University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Graduate Research Papers | Student Work

1982

A student milieu evaluation Wartburg College, 1981-82

John Douglas Kirchner
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1982 John Douglas Kirchner
Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Kirchner, John Douglas, "A student milieu evaluation Wartburg College, 1981-82" (1982). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2694.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2694

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

A student milieu evaluation Wartburg College, 1981-82

Abstract

Traditionally, colleges and universities have set up and changed institutional curriculum, policies, services, and physical spaces in an effort to aid in the education of their students. This educational effort unfortunately was often misguided, since it was rarely done on the basis of a systematic survey of student need. Students who did not adjust to the campus environment were either referred to a service to help them make the necessary adjustment or eased out of school.

This open access graduate research paper is available at UNI ScholarWorks: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2694

A STUDENT MILIEU EVALUATION

WARTBURG COLLEGE,

1981-82

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Department of School Administration

and Personnel Services

University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

---

by

John Douglas Kirchner

July 1982

This Research Paper by: John Douglas Kirchner

Entitled: A STUDENT MILIEU EVALUATION

WARTBURG COLLEGE,

1981-82

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

July 12, 1982
Date Approved

J. F. Kimball
Director of Research Paper

July 13, 1982
Date Received

Robert L. Frank
Graduate Faculty Advisor

July 19, 1982
Date Received

Robert Krajewski
Head, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE INVESTIGATION 1

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS 3

II. REVIEW OF HISTORICAL AND RELATED RESEARCH 5

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH 10

III. DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION. 15

IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSION 17

FIRST PHASE 17

SECOND PHASE 37

V. SUMMARY 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY 51

APPENDIX 52

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	PERCENT OF STUDENT RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP	18
II.	CLASS LEVEL	18
III.	SEX	19
IV.	HOME ORIGIN OF STUDENTS	19
V.	PERCENT OF STUDENTS BY HOUSING TYPES	20
VI.	CHRONOLOGICAL STUDENTS' SATISFACTION RANKINGS AND PERCENT OF USE OF COLLEGE SERVICES (SECTION 2)	21
VII.	STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 3)	23
VIII.	STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS OF SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS (SECTION 6)	26
IX.	STUDENTS' RANKING OF ACADEMIC AREAS	28
X.	STUDENTS' RANKING OF STUDENT SERVICE AREAS	29
XI.	STUDENTS' RANKING OF ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS	30
XII.	STUDENTS' RANKING OF STUDENT AREAS	31
XIII.	COMPARISON OF SECTION II STUDENTS' RANKINGS AND PERCENT OF USAGE, 1980; 1981; 1982	32
XIV.	COMPARISON OF SECTION III STUDENTS' RANKINGS 1980; 1981; 1982	34
XV.	NUMBER OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IN SECTION VI	37
XVI.	STUDENT WRITTEN ER's	38

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO THE INVESTIGATION

Traditionally, colleges and universities have set up and changed institutional curriculum, policies, services, and physical spaces in an effort to aid in the education of their students. This educational effort unfortunately was often misguided, since it was rarely done on the basis of a systematic survey of student need. Students who did not adjust to the campus environment were either referred to a service to help them make the necessary adjustment or eased out of school.

In response to this crisis, people in the student services profession have begun to focus on the campus ecology. This "ecosystem perspective" incorporates the student characteristics, the environmental characteristics, and most importantly, the "transactional relationship" between the two. To date, more has been written or talked about, concerning the ecosystem model, than has actually been accomplished. This paper is an update of one such ongoing study at Wartburg College, in an attempt to successfully design and redesign its campus environment. The funding for the study comes from the Project Examination Grant.

Project Examination is a six-year project designed to study Wartburg's educational mission and how to achieve it most effectively. The project is funded over the first three-year period by a $150,000 grant from the Northwest Area Foundation. The project includes the following four major thrusts:

1. Develop alternatives that will complement the lecture model of teaching/learning and encourage student initiative in the learning process.
2. Develop a general education curriculum which will provide more integrative approaches to education, provide a value-oriented emphasis, a global emphasis, and develop advanced learning and intellectual skills. The new Wartburg Plan of general education is an outgrowth of Project Examination.
3. Improve the educational environment of the campus to make it more conducive to intellectual, spiritual, moral, cultural and social development. This is to be achieved through several approaches including: strengthening student-faculty relationships, linking liberal studies with career development through further development of field experiences, internships and career counseling.
4. Implement a means of providing a continuous flow of data regarding the development of students, the life and activities of graduates, and the views of students and others for evaluating the success of the college.

The reason for the existence of the study you are about to read is two-fold: firstly, to give a complete and exhaustive analysis of the 1982 Student Opinion Survey by the American College Testing Program, and to compare these results to the 1980 and 1981 Student Opinion Survey results; and secondly, a brief look at the goals, history, and progress of

the entire Project Examination Program has been assembled in order to organize the different branches of the project. The present research is part of Project Goal Four and the data gathered is used by student-faculty committees, student government, and the college staff in an attempt to improve the quality of the educational programs and the campus environment.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Campus Ecology

"Campus ecology incorporates the influence of environments on students and students on environments." This focus of concern is not solely on student characteristics or environmental characteristics, but on the transactional relationship between students and their environment.[1]

Campus Environment

"A campus environment consists of all the stimuli that impinge upon the students' sensory modalities, including physical, chemical, biological, and social stimuli."[2]

C.L.I.C.

Campus Life Committee; which functions as the coordinating body of the Wartburg ecosystem.

---

[1]Banning, James J. "Campus Ecology: A Perspective for Student Affairs." NASPA Monograph, Cincinnati, Ohio: NASPA Journal, 1978, Preface.

[2]Aulepp, LuAnn and Ursula Delworth, Training Manual for An Ecosystem Model, Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, April 1976, p. vii.

ER -- Environmental Referent

"...when respondents go back over a perceptual instrument and write about those items which are most important to them."[3]

Transactional Relationship

"The transactional relationship exists between college students and their campus environment; that is, the students shape their environment and are shaped by it."[4]

WICHE

"Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, which developed an attempt to assess (map) environments to produce the most compatible transactions between students and their milieu."[5]

---

[3]Ibid., p. 40.

[4]Banning, op. cit., p. 5.

[5]Miller, Theodore K., and Judith S. Prince, The Future of Student Affairs, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977, pp. 123-24.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF HISTORICAL AND RELATED RESEARCH

In the last fifteen years, student services professionals have become increasingly concerned with the concept of "campus ecology," which simply denotes college students and their interactions with the environment and the environment's interaction with students. "Professionals wanting to draw attention to the importance of these issues dubbed their cause the 'ecological perspective' and heralded it as a new approach in dealing with student development issues."[6]

The concept of campus ecology is not really all that new of an idea. The ecological perspective's theoretical base is best summed up in work done by Walsh in 1979. In this work, he reviews six theories of person-environment interaction; Barker's theory of behavior settings, the subculture approach, Holland's theory of Personality Types and Model Environments, Stern's Need x Press = Culture Theory, Moos' Social Ecological Approach, and Pervin's Transactional Approach.

> "The basic rationale for Barker's theory is that behavior settings (a cluster of related behavior-milieu parts) select and shape the behavior of people who inhabit them. The concept of behavior settings structures the rules for enactment

---

[6]Huebner, Lois A., "Emergent Issues of Theory and Practice." New Directions for Student Services Redesigning Campus Environments, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Number 8, 1979, p. 1.

of behavior and the associated environmental parts necessary to effect the enactment. It is maintained in this view that people tend to behave in highly similar ways in specific environments, regardless of their individual differences as persons. Thus human environments seem to have a coercive influence upon human behavior."[7]

"The subculture approach is theoretically similar to behavior setting theory. Both approaches suggest that environments select and shape the behavior of people who inhabit them. From one point of view the various subcultures seem to be large behavior settings. The underlying theoretical assumption is that subculture and behavior settings both have a coercive influence upon the behavior of their members."[8]

"The underlying rationale of Holland's theory is that human behavior is a function of personality and environment."[9]

"The basic assumption of Stern's theory is that behavior is a function of the relationship between the individual (needs) and the environment (press). Stern, like Holland, stresses the significance of the individual."[10]

"Moos in his approach suggests that environments, like

---

[7]Walsh, W. B., Theories of Person-Environment Interaction: Implications for the College Student, Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979, p. 6.

[8]Ibid., p. 7.

[9]Ibid., p. 8.

[10]Ibid., p. 10.

people, have unique personalities. Just as it is possible to describe an individual's personality, so it is possible to describe and characterize an environment."[11]

"The basic rationale of Pervin's phenomenologically oriented theory is that behavior can best be understood in terms of the interactions of transactions between the individual and the environment. To Pervin, for each individual there are interpersonal and non-interpersonal environments that tend to match or to fit the individual's perception of himself. Thus, he hypothesizes that individuals will tend to evidence higher performance, more satisfaction, and reduced dissonance in environments that tend to be congruent with their personality characteristics (environments that tend to move the individual from his perceived self toward his perceived ideal-self)."[12]

It is out of these theoretical framewords that Kaiser, in The Eco-System Model: Designing Campus Environments,[13] identified eight central assumptions on which the ecosystem model rests:

1. A campus environment consists of all the stimuli that impinge upon the students' sensory modalities, including physical, chemical, biological, and social stimuli.

2. A transactional relationship exists between college students and

---

[11]Ibid., p. 10.

[12]Ibid., p. 11

[13]Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, The Ecosystem Model: Designing Campus Environments, Boulder Colorado: WICHE, January 1973, pp. 5-6.

their campus environment, i.e., the students shape the environment and are shaped to it.

3. For purposes of environmental design, the shaping properties of the campus environment are focused on; however, the students are still viewed as active, choice-making agents who may resist, transform, or nullify environmental influences.

4. Every student possesses the capacity for a wide spectrum of possible behaviors. A given campus environment may facilitate or inhibit any one or more of these behaviors. The campus should be intentionally designed to offer opportunities, incentives, and reinforcements for growth and development.

5. Students will attempt to cope with any educational environment in which they are placed. If the environment is not compatible with the students, the students may react negatively or fail to develop desirable qualities.

6. Because of the wide range of individual differences among students, fitting the campus environment to the students requires the creation of a variety of campus sub-environments. There must be an attempt to design for the wide range of individual characteristics found among students.

7. Every campus has a design, even if the administration, faculty, and students have not planned it or are not consciously aware of it. A design technology for campus environments, therefore, is useful both for the analysis of existing campus environments and the design of new ones.

8. Successful campus design is dependent upon participation of all campus members including students, faculty, staff, administration, and trustees or regents.

However, the main thrust of the campus-oriented movement came from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). "The WICHE Task Force on Campus Ecology laid the ideological and conceptual groundwork for the development of campus assessment and redesign schemes."[14]

In 1975, Aulepp and Delworth, working for WICHE, developed a workable training model based on the ecosystem persepctive. This training manual, entitled An Ecosystem Model, is the referent for the design of the Wartburg Project Examination. The design process itself involves seven steps:

1. Designers, in conjunction with community members, select educational values.

2. Values are then translated into specific goals.

3. Environments are designed that contain mechanism to reach the stated goals.

4. Environments are fitted to students.

5. Student perceptions of the environments are measured.

6. Student behavior resulting from environmental perceptions is monitored.

7. Data on the environmental design's successes and failures, as indicated by student perceptions and behavior, are fed back to the designers in order that they may continue to learn about student/environment fit and design better environments.[15]

Presently, the college is in the fifth stage of Project Examination.

---

[14]Huebner, op. cit., p. 3.

[15]Aulepp, Delworth, op. cit., p. ix.

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Wartburg began its ecosystem redesign project in 1978 with four major objectives: (1) Establish a design committee to review campus life and to facilitate change; (2) Conduct a series of surveys to identify perceived needs and to establish a base against which to measure changes in campus environment; (3) Facilitate changes in campus life to improve the learning environment and to achieve Project Examination goals; (4) Establish a process for monitoring the campus environment to provide for periodic assessment of perceived campus needs. The following is an update of progress in each objective area.

Objective 1

Taken care of in October 1978 when the faculty approved a Campus Life Committee (C.L.I.C.). The Campus Life Committee is concerned with the informal (campus life) educational program of the college and serves to facilitate the college decision-making processes. It reviews programs and recommends policies governing campus life. Committee recommendations are conveyed to the appropriate authorities for approval: administrative officers, the Faculty, or Student Senate. (It is also advisory to the Vice President for Student Affairs).

Membership of the committee consists of: two full-time teaching faculty members elected by the faculty; one full-time teaching faculty member and one administrator appointed by the President, the Vice President for Student Affairs as ex-officio member and Chair; and four full-time students nominated by the President of the Student Senate with

Senate approval and appointed by the President of the College. The Campus Life Committee performs a similar function in the area of campus life to that of the Educational Policies Committee in the area of academic affairs.

The Campus Life Committee has the responsibilities to:

1. Review campus life, recommend policies and programs. Recommendations will be forwarded to the appropriate decision-making body for action. (Examples: "Outfly" policies are established by the faculty, alcohol policies by the Regents, parking policies by the Business Office, etc.)

2. Provide for significant input from faculty, students and administration on campus life policy issues.

3. Provide a sounding board and clearing house for campus life issues.

4. Promote the integration of the academic program with the campus life of the college.

5. Serve as an advisory body to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

6. Promote and enhance the opportunities for minority and foreign students to participate fully in the life of the campus.

The following is an historical breakdown, by objective, of campus redesign since the beginning of Project Examination:

Objective 2

Conduct a series of surveys to identify perceived needs and to establish a base against which to measure changes in campus environment.

A. A second survey of the campus environment using the ACT Student Opinion Survey instrument with "ecosystem" design modifications was administered in the Spring Term 1980.

B. Students who withdrew from school or did not pre-register for the 1980-81 academic year were requested to complete the ACT Withdrawing/Non-Returning Student Survey.

Objective 3

Facilitate changes in campus life to improve the learning environment and to achieve Project Examination objectives.

A. The new academic probation policies resulted in dismissal of 25 students in 1980 versus 15 in 1979. Six of the students who appealed dismissal were readmitted on learning contracts.

B. The Faculty Associate advising program in the residence halls continued and is being further developed since 1980.

C. Parking regulations were further revised on the basis of experience and the student survey. An automatic fine system was adopted. A marketing program on parking was implemented with students, faculty, staff and parents.

*D. The Student Health Service was revised and a new College Nurse is employed for 1982-83. A new informational brochure was prepared, and a wellness program added.

E. Skill building programs in English, mathematics and reading are being integrated with the General Education Foundation Courses. The Reading program will use Foundation Course material for instruction. Study guides were prepared for the three Foundation courses. A tutor training workshop is scheduled to provide para-professional

help to students in the Foundation Courses.

F. Student Union renovation was approved by President's Cabinet and construction is in progress. Preliminary planning for use of facilities was completed in May Term.

G. New contracts were prepared for counseling services for 1980-81 which will provide students with both on-campus and off-campus services.

H. The major residence complexes have been converted to co-educational units. A new location for the Chrysalis Program has been incorporated. This is a major change and should have a significant effect on the residential environment.

I. A graduate intern in Student Personnel Administration will serve as the Resident Director in the new men's unit which was formerly all female. It is not possible to negotiate the employment of a seminary intern for the position.

*J. Foreign student enrollment reached 90 students for 1980-81 and the foreign student advisor has been employed on a half-time basis.

K. The Academic Advising Manual has been revised to incorporate the new General Education program.

*L. A program for career development has been developed with check list of requirements and student initiatives which focus both on the General Education Requirements and the parallel steps in career development. The concepts of "Berufung" or a sense of Christian calling are incorporated in the career development model. This program will be introduced in the Fall faculty workshop.

*M. In 1981, a comprehensive retention program is being developed

which centers on faculty and student para-professional advising of students in the General Education Foundation courses and in residence halls.

Objective 4

Establish a process for monitoring the campus environment to provide for periodic assessment of perceived campus needs.

A. The University Residence Environment Scale was conducted in 1978.

*B. The third campus ACT Opinion Survey was completed in Spring Term 1978.

*C. The ACT "Withdrawing/Non-Returning Student Survey" was administered in Spring and May Term 1981.

*D. Research on the retention of students is being conducted as part of the new retention program, which has been and still is successful.

E. The "Wartburg Student Data Survey" administered to all entering students is being completely revised to provide information helpful to Project Examination.

The above accomplishments have been gleaned from the Project Examination Progress Reports of 1978 and 1980. New developments since the 1980 report have been denoted by an asterisk.[16]

---

[16]Hawley, Kent, "Project Examination Wartburg College Report of Progress." August 1978, and August 1980.

Chapter III

DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION

Wartburg College employs a two-phase assessment tool to survey student opinion in order to cite areas for possible improvement.

The first phase is the ACT Standardized Student Opinion Survey, which is composed of five sections: Section One elicits demographic data; Section Two is concerned with college services; Section Three's focus is on the campus environment; Section Four is a provision for thirty supplementary questions of the college's choice (see the Appendix); and Section Five provides for comments and suggestions. Sections Two, Three, and Four are evaluated through the use of perceptual Likert scale rating from "dissatisfied" to "very satisfied."

The second phase of the instrument asks respondents to briefly describe their perceptions of items in Sections Two, Three, and Four. These perceptions are termed environmental referents (ER's) which provide those utilizing the survey results with greater understanding as to the "why" of the answer, allowing more descriptive information in planning and implementing environmental change. The format follows the WICHE Ecosystem Model ER Form. Students are asked to identify five to ten statements which are important to them and write the section and item number, rate it, and respond to one, two, or three of the following questions: (1) What things in the environment have happened to make you feel this way; (2) How have you responded to the feeling or situation; (3) What should be done to change the environment to improve the situation.

A computerized random sample of one-third of the Wartburg student population was selected to participate in this present survey. Three hundred and twenty-six surveys were sent out, and 205 were returned, for a ratio of 64%. Unlike past years, the survey was distributed through the resident assistant network instead of the student senate. This was done in an attempt to increase the return ratio. The resident assistants personally distributed each survey in order to create the impression with sampled students that because resident assistants were involved with the administration of the survey, their opinions would sincerely be heard. Students who returned their survey were then rewarded with a 50 cent coupon redeemable at a local eating establishment.

Returned questionnaires were checked to ensure that responses were properly marked for input into the computer. This was done for the first phase, the standardized ACT instrument, which was returned for scoring. The second phase was very time-consuming and consisted of the ER's which were first tabulated to discover which items received the largest number of responses (see Table XV). All responses for a particular item were then grouped together for clarity and distributed to administrators, faculty, and students (see Table SVI).

Chapter IV

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

In February 1982 The ACT Student Opinion Survey was distributed to a computerized random sample of 326 Wartburg College students. The results listed in this report are based on the return of 205 surveys for a return rate of 63.862 or 64%.

The survey instrument is composed of five sections:

Section One -- Background Information

Section Two -- College Services

Section Three -- College Environment

Section Four -- Supplemental Questions (provided by Wartburg)

Section Five -- Comments and Suggestions.

In conjunction with the above surveying instrument, a Short-Answer, Reactions and Recommendation Section (Six) was added to give more detailed information. Tables I through V present a demographic data of those students who returned the survey.

TABLE I

PERCENT OF STUDENT RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP

Race	Total	Percentage
Black	2	1.0
Indian/Alaskan	0	0.0
Caucasian	189	92.2
Mexican/Chicano	1	0.5
Oriental/Asian	7	3.4
Other	1	0.5
Prefer not to respond	2	1.0
Blank	3	1.5

TABLE II

CLASS LEVEL

Classification	Total	Percentage
Freshman	60	29.3
Sophmore	69	33.7
Junior	50	24.4
Senior	25	12.2
Special Student	1	0.5

TABLE III

SEX

Sex	Total	Percentage
Male	69	33.7
Female	136	66.3

TABLE IV

HOME ORIGIN OF STUDENTS

Classification	Total	Percentage
In-State	125	61.0
Out-of-State	71	34.6
International	9	4.4
Blank	0	0.0

TABLE V

PERCENT OF STUDENTS BY HOUSING TYPES

Residence	Total	Percentage
Residence Hall	199	97.1
Fraternity/Sorority	1	0.5
Married Housing	0	0.0
Room or Apartment	2	1.0
Parents' Home	2	1.0
Own Home	1	0.5

Tables VI and VII list in chronological order the average rankings received for those items comprising Sections 2 and 3, respectively.

CHRONOLOGICAL STUDENTS' SATISFACTION RANKINGS AND PERCENT OF USE OF COLLEGE SERVICES

(SECTION 2)

Item Number	Service	% Not Available	% Not Used	% Used	% Blank	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Score (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
5	Intramurals	0.0	19.0	79.5	1.5	4.25
6	Library Facilities	0.0	0.0	98.5	1.5	4.16
18	Honors Program	2.9	77.6	17.1	2.4	4.15
11	Student Employment	1.0	38.0	59.5	1.5	4.10
9	Tutorial Service	0.0	69.8	28.8	1.5	4.08
2	Personal Counseling	0.0	74.1	24.9	1.0	4.08
20	College Mass Transit	59.0	30.7	9.3	1.0	4.00
22	Veterans Services	40.0	56.6	1.0	2.4	4.00
14	College-Sponsored Social Activities	0.0	9.3	88.8	2.0	3.98
10	Financial Aid	1.0	17.1	80.0	2.0	3.93
8	Student Insurance Program	2.4	74.1	21.0	2.4	3.93
3	Career Planning	0.0	44.4	54.1	1.5	3.92
15	Cultural Programs	0.5	44.4	53.2	2.0	3.85

TABLE VI

CHRONOLOGICAL STUDENTS' SATISFACTION RANKINGS AND PERCENT OF USE OF COLLEGE SERVICES

(SECTION 2) (Continued)

Number	Service	% Not Available	% Not Used	% Used	% Blank	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
17	Credit by Examination	0.0	74.6	24.4	1.0	3.84
12	Residence Hall Services	0.0	12.7	85.4	2.0	3.81
1	Academic Advising	0.0	17.6	81.0	1.5	3.79
4	Job Placement	0.5	81.0	16.1	2.4	3.79
19	Computer Services	1.5	67.8	28.8	2.0	3.76
16	Orientation Program	0.0	13.7	84.9	1.5	3.70
7	Health Services	0.0	28.8	69.8	1.5	3.36
13	Food Services	0.0	1.0	97.1	2.0	3.35
23	Day Care Center	57.6	39.5	1.0	2.0	3.00
21	Parking Facilities	0.0	45.9	52.7	1.5	2.53

As can be seen in Table VI, 22 of the 23 items received rankings of 4.25 to 3.00 ("neutral"). Only one item, Parking Facilities, received a "dissatisfied" mark. Eight of the services received "satisfied" rankings, while 14 were in the "neutral" range from 3.98 to 3.00.

TABLE VII

STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

(SECTION 3)

Item Number	Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
7	Class Size	4.35
5	Faculty Attitude Towards Students	4.35
24	Athletic Facilities	4.32
38	Personal Involvement in Student Activities	4.20
42	College in General	4.20
35	Attitude of Non-Teaching Staff Toward Students	4.09
4	Out-of-class Availability of Instructors	4.05
40	Religious Activities	4.04
15	College Catalog	4.02
28	Availability of Student Housing	4.00
34	Concern for You as an Individual	4.00
2	Content in Major Field	3.98
3	Instruction in Major Field	3.96
25	Study Areas	3.95
32	Academic Calendar	3.91
41	Campus Newspaper and Radio	3.90
9	Availability of Advisor	3.90
14	Accuracy of Information About College Before Entering	3.86

TABLE VII

STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

(SECTION 3) (Continued)

Item umber	Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
23	Laboratory Facilities	3.86
13	Financial Aid Information Prior to Enrolling	3.84
11	Preparation for Further Occupation	3.83
12	Admissions Procedures	3.79
30	Registration Procedures	3.79
26	Student Union	3.77
21	Personal Security and Safety on Campus	3.77
4	Testing and Grading Procedures	3.75
22	Classroom Facilities	3.73
6	Variety of Courses Offered	3.67
17	Rules Governing Student Conduct	3.65
19	Academic Probation and Suspension Policies	3.63
29	Condition of Buildings and Grounds	3.63
33	Billing and Fee Payment	3.60
10	Information Provided by Advisor	3.59
18	Residence Halls Rules & Regulations	3.58
39	Student Government	3.56

TABLE VII

STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

(SECTION 3) (Continued)

Item umber	Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
8	Flexibility to Design Your Own Program	3.53
37	Opportunities for Student Employment	3.49
20	Use of Activity Fee	3.40
27	Campus Bookstore	3.33
31	Availability of Courses When You Need Them	3.26
36	Racial Harmony	3.26
16	Student Voice in College Policies	3.07

Table VII shows that 11 of the 42 items received favorable rankings, ranging from 4.35 to 4.00. The rest of the 31 items fall in the "neutral" range, and most importantly, no items received unfavorable rankings.

TABLE VIII

STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS OF SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

(SECTION 6)

Item Number	Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
30	The Artist Series	3.91
28	Quality of Religious Life	3.89
9	Convocation Program	3.86
12	Helpfulness of Library Staff	3.80
13	Encouragement to Grow in Faith	3.75
23	Student Affairs Staff Relationship With Students	3.66
5	Help Provided by Learning Resources Center	3.61
8	Protection of Personal Rights in Hall	3.67
16	Efficiency of the Controller's Office	3.52
4	Advisor's Ability to Help Look at Future Goals	3.49
29	Opportunities for Students to be Involved in Campus Government	3.43
20	Number of Non-Alcohol Events	3.42
19	Student Support for Other Students	3.40
14	Spaces for Community Events	3.37
24	Availability of Assistance for Emotional Problems	3.36
26	Procedures for Dealing with Cheating	3.35
10	Room as Quiet Study Place	3.32

TABLE VIII

STUDENTS' CHRONOLOGICAL SATISFACTION RATINGS OF SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

(SECTION 6) (Continued)

Item Number	Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
21	Effectiveness of Hall Government	3.29
27	Student Voice in Policy	3.23
6	Effectiveness of Judicial Board	3.23
17	Understanding of People with Diverse Backgrounds	3.09
7	Effectiveness of Grievance Procedures with Grades	3.04
22	Social Interaction Between Halls	3.01
25	Involvement of Students Affected by Policy Changes	2.92
18	Sexual Stereotyping	2.89
11	International Student Integration	2.84
3	Foundation Courses	2.69
15	Hall Telephone System	2.32

The reason for the overall lower ratings on this section is that these were questions provided by the College. Five items fell into the "dissatisfied" range.

Tables IX through XII present a breakdown of the rankings of items in Section 2 and 3, according to four campus areas, i.e., Academic; Student Service; Administrative; and Student.

TABLE IX

STUDENTS' RANKING OF ACADEMIC AREAS

Item		Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
1.	Class Size	4.35
2.	Faculty Attitude Toward Students	4.35
3.	Library Facilities and Services	4.16
4.	Honors Program	4.15
5.	Tutorial Services	4.08
6.	Out-of-class Availability of Instructor	4.05
7.	Course Content	3.98
8.	Instruction in Major Field	3.96
9.	Advisor Availability	3.90
10.	Laboratory Facilities	3.86
11.	Academic Advising	3.79
12.	Testing/Grading System	3.75
13.	Classroom Facilities	3.73
14.	Variety of Courses	3.67
15.	Academic Probation/Suspension Policies	3.63
16.	Value of Information Provided by Advisor	3.59
17.	Flexibility to Design Your Own Program	3.53
18.	Course Availability	3.26

TABLE X

STUDENTS' RANKING OF STUDENT SERVICE AREAS

Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
1. Student Employment	4.10
2. Personal Counseling	4.08
3. Religious Activities	4.04
4. Availability of Student Housing	4.00
5. Social Activities	3.98
6. Financial Aid	3.93
7. Health Insurance	3.93
8. Career Planning	3.92
9. Cultural Programs	3.85
10. Availability of Financial Aid Before Entering	3.84
11. Residence Hall Services	3.81
12. Job Placement	3.79
13. Orientation	3.70
14. Rules Governing Student Conduct	3.65
15. Residence Hall Rules	3.58
16. Student Health Services	3.36
17. Racial Harmony	3.26

TABLE XI

STUDENTS' RANKINGS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS

Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
1. Athletic Facilities	4.32
2. Intramurals	4.25
3. Attitude of Non-Teaching Staff Towards Students	4.09
4. College Catalog Information	4.02
5. Study Areas	3.95
6. Accuracy of College Information Before Entering	3.86
7. Credit by Examination	3.84
8. General Admission Procedures	3.79
9. Registration Procedures	3.79
10. Student Union	3.77
11. Personal Security on Campus	3.77
12. Computer Services	3.76
13. Building Conditions	3.63
14. Billing and Payment	3.60
15. Opportunities for Student Employment	3.49
16. Student Activity Fee Usage	3.40
17. Food Services	3.35
18. Campus Bookstore	3.33
19. Voice in College Policy	3.07
20. Parking Facilities	2.53

TABLE XII

STUDENTS' RANKING OF STUDENT AREAS

Item	Mean Ranking of Student Satisfaction Possible Scores (Satisfied 5.00-1.00 Dissatisfied)
1. Opportunity for Involvement in Campus Activities	4.20
2. College in General	4.20
3. Concern for You as an Individual	4.00
4. Student Paper/Radio	3.90
5. Preparation for Future Occupation	3.83
6. Student Government	3.56

It is important to realize that different sized groups answered these three surveys. For the 1980 Student Opinion Survey, 118 surveys were returned for a return rate of 53%. The 1981 report is based on 203 surveys or a 63% return rate, while the 1982 survey is based on 205, for 64%. The implications of this is that the validity and reliability of the 1981 and 1982 survey is much greater than the 1980 survey because of a larger sample size and return rate. Thus, the results of the 1981-82 surveys are based on a more representative sample of the student body at Wartburg College.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF SECTION II

STUDENTS' RANKINGS & PERCENT OF USAGE, 1980; 1981; 1982

Item	1980	1981	1982
1. Academic Advising	81.4% 3.90	82.3% 3.91	81.0% 3.79
2. Personal Counseling	28.7% 4.08	21.2% 3.95	24.9% 4.08
3. Career Planning	41.1% 3.83	50.2% 3.80	54.1% 3.92
4. Job Placement	15.5% 3.60	18.2% 3.51	16.1% 3.79
5. Recreation and Intramurals	83.7% 4.18	81.8% 4.27	79.5% 4.25
6. Library Facilities & Services	97.7% 4.06	97.0% 4.23	98.5% 4.16
7. Student Health Services	72.1% 3.29	70.9% 3.44	69.8% 3.36
8. Health Insurance	23.3% 3.70	26.1% 3.84	69.8% 3.36
9. Tutorial Services	20.9% 4.07	25.1% 3.84	28.8% 4.08
10. Financial Aid	82.2% 3.88	83.7% 3.78	80.0% 3.93
11. Student Employment Services	64.3% 3.82	59.1% 3.87	59.5% 4.10
12. Residence Hall Services and Programs	86.0% 3.75	83.7% 3.84	85.4% 3.81
13. Food Services	94.6% 3.37	95.1% 3.47	97.1% 3.35
14. Social Activities	91.5% 3.69	88.2% 3.74	88.8% 3.98

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF SECTION II

STUDENTS' RANKINGS & PERCENT OF USAGE, 1980; 1981; 1982

(Continued)

Item	1980	1981	1982
15. Cultural Programs	65.9% 4.11	56.7% 3.90	53.2% 3.85
16. Orientation Program	80.6% 3.52	82.8% 3.78	84.9% 3.70
17. Credit by Examination	15.5% 3.89	18.2% 3.86	24.4% 3.84
18. Honors Program	10.1% 4.08	18.2% 3.61	17.1% 4.15
19. Computer Services	25.6% 4.03	24.1% 3.74	28.8% 3.76
20. Parking Facilities & Services	55.8% 2.07	60.1% 2.18	52.7% 2.53

Table XIII shows that the greatest increase in usage occured in the health insurance program.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF SECTION III

STUDENTS' RANKINGS 1980; 1981; 1982

Item		1980	1981	1982
1.	Testing/Grading System	3.67	3.80	3.75
2.	Course Content	3.95	3.90	3.98
3.	Instruction in Your Major Field	3.99	3.86	3.96
4.	Availability of Professor	4.25	4.22	4.05
5.	Faculty Attitude Toward Students	4.25	4.30	4.35
6.	Variety of Courses	3.69	3.67	3.67
7.	Class Size	4.44	4.34	3.67
8.	Flexibility to Design Your Own Program	3.69	3.54	4.35
9.	Advisor Availability	4.07	4.03	3.53
10.	Value of Advisor Information	3.74	3.72	3.59
11.	Preparation for Future Occupation	3.78	3.84	3.83
12.	General Admission Procedures	3.69	3.85	3.79
13.	Availability of Financial Aid Information	3.85	3.89	3.84
14.	Accuracy of College Information Before Entering	3.68	3.89	3.86
15.	College Catalog	3.94	4.03	4.02
16.	Student Voice in College Policy	2.91	3.02	3.07
17.	Rules Governing Student Conduct	3.15	3.42	3.65
18.	Residence Hall Rules and Regulations	3.20	3.51	3.58

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF SECTION III

STUDENTS' RANKINGS 1980; 1981; 1982

(Continued)

Item		1980	1981	1982
19.	Academic Probation and Suspension Policy	3.23	3.55	3.63
20.	Student Activity Fee Use	3.39	3.39	3.40
21.	Personal Security & Safety	3.47	3.56	3.77
22.	Classroom Facilities	3.79	3.78	3.73
23.	Lab Facilities	3.92	3.85	3.86
24.	Athletic Facilities	4.24	4.27	4.32
25.	Study Areas	3.87	3.85	3.95
26.	Student Union	3.33	3.67	3.77
27.	Campus Bookstore	3.34	3.43	3.33
28.	Availability of Student Housing	3.52	3.62	4.00
29.	General Condition of Building	3.48	3.71	3.63
30.	Registration Procedures	3.70	3.77	3.79
31.	Course Availability	3.40	3.33	3.26
32.	Academic Calendar	3.97	3.86	3.91
33.	Billing and Fee Payment	3.51	3.51	3.60
34.	Concern for You as an Individual	3.88	3.90	4.00
35.	Non-Teaching Staff Attitude	3.73	3.96	4.09
36.	Racial Harmony	3.38	3.18	3.26

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF SECTION III

STUDENTS' RANKINGS 1980; 1981; 1982

(Continued)

Item		1980	1981	1982
37.	Opportunities for Student Employment	3.54	3.38	3.49
38.	Opportunities for Personal Involvement in Campus Activities	4.02	4.04	4.20
39.	Student Government	3.53	3.53	3.56
40.	Religious Activities and Programs	3.70	4.08	4.04
41.	Campus Media	3.75	3.82	3.90
42.	College in General	3.95	4.04	4.20

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: SECOND PHASE

The second phase results came from part 6 of the Wartburg assessment tool, in which students comment on specific items from Sections Two, Three, and Four of the survey instrument. This is the ER, or Environmental Referent part of the investigation. The following information is based on 64%, or 205, surveys which were returned.

Listed below in Table XV are those items which received 16 or more student responses in providing additional feedback. These items are those which elicited strong feelings.

TABLE XV

NUMBER OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IN SECTION VI

Item	Section	Item	Number of Respondents
1. Residence Hall Telephone System	4	#15	69
2. Parking Facilities & Services	2	#21	43
3. Food Services	2	#13	30
4. The Foundation Courses	4	#3	25
5. Foreign Student Integration	4	#11	22
6. Availability of Course Work	3	#31	22
7. Racial Harmony	3	#36	22
8. Student Health Service	2	#7	21
9. Personal Security & Safety	3	#27	21
10. Campus Bookstore	3	#27	21
11. Interaction Between Residence Halls	4	#22	19
12. Personal Program Design Flexibility	3	#18	16

The following is a summation of the written ER's provided by students:

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's

Item	Comments
1. Residence Hall Telephone System	Floor and house phones are outdated. Much time wasted on long-distance phone calls in trying to locate person. Should be able to call direct. Manors already have facilities to install seperate phones; check into costs for converting other residence halls. Begin a program right now for implementating a new phone service. Don't wait for a building to go up. If it is impossible to install phones in the room, maybe there is some way to charge those who call in only when they get the floor. The telephones are the worst part of dorm life. They ring and ring and no one answers them. Messages are never received -- there's no privacy -- pay phones are a hassle and you're always charged for operator assistance calls. This system should be updated. I feel strongly about installing phones in every room. A lot of phone damages from parties would be eliminated. Phones in the room would be great. At least there should be some system where we could dial direct and then be billed for the call. Check the telephones once or more a week to make sure they are operating. Phones should be installed in each room so you can carry on a private conversation in the comfort of your own room. This process could prove costly but broken up to rooms then that would be split at least in half so it would be accepted.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
	Phones should be installed in each room and an emergency phone for when a student can't be reached.
	Would like to see phones in each room -- less hassle and more convenient. Message wouldn't get lost, etc. Obtain phones for each room -- it is worth the cost.
	Place all phones in a phone booth or next to an area where there is privacy to speak.
	Doors on booths for all the phones.
	Install more phones or let students have phones in rooms.
2. Parking Facilities and Services	Be more consistent when giving out tickets on the weekends. Have specific snow removal procedures for lots.
	The lots are not cleared very well after a snowstorm. A little more attention to where they are piling the snow.
	Paying $40 to park by Hebron and then finding my space filled. Tickets for being in my registered spot.
	Enforce parking tickets -- so many are revoked that no one takes them seriously.
	Remain consistent so students know what to expect.
	Security should drive completely through D-Lot every hour. Lengthen unloading zone and have better access to unload and load from manor units.
	I think the snow removal could be done a little better without piling it all behind our cars.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
	Having to pay $1/week for temporary parking when the full semester costs $5.00.
	Parking lots are unpaved and generally muddy.
3. Food Services	Try a variety of different types of foods.
	The sick trays are made without regard to your sickness, plus not adequate food.
	Sick sacks: Take more care in finding out what sickness. Get different goods in the program.
	Procedures for giving back money for lunches or dinners because of regents, etc. needs work. Money should be given back for meals you don't eat.
	More oriental foods and less ham, cheese, and hot dogs. Revise policy which regulates money given to groups who skip meals.
	Although the majority of the food is good, there are some foods that don't get eaten and I don't see why they're still served.
	I don't like paying for meals I don't use. Ex.: I never eat breakfast.
	I think we should be able to purchase meal plans -- 14 meals a week, etc...
4. The Foundation Courses	Core classes take twice as much time studying in comparison to my other classes and don't feel they're any benefit.
	Reduce the amount of material covered in a particular core class.
	Limit the number of topics that are discussed in lecture -- that way we can get more from each one.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
Foundation Courses (continued)	After one year -- have an open forum with the freshmen and those involved. Are there any changes that can be made?
	The instructors of the courses should be better organized. Also, they should review all the majors to see where certain core courses wouldn't be necessary.
	The new GER courses are coming along good but some flaws still need to be worked out -- such as organization. Time and experience of going through these new courses will show what needs to be done. Student input will help to see new things.
	Professors should not teach a general course in their major area because they don't understand why some of the students can't grasp the material; the professors should teach the course more the same and have common due date for some material.
	They take too much time -- you don't get anything besides obscure ideas -- they pose enormous problems to double majors -- particularly foreign language. Grading is too tough and if it's supposed to be for the average person don't teach at the graduate level.
	Give the foreign language people a break. If music therapy can exempt cores, take a look at our schedules and give us the same break. Some of us can't afford overloads and summer school because cores push aside things we need for our majors.
	I have been told the number of required courses has been increased, so my electives are fewer and I cannot double major as I was planning before.
	I have complained in interviews on the core

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
Foundation Courses (continued)	courses, and I am forced into planning on taking summer courses elsewhere.
	Too much cheating.
	There is a lack of communication among the teachers and their students. Two of us turned in identical lab report and one teacher gave it a 4 while another gave it an 8. In "Person in Society" you discuss power and don't learn anything useful.
	Get away from team teaching and establish the goals of the class at the beginning.
	The GER's have provided me with an opportunity to become acquainted with a diversified range of knowledge and the classroom settings are great for discussions.
	A little more organization in tying things together would be helpful.
	Encourage self-regulation by students and a learning attitude.
	Have a session discussing the pros and cons with the profs that teach them. See what they want to show the students.
	Too vague and non-connective.
	Cut down on subjects and study connective ideas.
5. Foreign Student Integration With Campus Life	I feel that the foreign students don't make much of an effort. They stay to themselves and don't take advantage of opportunities to get to know people.
	More planned activities that they would be interested in attending.
	Ask foreign students to participate more.
	Use of peer advisors should be continued.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
	Maybe by better integration in the dorms, foreign student - American friendships would form more easily and everyone could benefit from exposure to other cultures.
	More presentations of their cultures and perhaps more international type affairs would help break the ice, i.e., International Dinners.
	Try to conduct more parties and meal-type situations with an international theme.
	Expose the International Club activities more.
	Have more small group integrating activities.
	More activities between International Club and other organizations.
6. Availability of Courses When Wanted	Offer the more demanded classes at a reasonable time (11:30). Offer demanded classes twice a year.
	So many courses that are needed are offered at the same period. Popular courses are only offered one semester a year.
	Don't bunch the morning classes. More afternoon classes.
	Persons who need a course for their specific major and also their grade level should be given priority. Also, when cutting a necessary course -- underclassmen should be given notice and some type of independent study of the course should be provided.
7. Racial Harmony	Make more students aware that the problem exists.
	Have an international awareness week.
	Have all students take a credit course in the study of different cultures, like Oriental Thought.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
Racial Harmony (continued)	Some of the white-oriented staff should be replaced with bi-racial-oriented people; blacks need staff back-up.
	Programs such as the BACO panel discussion are great if more students would show up for them.
	There is little interaction between Americans and foreign students.
	We could have an activity geared at their culture so we could share in it.
	There have been some incidents involving foreign students that are purely ridiculous.
	The foreign students stick together and don't seem to associate a lot with the other students. I find it hard to talk to them and kids on campus make fun of them.
	I don't think much can be done about racial prejudice. People from smaller communities just have not talked with and befriended people of different ethnic backgrounds. I'm not claiming to be totally prejudice-free and perfect. Just wish some students would not judge others by skin color. It's a shame they keep themselves from meeting other foreigners.
	The racial harmony at this school is not very good. True, there are not fights or constant tension, but the ignorance of some of the white students on campus is unbelievable. Ignorance is about their only excuse for their prejudice. I have heard foreign students referred to as "boat people" which is stupidity, nothing more. Blacks, whites, foreign students are three distinct groups on this campus and their interaction can hardly be called totally friendly. This makes me wonder when they are so holy and attend a Christian college. I am not Lutheran but always believed a person should believe what they want.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Conclusion)

Item	Comments
	Here, there even exists a kind of religious prejudice which I am also dissatisfied with, especially because this is a Christian school.
8. Student Health Services	I feel the campus nurse should hold slightly longer staff/office hours. I also feel the nurse and most of the doctors at the clinic minimize legitimate student health complaints not believing, or misdiagnosing the severity of an ailment. Generate a more receptive attitude towards students among professionals. Most of us are not hypochondriacs. When I did get service, it was good, but the nurse is hardly ever in. Also, the steps to follow when someone gets hurt -- no one better get seriously hurt! Have a full-time nurse or someone to call that can help immediately if there is a serious accident.
9. Personal Security/Safety On Campus	Better lighting between library and Clinton -- all over campus in general. Better lighting system on campus. The parking lots aren't checked periodically by Security like they're supposed to be. Complained to other students, have gotten proof of this violation by sitting in D-Lot for a period of time. Editorial in Trumpet... Place more lights in lots and have security there more. Put light in back of U Lot. Security should become familiar with the campus, RD's, etc.

TABLE XVI

STUDENT WRITTEN ER's (Continued)

Item	Comments
10. Campus Bookstore	High prices for books (ex.: markup)
	Prices for returned books are pretty bad.
	Book prices are exhorbitantly high...doubled in some cases over the retail prices and we must buy our textbooks there.
	Move our bookstore into a larger space and stock with things students need.
	Let students run it as a business project.

Chapter V

SUMMARY

With declining enrollment and poor retention of its present student body, Wartburg College made its commitment to redesigning its campus, based on an ecosystem model. Recognizing the importance of the transactional relationship between students and their environment, Wartburg, in 1978, stated Project Examination goal four as follows: Establish a process for monitoring the campus environment to provide for periodic assessment of perceived campus need. The college has decided to use a two-phase assessment tool for monitoring perceived campus needs.

The first phase employs the use of the ACT Standardized Student Opinion Survey which is composed of five sections: Section One elicits demographic data; Section Two is concerned with college services; Section Three's focus is on campus environment; Section Four is a provision for thirty supplementary questions of the college's choice (see the Appendix); and Section Five provides for comments and suggestions.

In 1982 a computerized random sample of 326 Wartburg students received the ACT Student Opinion Survey. Out of those 326 students receiving the survey, 205 students completed and returned the instrument for a return rate of 64%. The demographic data from Section One showed that: 92% of the survey sample population were Caucasian, 3% were Oriental or Asian, and 1% Black. Other data from Section One show that 38% of the respondents were sophmores, 29% freshmen, 24% juniors, 12% seniors; 66% female, 34% male; 61% claimed home origins in the state, 35% out-of-state,

4% were international students; 97% were hall residents, 1% lived in a room or apartment, and 1% lived in their parents' home. (For more information, see Table V.)

Results from Section Two show that students were, for the most part, "satisfied" with college services. Twenty-two of the 23 items received rankings of 4.25-3.0, which indicates "satisfied" and "neutral" rankings, respectively. Eight of the services received "satisfied" rankings in the following chronological order: intramurals, library facilities, honors program, student employment, tutorial service, personal counseling, college mass transit, and veterans' services. Only "parking facilities" fell into the "dissatisfied" ranking. (For more information, see Table VI.)

Results from Section Three showed that all of the 42 items in Campus Environment fell in the "satisfied" or "neutral" ranges. Eleven items fell in the "satisfied" range: class size, faculty attitudes toward students, athletic facilities, personal involvement in Student Activities, college in general, attitude of non-teaching staff toward students, out-of-class availability of instructors, religious activities, college catalog, availability of student housing, and concern for you as an individual. (See Table VII.)

The results from the supplementary questions showed that students perceived needs for improvement in the hall telephone system, the foundation courses, international student integration, sexual stereotyping, and involvement of students affected by policy changes. These items fell in the "dissatisfied" range. (See Table VIII.)

The second phase of the instrument incorporates the first phase by allowing respondents to briefly describe their perceptions and suggestions on any of the items. These perceptions are termed "environmental referents," which provide Wartburg with a greater understanding of the "why" of the

answers, allowing more descriptive information in planning and implementing environmental change. At least 25 of the surveyed students perceived a need for environmental change in the following areas: residence hall telephone systems, parking facilities, food services, and the foundation courses (for more information, see Table XV). By consulting the Environmental Referent Table XVI, one can see that students were "dissatisfied" with the telephone system because of a lack of phones, privacy, and service. Students suggested that more phones should be installed, booths built around existing phones, or phones put in the rooms, along with weekly service checks. Another area of concern is the parking facilities and services. The results showed that the ticketing system is inconsistent and parking lots are not well taken care of in either the security or maintenance areas. Some specific suggestions were to pave the lots, not pile snow behind cars, and patrol the lots on an hourly basis.

The major complaint about the food service was the lack of variety in the menu, and the food contained in "sick sacks" and more menus and meal plans should be developed.

The Foundation courses are also a major area of concern. Students feel the courses are too time-consuming, too general in nature, and unrelated to their major. (See Table XVI)

Wartburg has found the American College Testing Program's Student Opinion Survey with environmental referents to be a vital part of Project Examination. The surveying instrument is extremely successful at measuring student perceptions for several reasons: firstly, the large gamut of program and service items, which allows for the total environment to be evaluated; and added to these items are thirty supplemental questions which allow a college

or university to ask critical questions about sensitive areas at their particular institution. The environmental referents offer the necessary descriptive information which is essential in redesigning a campus.

Student input is a dynamic resource in redesigning a campus environment, and the present ecosystem model intact at Wartburg College is a conducive effort in attaining everyone's needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aulepp, LuAnn and Ursula Delworth. Training Manual for an Ecosystem Model. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, April 1976.

Banning, James J. "Campus Ecology: A Perspective for Student Affairs." NASPA Monograph. Cincinnati, Ohio: NASPA Journal, 1978.

Banning, James J., and Leland Kaiser. "An Ecological Perspective and Model for Campus Design." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 52, no. 6, February 1974.

Hawley, Kent. "Project Examination Wartburg College Report of Progress." August 1978.

Hawley, Kent. "Project Examination Wartburg College Report of Progress." August 1979.

Huebner, Lois A. "Emergent Issues of Theory and Practice." New Directions For Student Services Redesigning Campus Environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 8, 1979.

Kaiser, L.R. "Campus Ecology: Implications for Environmental Design." Unpublished Manuscript, Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, 1972.

Miller, Theodore K., and Judith S. Prince. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Moos, R. "Conceptualizations of Human Environments." American Psychologist, No. 28, 1973, pp. 652-65.

Pervin, C.A. "Satisfaction and Perceived Self-Environment Similarity: A Semantic Differential Study of Student-College Interaction." Journal of Personality, No. 623, 1967, pp. 6-34.

Walsh, W.B. Theories of Person-Environment Interaction: Implications for the College Student. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. The Ecosystem Model: Designing Campus Environments. Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, January 1973.

APPENDIX

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FROM 1982 ACT OPINION SURVEY

1. Indicate your current college residence:

   a. Centennial & Vollmer
   b. Manors
   c. Clinton
   d. Grossman
   e. Hebron Hall
   f. Trailor Court
   g. Off-Campus

2. Which type of student activity is of most interest to you?

   a. Athletics
   b. Concerts
   c. Speakers
   d. Student Clubs
   e. Informal Activities: games, cards, TV, etc.

Read each statement carefully Decide if you are very satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the statement. Mark your response on the answer sheet by blackening out the lettered spaces which best represent your perception. Use the following key:

A. Very Satisfied
B. Satisfied
C. Neutral
D. Dissatisfied
E. Very Dissatisfied

3. The GER foundation courses.

4. My advisor's ability to help me look realistically at my goals and achievements.

5. Help provided by the Learning Resource Center.

6. Effectiveness of the Residence Hall judicial board.

7. Effectiveness of the grievance procedure for grades.

8. Protection of my rights as an individual in the Residence Hall.

9. The convocation program.

10. My room as a quiet, comfortable place to study.

11. Foreign student integration with mainstream of campus life.

12. The helpfulness of the library staff.

13. The encouragement given to grow in my faith.

14. The availability of large spaces for community social events.
15. The residence hall telephone system.
16. The efficiency of the Controller's office.
17. The understanding of persons from diverse backgrounds and cultures.
18. Sexual stereotyping of persons on the campus.
19. The support given by students to events involving other students.
20. The number of social events where alcohol is not served.
21. Effectiveness of hall government.
22. The amount of social interaction between residential units.
23. The Student Affairs Staff relationship with students.
24. The availability of assistance for students with emotional problems.
25. Attempts to involve all persons affected by institutional policy changes.
26. Procedures for dealing with cheating.
27. Student participation in college policy/governance committees.
28. The quality of religious life on the campus.
29. Opportunities for students to be involved in campus governance.
30. The Artist Series.