Tennessee 37760. Thank you.

Copyright © 1995 by William M. McDonald. All rights reserved.

VITA

William Moore McDonald was born in Elkin, North Carolina, on July 9, 1958. He attended elementary schools in Elkin City School District and graduated from Elkin High School in June, 1976. The following September he entered at High Point College. In January, 1979 he transferred to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and in December, 1980 he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Recreation Administration. He entered Appalachian State University in August, 1981 and in August, 1983 he received a Masters of Arts degree in Student Development. From January, 1989 until August, 1990 he took post graduate work at Memphis State University. In August, 1990 he entered the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and in December, 1996 received an Educational Doctorate in Higher Education Administration.

He has sixteen years of experience in higher education. Presently, he is employed as the Vice President for Student Affairs at Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City, Tennessee.

Finally, he is married to Anne Mealor McDonald. Together, they have two children, Margaret Anne and Hannah Marian.