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The problem of this study was to ascertain the relationship of students' differential perception of a campus environment to some personality characteristics. The following correlates of perception were considered: personality traits, length of stay in college, sex, college entrance scores, academic marks, and leadership roles.

The major conceptual framework of this study included Kelly's (1955) psychology of personal constructs and Snygg and Combs' (1959) phenomenological determinant of behavior postulate.

The subjects of this study included 594 students enrolled at the Bukidnon Normal College, Philippines, during the school year 1970-71.

The College and University Environment Scales of C. Robert Pace (1966) and the new Edwards Personality Inventory (1966) were the two major instruments used in the study. In addition, the class advisers evaluated the students' leadership qualities using the Leadership Rating Form.
Means, standard deviations, analysis of variance, the F test of significance, Duncan's New Multiple Comparison Test, and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient were the statistical techniques used in the analysis of data.

The results showed that the freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior students had a consensus of the various dimensions that make up the school environment. It was found that the negative perceivers of campus environment tended to have some aggressive personality traits, while positive perceivers of campus environment tended to have some passive personality traits. In general, students tended to rate the campus environment lower as they stayed longer in the campus. Males were found to rate the campus environment lower than females. Furthermore, it was found that the students' perception of a campus environment was negatively related to individual academic performance and leadership roles.

Implications from the findings were made for counselors, faculty members and school administrators for the improvement of various educational programs at the college.

The major conclusion of the study is that students in the college have a consensus perception of the campus
environment and that those with positive and negative perceptions of the environmental press have some personality characteristics related to their manner of evaluating the institutional image.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

"A human being does not grow up in a vacuum; his development is determined not only by the physical environment as the biologist proved, and by the family environment as Freud proved, but by the massive data collected by the cultural anthropologists showed by the larger societal and cultural institutions. . . . Murray and Kluckhohn, 1956, p. 4)."

Understanding students' differential perceptions of campus environment is important in working with students, and considerable attention has been given to the study of campus environment is general (Maddi, 1961; McConnel, 1962; Schoen, 1966; Abbott, 1967; De Mars, 1968; Salzman, 1970). But, very limited research has been made comparing students' perceptions of campus environment and personality characteristics, and no research has been done relating deviant perception of a campus to personality traits. Yet it is probable that students who deviate in their perception of the college also manifest personality characteristics which are potentials for such educational ills as apathy, academic discontent, dropping out, underachievement, and student unrest. This study attempts to identify personality characteristics of such deviant perceivers.
It was assumed that the college campus can be defined, and is best described by the perception of the students who have stayed the longest period in that environment. It was further assumed that there would generally be a consensus among the students in their perception of the campus environment, but that there would be students who deviated from the general consensus either positively or negatively in their perceptions and that these deviates would have personality characteristics that distinguished them from the majority. It was hypothesized in this study that these deviates have unrealistic perceptions that would require reorientation from teachers and counselors.

Kluckhohn (1957) accepted the presence of such deviants as a kind of personality in a given culture when he wrote, "This does not, of course, imply that the personality characteristics of the members of any group are identical. There are deviants in every society and in every social class within a society (p. 152)."

Edwin L. Herr (1965) recommended the need for studying deviant campus environment perceivers when he wrote, "Distinctive deviance in perceptual responses . . . may identify students who truly do not perceive environ-
mental demands upon them which seem to be strongly evident to the majority of the student population (p. 588)."

A major justification for the need of identifying the correlation of the students' ratings of campus environment with some selected personality traits is Holland's (1959) theory that students' satisfaction with college will be greater if his type is congruent with his college environment. He states that "... generally congruent person-environment interactions are conducive to greater satisfaction (p. 73)." In Holland's (1968) study to support his theory, he found that "students are happier, the more closely they resemble the majority of the students ... (p. 5)."

The information from this investigation has potential for application in the total educational program. It could be utilized by the college counselors, administrators, and faculty members in the aspects of individual counseling; and could be used in group guidance, orientation, formulating educational goals, faculty-student dialogue, curriculum revision, and the improvement of the school plant.

Studying the environmental press should suggest to teachers and school counselors reasons for individual and
group problems on adjustments. It may suggest reasons for disoriented perception and poor identification with aspects of the school environment. It is possible that the total pattern of relationship between personality traits and environmental press may be more predictive of success, development and change than any single aspect of either person or the environment. Counselors may be better able to guide students in finding effective and satisfying roles in the environment of a given institution. School administrators may see more thoroughly the ways in which the educational program may be adjusted if different kinds of students are to develop most effectively with them or find optimum identification with the aims of the school. As Herr (1965) concluded, "when we understand student perceptions of educational climate and demands more fully, we will have added insights into their motivation and behavior (p. 589)." This in turn will provide counselors the much needed confidence in their helping relationships.

The basic problem of this study was: Are deviant perceptions of a campus environment related to some personality traits? The following possible correlates of perception were considered: personality traits, length of stay in college, sex, college entrance score, academic
marks, and leadership roles.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

Campus environment: The atmosphere of the college that includes the features and facilities of the campus, rules and regulations, faculty, curricula, instructions and examinations, student life, and extra-curricular activities.

Deviant perceptions: The highest (5%) and the lowest (5%) ratings of students on the characteristics of the campus environment based on the College and University Environment Scales z scores.

Passive Traits: Personality traits as defined by conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency in which normal individuals vary.

Aggressive Traits: Personality characteristics as defined by a feeling of superiority, being critical of others, and becoming angry easily, in which normal individuals vary.

Leadership qualities: The class advisers' evaluation of student potential and performance in such roles as: being
a good committee chairman, giving orders that are acceptable to the group, influencing others, and being regarded by others as a good leader.

Leadership role: The actual leadership function of the students in various organizations as indicated by each student in the personal data section of the answer sheets.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The theoretical framework includes the perceptual or phenomenological approach to psychology of Combs and Snygg, and the psychology of personal constructs by Kelly. To relate the role of deviant perception to personality traits, the development of this thesis has necessitated the inclusion of the theories of Kluckhohn and Sechrest.

**Perceptual Theory**

To understand problems of individual behavior, Combs and Snygg (1959) postulated the so-called "personal" or "perceptual" or "phenomenological" theory of psychology. The basic postulate of perceptual theory is that: "All behavior, without exception, is completely determined by, and pertinent to, the perceptual field of the behaving organism (p. 20)." Because of individual differences, the perceptual field of another person appears to others as containing many inconsistencies; it sometimes appears that other persons are incongruent with our ideas; but to the phenomenologists, the phenomenological field of each individual is reality; it is the only reality he can know.
The theory on perceptual approach to psychology has much relevance in the educational setting. One of the major aims of education is the development of adequate personality as represented by adequate self-concept. The perception of a student's potential as given by peers, parents and teachers appears to be significant in the formation of the actualization process. The same line of thinking was shared by Herr (1965) when he wrote that:

. . . education at all levels must once again experience their behavior and their attitudes toward students, not as conforming vessels but as individuals who offer far more potential than they have been given encouragement for possessing (p. 589).

It, therefore, appears that the key to understanding behavior lies in large measure in the skill developed in the explorations and understanding of perceptions.

Personal Constructs Theory

The fundamental postulate as stated by Kelly (1955) is: "A person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events (p. 103)."

This theory of personality considers the individual person rather than any part of the person. Part of the subject of psychology is assumed to be a process. Man ultimately seeks to anticipate real events. Anticipation
is not merely carried on for its own sake; it is carried on so that future reality may be better represented.

The systems by which Kelly constructs his theory assume that man looks at his environment through transparent patterns which he creates, and then attempts to put things together into his own realities. The constructs which man formulates are intended to aid him in his predicted efforts.

Among the corollaries of the fundamental postulate which hold bearing on this study are: (a) "Individuality Corollary: People differ from each other in their construction of events (p. 103)." People can be seen as differing from each other, not only because there may have been differences in the events which they have sought to anticipate, but also because there are different approaches to the anticipation of some events; and (b) "Choice Corollary: A person chooses for himself that alternative . . . through which he anticipates the greater possibility of extension and definition of his system (p. 103)."

If a person's processes are psychologically channeled by the ways in which he anticipates events, it follows that he must choose in a manner which is predicted by his anticipations. The assumption of the choice corollary is, therefore, that whenever a person is confronted with the
opportunity for making a choice, he will tend to make that choice in favor of the alternative which seems to provide the best basis for anticipating the issuing events.

According to this theory, when a person finds his personal construction (i.e., expectations) failing him, he suffers anxiety, which in turn may lead to threat if not dealt with constructively. In researches in social psychology, Maddi (1961), and Katsell (1968) have indicated that the expectations an individual has of an environment does affect the way in which he will cope with that environment. When applied to the present study, it appears Kelly would hold that those students whose view of the actual environment is at variance from their personal expectations would be most susceptible to threat. In this study, it was anticipated that some students would drop out of the school to remove the threat, and others would behave apathetically in their studies which results in underachievement because of seeking direct means of removing the threat.

Bio-Physical and Social Theory of Personality

The theory of personality by Henry A. Murray and Clyde Kluckhohn (1953) resulted from merging the findings of interdisciplinary fields. In brief, the theory states
that "the personality of an individual is the product of inherited dispositions and environmental experiences. These experiences occur within the field of his physical, biological, and social environment, all of which are modified by the culture of his group (p. 67)."

The theory of Murray and Kluckhohn does not deny the biological basis of human nature nor the physio-chemical basis of biology. It accepts the axiom that no postulate of a science of behavior may be incongruent with facts or principles accredited in other spheres. But it holds to the proposition that there are different "levels" of observation, analysis, and formulations, and that the behavior of human personalities is on a different level from physiological phenomena, and hence should be studied and conceptualized in its own right without waiting for more "basic" sciences to provide a complete foundation.

Murray and Kluckhohn consider personality as a continuous functional manifestation of organized processes and overt behavior from birth to death. He considers the following functions of personality: "to exercise its process; to express its feelings and valuations; and to reduce successive need tensions (p. 49)."

Murray and Kluckhohn's theory is very closely
related to Cohen's (1966) psycho-social theory which states that "personality is determined by some background events or circumstances, . . . attitudes and characteristics of the parents, early experiences, or social class background (p. 43)." This theory states that behavior is a result of the interaction between personality and situation by the members of the system.

Relative Deviant Personality Theory

To complete the conceptual model of this study, the theory of Sechrest (1963) on relative deviant personality has been adopted. Actually, Sechrest's theory is only an extension of Berg's (1955) and Jackson's (1963) theories on deviant responses. Berg's statement of the deviation hypothesis was:

Deviant response patterns tend to be general; hence those deviant behavior patterns which are significant for abnormality as thus regarded as symptoms are associated with other deviant response patterns which are in noncritical areas of behavior and which are not regarded as symptoms of personality aberrations (p. 62).

An alternative hypothesis was made by Jackson (1963) as a limitation on Berg's statement which resulted in a probably more accurate but less interesting form; namely, "Deviant response tendencies are sometimes associated
A further limiting condition under which the deviation hypothesis of Jackson might hold was postulated by Sechrest (1963) who stated that "those individuals that are deviant on one measure, or in one way, will be deviant in some other way (p. 26)." When applied to this study, the relevance of the relative deviation hypothesis is stated as those individuals who are deviant in rating the campus environment, will also be deviant in some personality traits.

Although none of the theories as presented is comprehensive enough to form the conceptual model for the study, taken together they can stand as a functional framework for the investigation.

In summary, the relevance of the theoretical model to this study is the psychological assumption that if the motivation and behavior of students is to be functionally approached, then their perception of the environmental press has personality correlates that must be considered in the process of planning, executing and evaluating of the educational program.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Various studies to describe the differences between
Campus environments can be classified according to the questions that have guided the researchers. The earliest approach was to ask, What are the demographic features of the environment? Is it public or private, rural or urban, rich or poor? A second approach was to ask the question, Who lives in the environment? The assumption here is that students make the college. The third approach is illustrated by the question, How do students behave in the environment? The latest approach which has been adopted in this study, has been to ask the question, What do students perceive to be the characteristics of the environment? The justification for selecting the last approach was the strong theoretical support which has been previously alluded to.

The study of campus environment has comparatively gained momentum only in the last decade. Murray's (1938) theory on environmental press pioneered in the field of environmental and personality characteristics. Individuals were seen as having characteristic needs, and the strengths and relationship of these needs were what characterized the personality. The interaction between personality needs and environmental press was made a model for studying behavior.

The various research done to describe the differences between college environments used the collective perceptions
of student subgroups as a basis for defining environmental press. As can be noted in the review of the literature, only a few investigations were done comparing students' perceptions with personality characteristics and no study made on deviant perceptions of institutional environment. This lack may be partly explained by the almost consistent result which found no relationship between total students' population perception of a campus environment and their personal characteristics. But Herr (1965) found the challenging prospects of studying separately deviant perceptions as a result of his postulating of the field theory and differential press and its implications to counseling. To date, he has not done any research on the subject. However, despite the absence of directly related studies on deviant perception of campus environment and personality traits, some of the following indirectly related researches are of considerable interest to the research investigation.

Studies Having General Relevance to the Problem

Stern, Stein and Bloom (1956) made the first investigation at the University of Chicago on the relationships of situations, personality and learning in higher education.
The instruments used categorized students into four groups: authoritarian, anti-authoritarian, irrationals, and rationals. Initial results indicated that institutions varied considerably in the relative proportions with which each type of person was represented. Although the investigation was much broader than measurement of the college environment alone, it served an extremely important function in aiding future research.

In 1957, Pace and Stern administered the first edition of the College Characteristics Index to students and faculty at institutions of higher learning. The results showed that the differences in the institutional climates were significant and could be directly measured. The investigation also indicated a trend for cultures within a student population to be as diverse as variables among student bodies at different institutions.

Among the earliest studies of satisfaction with the college experiences in relation to environmental factors was that done by Davie (1958) at Yale University. The assumption of his study was that satisfaction is a direct result of the interaction process between the student and college environment. A major characteristic of the environment was arbitrarily defined as any attribute
subscribed to the satisfaction measure on: (a) a very hazy perception of Yale at entrance (negative), (b) spending money per month, (c) student employment, (d) getting along with girls, (e) getting along with boys, and (f) ease of making friends at Yale. The general conclusion was that those students who found what they expected to find, experienced greater satisfaction than did those students who found less of the expected characteristics.

A series of studies were conducted by Pace (1960, 1963, 1967) using the original and revised College and University Environment Scales (CUES). Among the consistent findings relevant to this study were: (a) students have a consensus on the perception of any campus environment, (b) incoming freshmen perception of a campus environment is more positive than that of upperclassmen, (c) the behavior of students expressed by them in college are also generally congruent with the environmental press of their campus, and (d) students majoring in education generally get higher percentiles in the practicality and propriety scales. All these studies emphasized the consensus opinion of student subgroups regarding the dominant features or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the campus.

In his doctoral dissertation, Burnett (1963)
attempted a descriptive study of the image of Forth Hays Kansas State College held by high school seniors in forty selected public high schools. In gathering the information for the study, a self-made sixty item inventory was used. Items were classified into subject areas dealing with student body, physical plant, student activity and other related matters. Items included in the Inventory were drawn from more than 200 essays written by freshmen students, dealing with advantages and disadvantages of attending public high schools. Variations in the patterns or responses suggested that the image of the college was not equally well defined in all geographical and subject areas. In general, the closer the seniors lived to other opportunities for higher education, the more uncertain they became about their opinion regarding the State College.

In the City of St. Louis, Seymour (1965) studied the nature and accuracy of college environment held by students and counselors in nine high schools and four colleges. The College Characteristics Index of Pace and Stern was used to measure the perception of the environment. The resulting profiles were treated for similarity (or difference) using both the D statistics and profile correlations. Individual factor score means were treated for differences using the t
test. The findings were that: (a) the perceptions of the four area colleges held by the high school seniors were different from those of high school counselors; (b) using college students' perception of their own college environment as a measure of a college's "real" environment, the perceptions of the seniors and high school counselors are quite inaccurate. Furthermore, high school seniors who were seriously considering attending one of these colleges perceived it differently from seniors who had not considered that college. This study presents a lot of implications to vocational counselors in the high schools.

Differential perceptions were the concern in Duling's study (1966) in which the CUES was administered to 683 juniors at Colorado State College. The analysis of perceptions of students belonging to various subgroups showed that statistically there were many differences in the mean scores of each subgroup. It was found that students' perceptions of campus environment seemed to change relative to how much time elapsed in the quarter when the measurement was taken. Little difference was found when students were tested individually or in college classes. The researcher recommended that further studies be made at other levels of the student body to determine if the results were charac-
teristic of all classes or if a trend could be identified. The fact that this study utilized only changes among those in the junior level was noted as a weakness of the study.

McGibbeny (1967) administered the College Characteristics Index to measure the internal and public image of a State College. The analysis of variance to test for significance of difference at the .05 level showed that:
(a) the public intellectual and non-intellectual images of the State College were incongruent with each other, and
(b) the internal image of the college has not been communicated to prospective students and guidance directors. It was recommended that emphasis on the improvement of intellectual climate should be made within the freshman year, when the expectations are still high and viable. A significant limitation of the study was the absence of information as to the degree of influence the guidance directors have in the freshmen's choice of the college.

Studies Having Particular Relevance to the Problem

A study by Sinco (1968) on the personality needs of students and their perceptions of the environmental press was done in three (public, private, sectarian) universities in the Philippines using the College Charac-
teristics Index to measure perceptions and the Stern Activities Index to measure personality factors. The findings showed that, in general, no significant differences between the perceptions of freshmen and sophomores were found on the eleven environmental factors and twelve personality needs of students. However, the students from the public university were found to have high needs in the following personality factors: Applied Interests, Intellectual Interest, Motivation, Orderliness, Closeness, and Submission. They showed low needs for expression-constraints and egoism-diffidence. For the private sectarian university students, the press of environment was found strongest in academic climate, academic achievement, social press, academic organization, group life, and vocational climate, and lowest in student dignity. The press of the environment in a private nonsectarian institution was in the direction of vocational climate and academic organization. Low press was perceived in the factors of aspirational level, intellectual climate, and academic climate.

In a study designed to determine the relation or congruency that exists among students' perceptions of the environment, as measured by the CUES, and the openness and
closedness of their belief systems, as measured by the
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. Shearer (1969) found significant
differences when the freshmen most open to change were
compared with data gathered at the first and second testing
sessions. Furthermore, it was concluded that the upper-
classmen's perception, translated into behavior, do much to
create an environment which fits their description.
Students most open to change did not perceive the environ­
ment differently than the students most closed to change.
Thus, student perceptions are due to factors in the
environment rather than the openness of closedness of their
belief systems, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.

Another pertinent study is that of Hersemann (1969).
Students participating in this study were classified into
four sub-cultures—collegiate, vocational, academic, and/
or non-conformist; and staff members classified into Dean
of Students' Staff members and Staff members in other
administrative offices. The subjects consisting of 242
upperclassmen and forty staff members answered the CUES.
Student personnel workers and students generally perceived
the campus environment in a similar manner. Perceptions
held by members of the non-conformist subculture, however,
were generally different from those of other subcultures.
Non-conformists saw less emphasis on the awareness dimension and significantly less emphasis on the scholarship dimension in the environment. Dean of students' staff members and staff members in other administrative offices had statistically significant differences on the community and scholarship scales, with the latter perceiving greater stress in these areas.

In the 1969 APGA convention at Las Vegas, Vernon L. Hendrix presented a research paper on Junior College Environments and Student Program Change Mechanism, which utilized a different approach and different instruments but was considerably related to the present study. The primary concern of the study was to identify relationships between environmental measurements in twenty-four colleges and selected attitudes and behaviors of the new freshmen. The instruments used were self-made Environmental Scales (Conventional Conformity, Internalization, Maturation, and Humanism), Super's Work Values Inventory, and the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB). The analysis utilized the multiple regression equation for the environmental variables, along with the individual correlation coefficients between the environmental variables and the two standardized instruments mentioned. Because of its large sample (10,000
students), a significant level of $\alpha$ equal to .001 was selected. It was found that in most cases the environmental measures were statistically significantly related to students' beliefs in the extent to which they could succeed, participate in college activities, and had been encouraged or discouraged to pursue their education.

Salzman (1970) made a study of an all female liberal arts college on the relationships between students' needs and/or perceptions for experience of satisfaction with the college environment. Perceptual variables were determined by raw scores on the CUES. Need disposition was measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Scale, and satisfaction was assessed by the College Satisfaction Index. The results showed that: (a) a significant relationship between students' needs and their perceptions of the college emerged not only for the total sample but for the groups categorized as satisfied and dissatisfied; (b) students who tend to be satisfied manifested greater needs to be dependent, to conform, to follow instructions, to have things run smoothly, and to be generous with other individuals; (c) satisfied students perceived the college environment as being friendly and cohesive; as stressing personality enrichment and expressiveness; and as emphasizing polite-
ness, consideration and academic pursuits; and (d) dissatisfied students manifested greater needs to be successful and be recognized, to criticize and attack contrary points of view, and to experience novelty and change in daily routine.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The primary purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between students' perceptions of a campus environment and some personality characteristics. The study assumed that although there will be a consensus among students in each aspect of campus environment, there will be some students with differential perceptions who will manifest distinct personality traits. More specifically, the following correlates to perception were hypothesized: personality traits, length of stay in the college, sex, grade-point average, college entrance score, and leadership roles.

The research questions on which the hypotheses of this study were based, were the following:

Perception and Personality Traits: Will students' perception of a campus environment correlate with some personality characteristics?

C. R. Pace (1966) found that what a student reports to be true about his environment is generally unrelated to his personal characteristics (p. 10)." However, Pace's
studies did not categorize separately the low and high raters of campus environment in his study, because his studies were based on the topic of consensus definition of a campus environment.

Astin (1965), who has made extensive research on campus environment based on students' characteristics, stated that "the character of a social environment is dependent upon the nature of its members, and that if we are able to determine the character of those who make up the group, we should know the climate which that group creates (p. 308)." Astin wrote further that "... if we accept the current belief that academic achievement is more than individual capacity to learn, ... it is preferable to study these characteristics in detail as well as the perceptions of the student body as a whole (p. 308)."

Sidles (1966) recommended research on perceptions-personality interactions when he wrote: "Perhaps the most significant implication for future research arising from the study is the impetus to use both personality measure and environmental dimensions, and the interactions of these factors, in future research (p. 130)."

However, there have been conflicting findings on the studies regarding the relationship of environmental percep-
tions to personality. While Shearer (1969) concluded that the openness or closedness of students' belief systems did not seem to influence the change in the students' perceptions of the environment, Hersemann (1969) found that perceptions held by members of the non-conformist subculture were generally different from those of members of other subcultures.

Most of the studies supported the fact that students have a consensus in describing a campus environment and their perceptions are not related to personality characteristics. However, this study assumes that there will be a few "deviates" who would rate an institution either very positively or negatively. Deviant perceivers are being hypothesized as having personality traits correlates.

**Length of Stay in College:** Does the length of stay in the College relate to the perception of students on the campus?

This question was specifically concerned with the similarity or differences of student subgroups' (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors) ratings of college environment, as categorized by their length of stay in the college.
Duling (1966) found that student perceptions of the campus environment seemed to change relative to how much time has elapsed in the quarter when the measurement was taken. The tendency was for the rating of the college environment to become more negative as the students stayed longer on the campus. The same results were found in the study by Shemsky (1966) which found the freshmen group the least dissatisfied with the Saint Joseph's College environment, with the seniors sharing the greatest amount of dissatisfaction.

This study has also embraced the findings of Shearer (1969) that freshmen's perceptions are much more complimentary to the university than the upperclassmen's. The upperclassmen's perceptions, translated into behavior, also do much to create an environment which fits their description of a campus environment.

However, the only study of the campus environment done in the Philippines (Sinco, 1968) found no significant difference in the perceptions between freshmen and sophomore students using the College Characteristics Index. This study, therefore, has attempted to shed light on the consistency of perception as related to length of stay in a Philippine campus environment.
Perception and Sex: Do male students differ in their perceptions of the campus environment from female students?

Pace's assumption is that there will be no difference in the perceptions of an educational environment between male and female students. Herr (1965) took exception to Pace's assumption. In his research of differential perceptions of environmental press by high school students with the use of the High School Characteristics Index, the results showed that girls tended to perceive more intellectual and dependency press than did boys. Girls also tended to perceive more emotional expression press for dominance, emotionality, narcissism and sexuality than did boys. In terms of statistical significance (chi square at .05 level), boys perceived more press for play and aggression. The same results were supported in the study of Finley (1968) in his investigation of the phenomena of student satisfaction with their school experiences, in which girls expressed significantly higher satisfaction scores than did boys. The research of Abbott (1967) also concluded that sex differences influence the perceptions of a college environment.

The fact that this study is being done in a public normal college in the Philippine setting presents an
unpredictable result when it comes to sex differences. Only about one-fourth of the subjects in this study are males. In the Philippines, it has always been a cultural attitude to look upon teaching as a feminine function. The rigid admission requirements in the Regional Teacher-Education Colleges however, attract many male students of potential. This study, therefore, hypothesized that the males will rate the campus environment lower than the females since the Filipino culture in general demands that the male take a more aggressive role than the females. McConnel and Heist (1962) ably reinforced the cultural influence when he wrote: "... It is becoming increasingly apparent that the social and cultural background of students ... condition their perceptions (p. 19)."

Grade-Point Average, College Entrance Scores, and Leadership Role: Do the grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership qualities correlate with students' perception of a campus environment?

The additional variables included in this study are: (a) the grade-point average of all the students included in this study based on their first semester ratings during the school year 1970-71, (b) the results of the required college
entrance scores, and (c) the leadership qualities as rated by class advisers, and leadership roles as indicated by students in the answer sheets.

Among Herr's findings (1965), in his study of high school students' differential perception, was that students who participated actively in extra-curricular activities or who assumed leadership roles perceived the environment differently from those who did not participate actively. It resulted in achievement level having a far heavier role in producing the significantly different perceptions than did participation (or leadership in this study).

Pace (1969) reported positive relationship between scholastic aptitude and scholarship scale scores. Planning to enter graduate school was related negatively to practicality, community, and propriety scale scores, and positively to the scholarship scale. Dean (1966) found no relationship between grades and what students stated they expected when high school seniors and what they stated they actually found as freshmen at the campus.

This study did not anticipate any positive relationship of school marks, entrance scores and leadership roles to the student's perception of the campus environment. As a whole the students will have a consensus rating of the
campus environment as it actually exists, and this unanimity of impression is being hypothesized as not positively related to individual performance.

HYPOTHESES

On the basis of the preceding questions, the following hypotheses were made:

I. The students' differential perceptions of a campus environment are related to some personality traits.

A. The students with positive perception of the campus environment will get a higher percentile in the passive personality traits of conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency; and a lower percentile in the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry.

B. The students with negative perception of campus environment will get a higher percentile in the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry; and a lower
percentile in the passive personality traits of conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency.

C. The typical group's perception of campus environment will not be related to either the passive personality traits of conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency, or the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry.

II. The freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior students' perceptions will have a consensus in rating the seven major areas as defined by practicality, community, awareness, propriety, scholarship, campus morale, and quality of teaching and faculty-student relationship of the campus environment.

III. The students' perception of campus environment will be lower, the longer they stay in the college campus.

IV. The male students' perception of the college environment will be lower than that of the females.
V. The students' perception of the campus environment will not be positively related to their grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership qualities.
CHAPTER IV

DESIGN OF THE STUDY, PROCEDURES, AND INSTRUMENTS

DESIGN

To investigate the five possible correlates of the students' perception, the following design was used.

The students were measured on the dependent variable: perception; and on the independent variables: personality traits, length of stay in the campus, sex, grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership qualities. Relationships between these dependent and independent variables were tested for significance where possible.

The students' personal ratings of the campus environment, their concept of how other persons who know them well would rate them on some personality traits, their writing of actual leadership role, and the evaluation of class advisers of the students' leadership qualities were the bases for measuring the dependent and independent variables.

PROCEDURES

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 594 students which was
equivalent to 92 percent of the entire student population at the Bukidnon Normal College, Philippines, during the school year 1970-71. The distribution of subjects by academic year and by sex is shown on Table I.

The Bukidnon Normal College, founded in 1924, is one of the seven regional public teacher-training institutions in the country. The students enrolled in the college come from thirteen service-area provinces on the island of Mindanao. Among the requirements for applicants to be admitted to the college are: (a) they must be secondary graduates who belong to the upper 50% of the graduating class; (b) they must pass the interview during which oral English, physical condition, and personality are appraised; and (c) they must pass the entrance examination given annually. A student who fails in three courses during the year is automatically dropped from the college (BNC 1970-71 Brochure).

**Collection of Data**

The investigator sent a letter to the superintendent of the Bukidnon Normal College requesting the college counselor, with the assistance of another instructor, to undertake the following functions: (a) receiving, reading,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>491</strong></td>
<td><strong>594</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and interpreting the Manual of Instructions and other pertinent literature regarding the study; (b) scheduling the administration of the two major questionnaires; (c) collecting the forms for rating students' leadership qualities from class advisers; (d) mailing the accomplished answer sheets to the investigator; and (e) making arrangements with the registrar in gathering other needed information such as the grade of students, college entrance scores, and the history of the college.

The questionnaires were answered by class groups. Before answering the questionnaires, the students were requested to supply the following personal data: name, sex, section classification, and specific leadership roles in various school organizations.

Oral and written instructions for answering the questionnaires were given. Sufficient time was provided for answering the questionnaires. A fifteen-minute break was provided before the second questionnaire was administered.

Since the schedule for administering the questionnaires was done a week after the island was visited by a destructive typhoon, a special schedule for individual and group administration of the questionnaires to students who were absent was made.
The written directions for answering the questionnaires can be referred to in Appendixes B and D.

The sixteen class advisers were requested to rate the leadership qualities of the students. By policy and tradition, class advisers are generally the first persons the students would approach in the school regarding their desire for participation in extra-curricular activities. Assignment of class advisers are generally permanent to give instructors the opportunity to provide better knowledge and service to students as the students stay longer on the campus.

Information regarding leadership role was supplied by the students themselves as part of the information requested in the answer sheet form.

The grade-point average of the students was based on the first semester's grades submitted in December 1970 for the school year 1970-71. Except for the two senior classes undergoing at the time on- and off-campus practice teaching, the students in general take a load of seven courses each semester. The school uses a 1 (excellent) to 5 (failure) figure marking system with 2.5 as the standard for average mark. A student who gets a grade of 3.6 to 4.4 is considered "condioned" and may pass or fail a course after
taking a second examination.

The College Entrance Scores used were those from a Competitive Entrance Examination used as a basis for admission to regional public teacher-training institutions. The Entrance Tests consists of Part I: Intelligence Test, and Part II: Questions on English Usage and General Information.

INSTRUMENTS

Two standardized instruments were used in this study. A brief description of the measurement tools follows:

The College and University Environment Scales (R. Pace, Revised, 1966).

The CUES provide a measure of the campus environment along seven dimensions or scales. They are: Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, Scholarship, Campus Morale, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships. The rationale for selecting the subscales is that it is generally accepted that the atmosphere of any campus is a mixture of features and attitudes, including: rules and procedures, faculty characteristics, student interests, courses of study, extra-curricular activities, the extent to which this is communicated among students, faculty and
administration, and the degree of awareness, involvement, and controversy. The CUES defines a school environment by the perception of the students who live in it. The assumed validity of the student perception approach of Pace (1963) lies in the following argument:

... Regardless of individual behavior, or assorted physical facts such as money or size, the environment, in a psychological sense, is what it is perceived to be by the people who live in it. ... Thus realistically, what people think is true is true for them (p. 7).

The said assumption has been fully supported by both Combs' and Kelly's theories and adopted as the conceptual framework of the study.

The CUES questionnaire consisted of 100 items in which the students were requested to answer either true or false. The investigator randomly distributed the items and substituted some words which were considered by a group of Filipino professionals to be absent in the students' cultural context, such as, professor to instructor; messy to disorderly, figures to persons, drinking to drinking alcoholic beverages, university housing to college boarding houses, local politics to civic organizations (faculty members are not allowed to engage in politics), bermuda shorts to jeans (shorts are never used in school), pin-up pictures to sexy
pictures, and pranks to mischiefs.

In this questionnaire, the student takes the function of being a reporter of the college and indicates whether he thinks each statement is generally characteristic; a condition that exists; an event that occurs or may occur; and the way the people generally act or feel in a particular environment.

The CUES have a high degree of internal consistency ranging from .89 to .94 based on Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha (Pace, 1969, p. 42). The instrument is also supported by a good deal of concurrent validity, with correlations ranging from 40 to 60 (pp. 53-54). Description of the five scales can be found in Appendix A.


The items in the EPI were developed from three major sources: (a) interviews in which individuals were asked informally about personality characteristics of someone well known to them; (b) published biographies and autobiographies; and (c) statements written specifically to represent a given personality trait.

Each of the sets of scales were intercorrelated and
the correlation matrix was factor analyzed by the method of principal components. Only scales with high loadings on each of the factors in the four analyses were selected. The instrument has a reliability ranging from .71 to .94 using the Kuder-Richardson Formula of internal consistency. Only six out of the 53 scales were administered because they best represent the passive and aggressive personality traits needed for categorizing students in this study. The items in the six scales were randomly distributed in the questionnaire.

The EPI was designed to measure a large number of personality characteristics in which normal individuals vary. The new EPI differed from other personality inventories. For instance, almost all items inquiring into the examinees' religion, and political beliefs, or into his relations with the family, were eliminated. There were no items about his health or bodily functions. Furthermore, nearly all items that had extreme socially undesirable scale values were eliminated because of "... evidence (Walsh, Layton, and Kleiger, 1966) that college students regard their being asked to respond "true" or "false" to such items as an invasion of privacy (Edwards, 1966, p. 1)."

The EPI requested the examinee to describe himself as
he believes others who know him well would rate him. It is based on the hypothesis "... that the personal problems of many individuals are related to the way in which they believe others perceive them (p. 2)." The investigator assumed that the direct answering about one's behavior in a group administration setting is anxiety provoking and less accurate because the respondents are likely to be defensive in the process.

The six passive and aggressive traits used for the study were: Conformity (from Booklet I-A-H), Dependency (Booklet IV-J), Avoids Facing Problems (Booklet II-B), Becomes Angry (Booklet IV-E), Critical of Others (Booklet IV-B), and Feels Superior (Booklet III-H).

**Non-Standardized Measures**

The Leadership Rating Scale Form requested the class advisers to indicate by assigning the appropriate number of their rating in the (1 to 5) continuum scale, the measured rating that best describes the Leadership Qualities of the individual student. Judgments of instructors were based on actual observations and experiences with the students using the definition from the EPI (Edwards, 1966, p.7). The Leadership Rating Scale Form can be found in Appendix E. In
an accompanying letter, the instructors were requested to keep their evaluation of students' Leadership Qualities highly confidential. All accomplished forms were duly signed by the class advisers.

The Leadership Role, as supplied by the students in the answer sheet, was rated by the investigator according to the importance of the student's participation in various extra-curricular activities. The same continuum as that of Leadership Quality was used.

After examining the returns of the data, 594 of the students were included as sample for the research. Subjects were deleted on the bases of incomplete data return due to (a) inability of the students to follow directions, and (b) the adviser refraining from rating said student due to lack of evidence as suggested in the basic instructions.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Scoring

Scoring the CUES (Pace, 1969, pp. 12-13) is based on a consensus rationale and obtained as follows:

a. Add the number of items answered by 66 percent or more of the students in the keyed direction.

b. Subtract the number of items answered by 33 percent or fewer of the students in the keyed direction.
c. Add 20 points to the difference, so as to eliminate any possibility of obtaining a negative score.

The manner for scoring the CUES has been modified in the present study in order to identify the individual Negative, Typical, and Positive responses. Every individual student's incorrect responses were subtracted from the correct responses based on the keyed direction, and 20 points were added to the difference to eliminate negative scores. The scores were then converted to raw score percentiles using the table in the manual. The percentile equivalents for CUES scores, second edition, were based on the reference group of 100 colleges and universities in the United States.

The scoring for the EPI considered only the answer sheets with complete responses. A question mark was not considered a response and therefore, was not scored to avoid distorted results. The keys for scoring responses for the scales in the EPI were based on the manual (pp. 45-48). The raw scores were converted into percentiles (pp. 36-44), which are based on percentile norms of university students.

There were two major reasons for using the percentile score in the analysis. First, for comparability of results
since both instruments recommend interpretation by means of percentiles; and second, because of Pace's (1969) statement that "since the raw scores on one scale are not equivalent in items with the raw scores in the other scales, the scores have been converted to percentiles (p. 27)." In the EPI manual, Edwards also wrote that the "interpretation of scores on the EPI ordinarily will be accomplished by means of percentile norms prepared for each of the scales (p. 5)."

**Statistical Analysis**

All data were processed at the University of British Columbia using the 360/67 Model Computer.

In identifying the low, average, and high raters of the campus environment, the average of individual CUES scores were transformed to $z$ scores. Each $z$ score represented the deviation from the mean expressed in standard deviation units. The individual $z$ scores were then sorted from the lowest negative to the highest positive $z$ score value. The lowest 5% raters with $z$ scores ranging from -3.699 to -1.969 were categorized as Negative Raters; 5% of the mid-average students with $z$ scores ranging from .131 to .234 as Typical Raters; and the highest 5% with $z$ scores from 1.330 to 1.746 as Positive Raters. Each subgroup had
thirty students with a total of ninety students for the three subgroups. It can be noted from the z score distribution that there were more cases of extreme positive than negative raters of the campus environment.

In comparing possible significant differences between means in Hypotheses I to IV, an analysis of variance was applied using the F ratio (Walker and Lev, 1953, p. 25). For determining which comparisons among the means were significant in Hypotheses I to III, Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (Edwards, 1968, p. 131) was also applied.

In determining the degree of relationship among the eleven variables needed to answer Hypothesis V, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed as a statistical technique (Runyon and Haber, 1967, p. 85).

The level of significance set for making statistical decisions was set at $\alpha .05$ for all the hypotheses.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The results of the study will be presented in accordance with the hypotheses. For a more meaningful presentation, the subhypotheses will be simultaneously discussed.

Results Relevant to Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I: The students' differential perceptions of a campus environment are related to some personality traits.

Subhypothesis A: The students with positive perception of the campus environment will get a higher percentile in the passive personality traits of conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency; and a lower percentile in the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry.

Subhypothesis B: The students with negative perception of campus environment will get a higher percentile in the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry; and a lower percentile in the passive personality traits of conformity,
avoiding facing problems, and dependency.

Subhypothesis C: The typical group's perception of campus environment will not be related to either the passive personality traits of conformity, avoiding facing problems, and dependency, or the aggressive personality traits of feeling superior, being critical of others, and becoming angry.

Hypothesis I was tested by comparing the differences of percentiles in the personality traits of students in three subgroups, namely the Negative Raters, Typical Raters, and Positive Raters of campus environment.

The personality traits percentile of Negative, Typical, and Positive Raters are shown in Table II. In general, the data show a trend for the positive perceivers to get a higher percentile on the passive traits (Conforms, Avoids Facing Problems, and Dependent), while the students categorized as Negative Raters got a higher percentile in the aggressive traits (Feels Superior, Critical of Others, and Becomes Angry). However, the inconsistent result for the Typical Raters in the two aggressive traits did not support the hypothesis on students categorized as average raters. It was assumed that at least the three subgroups would follow a trend in all six personality traits. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>Negative Raters</th>
<th>Average Raters</th>
<th>Positive Raters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms</td>
<td>52.27</td>
<td>69.93</td>
<td>75.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids Facing Problems</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>82.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>44.77</td>
<td>59.10</td>
<td>75.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels Superior</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>37.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical of Others</td>
<td>56.87</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>50.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becomes Angry</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>58.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = NR = 30
AR = 30
PR = 30
results showed that the Typical Raters got a lower percentile than the Positive Raters in the trait of superiority and a slightly higher score than the Negative Raters in the trait of being critical of others. The percentile profiles of student subgroups' personality traits can be compared in Figure 1.

A summary of the analysis of variance using the F ratio for obtaining significance is shown in Table III. The three subgroups' passive personality traits were found significantly different at the .001 level. In the aggressive traits, there were no significant differences in the traits of Feels Superior (.23) and Critical of Others (.41), but a significant difference was found among the subgroups in the aggressive trait of Becomes Angry (.03).

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied to the same variables to determine which comparisons among means were significant. The Duncan ranges, as used between the first and second and third subgroups, are: 2.7836 and 2.9271. A summary of the findings is shown in Table IV.

In the passive traits of all the subgroups—Low or Negative Raters, Average or Typical Raters, and High or Positive Raters—pairings were significantly different, except in the comparison between the Average Raters and the High Raters in the trait of Conformity. In contrast, no
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Figure 1
Personality Traits Percentile Profiles of Negative, Typical, and Positive Raters of Campus Environment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Observed F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conforms</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7957.10</td>
<td>3978.50</td>
<td>11.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29521.00</td>
<td>339.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37478.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids Facing</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15261.00</td>
<td>7630.50</td>
<td>18.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35744.00</td>
<td>410.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51005.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14127.00</td>
<td>7063.30</td>
<td>20.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30321.00</td>
<td>348.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74282.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels Superior</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2459.50</td>
<td>1229.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71823.00</td>
<td>825.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74282.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical of Others</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>934.16</td>
<td>467.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44842.00</td>
<td>515.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45776.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becomes Angry</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3692.30</td>
<td>1846.10</td>
<td>3.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46256.00</td>
<td>531.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49948.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>Perceptual Pairing</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Statistical Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Conforms</td>
<td>AR over LR</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over LR</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over AR</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Avoids Facing Problems</td>
<td>AR over LR</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over LR</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over AR</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dependent</td>
<td>AR over LR</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over LR</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over AR</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Feels Superior</td>
<td>AR over LR</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over LR</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR over AR</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Critical of Others</td>
<td>AR over LR</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR over HR</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR over HR</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Becomes Angry</td>
<td>LR over AR</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR over HR</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR over HR</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Not sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- LR = Low Raters of campus environment or Negative Raters
- AR = Average Raters or Typical Raters
- HR = High Raters or Positive Raters
significant difference in means was noted in two aggressive traits; however, the mean of the Low Raters and the High Raters in the personality trait of Becomes Angry was found significantly different.

It is of interest to note that except in the aggressive traits of Feels Superior and Critical of Others, the difference between the means of Negative and Positive Raters was significant. In addition, the subgroups, in general, got a higher percentile in the passive traits than in the aggressive traits.

The results support Subhypothesis A that the students with positive perceptions of the campus environment will get a higher percentile in the passive personality traits and a lower percentile in the aggressive personality traits. Subhypothesis B was also supported in that students with negative perceptions of campus environment did get a higher percentile in the aggressive personality traits and a lower percentile in the passive personality traits. However, Subhypothesis C, that the perception of students categorized as belonging to the typical group will not be related to either the aggressive or passive traits, was not supported. Although the trend shows that the typical group's percentile was between the two extreme
subgroups in the passive traits, the Typical Raters got a slightly lower percentile in the trait of Feels Superior and also a slightly higher percentile in the trait Critical of Others.

In summary, the findings showed statistically significant differences among the Negative, Typical, and Positive Raters in the passive personality traits as hypothesized. The Negative and Positive Raters also showed differences in the aggressive traits in the direction of the hypothesis. However, the results for the Typical Raters did not show a consistent trend in the aggressive traits.

**Results Relevant to Hypothesis II**

Hypothesis II: The freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior students' perceptions will have a consensus in rating the seven major areas as defined by practicality, community, awareness, propriety, scholarship, campus morale, and quality of teaching and faculty-student relationship of the campus environment.

Results relating to Hypothesis II are based on the 594 Freshmen, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students used as subjects in this study. The number of subjects in each
subgroup can be referred to in Table I on page 38.

Table V shows the percentile for CUES scores categorized by academic year of attendance at the college. The consensus perception of the four subgroups of the campus environment is evident not only in the rating of the CUES subscales but also in the following average ratings: Freshmen, 71.89; Sophomores, 71.80; Juniors, 76.04; and Seniors, 68.58.

The summary of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the CUES categorized by academic year is shown in Table VI. As indicated, the significant F ratios were found by comparing the subgroups' differences with the scales on (a) Awareness ($p < .003$), (b) Scholarship ($p < .03$), and (c) Campus Morale ($p < .03$), respectively. The scores in the four other scales—(a) Practicality ($p < .68$), (b) Community ($p < .26$), (c) Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship ($p < .19$), and (d) Propriety ($p < .07$) were not significantly different.

The results of the statistical analysis using Duncan's New Multiple Comparison Test is presented in Table VII. The table presents only the significant mean differences among student subgroups for the convenience of the reader. The third range (3.0161) was added in this specific
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>83.18</td>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>85.44</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>84.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>60.29</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td>55.63</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>56.26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>53.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>65.30</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>73.16</td>
<td>70.08</td>
<td>73.09</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td>90.10</td>
<td>90.71</td>
<td>88.35</td>
<td>89.81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching, and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>75.58</td>
<td>76.38</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>74.20</td>
<td>75.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentile</td>
<td>71.89</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>71.68</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Freshmen = 157
Sophomores = 142
Juniors = 140
Seniors = 155
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Observed F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>435.31</td>
<td>145.10</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>.16646</td>
<td>282.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.16690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5033.00</td>
<td>1677.70</td>
<td>3.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>.32105</td>
<td>544.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.32609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2619.20</td>
<td>873.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>.38764</td>
<td>657.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.39026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8141.10</td>
<td>2713.70</td>
<td>4.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>.33763</td>
<td>572.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.34577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2023.80</td>
<td>674.59</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>.16998</td>
<td>288.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.17200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>467.43</td>
<td>155.81</td>
<td>3.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>30312.00</td>
<td>51.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>30779.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>414.00</td>
<td>139.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>51376.00</td>
<td>87.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>51790.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
analysis, since there are four subgroups being compared for significant differences between means. As stated earlier, the analysis of variance found that three of the seven College and University Environment Scales had significant differences among means. For this specific analysis, each scale will be discussed separately below. The seven scales are:

A. Practicality: The subgroups' mean percentile scores (Freshmen, 83.18; Sophomores, 84.80; Juniors, 85.44; and Seniors, 84.92) on this scale were found to be homogeneous.

B. Scholarship: Only one of the six pairwise combinations was found to have a significant mean difference. It was the comparison between Freshmen and Senior students, with a difference of 7.96.

C. Community: This scale was found to have homogeneous subgroup mean percentile scores; that is, no pairs differed by more than the shortest significant range.

D. Awareness: Half of the pairwise combinations were found to have significant differences in means. They were: (1) Juniors over Seniors, with a mean difference of 6.15; (2) Sophomores over Seniors with 6.45; and (3) Freshmen over Seniors, with the biggest mean difference of
TABLE VII

SIGNIFICANT CUES MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SUBGROUPS USING DUNCAN'S NEW MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUES Scale</th>
<th>Non-Homogeneous Subgroup</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>No significant differences between subgroups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>A. Freshmen over Seniors</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>No significant differences between subgroups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>A. Juniors over Seniors</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Sophomores over Seniors</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Freshmen over Seniors</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>A. Freshmen over Seniors</td>
<td>4.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Sophomores over Seniors</td>
<td>4.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>A. Freshmen over Seniors</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Sophomores over Seniors</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Juniors over Seniors</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>No significant differences between subgroups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of pairs tested for significance 42
Total number of pairwise comparisons found sig. 9

* Not significant at α .05 in the F test.
E. Propriety: Although in the analysis of variance the F ratio of this scale between groups was not considered significant (.07), the Duncan's New Multiple Comparison Test found two significant differences. They were:
(1) Freshmen over Seniors, with 4.37; and (2) Sophomores over Seniors, with 4.54.

F. Campus Morale: This scale was found to have three significantly heterogeneous groups. They were:
(1) Freshmen over Seniors, with a mean difference of 2.74;
(2) Sophomores over Seniors, with 2.75; and (3) Juniors over Seniors, with 2.36.

G. Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship: There were no significant differences between subgroups in this scale. The means of 75.58 for Freshmen, 76.38 for Sophomores, 76.04 for Juniors, and 74.20 for the Seniors were considered homogeneous.

It was apparent from the results that the student subgroups rated the campus environment very highly in Campus Morale with a percentile of 90; high on Practicality (85); a slightly elevated rating in the two scales, Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship (76), and Propriety (73); high average rating on Awareness (65)
and Scholarship (56); and average in Community (53). The percentile profiles, as indicated in Figure 2, indicate the strong consensus of students with regards to their perception of the campus environment at the Bukidnon Normal College on the seven scale dimensions. The F ratios of significance test in the analysis of variance indicated that four of the seven scales are significantly homogeneous. This was further supported by the Multiple Range Test which found that only nine of the forty-two paired combinations had significantly different means. All of the nine significant mean differences among the pairings involved Senior students. This study showed that despite the fact that the overall means of the Freshmen was higher than the other subgroups, their perception could not be considered unrealistic.

The relationship of students' perception of the campus environment by academic year will be further discussed in Hypothesis III, which is closely related to Hypothesis II.

In summary, Hypothesis II that the student subgroups' perception will have a consensus in rating the seven major areas of the campus environment at the Bukidnon Normal College was supported. The subgroups' CUES scores on
Legend:

--- Freshmen
--- Sophomores
--- Juniors
--- Seniors

Figure 2

Illustrative CUES Percentile Profiles of Students Categorized by Academic Year
Practicality, Community, Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship, and Propriety, respectively, were found significantly homogeneous by the F test in the ANOVA (with the exception of Propriety), and also by the Multiple Range Test. In general, the students were more positive than negative in rating the seven major areas of the campus environment.

 Results Relevant to Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III: The students' perception of campus environment will be lower, the longer they stay in the college campus.

This hypothesis is closely related to the question raised in Hypothesis II. Specifically, this hypothesis was concerned with the differences of student subgroups' (Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors) ratings of the college environment as categorized by their length of stay in the college.

In as much as the data of student subgroups' responses were partly discussed in Hypothesis II, the discussion will delete duplication of information and will instead concentrate on presenting the subgroups' mean differences according to length of stay in the College.
Table VIII presents the ranking of CUES means by academic year. The table gives the following information according to length of stay in college:

**Freshmen**: This subgroup got the expected rank of 1 (highest mean) in only two scales (Scholarship and Awareness). It got the second highest mean in Propriety, ranked third in Campus Morale, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship, and the lowest mean (rank 4) in Practicality and Community.

**Sophomores**: They assumed rank of 2 in the CUES subscales of Scholarship, Community, Awareness, and Campus Morale; rank 1 in Propriety, Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship; and rank 3 in Practicality. The group did not deviate more than one rank from its expected position in each dimension of the campus environment.

**Juniors**: This subgroup got its expected rank of 3 in Scholarship, Awareness, and Propriety; a rank of 2 in the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship scale; and the highest mean percentile in the dimensions of Practicality, Community, and Campus Morale.

**Seniors**: The seniors got the lowest rank as expected in five scales, but got the rank of 3 in the aspect of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Freshmen Mean</th>
<th>Freshmen Rank</th>
<th>Sophomores Mean</th>
<th>Sophomores Rank</th>
<th>Juniors Mean</th>
<th>Juniors Rank</th>
<th>Seniors Mean</th>
<th>Seniors Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>83.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>60.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>75.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community, and the rank of 2 in Practicality. This study assumed that seniors have the most realistic perception of the campus environment.

It can be noted that the two subscales, Scholarship and Awareness, were the only ones that fully supported the hypothesis, if the trend in ranking is made the basis of finding differences according to length of stay in the college. The differences in these two subscales was further supported by the high level of significance in the F ratio of the analysis of variance, which were .02 and .003, respectively. The Duncan's New Multiple Comparison Test also found the Awareness and the Campus Morale scales not homogeneous.

It can, therefore, be stated that the students' perception of the campus environment only partially supported the length of stay criteria in evaluating the institutional image when categorized by CUES subscales. This was shown in the results of the F test in the Analysis of Variance and corroborated in the Duncan's New Multiple Range Tests.

Results Relevant to Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV: The male students' perception of the campus environment will be lower than that of the females.
The results of this hypothesis were again based on the seven dimensions of the College and University Environment Scales. The number of subjects were unequal as regards to sex category. There were only 103 males as compared to 491 females.

Table IX shows the mean differences between males and females on the CUES percentile scores. As indicated in Table IX and in Figure 3, both sexes perceived the environmental press in practically the same manner; however, the males got lower means than the females in all dimensions of the CUES. There were three subscales in which the differences were not found to be significant. The first was in the area of Practicality, in which the mean difference was 1.16 and a probability of .54; the second was in the Awareness scale with a mean difference of 1.09 and a probability of .68; and the third was in the Scholarship scale with a difference of 3.57 and a probability of .07. However, the scales on Community, with a difference of 6.61, was significant at α .05; and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship, with a mean difference of 3.45, was highly significant at the .0007 level. The summary of the analysis of variance on CUES total and subscales with sex as an independent variable is shown in
TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES' AND FEMALES' PERCENTILE SCORES ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean for Males</th>
<th>Mean for Females</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>83.60</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>57.07</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>54.08</td>
<td>6.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>63.62</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>69.94</td>
<td>73.70</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>88.21</td>
<td>90.12</td>
<td>1.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td>3.45***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p significant at \( \alpha .05 \)
**p significant at \( \alpha .01 \)
***p significant at \( \alpha .001 \)

n for Males = 103; Females = 491
Profile Comparing Mean Percentile Differences Between Male and Female Students on CUES
The overall F ratio of 5.62 indicated that as a whole, the difference between sexes on all CUES subscales was significant at the .02 level. The hypothesis, then, that male students will rate the campus environment lower than the females was supported in part by the direction of mean differences, which showed males as having lower means than females in all CUES scores, and by the fact that the differences in four of the seven scales were significant.

Results Relevant to Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V: The students' perception of the campus environment will not be positively related to their grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership qualities.

In this hypothesis, the 594 subjects were considered as one for the purpose of analysis. As in all previous discussions of findings, the dependent variable, perception, as measured by CUES, was the basis for correlating the independent variables of grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership roles.

As seen in Table XI, the negative correlations of the four variables with the CUES scales is very apparent.
### TABLE X

ANOVA SUMMARY OF CUES SUBSCALES WITH SEX AS INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Observed F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115.23</td>
<td>115.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>.16678</td>
<td>281.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.16690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1792.90</td>
<td>1792.90</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>.32429</td>
<td>547.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.32609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3256.00</td>
<td>3256.00</td>
<td>4.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>.38700</td>
<td>653.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.39026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>.34567</td>
<td>583.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.34577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1212.70</td>
<td>1212.70</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>.17079</td>
<td>288.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.17200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Morale</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311.27</td>
<td>311.27</td>
<td>6.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>30468.00</td>
<td>51.466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>30779.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1022.00</td>
<td>1022.00</td>
<td>11.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>50768.00</td>
<td>85.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>51790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5771</td>
<td>5.5771</td>
<td>5.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>587.66</td>
<td>.99266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>593.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01  
***p < .001
The negative relationship between the variables with the seven CUES subscales can be summarized as follows:

1. GPA, with $r's$ from -.23 to -.07
2. CES, with $r's$ from -.22 to -.10
3. RL, with $r's$ from -.12 to -.05
4. LR, with $r's$ from -.11 to -.02

The date on Table XII gives the following information:

CUES and Grade-Point Average: Four of the CUES (Scholarship, Awareness, Propriety, and Campus Morale) were found to be significantly negatively related with Grade-Point Average at $\alpha .01$. The scales on Community and Faculty-Student Relationship were also negatively related with Grade-Point Average at $\alpha .05$. Only the scale on Practicality had a low degree of negative relationship with Grade-Point average.

CUES and College Entrance Scores: All scales were found to be significantly negatively related with College Entrance Scores. The scale on Campus Morale was found significant at $\alpha .05$, and the six scales significant at $\alpha .01$.

CUES and Rated Leadership: The students' perception of the campus environment was highly negatively related to Rated Leadership in the dimension of Awareness; significantly
# TABLE XI

RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS' MARKS, COLLEGE ENTRANCE SCORES, AND LEADERSHIP QUALITIES TO CUES PERCENTILE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Qualities and Academic Performance</th>
<th>College and University Environment Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade-Point Average</td>
<td>-.07  -.17**  -.09*  -.23**  -.19**  -.14**  -.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Entrance Score</td>
<td>-.13**  -.16**  -.18**  -.22**  -.13**  -.10*  -.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Leadership</td>
<td>-.10*  -.06  -.08*  -.12**  -.09*  -.06  -.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Role</td>
<td>-.03  -.10*  -.02  -.11**  -.09*  -.09*  -.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 594

*p significant at α .05

**p significant at α .01
negatively related in the dimensions of Practicality, Community, and Propriety; but not significantly negatively related in the scales of Scholarship, Campus Morale, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship.

**CUES and Leadership Role:** The scale on Awareness was again found to be highly negatively related to Leadership Role. The scales on Scholarship, Propriety, and Campus Morale were negatively related to Leadership Role. However, the scales on Practicality, Community, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship were found to have a low degree of negative relationship with Leadership Role.

Added information of interest to this specific hypothesis was the insignificant relationship between the instructors' rating on students' Leadership Quality and the actual Leadership Role as indicated by the students themselves ($r .07$). This discrepancy between the perception of the class advisers and the students will be discussed in detail in the implications for the study.

The mostly negative correlations between the Grade-Point Average, College Entrance Scores, Leadership Quality, and Leadership Role with the seven dimensions of the College and University Environment Scales support the
research hypothesis that in the Bukidnon Normal College, the students' perception of the campus environment is not positively related to academic performance and leadership roles in extra-curricular activities. The results showed consistent inverse relationships. These indicated that students with high academic performance and with leadership qualities gave the campus environment a low rating.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to ascertain the relationship of students' perception of a campus environment to some personality characteristics. The general hypothesis underlying the study was: the students' differential perceptions of the campus environment are related to some personality traits. The following correlates of perception were considered: personality traits, length of stay in college, sex, college entrance scores, academic marks, and leadership roles.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The major conceptual framework of this study included the postulate of Kelly's (1955) psychology of personal constructs that "... a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events (p. 46)," and Combs' (1959) phenomenological determinant of behavior postulate that "... all behavior, without exception, is completely determined by, and perti-
The subjects of this study included 594 students enrolled at the Bukidnon Normal College, Philippines, for the school year of 1970-71.

The College and University Environment Scales of C. Robert Pace (1966), and the new Edwards Personality Inventory (1966) were the two major instruments used in the study. In addition, the class advisers evaluated students' leadership qualities.

Means, standard deviations, analysis of variance, the F test of significance, Duncan's New Multiple Comparison Test, and the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient were the statistical techniques used in the analysis of data on the dependent and independent variables. All data were processed at the University of British Columbia with the use of a 360/67 Model Computer.
Results Relating to Differential Perceptions

The presence of differential perceptions in the evaluation of campus environment was assumed before the investigation was made. It was hypothesized that students with negative perceptions (low raters of campus environment) would get a higher percentile in aggressive personality traits, while students with positive perceptions (high raters) would get a higher percentile in passive personality traits, in comparison with low raters.

The findings showed statistically significant differences among the Negative, Typical, and Positive Raters in the passive personality traits. The Negative and Positive Raters also showed differences in the aggressive traits in the direction of the hypothesis. However, the typical group did not have a consistent trend as hypothesized, and therefore made the results inconclusive as far as the aggressive traits for the typical group is concerned.

In summary, three general conclusions can be drawn from the results of the analysis of differential perception as related to personality traits:

1. Differential perceptions exist with some students
in the Bukidnon Normal College, as far as rating the institutional image is concerned.

2. A distinct difference in the passive personality traits of Conformity, Avoids Facing Problems, and Dependency is present among low, average, and high raters of the campus environment.

3. A distinct difference in the aggressive traits of Feels Superior, Critical of Others, and Becomes Angry is present between high and low raters, but not for students categorized as average raters.

The analysis of the deviant responses by some of the students on the institutional press may suggest distorted perceptions of the demands upon them by the institution. It may suggest poor identification with the schoolmates, instructors, school administrators, and even on the courses being offered. Deviant perceptions could possibly be a result of other factors, such as the cultural background of the subjects. It could be that the total pattern of congruence between individual expectations and the perceived environmental pressures may be more predictive of academic achievement, dropping out of school, and even initiating campus unrest than any single aspect of either person or environment. Because of this, the school should capitalize
upon its ability to offer more individualized counseling, especially to deviant perceivers of campus environment. The students' evaluation of the campus is a concrete source of knowing how they feel about the campus in this age when many students in the Philippines and elsewhere are complaining about the lack of individual attention, and adult domination. This concern for better student-faculty relationship is needed in the Bukidnon Normal College because in the school year 1970-71 alone, there were two incidents caused by faculty-student misunderstanding, the latter resulting in the closing of the school on March 30 to April 1, 1971.

Further research might determine whether the differential perception among students represents actual differences of personality characteristics that can be traced from the family history or acquired while on campus. The lower percentile that the student subgroups got in the aggressive traits as compared to the passive traits provides an interesting problem for further study with the use of subjects from various faculties to establish whether the finding holds true for students from other disciplines.

The fact that all the three subgroups (negative, typical, and positive perceivers) got the lowest percentile
(41) in the trait of Feels Superior could also be a focus for study. It raises these questions: Do Filipino Normal School students believe that they can not do things better than others?; Do they feel that their opinions are incorrect?; Does the trait affect their self-concept and ultimately their chances of success in studies and acceptance of life's career?

The high percentile that the Positive Raters got in the passive personality trait of Avoids Facing Problems presents an interesting topic for future investigation. If positive raters put off things until the last minute, do not face problems readily, or get rid of anxiety by not thinking about it, then, the counselor can make use of this to modify such behavior before the student forms the habit of using apathy in solving his problems.

Maybe some other personality characteristics can be chosen to compare differences between Negative, Typical, and Positive Raters of campus environment. Among the possibilities are the personality characteristics of masculinity, pragmatism, dogmatism, internalization, maturation, and humanism. Another angle that should be investigated is the verification of the CUES and EPI items for relevance, since the instruments have not been validated for cultural
differences.

Before guidance counselors, teachers and school administrators can implement the findings of the proposed studies, caution is needed to avoid making students conform in a stereotype manner to attain educational goals. Instead, the findings of this study suggest more creative and useful diversifications must be encouraged to provide outlets for individual differences. The findings also have implications for college counselors in their catalytic roles. The presence of deviant perceptions among students demands that the counselors need to appraise the press of the school and apply the results to the educational program. As the counselor participates in the curriculum, extra-curricular or administrative committees, continuous opportunities will arise for him to present the problems of deviant perceivers to other members of the school staff, and how it can be used as guidelines in such educational matters as academic responsibilities, student interests, and school policies. Sensitization to differential press is not only the concern of the counselor but also of all the staff members.

Results Relating to Student Subgroups' Perception on Seven Dimensions of College Campus

The hypothesis was that the freshmen, sophomore,
junior, and senior students' perception would have a consensus in rating the seven major areas of a campus environment as defined by Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, Scholarship, Campus Morale, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship.

In general, Hypothesis II was supported by all statistical analysis. The subgroups' CUES percentile in Practicality, Community, Propriety, and Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship were found significantly homogeneous in the analysis of variance and also by the Multiple Range Test. Only nine of the forty-two pairwise combinations were found to be significantly different in the Multiple Range Comparison Test. Although there was a consensus of trend in the students' evaluation of the entire CUES, the lack of homogeneity in the percentiles for the Awareness and Scholarship scales cast doubt about the unanimity of students' perception regarding the intellectual aspects as offered in the educational institution. As a whole, the students rated the Bukidnon Normal College Environment quite positively. The average percentile rating for each scale were as follows: (a) Campus Morale—90%; (b) Practicality—85%; (c) Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship—76%; (d) Propriety—73%; (e) Aware-
ness—65%; (f) Scholarship—56%; and (g) Community—53%.

Although the students as a whole perceived the image of the college quite positively, the average rating (53%) given to the school as a community needs further verification. Some of the following possible reasons for its low rating should be examined in these areas: (a) helpfulness and sharing among students, (b) loyalties and friendliness of schoolmates, and (3) the presence of "dialogue" between faculty and students, as they are matters requiring mutual evaluation.

There must be a continuing examination of educational objectives and actualization, and a conscious attempt to merge the two in a functional way. The combination of idealism and actual happening is the important ingredient in decision making. It is hoped that the students' differential perception of the campus environment will be considered by the college administrators in modifying the goals and operations of the institution.

To deny the importance of students' perceptions in evoking change could prove to be a serious lack of foresight on the part of the Bukidnon Normal College administrators. In addition, there is a need for a full scale institutional analysis of the students, faculty, and parental perceptions.
of the school campus. This study can only serve as a beginning of inquiry requiring much participation on the part of all concerned with the institution.

Results Relating to Perception of Campus Environment and Length of Stay in College

It was hypothesized that the students' perception of campus environment will be lower as they stay longer in college. Ranking the means of the four subgroups consisting of Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors showed that only the subscales of Scholarship and Awareness fully supported the hypothesis. However, the trend was in the direction of the hypothesis. The overall means indicated that the students' perception of the campus environment was becoming less positive as they stay longer on campus. As expected, the Freshmen as a group rated the campus environment highest in the area of Scholarship and Awareness, which was also the findings in previous studies in western countries. The fact that the Freshmen ranked lowest in the dimension of Practicality and Community suggests that incoming students are finding adjustment problems in a new situation. This presents several implications for counselors, teachers, and school administrators in the aspects
of orientation to campus life, the need to enhance fellow­
ship, and the feeling of belongingness, so that Freshmen
can avoid undue anxiety and frustrations during the early
part of the college life. This need for adjustment in the
first year of college life may make the difference in
academic achievement and in preventing dropping out from
college. The relevance of the above reasons may also have
an influence on the low rating given by Freshmen for Campus
Morale and Faculty-Student Relationship in comparison to
upperclassmen's ratings.

Among the issues found in the study that requires
further investigation is why the Juniors, who are supposed
to have stayed for three years in college, perceived the
campus environment higher than the Freshmen and Sophomores
in the dimensions of Practicality, Community, and Campus
Morale.

A follow up study to find out how the same group of
students (except for the Seniors who are graduating) will
perceive the institutional image a year from now, is worth
undertaking to ascertain the differences of perception of
students in a longitudinal way.
Results Relating to the Differences in Perception Between Male and Female Students

The hypothesis was that the male students' perception of the college environment will be lower than that of the females. This hypothesis has been consistently supported both in the trend of mean differences and also in the analysis of variance for each CUES subscales. The difference between the males and females in both Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship was significant at the .0007 level. The subscales on Campus Morale and Community were significant at $\alpha .02$; Propriety at $\alpha .03$; and Scholarship bordering the level of significance set for the study with $\alpha .06$. Although the subscales of Practicality and Awareness got a non-significant difference, the male means on these scales were lower than that of the females.

However, caution should be exercised in interpreting these results. The subjects used are education students and as stated earlier, there was an unequal number of males (103) and females (491).

Maybe a direct look at the responses between males and females will lead students and staff members to speculate about the reasons for responses they did not anticipate and raise questions about the extent to which
responses are in harmony with or contrary to college objectives and the kind of environment the male or female students really desire to have. This will guide the administrators in making reasonable changes in the campus.

The highly significant difference between males and females in the subscale for measuring Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship, poses an urgent problem for consideration for the faculty members, school administrators and college counselors. The implication of this difference among sexes can also be incorporated with the consistent results on other subscales. Among the relevant questions possible to raise regarding the difference in perception on the Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationship are: Are the instructors thorough teachers and dedicated scholars? In their relationship with students, do college instructors and counselors show interest in both male and female students' personal problems by going out of their way to be helpful? Satisfaction with instructors, as well as personal and emotional security from instructors, will greatly enhance the functioning of the students in matters of academic pursuits and as an individual person.

Possibly, further research involving students from various disciplines and equating the relationship of
perceptions between males and females to pertinent variables such as personal characteristics, parental values, attitude and socio-economic status, career plans, and masculinity will offer a more reliable information of sex differences on the perception of campus environment.

Results Relating to Perception of Campus Environment and Students' Marks, College Entrance Scores, and Leadership Roles

Hypothesis V stated that the students' perception of campus environment will not be positively related to their grade-point average, college entrance scores, and leadership qualities. To find the relationship between variables, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. All the correlations between the four variables with the CUES were negatively related and the trend was in the direction of the hypothesis. The independent variables of GPA, RL, and LR had \( r's \) ranging from -.23 (between Grade-Point Average and Awareness) to -.02 (between Leadership Role and Community).

The consistent results of negative relationship between the CUES and the variables of Grade-Point Average, College Entrance Scores, Rated Leadership, and Leadership
Role indicate that students with high academic performance and leadership qualities at the college gave the campus environment a low rating.

Pace (1966) found that in general, responses to the CUES items were not influenced by the personal characteristics of students. "What a student reports to be true about his college environment is generally unrelated to his personal characteristics (p. 10)." He found a non-significant correlation between .00 and +.29 among 86% of his subjects. This study supported Pace's findings of no positive relationship between the CUES and individual performance qualities. However, Pace's direction of rejection, of no relationship was not the case in this study. The result was an inverse relationship in this case.

This study also found an insignificant relationship between the related variables of Rated Leadership and Leadership Role. It appears that the class advisers, despite their very close contacts with students in their respective advisory sections, are not capable of identifying students with specific leadership qualities.

The implications for the above assumptions are obvious. It requires better identification of students with potential for leadership and means of providing the
necessary encouragement for the students to assume leadership roles. The class advisers can do much to initiate activities that will interest students with leadership potentials, and to assume responsibilities. The varied extra-curricular activities in the campus can certainly provide outlets for the dormant leadership potentials. But this can only happen if students with leadership qualities perceive leadership roles as a rewarding experience. Just how rewarding leadership roles are in the campus is a good starting point for evaluation by instructors and students. Possibly, some changes in objectives, management and activities of school organizations can make a difference between student involvement and general apathy. This same issue can make a difference between a happy and dull campus environment.

While professional counseling facilities are available at the Bukidnon Normal College, they are quite limited in function and can not assume the entire responsibility of enhancing leadership roles. Therefore, the guidance and personal attention received by the students must also be shared by the class advisers.
Limitations of the Study

The two major instruments (CUES and EPI) used in the study are not "culture free" assessment tools. Pace reports of highly consistent results in studies made using the CUES, and Edwards also mentions of the general applicability of the EPI. However, the said instruments have not been used in the specific setting of the present study. Although some words and phrases have been changed to meet local conditions, the norms used for interpreting scores can only be safely applied to measure differences among the subgroups in the study but not as an accurate norm for Filipino students.

Being an exploratory study on deviant perception of a campus environment, it lacks guidelines from previous studies for possible avoidance of weaknesses regarding the theoretical framework, instrumentations, and procedures.

The subjects were education students and there was an unequal proportion of male and female students. Therefore, caution should be exercised in making generalizations from the results.

Different class advisers rated different groups of students, and therefore, a certain degree of individual differences in the manner of rating may have affected the
ratings on students' leadership qualities among subgroups.

Summary of Recommendations for Further Research

This study has encountered many unanswered questions regarding the problem of student perceptions of campus environment in an Asian setting, which requires more evidence through further studies. Scientific investigations on students' perceptions of educational press can provide students and educators a more realistic approach to the problems of education. Socrates once said, "a life unexamined is not worth living." It seems appropriate also to say that an educational setting unexamined may not be worth living in. Institutional research on the following topics are therefore recommended:

1. The relationship between deviant perceptions of a campus environment and attrition, underachievement, radical attitude, and most especially family values and personal history.

2. The relationship between perception and other broader personality characteristics such as cultural interest and self understanding.

3. An investigation of personality trait differences between Filipino male and female students.
4. The causes of differential perceptions regarding the intellectual dimensions of a campus environment.

5. The effects of individualized attention by class advisers and counselors to students' manner of evaluating the institutional press.

6. A study of the differential perception of a campus environment by Filipino students, faculty, administration, and parents.

7. A survey of the adjustment problems of freshmen in teacher-education colleges coming from urban and rural communities.

8. A study of differences in perceptions of a university campus environment in the Philippines involving students from various faculties.

9. A survey of the relationship between leadership potential and actual leadership role in various extra-curricular activities.

10. The problem of interpersonal communications between Filipino students and adults in a school system.

11. A longitudinal study on the changes of perceptions of campus environment by student subgroups.

12. An analysis of values and attitudes of students found with deviant perceptions of campus environment.
CONCLUSIONS

The perceptions of students on a campus environment was studied and the major conclusion of the study is quite clear: students have a consensus of the various dimensions that make up the school environment. It was established that deviant perceivers of the campus environment manifest some personality traits which are basically related to their manner of evaluating an institution. However, the case of the Typical Raters of the campus environment is inconclusive. In general, students have the tendency to rate the campus environment lower as they stay longer in the campus. Males were also found to rate the campus environment lower than females. Furthermore, it was found that the students' perception of campus environment was not positively related to individual academic performance and leadership roles. The implications of the findings and the need for further research was simultaneously discussed for suggested implementations.

The encouragement given by Herr (1966) on the need for identifying deviant perceivers of campus environment has been greatly justified in this study. But the research needs to be replicated to test the consistency of results.
The results of the students' perception of the campus environment generally supported the findings of Pace (1963, 1966) and others on consensus perception, but not when results were categorized into certain subgroups and with sex groupings.

Since behavior has been considered in the theoretical model as determined by the perceptual field of the organism, and psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events, the results of this investigation pose a lot of challenge to counselors, faculty members, and administrators at the Bukidnon Normal College in their quest for a quality education.

With regard to the search for excellence in educational institutions, the following quotation from the ACE Journal serves as an appropriate conclusion to this thesis:

... Part of an educator's task is to provide an environment in which young people may become more sensitive to truths and beauty... The instrument of knowledge must have a timelessness and timeliness in combination, giving students perspective in their view of themselves and of the world. When the total attributes of education are identified or translated in such terms, there can be reasonable assumptions of quality and effectiveness (ACE, 1960, p. 5).
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Scale 1. Practicality. The 20 items that contribute to the score for this scale describe an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities. There are both vocational and collegiate emphases. A kind of orderly supervision is evident in the administration and the classwork. As in many organized societies there is also some personal benefit and prestige to be obtained by operating in the system—knowing the right people, being in the right clubs, becoming a leader, respecting one's superiors, and so forth. The environment, though structured, is not repressive because it responds to entrepreneurial activities and is generally characterized by good fun and school spirit.

Scale 2. Community. The items in this scale describe a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty that encompasses the college as a whole. The atmosphere is congenial; the campus is a community. Faculty members know the students, are interested in their problems, and go out of their way to be helpful. Student life is characterized by togetherness and sharing rather than by privacy and cool detachment.

Scale 3. Awareness. The items in this scale seem to reflect a concern about the emphasis upon three sorts of meaning—personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggests the search for personal meaning. A wide range of opportunities for creative and appreciative relationships to painting, music, drama, poetry, sculpture, architecture, and the like suggest the search for poetic meaning. A concern about events around the world, the welfare of mankind, and the present and future condition of man suggests the search for political meaning and idealistic commitment. What seems to be evident in this sort of environment is a stress on awareness, an awareness of self, of society, and of aesthetic stimuli. Along with this push toward expansion, and perhaps as a necessary condition for
it, there is an encouragement of questioning and dissent and a tolerance of nonconformity and personal expressiveness.

Scale 4. Propriety. These items describe an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. There is an absence of demonstrative, assertive, argumentative, risk-taking activities. In general, the campus atmosphere is mannerly, considerate, proper, and conventional.

Scale 5. Scholarship. The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline. The emphasis is on competitively high academic achievement and a serious interest in scholarship. The pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific or philosophical, is carried on rigorously and vigorously. Intellectual speculation, an interest in ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline—all these are characteristic of the environment.

Campus Morale. The items in this scale describe an environment characterized by acceptance of social norms, group cohesiveness, friendly assimilation into campus life, and, at the same time, a commitment to intellectual pursuits and freedom of expression. Intellectual goals are exemplified and widely shared in an atmosphere of personal and social relationships that are both supportive and spirited.

Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships. This scale defines an atmosphere in which professors are perceived to be scholarly, to set high standards, to be clear, adaptive, and flexible. At the same time this academic quality of teaching is infused with warmth, interest, and helpfulness toward student. (C. Robert Pace, 1967, p. 11).
The purpose of this instrument is to describe the general atmosphere of the Bukidnon Normal College. You are asked to be a reporter of the school because you have lived in its environment and participated in its activities. There are 100 statements in this booklet. You are to answer T if true or F if false, using Part I of the Answer Sheet. You are asked whether the statement is generally characteristic or not characteristic of a condition or event. This is not a test in which there are right or wrong answers; it is an opinion poll to find how much agreement there is about the characteristics of the campus environment. The purpose of this is to help you as students. Please feel free to answer the statements as honestly as you can. The responses will be kept confidential. Thanks for your cooperation.

1. Students almost always wait to be called on before speaking in class.
2. The big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support.
3. There is a recognized group of student leaders on this campus.
4. Frequent tests are given in most courses.
5. Students take a great deal of pride in their personal appearance.
6. Education here tends to make students more practical and realistic.
7. The instructors regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are being carried out properly and on time.
8. It's important socially here to be in the right club or group.
9. Student rallies, parades, dances or demonstrations occur very rarely.
10. Anyone who knows the right people in the faculty or administration can get a better treatment here.
11. The instructors really push the students' capacities to the limit.
12. Most of the instructors are dedicated scholars in their fields.
13. Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class.
15. Class discussions are typically intense or "heated" discussions.
16. A lecture by an outstanding speaker would be poorly attended.
17. Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading student papers, reports, or discussions.
18. It is fairly easy to pass most courses without working very hard.
19. The school is outstanding for the emphasis and support it gives to pure scholarship and basic research.
20. Standards set by the instructors are particularly not hard to achieve.
21. It is easy to take clear notes in most courses.
22. The school helps everyone get acquainted.
23. Students often run errands or do other personal services for the faculty.
24. The history and traditions of the college are strongly emphasized.
25. The instructors go out of their way to help you.
26. There is a great deal of borrowing and sharing among the students.
27. When students run a project or put on a show everybody knows about it.
28. Many upperclassmen play an active role in helping new students adjust to campus life.
29. Students exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to the expected codes of conduct.
30. Graduation is an unemotional and ordinary event.
31. Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily accessible.
32. Students are encouraged to take an active part in social reforms or political programs.
33. Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs.
34. There are a good many colorful and controversial persons in the faculty.
35. There is a considerable interest in the analysis of value systems and the relativity of societies and ethics.
36. Public debates are held frequently.
37. A controversial speaker always stirs a lot of student discussion.
38. There are many facilities and opportunities for individual creative activity.
39. There is a lot of interest here in poetry, music, painting and literature.
40. Concerts and art exhibits always draw big crowds of students.
41. Students ask permission before deviating from common policies or practices.
42. Most students' rooms are disorderly.
43. People here are always trying to win an argument.
44. Drinking alcoholic beverages and late parties are generally tolerated, despite regulations.
45. Students occasionally plot some sort of resistance or rebellion.
46. Many students drive motorbikes.
47. Students frequently do things in the spur of the moment.
48. Student publication never strike dignified people or institutions.
49. The person who is always trying to "help out" is likely to be regarded as a nuisance.
50. Students are conscientious about taking good care of school property.
51. The important people at this school expect others to show proper respect for them.
52. Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling.
53. Everyone has a lot of fun in this school.
54. In many classes students have an assigned seat.
55. Student organizations are closely supervised to guard against mistakes.
56. Many students try to pattern themselves after people they admire.
57. New fads and phrases are continually springing up among the students.
58. Students must have a written excuse for absence from class.
59. The college offers many really practical courses such as gardening and cooking.
60. Student rooms are more likely to be decorated with pennants and magazine pictures than with paintings and carvings.
61. Most of the instructors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects.
62. Most courses are a real intellectual challenge.
63. Students put a lot of energy into everything they do in and out of class.
64. Course offerings and faculty in physical and natural sciences are outstanding.
65. Courses, examinations, and readings are frequently revised.
66. Personality, pull, and bluff get students through many courses.
67. There is very little studying here before and after classes.
68. There is a lot of interest in the philosophy and methods of science.
69. People around here seem to thrive on difficulty— the tougher things get, the harder they work.
70. Students are very serious and purposeful about their work.
71. This school has a reputation for being very friendly.
72. All students must live in college approved boarding houses.
73. Instructors clearly explain the goals and purposes of their courses.
74. Students have many opportunities to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of others.
75. Most of the faculty are not interested in students' personal problems.
76. Students quickly learn what is done and not done on this campus.
77. It is easy to get a group together for indoor games, picnics, singing and etc.
78. Students mostly share their problems.
79. Faculty members rarely or never call students by their first name.
80. There is a lot of group spirit.
81. Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices.
82. The expression of strong personal belief or conviction is pretty rare around here.
83. Many students here develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life.
84. There are a number of prominent faculty members who play significant roles in national or local civic organizations.

85. There would be a capacity audience for a lecture by an outstanding speaker.

86. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding.

87. Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, etc.

88. The school offers many opportunities for students to understand and criticize important works of art, music, and drama.

89. Special museums or collections are important possessions of the college.

90. Modern art and music get little attention here.

91. Students are expected to report any violation of rules and regulations.

92. Student parties are colorful and lively.

93. There always seem to be a lot of little quarrels going on.

94. Students rarely get drunk and disorderly.

95. Most students show a great deal of caution and self control in their behavior.

96. Jeans and sexy pictures are common on this campus.

97. Students pay little attention to rules and regulations.

98. Classroom raids, water fights, and other student mischiefs would be unthinkable.

99. Many students seem to expect other people to adapt to them rather than trying to adapt themselves to others.

100. Ball games and other sports are an important part of intramural athletics.
APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF SCALES USED FROM THE EDWARDS PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Conforms. He avoids doing things that other people may regard as unconventional; obeys rules and regulations; seldom criticizes anyone in the position of authority; is uncomfortable in the situations where he does not know what is expected; conforms to custom; does not dislike being told what to do; does not have the reputation of being a non-conformist; does not have a strong need to be independent of others.

Avoids Facing Problems. He tends to put off difficult decisions until the last minute; forgets anything unpleasant that happens to him; is distracted from any job he does not like doing; puts off things until the last minute; has to be reminded more than once about doing an unpleasant talk; does not face problems readily; gets rid of anxiety about something by not thinking about it.

Dependent. He is dependent upon others for the solution of his problems; turns to his friend for help when discouraged; asks others about suggestions about problems he has; tells others about his personal problems; likes to have others help him with his difficulties; needs assistance from others; does not have difficulty asking others for help.

Feels Superior. He believes he is able to do things better than others; seldom discusses his mistakes; sticks to a decision once he has made it; often disagrees with the statements and opinions of others; sometimes gives the impression that he knows the answer to everything; is convinced that his opinions are correct; goes his own way regardless of the decision of the group.

Critical of Others. He is sarcastic; says things that irritate others; points out mistakes made by others; is critical of others; lets people know where they stand; lets others know if he dislikes them; is blunt and outspoken; finds it easy to point out the faults in others; criticizes those in a position of authority; is aggressive in relations with others.
Becomes Angry. He gets angry if he feels someone is blocking his plans; raises his voice when he becomes angry; gets angry when someone tries to take advantage of him; gets angry when he can't find what he is looking for; becomes angry when he has to wait for others; does not get over an angry spell quickly. (A. Edwards, 1966, pp. 7-10).
Dear Fellow Students: This inventory contains a number of statements that other people may use in describing you. Presumably, anyone who has observed you over a long period of time would be in a position to judge which of the statements accurately describes you. Your task is to predict frankly how the people who know you well (parent or friend etc.) would mark each statement. Use T for true and F for false. If you are in doubt about how the person who knows you well would mark a statement, put a question mark (?) beside your answer. This is not a test and the data will be confidential. There is no right or wrong answer and the value of this research will depend upon how honest you are in answering the statements. Kindly use the Part II of your answer sheet. Thanks again.

1. He plays any game strictly according to the rules.
2. He tries to retreat from a problem rather than face up to it.
3. He doesn't bother others with his problems unless he find it absolutely necessary.
4. He sometimes gives others an impression he knows the answer to everything.
5. He is blunt and outspoken.
6. He has difficulty controlling his anger when someone hurts him.
7. He is inclined to follow his own ideas rather than to do what is expected of him.
8. He has trouble forgetting about things that are past and over and that cannot be changed.
9. He is very dependent on others for solutions to his problems.
10. He often disagrees with the statements and ideas expressed by his associates.
11. He is sarcastic about his comments about others.
12. He becomes angry when he sees someone being mistreated.
13. He would hesitate to do anything that others might consider wrong.
14. He has been known to forget about appointments he didn't want to keep.
15. He seldom tells others when he is not feeling well.
16. He seldom discusses any mistakes he has made.
17. He has no hesitation in telling people what he thinks of them.
18. He is the sort of person who is not difficult to make angry.
19. He feels uncomfortable if he is asked to do something he has never done before.
20. He is easily distracted from some job he has to do but doesn't like doing.
21. He depends on his friends to help him with his problems.
22. He is well informed about most things.
23. He is overly frank in his comments about others.
24. He becomes so angry that he feels like throwing or breaking things.
25. He does his best to prevent anyone from dominating him.
26. He tends to put off difficult decisions until the very last moment.
27. He turns to his friends for help when he is discouraged.
28. He sticks to a decision once he has made it.
29. He says things that irritate others.
30. He gets angry if he feels someone is blocking his plans.
31. He obeys without question rules and regulations set by those in positions of authority.
32. He tends to forget anything unpleasant that happens to him.
33. He keeps his troubles to himself.
34. He believes he knows more than others do about most things.
35. He has a direct way of speaking that can easily antagonize people.
36. He raises his voice when he gets angry.
37. He does not like to be told what to do.
38. He finds that he can get rid of worry or anxiety most easily by simply refusing to think about it.
39. He tries to handle all of his personal problems by himself.
40. He is a good critic of the plans suggested by others.
41. He is inclined to be critical of others.
42. He seldom gets angry about anything.
43. He can always find some reason for doing what he wants to do.
44. He has to be reminded more than once about doing an unpleasant task.
45. He goes to others for help whenever he has a personal problem.
46. He resents it when older persons tell him that they have had more experience than he has.
47. He tends to be somewhat blunt in his relations with others.
48. He gets angry easily but gets over it quickly.
49. He does things that others regard as unusual.
50. He easily forgets about the unpleasant things that have happened to him.
51. He likes to have others help him with his problems.
52. He has a great deal of drive to get ahead in the world.
53. He often has cause to regret the things he says to others.
54. He gets angry with anyone who tries to restrict his freedom to do what he wants.
55. He resents having to conform to the rules and regulations of the group he belongs to.
56. He puts things off until the last minute.
57. He always asks for suggestions from others about any problem he has.
58. He is a hard person to get to change his opinions.
59. He criticizes people publicly if he feels they deserve it.
60. He seldom gets angry with others.
61. He has a trait of non-conformity in him.
62. He does not run away when faced with a problem.
63. He turns to his friends for sympathy when he is depressed.
64. He is usually convinced that his opinions are right and those of others are wrong.
65. He doesn't hesitate to criticize his superiors.
66. He gets over an angry spell quickly.
67. He usually manages to do what he wants to do.
68. He has difficulty forgetting about the embarrassing things that have happened to him.
69. He doesn't burden others with his problems.
70. He goes his own way regardless of the decisions of the group.
71. He is very candid and blunt in the things he says to others.
72. He gets angry when he can't find something he is looking for.
73. He avoids doing things that other people might consider unconventional.
74. He puts off unpleasant tasks and assignments for as long as possible.
75. He doesn't like to be helped when he is in trouble.
76. He is obsessed when he finds that others know more about something than he does.
77. He is aggressive in his relations with others.
78. He becomes angry when he has to wait for others.
79. He resents rules and regulations.
80. He does not face problems readily.
81. He readily tells others about his personal problems.
82. He is intolerant of any beliefs of others which he disagrees with.
83. He has difficulty in not being rude to someone he dislikes.
84. He gets angry if his belongings are disturbed by someone.
85. He has a reputation for being a non-conformist.
86. He does his best to forget about any of his past failures.
87. He hesitates to ask others for help.
88. He has difficulty accepting group decisions if he does not agree with them.
89. He lets people know where they stand with him.
90. He gets angry if someone tries to take advantage of his friendship.
91. He has accepted most of the beliefs and values of his parents.
92. He tries to relieve the anxiety caused by a difficult problem by putting off having to face it.
93. He refuses to let others help him when he has a personal problem.
94. He seldom admits he is wrong.
95. He has difficulty being frank with others when he feels they will not like what he has to say to them.
96. He conforms to custom.
97. He avoids facing a problem as long as he possibly can.
98. He has a strong need to be dependent on others.
99. He regards his own opinion as more likely to be right than those of others.
100. He has a direct way of speaking that tends to antagonize some people.
101. He is a very unusual person.
102. He can handle any personal problem without assistance from others.
103. He believes that he is able to do most things better than other people can.
104. He has a tendency to say sarcastic things.
105. He has a strong need to be independent of others.
106. He tells others about his personal problems and difficulties.
107. He strongly defends his opinions when discussing them with others.
108. He seldom lets others know how he feels about them.
109. He is uncomfortable in any situation in which he does not know clearly what is expected of him.
110. He has difficulties asking others for help.
111. He likes to try to show other people that they are wrong and he is right.
112. He says things that others resent.
113. He seldom criticizes anyone in a position of authority.
114. He doesn't want others to express any sympathy to him at all.
115. He has relatively little confidence in his opinions.
116. He believes in being frank with others, even when he knows that what he says may hurt their feelings.
117. He finds it very easy to point out the faults in others.
118. He tends to be critical of the mistakes of others.
119. He doesn't hesitate to give some sign of his feelings if he dislikes someone.
120. He doesn't hesitate to point out mistakes by others.
121. He finds faults with others.
122. He is critical of other people.
123. He has an aggressive personality.
124. He doesn't hesitate to criticize someone who is in a position of authority.
125. He keeps his opinions about others to himself.
LEADERSHIP TRAITS RATING FORM (FOR CLASS ADVISERS)

Confidential  Date _____________________________

Direction for rating: Please read very carefully the description of leadership traits and numerical values of ratings below. Although the leadership behavior of students may vary from day to day, it is usually possible to select from the range of behavior the one that is generally characteristic of the student. Kindly indicate by assigning the appropriate number of your rating in the continuum which best describes the individual student concerned.

Is a leader. He is regarded as a good committee chairman; can be counted upon to bring a group discussion to some form of common agreement; likes to tell others how a job should be done; is able to give orders to others in a way that makes others willing to accept them; is regarded by others as a good leader; likes to be in a position where he can influence others; is able to get others to support his decision; likes to make the decisions for the group. (A. Edwards, 1966, p. 7).

Scale Rating Equivalent:
Numerical Rating of: Value definition of numeral rating continuum
1 displays trait in a high degree
2 displays trait in a marked degree
3 displays trait in a moderate degree
4 displays very little of the trait
5 does not display the trait at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of student (Family name first, Males followed by Females)</th>
<th>Evaluation of Leadership Traits (Encircle appropriate number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>