

The Quality of Life as Perceived by Students in the  
Business Division, Niagara College.

T. V. Menzies, Dip. Com. (Hon.)

Department of Graduate and Undergraduate  
Studies in Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Education,  
Faculty of Education, Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario

©Teresa V. Menzies  
March, 1992

## Abstract

Within the Business Division of Niagara College of Arts and Technology, 245 students were utilised for a convenience stratified sample of First, Second, and Third Year students. The students answered 33 items regarding their Quality of Program and 40 concerning their Quality of Life, along with demographic and motivational questions and open comments. The responses were classified using an SPSS/PC statistical package and frequency statistics extracted. The data were examined for the entire sample and also for each year within the Business Division. There were high positive responses to both QOP and QOL items. However, there was greater satisfaction for students in First Year Accelerated, Second Year and Third Year than First Year. All students noted high satisfaction for the overall assessment of the program. There were lower positive responses for Professor Items where students were unsure if teachers helped them to do their best or took a personal interest in helping students do their best. This may highlight problems which need attention in the Freshman year. The area where all students were most neutral was regarding how others view them which raises questions of the self-esteem of students at Niagara College. The implications from this study seem to suggest that well-motivated, small, closely identified groups with interactive teaching methods lead to positive QOL and QOP.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the help that has been afforded to me by the instructors at the Brock Faculty of Education. Special thanks must go to Dr. T. Boak for the dedicated guidance he has provided throughout this research. Professors Kirkwood, Drake and Cranton are also to be commended for their patience and advice.

I would also like to thank the administration, faculty, and staff of Niagara College who have been very helpful and especially the teachers who gave up class time to allow the students to answer the questionnaire. Andy Ferguson, the Director of Business; Bette Ferguson, Director of Student Services; David Schleicht, Vice President Academic, have been particularly supportive. The students themselves have been so friendly and interested they also deserve my appreciation.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, John, who has been a major inspiration to me. My three daughters, Erica, Fiona, and Rebecca have never allowed me to give up on the M.Ed. even when it meant I had less time to talk to them. This thesis is a representation of the assistance from all the aforementioned but I am solely responsible for the shortcomings within.

## Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM	1
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY & PROCEDURES	30
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	42
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS	125
References	142
Bibliography	148
Appendices	151
Appendix A	152
Appendix B	161
Appendix C	165

## List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Breakdown of Stratified Sample	38
Table 2: Program Characteristics of Respondents	44
Table 3: Ethnicity	48
Table 4: Educational Achievement of Parents	49
Table 5: Occupation of Parents	50
Table 6: Student Motivation Level	53
Table 7: Average Grades Reported	54
Table 8: Comparing Work to Others	56
Table 9: Future Intentions	57
Table 10: Quality of Program Responses	62
Table 11: Comparison of Student Perceptions Regarding Quality of Program by Year of Program	65
Table 12: Quality of Life Responses	83
Table 13: Comparison of Student Perceptions Regarding Quality of Life by Year of Program	87

## List of Figures

	Page
Figure 1: Development of the Survey Instrument.	33

## CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

### Introduction

This thesis is a study of the Quality of Life (hereafter referred to as QOL) and Quality of Program (hereafter referred to as QOP) as perceived by students in the Business Division at Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology. Quality of Life is an innovative form of research which departs from the traditional attempts to define educational success as a linear function solely dependant upon input and output variables (Bulcock & Mendoza, 1988).

### Background of the Problem

Community colleges in Canada have been challenged to explore new program initiatives as well as new forms of organization and techniques (Dennison, 1984). Dennison (1984) stated that community colleges are unaware of their own mission and to survive they must quickly identify one. The college in this study has developed a mission statement as follows:

Niagara College is recognized as a dynamic centre of educational excellence. Our programs and services assist students, clients and staff to achieve their full potential and to contribute positively to societal needs and changes with pride, confidence and commitment. As a vital partner in the economic, cultural and social development of the Niagara Region, we enhance its prosperity and quality of life.

(Operational/Strategic Plan, 1990-93, p.1)

Two phrases require analysis, namely educational excellence and quality of life. Educational excellence has been measured by the traditional input and output variables and Niagara College does indeed have an excellent record in graduate placement. However, this study will look at whether the students within the programs perceive excellence in their education and whether they feel they have a positive QOL. The justification for taking this research route was derived from organizational effectiveness literature which cautions against overall assessments of effectiveness and suggested that the focus of research efforts be on "domains of effectiveness" (Cameron, 1981, p.45). Different levels of effectiveness may exist across sub-domains of education (Cameron, 1981; Clifton, Jenkinson, Marshall, Roberts & Webster, 1987; Bulcock & Mendoza, 1989; Boak & Ellis, 1991) and this was the focus of the present study.



### Statement of the Problem Situation

The Vision 2000 document (OMCU, 1990) which sets the outlook for the Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology for the future, identified key areas of change necessary for a renewal of the system, namely, in programming, student access, and evaluation. In making 40 major recommendations, the Vision 2000 Report stressed the necessity of providing quality programs.

### Objectives to be Investigated

The specific objectives of the study were to ascertain:

1. the entering characteristics of the sample group, namely, age, sex, ethnic origin, educational background, academic preparedness, parental SES, health and learning problems (Part 3 of Questionnaire);
2. the intervening variables, namely, motivation and commitment and evidence of this aspect in the form of marks attained and post-college expectations and how they impact upon the QOL domain and vice versa (Part 3 of Questionnaire);

and to ascertain and analyse:

3. the students' perceptions regarding the quality of their program (QOP). This is measured over the Cognitive sub-domain items - knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation and the Affective sub-domain item-value (Part 1 of Questionnaire);

4. the students' perceptions of quality of life (QOL). This includes their well-being in the form of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and the college climate measured over opportunity, identity, status and professorial interaction (Part 2 of Questionnaire);

5. students' comments upon their QOL and QOP or the Questionnaire.

#### Rationale

1. Educational - Student attrition is a major problem for colleges of applied arts and technology. According to the Vision 2000 Report (OMCU, 1990) attrition levels are currently in excess of 40%. This rate is higher for female students and to those belonging to minority groups where, in both instances, a higher drop out rate occurs (Grosset, 1989). Retention studies (Winter & Fadale, 1986; Stodt &

Klepper, 1987; Voorhees, 1987; Tinto, 1982, 1987, 1988; Braxton & Brier, 1989; Webb, 1989) highlight the need for a positive campus climate to be developed (positive QOL). Thus it is critical to have some estimation of how students perceive their present college climate and in what areas improvements are necessary. Noel, Levitz, Saluri & Associates (1985) state that "a staying environment is based on the premise that the quality of student life on campus is everyone's concern" (p.390).

2. Educational Effectiveness - Roberts & Clifton (1991) refer to humanistic reasons as a rationale for looking at QOL and QOP. They state that "instead of the organization serving students in pursuing their objectives, students become tools used in the service of organizational ends" (p.4). This leads to student dissatisfaction and this dehumanised approach reduces educational effectiveness. According to Noel et al. (1985), there "is the growing realization by leaders in industry and business, as well as in higher education, that attention to the quality of work life and to employee involvement is critical to success" (p.370). According to Roberts & Clifton (1991) it is essential to measure QOL so that if a need is perceived "corrective action against the organizational rigidity that alienates and demoralizes students" (p.5) can be taken.

3. Economic, Social & Political - Vision 2000 (OMCU, 1990) suggests that "Trends such as aging of the workforce, industrial restructuring, technological innovation, and the changing skill content of jobs highlight the need for a dynamic college system which provides high-quality, relevant education for a broad range of learners" (p.9). The economic prosperity of Canada depends upon the ability of the community colleges to meet these demands. If 40% of the students who enter colleges decide to discontinue their program, this may infer that we are not achieving the optimum effect. Research into community colleges abounds with studies on attrition and retention and there appears to be no easy solution. However, study of the QOL and QOP as perceived by students within a community college is of considerable global value.

As one in ten people in Ontario who are over the age of 17 are taking a course at a community college, it seems politically wise to make that a rewarding experience.

#### Theoretical Framework

The theoretical conceptualization for this work is grounded in the QOL literature (Schuessler & Fisher, 1985). Three major approaches have been utilised in considering QOL from a theoretical standpoint. First, a "Social

Psychological" approach has been employed in which the individual's psychological perspectives have been viewed in terms of personal well-being (Gerson, 1976). Secondly, an Economic approach has been explored in which the needs whether met or not are rationalised and systemized by individuals in a rational manner into a sense of QOL (Juster, Courant & Dow, 1981). Finally, an Ecological approach implements a holistic view of an individual's physical and social environments in which QOL was influenced by all factors that in turn influenced each other (Bubolz, Eicher, Evers & Sontag, 1980). The education domain-specific constructs were adapted from those developed by Williams & Batten (1981) and Clifton et al. (1987) and later replicated by Bulcock et al. (1989) and Boak & Ellis (1991). The QOP items in the questionnaire developed by Clifton et al. were adapted and new items inserted that related specifically to community college educational objectives as set out in the Vision 2000 Report (OMCU, 1990).

#### Importance of the Study

The purpose of doing this particular study is to shed light on how students feel about their college experience. It is assumed that if a student remains to finish his/her program, he/she must have been satisfied in terms of QOL and

QOP; this might not be the case. There is also justification in the literature for looking at sub-domains of the educational experience in order to increase overall effectiveness (Cameron, 1981).

This study was of great interest to the students who completed the questionnaires. Faculty who gave time for completion of the instrument were extremely supportive and curious about the results. The Administration at Niagara College were exemplary in their attitude towards the study. The funding appropriation from the College towards this study is further evidence of their positive support. Administrators who gave time to discuss the study were extremely positive about the value of conducting this investigation. According to Upcraft, Gardner, and Associates (1990) retention of students is "an inappropriate goal" (p. 81). In their opinion institutions of learning are gradually changing their focus towards a student outlook instead of organizational. "The key to attracting and retaining students in the years ahead is going to be quality. We must extend quality programs, services, and people to the freshmen we are here to serve" (p. 81). Thus, if organizations are student driven, it seems appropriate to find out how students perceive the quality of their program and quality of their life within that program. Administrators and faculty at Niagara College viewed this study as an innovative approach to the traditional

retention, attrition studies which abound in relation to colleges. There is also the possibility of comparison of results with those obtained in the three University studies of QOL and QOP (Manitoba, Memorial & Brock).

#### Definition of Terms

QUALITY OF LIFE: This has been defined by Campbell, Converse & Rodgers (1976) "as a vague and ethereal entity, something that many people talk about, but which nobody knows very clearly what to do about" (p.471).

Rodgers (1977) suggested that "QOL is a vogueish concept that has perhaps already passed its prime, and one that suffers ... a lack of any clear definition" (p.267).

Williams and Batten (1981) quote Gerson, (1976) "QOL is measured by the degree to which an individual succeeds in accomplishing his desires despite the constraints put upon him by a hostile or indifferent nature, God or social order" (p. 5).

PERCEIVED QUALITY OF LIFE: This, according to Campbell et al. (1976), "involves the relationship between subjective and objective indicators of well-being" (p.474).

SUBJECTIVE QUALITY OF LIFE: Rodgers stated this was "how people feel about their own lives" (p.271).

OBJECTIVE QUALITY OF LIFE: According to Schuessler and Fisher (1985) objective QOL is "observable environmental conditions such as per capita income or average daily temperature" (p.132).

WELL-BEING: Campbell et al. (1976) considered that well-being "takes for granted the basic essentials of life ... and places its emphasis on less tangible values - a sense of achievement in one's work, an appreciation of beauty in nature and the arts, a feeling of identification with one's community, a sense of fulfilment of one's potential" (p.1).

HAPPINESS: According to Campbell et al. (1976) this is defined "as an experience of feeling or affect" (p.8). Campbell and Converse (1972) stated that "happiness is a many-faceted concept" (p.463). Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) considered happiness "the result of the relative strengths of positive and negative feelings, rather than of the absolute amount of one or the other" (p.21).

SATISFACTION: Campbell et al. (1976) defined this as "the perceived discrepancy between aspiration and achievement, ranging from the perception of fulfilment to that of deprivation. Satisfaction implies a judgmental or cognitive experience" (p.8). For the purposes of Campbell



et al.'s research, they defined QOL in terms of satisfaction.

According to Cantril (1965), "satisfaction comes from attaining a goal through action based on choice - a neverending process of transforming a potential desire into an experiential reality" (p.274).

DOMAINS: Campbell et al. (1976) considered these "regions of experience" (p.61).

#### Scope and Delimitations of the Study

This study was an investigation into QOL and QOP of students in the Business Division of Niagara College. As a good rapport had been established with the Director of Business, he agreed to the administration of the questionnaire. Unfortunately, it was not possible to sample other divisions within the college, which might have led to interesting comparisons. Due to the selectivity of sample, there are limitations regarding interpretation and generalizability of results. The study did not sample those students who had left college before the end of the winter term of 1991. Thus this study does not shed light on those students who are part of the 40% attrition statistic. However, this exploratory study into QOL and QOP as

perceived by Business students provides a good starting point for other researchers in the field.

#### Outline of the Remainder of the Document

Chapter Two outlines the related literature on QOL and QOP. Chapter Three discusses the methodology adopted for this study. The results and an interpretation of the findings are presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five gives a summary of the study, conclusions are drawn and recommendations and implications outlined.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Introduction

The literature pertaining to Quality of Life is extremely broad, covering many aspects of human life and circumstance. In the first section of this review the present study is placed within a historical framework; secondly, the concept of domain-specific studies is reviewed; and thirdly, those studies of a similar nature within the field of Education are evaluated.

### Quality of Life - Historical Review

Concern for and perception of the inherent value, satisfaction, happiness and personal well-being of life extends back presumably to the dawn of human evolution. The Greek civilisation contemplated that apparently undefinable sense of life's quality as has every human being to a greater or lesser degree (Argyle, 1987). With the advent of modern psychology and sociology, a growing number of academics have pondered this sense of well-being and

attempted to, at least indirectly, measure what has become known as QOL. Perhaps the greatest and most persistent problem in assessing QOL is in its measurement since QOL is a latent trait not capable of direct observation. Measurement, therefore, has focused upon social indicators as indices of overall QOL.

Global: Scientific inquiry into QOL was initiated by research into the area of happiness within marriage by Burgess & Cottrell (1939). However, concern for a quantifiable measure of QOL did not emerge until the 1960s in the United States. At that time, Cantril (1965) studied the satisfaction level of people in thirteen different countries using questions that elicited best and worst scenarios. It emerged in these early empirical studies of QOL that two basic aspects that directly pertain to QOL existed namely, the objective side of life (food, shelter, life's necessities), and the subjective (attitudes, feelings, desires), both of which, in a complex amalgam of perception conditioned by each other, led to a general psychological sense of well-being or specific QOL. It needs to be pointed out that the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development (OECD) prefers the phrase well-being to QOL since it has fewer connotations from past work (Schuessler & Fisher, 1985). With this underlying thesis, Bradburn & Caplovitz (1965), in what was to become a seminal

work in the field, conducted a pilot study to ascertain the perceptions people have of their level of happiness and then to assess how this is represented across different social (SES) groups in America. They further placed this work within the context of changing sense of QOL over time. The generally crude methods of inquiry adopted in this study aroused in other workers incredulity concerning the methodology and scepticism with regard to the derived data because the results revealed not that those in better SES groups felt better or happier but that levels of QOL were often remarkably constant and were related more to intrinsic perception of the individuals who expected no more from their life than they were receiving rather than a continual quest for betterment of poorer groups as was extrinsically assumed.

The purpose of Bradburn & Caplovitz's research was an attempt to develop effective instruments using social indicators and subjective questions to assess the socio-psychological essence of the American population (Land, 1983). This cardinal thesis underlies almost all QOL research whether it is to grasp the perceived QOL of ethnic minorities, aging populations, recovering cancer patients, or rural versus urban dwellers. Essentially, QOL attempts by assessing well-being to determine the extent to which satisfaction and happiness are affected by and impact upon governmental policy decisions and interventions, and to what

extent QOL reflects changing social and environmental attributes of given domains over time. When Bradburn & Caplovitz initiated their research, the domain of relevance was at the Global level which was an attempt to establish trend lines, in the broadest spectrum of affect, for different social groups, ages, sex and answer some questions relating to mental health and social environment. Their sample population was from four neighbourhoods in Illinois, two of which were economically successful and two of which were not. They expected to find differences based upon economic disparity but, as noted above, they did not. Instead they discovered that "feeling states were composed of two almost completely unrelated dimensions: positive and negative feelings.... It was the balance between positive and negative feelings that determined whether or not an individual would assess him/herself as 'happy' or 'unhappy'" (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965, p.viii). This dichotomy of feelings now termed positive and negative affects are perhaps the most crucial cited findings of this research.

A later study by Bradburn (1969) focused upon five socio-economic groups selected on the basis of their likelihood of experiencing great stress in their every day lives. From this work, Bradburn derived the Affect Balance Scale which attempted to relate feelings both positive and negative to each other in a summation of personal well-being. The key finding was that both attributes although

impinging upon each other were essentially independent of each other. Argyle (1987), in reviewing Bradburn's research, suggested that while the frequency of positive and negative feelings are inversely related, the intensities are often positively related. Thus, someone who feels intense happiness may also experience great depression (Cherlin & Reeder, 1975; Kammann & Flett, 1983; Diener, Sandvik & Larsen, 1985).

By 1975 it was acknowledged that the mental health orientation of Bradburn & Caplovitz (1965) and Bradburn (1969) had greater implications and their instruments of measurement were able to be used to identify subjective well-being. To that end Cherlin & Reeder (1975) conducted a replication and critical review of Bradburn's 1969 study. Their work largely supported the earlier research findings of Bradburn. However, the study also found support for a link between positive emotions with years of education but no support for employment status with reference to QOL for men in the study. In discussing the Bradburn's Affect Balance Scale (ABS), Cherlin & Reeder point out that this scale, the key to much of Bradburn's findings, measures by difference or discrepancy scores and may not be well-founded as a psychological model but that, if the ABS accurately reflects the psychological process whereby people establish their sense of well-being, the ABS is a very powerful research tool. However, caution is expressed in the use of

the ABS and Cherlin & Reeder preferred to utilise the positive and negative affect scores independently of each other. In their conclusion, Cherlin & Reeder affirm the continued study of QOL by analysis of subjective perceptions rather than social indicators alone (Andrews & McKennell, 1980; Schuessler & Fisher, 1985).

Domain -Specific: In an epic volume on the Quality of American Life, Campbell et al. (1976) attempted to examine the QOL in order to elucidate the process of social change and to help society function better by being more informed about itself. The work was part of a longitudinal study which emphasised "the experience of life rather than the condition of life " (p.7) and thus accentuated the subjective rather than the objective aspects of life. In considering the approach to take, Campbell et al., in a lengthy discussion, decided that satisfaction rather than happiness was a better way to define QOL. This study was among the first to be domain-specific rather than global in its pursuit of a measure of QOL. Thus individual domains of a person's life were analysed, cross-referenced and then amalgamated into a general sense of QOL. The dichotomy between satisfaction and objective measures of, for example income level, were discussed in detail. For instance, Campbell et al. noted that a person's income level alone does not give a measure of whether a person is approaching



or descending from a previous income level. Obviously, the former individual may have a totally different level of satisfaction, and thus QOL, than the latter. Campbell et al. (1976) conducted personal interviews with 2,164 individuals living within the United States. The questions were based upon overall or global evaluation of their lives, the overall satisfaction with specific domains and, finally, a more thorough analysis of the separate domains. However, Campbell et al. were unable to resolve the problem of objective versus subjective measures of QOL and, ultimately, utilized a combination of both, concluding that the interrelationship between these two elements constitutes the root of QOL measurement. Campbell et al. emphasized the temporal element in their QOL research thus it only gives a guideline for the present study in the analysis of domain-specific questions.

Contemporaneous with much of the above QOL research was the growing awareness that well-being is a composite of three dimensions. The first, discussed above, discerns well-being as an internalized perception; while, secondly, the extent or otherwise of power a person feels he/she externally has also determines his/her own well-being within society (Mitchell & Spady, 1983); and a final aspect is the structure of well-being, itself, which is essentially a set of interrelated continua of perceptions which individuals employ to assess their QOL (Andrews & McKennell, 1980;

McKinnell & Andrews, 1980). In an attempt to examine this broader facet of well-being, Burt, Wiley, Minor & Murray (1978) analysed " An internalized structure of well-being ... in terms of which individuals evaluate their well-being (as opposed to social prescribed levels of aspiration against which they evaluate their well-being)" (p. 368). They identified general satisfaction as the single dimension from which to measure well-being and only subsequently were positive and negative affects utilized to refine their analysis (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965). In reviewing previous domain-specific studies Burt et al. identified those by Andrews (1974), Andrews & Withey (1976) and Campbell et al. (1976) as most pertinent. These studies consider the structure of well-being as being composed of perceived satisfaction or well-being in several domains of life of an individual within a societal structure of well-being. Burt et al.'s major thesis was to develop a model of overall societal well-being as a structure within which an individual's well-being might be mirrored. By constructing hypotheses to test the form, content and stability of well-being, Burt et al. (1978) favoured combining general satisfaction, positive and negative affects and domain-specific satisfaction. The implications of Burt et al.'s work was that a framework was constructed of well-being structure within which hypotheses are testable. Secondly, it became apparent that different societies have different

norms of QOL, therefore latent within any individual's QOL may be different structures. Thus, analyses of individuals from sub-cultures and ethnic minorities may require different criteria of normative QOL and thus different well-being structures nested within the general population of a macro-society such as the U.S.A. or Canada. This difference in possible criteria and structure has immense relevance in studying, for example, different age, social, educational, and religious groups. Burt et al. found that the effect of culture and degree of socialization are perhaps the key elements in these different well-being structures.

#### Quality of Life - Education

Research into QOL focused upon Global or Multi-domain specific well-being until Williams & Batten (1981), in Australia, perceived the need to adapt the QOL research to the single domain of Education. The underlying rationale for their research was derived from the Effective School Movement (Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen & Ginties, 1972). Until the research of Williams & Batten, QOL research had failed to delineate the specific domains within education. Building upon the work of Spady & Mitchell (1979) where a rationale was identified as regards what society expects from schools and how schools are organised

to achieve these expectations, Williams & Batten attempted to measure the quality of school life of secondary school students. This work stands as the key basic reference work on QOL within the specific domain of education. The basis of the Williams & Batten study hinges upon a series of discrete question sets that attempt to indirectly answer the four basic societal expectations of the school system in how it relates to and nurtures students (Mitchell & Spady, 1983). From an analysis of the four basic scholastic expectations, Williams & Batten (1981) suggested that students' experiences were a function of imposed school structures that were, themselves, a construct of society's expectations. Therefore, student experience was measured in terms of opportunity, adventure, identity and status that were collectively functions of certification, instruction, socialization and supervision respectively, and these structures stemmed from society's expectations of technical competency, personal development, social integration and social responsibility, respectively.

In applying their questionnaire within the above construction of expectations, Williams & Batten found that when experiences and perceptions were positive students tended to judge their QOL at school as high and vice versa. Thus, Williams & Batten (1981) distilled the quality of school life into six constructs, namely, the above four domains of expectation of school life, and the general and

positive/negative affect, as perceived by the students. The function of their questionnaire was to use as empirical indicators a set of domain-specific questions, the response to which may be construed as indicative of student QOL.

Clifton et al. (1987) undertook the first education domain-specific QOL study in Canada. This study, however, took education domain-specific QOL research a stage further by including a study of the students' perceptions of program quality (QOP). Clifton et al.'s study included examination of the entry characteristics of students, the perceptions they had of the quality of their program and the perceptions of their QOL within the faculty, along with various other characteristics of undergraduate and graduate students in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. Clifton et al. utilised the questionnaire derived by Williams & Batten as their instrument dealing with various facets, namely, educational program quality, QOL and student entrance characteristics.

Examination of QOP was based upon the theoretical constructs founded in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964). This work by Bloom was considered an ideal construct against which to measure the effectiveness of the educational process by asking questions pertinent to the whole range of educational objectives. According to Bloom (1956) "the taxonomy helps to specify objectives so that it becomes easier to plan

learning experiences and prepare evaluation devices. In short, teachers and curriculum makers should find this a concise model for analysis of educational outcomes in the cognitive area of remembering, thinking, and problem solving" (p.2). The arrangement of learning behaviours or understanding from simple to complex is organized into six pyramidal zones, namely, knowledge at the first level; comprehension; application; analysis; synthesis; and, at the highest level, evaluation. Added to these questions were others relevant to the affective domain (Krathwohl et al., 1964) that included: receiving (awareness, willingness, and selected attention); responding (acquiescence, willingness, satisfaction); valuing (acceptance, preference, commitment); organization (conceptualization, organization of value system); and finally, characterization by value or value complex. This latter aspect of value complex "is a basic orientation that enables the individual to reduce and order the complex (surrounding) world (from chaos to order) ... and to act consistently and effectively in it" (Krathwohl et al., 1964, p.164). This characterization is the "peak of the internalization process... a value system... a consistent philosophy of life" (Krathwohl et al., 1964, p.185). Clifton et al. (1987) identified five domains of the Quality of University Life, namely, general affect (positive), the negative affect from Bradburn's (1969) work, feelings of status, identity, teacher interaction and

opportunity (Spady & Mitchell, 1979). The empirical indicators were adapted from Williams & Batten to estimate the University QOL. Clifton et al. surveyed approximately 21% of the undergraduate and 18% of the graduate students at the College of Education, University of Manitoba. They ascertained that the majority of students were female, white English and from working class families. Students perceived weaknesses in their educational program (QOP) and overall only 38% and 50% of the undergraduates and graduates, respectively, were pleased with their program. With reference to the QOL, 41% and 47% of undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, felt proud to be students at the University of Manitoba.

Whether these above results are of a reasonable expectation given the particular sample used is never discussed. Like other education domain-specific QOL studies, an implicit assumption, even faith, is placed upon results. Little or no explicit recognition is given to the psychological factors of mood, gender, age, marital status, culture, and campus climate in terms of their impact on individual psychology and thus derivative QOL results (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland & Hood, 1966; Burt et al., 1978; Morgan, 1983; Schuessler & Fisher, 1985; Tinto, 1987). Not only is attending an educational institution a potentially stressful period of a person's life, but the dominant attending age group are often in the midst of

psychological maturation that in itself is an additional and critical stressful period in their lives. Therefore the lack of a reappraisal of the contextual meaning of results of QOL studies, especially in post-secondary education, is a potential flaw that must be addressed. To paraphrase Schuessler & Fisher (1985), it appears that too often criticism of QOL is self-imposed with little attempt being made to ask some of the more fundamental questions on relevance and interpretation of QOL results.

Following the Manitoba study, Bulcock et al. (1989) replicated a similar study at Memorial University of Newfoundland. They examined the perceptions of undergraduates in the Faculty of Education in terms of the quality of their program (QOP) and the quality of life (QOL). Two sections of the Manitoba questionnaire were employed to study QOP and QOL. The sample, unlike that at Manitoba which was a stratified random cluster procedure, was a convenience sample that included 15.5% of the full-time education students. A useful aspect of this study was its comparability with that by Clifton et al. This comparability is useful not only within a time frame but also allowing inter-university comparison (Campbell et al., 1976). Bulcock et al. found some differences in demographic and ethnic background but most interesting were the findings regarding QOP and QOL. The QOP was considered superior at



Memorial University but concern was expressed in the areas of comprehension, analysis, application and value complex domains. In an overall evaluation of the QOP at University of Manitoba only 33% of the students agreed they were satisfied, whereas at Memorial University just over 50% agreed.

The other major part of the replication study at Memorial University considered the QOL as perceived by students within the Faculty of Education. The findings of this aspect of the study indicated that students felt alienated, found life impersonal and that faculty/student interaction needed improvement. The underlying premise of both the Manitoba and Memorial University studies was that effective faculties rate well on QOP and QOL.

The third QOL study within Faculties of Education was performed at Brock University by Boak & Ellis (1991). They surveyed BEd graduates from the Brock University Pre-Service Education Program by mailed questionnaire, receiving a 46.5% rate of return. In essence, the questionnaire was the same as that used at the Universities of Manitoba and Memorial. This study pointed out the limitations of descriptive data in terms of determining the causal relationship between variables. Major differences between this study and previous counterparts exist in terms of rate of questionnaires returned, and the fact that the Brock students all had degrees before entry into the program.

This latter aspect has important implications regarding an existing structure of normative aspirations and goals being in place for Brock students as compared to those students from Manitoba and Memorial Universities who had not completed their university education and were probably less aware of university life. The status of Brock students must also be higher since they already have a degree, thus enhancing positive affects to a level few Manitoba or Memorial students have and only aspire to attain. The comparison, therefore, between the three universities is perhaps only apparent rather than real, causing parallels between these institutions to be less valid than expected. From the derived data, it appears that Brock rates better than either Manitoba or Memorial but the above concerns of comparability remain.

#### Summary

Interest in finding a quantifiable measure of QOL began in the United States in the 1960s. Cantril (1965) identified two basic aspects of QOL, namely, the objective and the subjective, which led to a psychological sense of well-being. Bradburn & Caplovitz (1965) attempted to develop useful instruments to assess the socio-psychological essence of the American population. Bradburn (1969)

developed an Affect Balance Scale which looked at positive and negative feelings in an attempt to give an overall summation of personal well-being. Campbell et al.(1976) were the first to look at domain specific rather than global QOL. Burt et al. (1978) developed a model of overall societal well-being as a structure within which an individual's well-being might be tested.

The first education domain specific QOL study was undertaken by Williams & Batten (1981). Student experience was measured in terms of opportunity, adventure, identity and status, along with the general and positive/negative affect, as perceived by students.

Clifton et al.(1987) carried out the first education domain specific study in Canada at the University of Manitoba. They included an examination of QOP, using the Taxonomy of Educational Objective (Bloom, 1956; and Krathwohl et al. (1964) as a basis for item construction. Bulcock et al. (1989) replicated a similar study at Memorial University of Newfoundland. The third QOL study was performed by Boak & Ellis (1991) at Brock University. The Canadian QOL and QOP studies were all performed within Faculties of Education.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

### Description of Research Methodology

This was a descriptive study of student perceptions of their QOL and QOP. A questionnaire that was adapted from the study by Clifton et al. (1987) was the research instrument administered to Business students at Niagara College. Analysis of data was performed and frequencies discussed in relation to QOL and QOP.

### Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted whereby the questionnaire was tested on ten students who attended Niagara College and who were in their second or third year of the Business programs. This was done, first, to ascertain the time it might take to complete the questionnaire. The times taken to complete the questionnaire ranged from 12 to 30 minutes. Thus, it was established that it was feasible to ask students to complete the instrument while they were in

class. Secondly, the pilot study was performed to discover any problems the students had in completing items. One of the items - to acquire tolerance for minorities and the disabled - was considered a condescending phrase by one of the pilot students and this was changed as follows - to acquire an understanding for minorities and the disabled.

Professor Boak at Brock University reviewed the questionnaire at all stages during its compilation. The Director of Students, Director of Business and a Co-ordinator within the Business Division, Niagara College were given copies of the questionnaire on which to comment. The Director of Students made several suggestions which were taken into account in the final version of the questionnaire.

#### Selection of Subjects

To obtain data, a convenience volunteer sample of students was selected from ongoing Business classes. The Business students were selected as they were the Division in which the author of this study taught and the Director of the Division was willing to co-operate in the study. As the Division of Business contained 734 students, as of the 13th of March, 1991, this was considered a sufficiently large group of Niagara College students to sample. Only teachers who volunteered class time were asked to participate in the study.

Stratified sampling by year was employed to ensure an adequate number of returns from each of the three years within the Division. There were 419 First Year students, 235 Second and 80 Third enrolled at the time of the study. It was estimated that a 27 to 30 percent sample was sufficient to meet the objectives of the research. According to Sudman (1976), "there should be at least 100 subjects in each major subgroup and 20 to 50 in each minor sub-groups whose responses are to be analyzed" (Borg and Gall, 1989, p.233).

#### Instrumentation

The research instrument was a questionnaire adapted from one previously validated and was considered a reliable measure of QOP and QOL in an educational setting (Figure 1). Williams and Batten (1981) were the first to derive the QOL section of the present questionnaire and subsequently Clifton et al. (1987) used this along with a new section they derived on QOP and this instrument was subsequently used at Memorial University by Bulcock et al. (1989) and Brock University by Boak and Ellis (1991).

Survey Instrument for 15-year-old  
Australian students.  
Designed by Williams & Batten, 1981.

Adapted for  
  
Senior Undergraduate & Graduate  
Students at Univ. of Manitoba.  
By Clifton et al. 1987.

Adapted for  
  
Third Year Undergraduate Education  
Students at Memorial Univ., Newfoundland  
By Bullock & Mendoza, 1988.

Adapted for  
  
Community College 1st - 3rd Year  
Students at Niagara College, Welland  
By Menzies, 1991.

Figure 1: Development of the Survey Instrument

The questionnaire used by Clifton et al. (1987) at the University of Manitoba was amended for this study. The QOL part of the questionnaire which included 40 items was adopted and used as the QOL measure in this study. However, the QOP questions were not specifically relevant to community college students and some were excluded while other questions were reworded to suit the sample population. A copy of the questionnaire used in this study is included in Appendix A. Additional items included in the QOP section were derived from the Vision 2000 Report (OMCU, 1990); they included goals based on a perceived need as well as theoretical educational objectives. The QOP part of the questionnaire contained 33 items and, of these, 18 were different from the Manitoba instrument. The new items comprised, namely: Knowledge Items, familiarity with the language of business, broad skills I can apply to many jobs, narrow job-specific skills, knowledge of the important principles in the program; Comprehension Item, to reason clearly; Application Items, to assess interrelationships between topics, to make assessments of every-day problems; Synthesis Items, to come up with new interpretations of what I have been taught, to be original and come up with my own ideas; Evaluation Item, to evaluate what I read and sometimes disagree; Value Complex Items, to value others, to increase my interpersonal skills, to expand my opportunities for further education (e.g., university), to become a more



informed citizen, to acquire marketable skills, more vocational skills and less general skills, more awareness of global issues, understanding for the disabled and minorities.

Questions were added to the entering characteristics section of the questionnaire regarding marital status, health problems, physical or learning disability and academic preparedness. A section on social identities included in the Boak & Ellis questionnaire was omitted in this study.

The questionnaire and data collection procedures were given to the Brock University Ethics Committee for approval. The procedure for the study assistants to follow in administration of the questionnaire, the instructions they read to student and the consent form that the students signed are contained in Appendix B.

The questionnaire was also read by the Director of Student Services at Niagara College and considered an acceptable instrument for the students to complete.

A Likert-type scale was used for the students to mark their responses, namely, definitely agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree and definitely disagree (Borg & Gall, 1989, p.311). There have been a number of studies (Chapter 2) using a similar research instrument; however, reliability and validity have yet to be established. Roberts and Clifton (1991) attempted a sophisticated

procedure to test for validity and concluded that there was sound theoretical and empirical support for this instrument but that further studies were required to establish reliability and validity.

#### Data Collection

College professors were verbally asked if they might like to participate in this study by allowing their students to complete a questionnaire during class time. Some professors were doing important review classes and could not allow the time. However, approximately 80% of those teaching First and Second Years students agreed. All the teachers of the Third Year students were unable to allow class time. For the Third Year students a batch of questionnaires was handed to three professors who volunteered to hand them to their classes and collect the returns. Therefore, collection of data was different for the First and Second Year from the Third Year.

The aim was to obtain sufficient completed questionnaires for each of First, Second and Third Year students to stay within the guideline figures as stated by Sudman (1976). When analysing the QOP and QOL by year, the First Year was divided into First Year who began their studies in September of 1990 and First Year Accelerated who started their program in January 1991. The First Year

Accelerated students are those who missed the September intake and complete their first year of a program by taking classes from January to July instead of September to April. They take eight courses in their first term instead of the regular seven. There is a tendency for this group of 40 or so students to be more mature and self-motivated; however, there is a larger attrition rate from this group than the September First Year intake (Gilmore, personal communication 1992).

The questionnaire was administered by two full-time M.Ed. students and one university professor who had no connection with this study. This was to avoid coercion and the identity of the author of the study was not disclosed. Two days were selected during the last two weeks of term for these study assistants to visit the college and administer the questionnaire. Some classes had fewer students than they might have normally as it was the end of term and some were absent to study for exams et cetera. The professor was asked to leave the room during completion of the questionnaire to avoid any coercion. In total, the questionnaire was administered to 140 First Year students and 139 completed questionnaires were obtained that were made up of 37 First Year Accelerated program students completing their first term and 102 First Year students completing their second term. A total of 86 questionnaires were administered and completed by Second Year students.

There were 40 questionnaires handed out to Third Year students and 22 were returned (Table 1).

The study assistants were careful to inform the students that their participation was entirely voluntary and that their completed questionnaires were confidential and anonymous.

TABLE 1: Breakdown of Stratified Sample.

Year of Program	% of No. Enroled <sup>a</sup>	Sample Size <sup>b</sup>	% of Sample
1	57	137	56
2	32	86	35
3	11	22	9

<sup>a</sup> $\bar{n}$  = 734

<sup>b</sup> $\bar{n}$  = 245

Only two questionnaires administered to the First Year students were returned and had to be destroyed as they were defaced. In the entire stratified sample, only one student in the First Year Accelerated class refused to complete the questionnaire (excluding the Third Year non-returns). Therefore, 245 students formed the sample population for statistical and qualitative analyses.

## Data Processing and Analysis - Statistical Analysis

The data obtained was codified and entered using DATA ENTRY into SPSS/PC+ 4.0 software on a microcomputer. Once entered, the data were processed for standard statistical analyses: frequency, mean and standard deviation. The data were then tabulated and printed.

### Methodological Assumptions

The first assumption made in this study was that the students sampled were a good statistical cross-section of the students in the Business Division at Niagara College and thus give a valid measure of their perceived QOL and QOP. A second assumption was that students engaged in completing the questionnaire might do so without bias and with a degree of honesty. Part 4 of the questionnaire was designed to allow those students who wished to include additional material to do so, thus increasing the degree of candour and forthrightness that was sought. A final assumption was that students completing the questionnaire had considered the questions posed in some other form either internally or in dialogue with others; therefore there was already a perception within each student of what he or she perceived his/her QOL and QOP to be at Niagara College.

### Limitations

There was a different method of collection of data for the First and Second Year students and the Third Year students. The teachers of the Third Year classes did not feel they could allow class time for completion of the questionnaire and Third Year students, unlike the First and Second Year, took the questionnaire home to complete. As the Third Year questionnaires were distributed and collected by one of their class professors there may have been some bias in the responses. Some of the Second Year students were completing their final year of a two-year program and some still had a year to completion of their three-year program.

The questionnaire was administered to a convenience sample of 245 students. Therefore, interpretations arising from this research relates only to the specific students sampled. Since the questionnaire was conducted at the close of the winter term some student attrition from the various programs had already occurred.

### Restatement of the Problem Statement

This study was designed to measure the perceived QOL and QOP of the students in the Business Division of Niagara College. The students sampled were from First, Second and

Third Years. It is necessary for the continued success of community colleges that key areas be identified that are capable of change through intervention and policy changes at the Administrative and Faculty levels. To ascertain which key areas do or do not need future consideration and possible remedial action, it was the purpose of this study to establish the QOL and QOP as perceived by the students in the Business Division.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

### Overview

This chapter presents the results of the investigation into the Quality of Life (QOL) and Quality of Program (QOP) as perceived by students in the Business Division at Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology. The specific objectives of the study were to ascertain:

1. The entering characteristics of the sample group, namely age, sex, marital status, number of dependents, prior education, health and learning problems, ethnicity, parental SES, and academic preparedness;
2. The intervening variables, namely, motivation and commitment and evidence of this aspect in the form of marks attained and post-college expectations;

and to ascertain and analyze:

3. The students' perceptions regarding the quality of their program;



4. The students' perceptions of their quality of life;
5. The students' comments upon their QOL and QOP or the Questionnaire.

### Results

This section will highlight, in the text, results of particular interest. Tables contain all the results. At the beginning of the questionnaire, students were asked to identify the program and year in which they were enrolled (Table 2). The largest concentration of respondents (38%) were in the first year, Business Administration program. The Business Administration Accelerated students represented 9% of the survey. Overall, First, Second and Third Year Business Administration students represented 75.9% of responses. The balance of responses was comprised of Accounting Diploma students (15.1%), Sales (2.9%), and Computer Programmers (6.1%). There were two programs that were not represented in this survey, namely the Accounting Co-op and the Retail Management. Both of these groups were absent from the college, fulfilling the co-operative education part of their program when this survey was administered. As shown in Chapter 2, a breakdown of responses according to year shows that 56.5% were First, 34.8% Second and 8.7% Third Year students (Table 1).

Table 2: Program Characteristics of Respondents<sup>a</sup>

Program	n	%
<b>Accounting</b>		
First Year	7	2.9
First Year Accelerated	15	6.1
Second Year Sales	15	6.1
Second Year	7	2.9
<b>Business Administration</b>		
First Year	93	38.0
First Year Accelerated	22	9.0
<b>Second Year :</b>		
Accounting Academic	4	1.6
Accounting Co-op	1	0.4
Human Resources	13	5.3
Information Systems	1	0.4
Marketing	9	3.7
Operations	21	8.6

(table continues)

Program	n	%
Third Year :		
Accounting Academic	5	2.0
Human Resources	5	2.0
Information Systems	7	2.9
Operations	5	2.0
Computer Programmer		
Second Year	15	6.1

n = 245

### Objective 1: Entering Characteristics

The entering characteristics were answered by the majority of students, except on parental education and occupation where a few did not reply. Five declined to answer regarding their mothers' educational achievement and ten on their mothers' occupation. Six did not give their fathers' education and twelve did not indicate their fathers' occupation. There were a majority of females in the survey (55.5%). Most students were under 23 years of age (79.3%) with the youngest being 18 years and the oldest 52 years. However, the average age of females (23.02 years) was higher than that of the male students (21.80 years).

Most students (87.3%) in the sample were single, 6.2% of these stated that they had been divorced, separated or widowed. Only 12.7% of the students sampled were currently married.

The majority of students (85.2%) had no dependent children living at home, while 14.8% did. Those with dependent children gave the ages as ranging from newborn to 17 years with the minimum number of children per student being one and the maximum four.

In terms of previous education, 82% of the students came to Niagara College directly from high school, while 17.9% had previously attended college or university. Only

ten students had been part-time students before joining a full-time program.

Health problems or physical disabilities were acknowledged in 14.3% of the sampled students, and 1.2% felt they had a learning disability.

From Table 3 it can be seen that 67.1% of the sample were of West European extraction and 9.8% East European. Only 4.8% were Asian and 0.4% Native American.

The educational achievement of parents, shown in Table 4, presents information on both the mother and father. The Table shows that 17.9% of mothers and 20.1% of fathers had not gone on to high school and 28.3% of mothers and 25.9% of fathers did not complete high school. Education beyond the high school level had been undertaken by 25.5% of the mothers and 32.6% of the fathers.

The occupation of parents given in Table 5 shows 25.5% of Mothers were homemakers while 24.3% were employed as skilled or semi-skilled clerical and sales people. Only 5.5% of the Mothers had jobs that were high level professionals or managers. Skilled crafts and trades was stated as the Fathers occupation by 23.2% of students and middle management jobs for 17.6%. High level professional or managerial jobs were held by 12.8% of the Fathers.

Table 3: Ethnicity<sup>a</sup>

Question: What is your ethnic origin?

Category	%	
British	30.1	(74)
Canadian	13.1	(32)
French	10.5	(25)
Italian	9.8	(24)
German	9.8	(24)
East European	9.8	(24)
Dutch	6.9	(17)
Asian	4.8	(12)
Native American	0.4	( 1)
Miscellaneous	4.8	(12)

<sup>a</sup>n = 245

Table 4: Educational Achievement of Parents

Highest level achieved	Mother <sup>a</sup> %	Father <sup>b</sup> %
Elementary School	17.9 (43)	20.1 (48)
Some High School	28.3 (68)	25.9 (62)
Completed High School	28.3 (68)	21.3 (51)
Some Technical and Vocational	3.8 ( 9)	14.2 (34)
Completed Community College	12.5 (30)	5.4 (13)
Some University	4.6 (11)	2.9 ( 7)
Completed Bachelor Degree	2.5 ( 6)	5.9 (14)
Some Graduate level	0.8 ( 2)	2.1 ( 5)
Completed Graduate Degree	1.3 ( 3)	2.1 ( 5)

<sup>a</sup>n = 240<sup>b</sup>n = 239

Table 5: Occupation of Parents

Category	Mother <sup>a</sup> %	Father <sup>b</sup> %
Self-Employed Professional (e.g., architect, engineer)	0.4 ( 1)	1.7 ( 4)
Employed Professional (e.g., accountant, teacher)	5.1 (12)	9.0 (21)
High Level Managers (e.g., vice-president, manager)	0	2.1 ( 5)
Semi-professional (e.g., musician)	7.2 (17)	2.1 ( 5)
Technicians (life science)	1.7 ( 4)	1.3 ( 3)
Middle Manager Business/Gov.	8.5 (20)	17.6 (41)
Supervisor, Foreman	3.8 ( 9)	7.7 (18)
Skilled Clerical/Sales	13.2 (31)	3.0 ( 7)
Skilled Crafts & Trades (e.g., plumber, cabinet maker)	1.7 ( 4)	23.2 (54)
Farmer	0.4 ( 1)	2.6 ( 6)
Semi-skilled Clerical, Sales	11.1 (26)	1.3 ( 3)
Semi-skilled Manual (e.g., cook, taxi driver)	5.1 (12)	13.7 (32)
Unskilled Clerical, Sales (e.g., mail carrier)	3.8 ( 9)	1.7 ( 4)
Unskilled Manual (e.g., janitor)	9.4 (22)	6.0 (14)
Farm Labourer	0.9 ( 2)	1.3 ( 3)

(table continues)



Category	Mother <sup>a</sup> %	Father <sup>b</sup> %
Homemaker	25.5 (60)	0
Unemployed	1.3 ( 3)	1.3 ( 3)
Other (inc. retired, deceased)	0.9 ( 2)	4.3 (10)

Note. Occupational categories adapted from Pineo, P.C. et al. (1977).

<sup>a</sup>n = 235

<sup>b</sup>n = 233

Although somewhat subjective, student academic preparedness shows that 86.9% of students felt they were well prepared for college while 13.1% thought they were under-prepared.

### Objective 2: The Intervening Variables

The students were asked to rate their motivation on a five-point Likert-type scale and 68.6% were motivated to very motivated (Table 6). Only 8.1% said they were little motivated to unmotivated.

Students estimated that they allocated their time on average, 23 hours attending class, 10 hours studying, 9 hours in paid employment and 12 hours per week on recreation. Paid employment was undertaken in conjunction with their studies by 54.7% of students while 45.3% of students had no paid employment and 10.7% declared they had no time for any form of recreation.

Students reported their current grades to be mostly B's (44%), A's (36.5%) and C's (18.6%) (Table 7). Only four students (1.6%) reported a D or failing grade. There were similar grades reported for cumulative grades, 44.1% got B's, 35.9% got A's, 17.1% got C's and 2.9% (7 students) had a D or failing grade.

Table 6: Student Motivation Level<sup>a</sup>

Motivation	Sample %
Very Motivated	35.1 (86)
Motivated	33.5 (82)
Neutral	23.3 (57)
Little Motivated	5.7 (14)
Unmotivated	2.4 ( 6)

<sup>a</sup>n = 245

Table 7: Average Grades Reported<sup>a</sup>

Grades	Current Term Sample %	Cumulative Sample %
A++ (≥90)	6.9 (17)	7.1 (18)
A+ (≥85)	12.4 (31)	10.3 (26)
A (≥80)	17.2 (43)	18.5 (26)
B+ (≥75)	23.1 (58)	19.4 (49)
B (≥70)	20.9 (52)	24.7 (62)
C+ (≥65)	9.5 (24)	9.5 (24)
C (≥60)	8.6 (21)	7.6 (19)
D (≥50)	0.8 ( 2)	0.5 ( 1)
F (a failing grade)	0.8 ( 2)	2.4 ( 6)

<sup>a</sup>n = 245

When asked to compare their work to other students in their year at college, 59.7% said they were a little above average to a lot above average (Table 8). Only 22.2% stated they were a little to a lot below average.

Table 9 gives the future intentions of students and shows that 52.7% expect to work in the field in which they hope to graduate. Those who thought they might not complete the diploma or who might change career represented only 5.3%. Further education instead of getting a job in the field of their diploma, was the goal of 15.1% of students. Some students replied that they might like to work in the field of their diploma and continue education (26.9%).

Table 8: Comparing Work to Others\*

Question: How good are you at your college work compared to other students in your year level?

---

	%	
A lot above average	17.7	( 43)
A little above average	42.0	(102)
Average	30.5	( 74)
A little below average	21.0	( 9)
A lot below average	1.2	( 3)

---

\*n = 231

Table 9: Future Intentions<sup>a</sup>

Question: What are you most likely to be doing within six months of completing your diploma?

---

	%	
Do not expect to complete Diploma	3.3	( 8)
Work in the field of graduation	52.7	(129)
Further education	15.1	( 37)
Stay home	0	( 0 )
Change career	2	( 5)
Work in the field and Further Education	26.9	( 66)

---

<sup>a</sup>n = 245

### Objective 3: Quality of Program

As discussed in Chapter 3, Quality of Program was measured over the cognitive and affective domains using theoretical constructs namely, Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Synthesis, Evaluation and Value Complex Items. The students responded on a five-point Likert-type scale. Information on the overall student perceptions of QOP is shown in Table 10: QOP by year is presented in Table 11.

According to the survey, 74.1% of students definitely or mostly agreed that the knowledge objectives had been met, while only 4.6% mostly or definitely disagreed (Table 10).

The Knowledge Items which elicited the highest positive responses were knowledge of the important principles in the program (82.9%), and having learned a considerable amount about the subjects they planned to use (82.5%). There was an 11.8% negative response to the question narrow job-specific skills which was the highest negative response within the Knowledge Items. Students may have considered their education to have been more broadly based. This is borne out by the item broad skills I can apply to many jobs which received a 77.6% positive response. The First Year were least positive about the knowledge objectives while the other groups were considerably more positive.

The Comprehension Items received the lowest positive



mean with 63.7% definitely or mostly agreeing. However, 70.2% answered that they definitely or mostly agreed they had learned to reason clearly.

The lowest scoring item in the comprehension unit was to speak in a clear and concise manner where 54.3% were positive and 35.1% neutral. Agreement that the comprehension objectives had been met increased greatly by year, from a low of 53.8% for First Year to a high of 87.5% for Third Year. The lowest scoring items for First Year within the comprehension questions were to speak in a clear and concise manner and to write in a precise manner (Table 11).

Application Items received a 69.8% mean positive score (Table 10). The item to apply knowledge gained to different situations received the most positive responses with 78.8% definitely or mostly agreeing with the statement and only 0.4%, one person in the entire survey, mostly disagreeing. There was a high neutral response (31.0%) to the item to use a variety of ways to solve a problem. The responses to the Application Items were positive in ascending order of year. The lowest positive response within the Application Items in First Year was to the item to interpret new problems (55.0%, Table 11).

There was a 67% positive response to the analysis items (Table 10). Responses were increasingly positive from First to Third Year (Table 11).

The Synthesis Items received a similar response to the analysis items, with the percentage mean showing 68% of students definitely or mostly agreeing that, among other things, they had learned to combine information from a number of sources (75.1%) and to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives (68.6%, Table 10).

In response to the Evaluation Items, the students definitely or mostly agreed (71.1%) with the statements (Table 10). The responses were increasingly positive from First to Third Year (Table 11).

The percentage mean for the Value Complex Items showed that 69.2% definitely or mostly agreed with these items. There was a large disparity on different items within the value complex unit. The most positive responses were in reply to the statements to value myself as a prospective employee (82.5%) and to value the work skills I have learned (82.4%), and the most negative was in response to the item to acquire understanding of the disabled and minorities where only 40% of students definitely or mostly agreed (Table 10). First and Second Years showed positive responses in the sixty percent range and First Year Accelerated and Third Year in the seventy percent range (Table 11).

The overall evaluation of the program, as perceived by students in the Business Division was 75.9% positive and only 5.3% negative (Table 10). Therefore, 186 students

definitely or mostly agreed that they were satisfied with their program in the Business Division, while only 46 gave a neutral response and 13 negative. For the overall satisfaction with their program all the years were very satisfied; however, the First Year were the most satisfied (79%) and the Second and Third the least satisfied with 72.1% and 72.7% respectively (Table 11).

Table 10: Quality of Program Responses <sup>a</sup>

In the Business Division, I have learned....

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Knowledge Items</b>					
..a considerable amount about the subjects I plan to use	22.9	59.6	14.7	2.4	0.4
..familiarity with the language of business	16.3	61.6	20.4	1.6	0.0
..narrow job-specific skills	12.7	37.1	38.4	10.6	1.2
..knowledge of the important principles in the program	27.8	55.1	14.7	1.6	0.8
..broad skills I can apply to many jobs	29.4	48.2	18.4	4.1	0.0
Mean of Knowledge Items	21.8	52.3	21.3	4.1	0.5
<b>Comprehension Items</b>					
..to communicate effectively	20.4	45.7	29.4	4.1	0.4
..to write in a precise manner	20.0	44.1	31.0	4.1	0.8
..to speak in a clear and concise manner	16.7	37.6	35.1	8.6	2.0
..to reason clearly	18.4	51.8	24.9	4.9	0.0
Mean of Comprehension Items	18.9	44.8	30.1	5.4	0.8
<b>Application Items</b>					
..to interpret new problems	20.0	46.9	28.2	4.1	0.8
..to think critically	19.6	49.0	26.9	4.1	0.4

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..to apply knowledge gained to different situations	18.8	60.0	20.8	0.4	0.0
..to use a variety of ways to solve a problem	15.1	49.8	31.0	4.1	0.0
Mean of Application Items	18.4	51.4	26.7	3.2	0.3
Analysis Items					
..to assess interrelationships between topics	19.2	47.8	28.6	3.3	1.2
..to make assessments of every-day problems	18.0	49.0	26.5	5.7	0.8
Mean of Analysis Items	18.6	48.4	27.6	4.5	1.0
Synthesis Items					
..to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	19.6	49.0	26.9	4.1	0.4
..to come up with new interpretations of what I have been taught	15.1	48.6	29.4	6.5	0.4
..to be original and come up with my own ideas	22.0	42.4	25.7	6.9	2.9
..to combine information from a number of sources	25.7	49.4	22.4	2.4	0.0
Mean of Synthesis Items	20.6	47.4	26.1	5.0	0.9
Evaluation Items					
..to examine my own abilities critically	22.0	48.6	22.4	6.1	0.8
..to evaluate what I read and sometimes disagree	24.5	46.9	20.8	7.3	0.4
Mean Evaluation Items	23.3	47.8	21.6	6.7	0.6

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Value Complex Items</b>					
..to value myself as a prospective employee	38.4	44.1	13.9	2.9	0.8
..to value the work skills I have learned	35.1	47.3	14.7	2.0	0.8
..to value the Business Division	20.8	51.4	23.3	2.9	1.6
..to value others	29.4	46.5	17.6	4.9	1.6
..to increase my interpersonal skills	27.8	51.4	17.6	2.9	0.4
..to expand my opportunities for further education	35.4	33.7	20.2	7.0	3.7
..to become a more informed citizen	29.4	41.2	2.4	5.3	1.2
..to acquire marketable skills	30.6	47.8	19.2	2.0	0.4
..to acquire more vocational skills and less general skills	17.6	45.3	28.6	7.3	1.2
..to acquire more awareness of global issues	14.3	33.9	34.7	13.9	3.3
..to acquire understanding of the disabled and minorities	13.1	26.9	33.5	19.2	7.3
Mean Value Complex Items	26.5	42.7	22.3	6.4	2.0

**Overall Evaluation**

..Overall, I am satisfied with my program in the Business Division	24.5	51.4	18.8	4.5	0.8
--	------	------	------	-----	-----

Note. 1 = Definitely Agree, 2 = Mostly Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Mostly Disagree, 5 = Definitely Disagree.

<sup>a</sup>n = 245

Table 11: Comparison of Student Perceptions Regarding Quality of Program by Year of Program.

In the Business Division, I have learned....

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Knowledge Items</b>					
<b>..a considerable amount about the subjects I plan to use</b>					
First year <sup>a</sup>	18.0(18)	58.0(58)	19.0(19)	4.0 (4)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated <sup>b</sup>	29.7(11)	54.1(20)	16.2 (6)	0	0
Second year <sup>c</sup>	19.8(17)	69.8(60)	8.1 (7)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year <sup>d</sup>	45.5(10)	36.4 (8)	18.2 (4)	0	0
<b>..familiarity with the language of business</b>					
First year	11.0(11)	54.0(54)	31.0(31)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	59.5(22)	16.2 (6)	0	0
Second year	17.4(15)	68.6(59)	14.0(12)	0	0
Third year	22.7 (5)	72.7(16)	4.5 (1)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..narrow job-specific skills					
First year	6.0 (6)	38.0(38)	38.0(38)	15.0(15)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	21.6 (8)	32.4(12)	40.5(15)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	11.6(10)	43.0(37)	34.9(30)	10.5 (9)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	18.2 (4)	50.0(11)	0	0
..knowledge of the important principles in the program					
First year	22.0(22)	59.0(59)	16.0(16)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	59.5(22)	13.5 (5)	0	2.7 (1)
Second year	32.6(28)	50.0(43)	15.1(13)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	40.9 (9)	50.0(11)	9.1 (2)	0	0
..broad skills I can apply to many jobs					
First year	25.0(25)	48.0(48)	21.0(21)	6.0 (6)	0
First year accelerated	37.8(14)	32.4(12)	27.0(10)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	30.2(26)	55.8(48)	10.5 (9)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	22.7 (5)	0	0

(table continues)



Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Mean of Knowledge Items</b>					
First year	16.4(16)	51.4(51)	25.0(25)	6.2 (6)	1.2 (1)
First year accelerated	27.5(10)	47.6(18)	22.7 (8)	1.6 (1)	0.5 (0)
Second year	22.3(19)	57.4(49)	16.5(14)	3.7 (3)	0
Third year	34.5 (8)	44.6(10)	20.9 (5)	0	0
<b>Comprehension Items</b>					
<b>..to communicate effectively</b>					
First year	8.0 (8)	52.0(52)	31.0(31)	0	0
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	45.9(17)	35.1(13)	0	0
Second year	29.1(25)	37.2(32)	31.4(27)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	45.5(10)	50.0(11)	4.5 (1)	0	0
<b>..to write in a precise manner</b>					
First year	10.0(10)	39.0(39)	42.0(42)	8.0 (8)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	56.8(21)	32.4(12)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	27.9(24)	48.8(42)	20.9(18)	1.2 (1)	1.2 (1)
Third year	54.5(12)	27.3 (6)	18.2 (4)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..to speak in a clear and concise manner					
First year	8.0 (8)	37.0(37)	39.0(39)	13.0(13)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	18.8 (7)	40.5(15)	35.1(13)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	22.1(19)	33.7(29)	36.0(31)	5.8 (5)	2.3 (2)
Third year	31.8 (7)	50.0(11)	13.6 (3)	4.5 (1)	0
..to reason clearly					
First year	10.0(10)	51.0(51)	30.0(30)	9.0 (9)	0
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	48.6(18)	27.0(10)	0	0
Second year	22.1(19)	52.3(45)	22.1(19)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	59.1(13)	9.1 (2)	0	0
Mean of Comprehension Items					
First year	9.0 (9)	44.8(45)	35.5(36)	7.5 (8)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	17.5 (7)	48.0(18)	32.4(12)	2.0 (1)	0
Second year	25.3(22)	43.0(37)	27.6(24)	3.2 (3)	0.9 (1)
Third year	40.9 (9)	46.6(10)	11.4 (3)	1.1 (0)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Application Items					
..to interpret new problems					
First year	12.0(12)	43.0(43)	36.0(36)	7.0 (7)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	51.4(19)	24.3 (9)	0	0
Second year	25.6(22)	50.0(43)	22.1(19)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	27.3 (6)	45.5(10)	22.7 (5)	4.4 (1)	0
..to think critically					
First year	18.0(18)	44.0(44)	29.0(29)	9.0 (9)	0
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	56.8(21)	21.6 (8)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	20.9(18)	50.0(43)	27.9(24)	0	1.2 (1)
Third year	22.7 (5)	54.5(12)	22.7 (5)	0	0
..to apply knowledge gained to different situations					
First year	14.0(14)	61.0(61)	25.0(25)	0	0
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	59.5(22)	24.3 (9)	0	0
Second year	20.9(18)	61.6(53)	16.3(14)	1.2 (1)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Third year	36.4 (8)	50.0(11)	13.6 (3)	0	0
..to use a variety of ways to solve a problem					
First year	10.0(10)	51.0(51)	34.0(34)	5.0 (5)	0
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	51.4(19)	27.0(10)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	18.6(16)	47.7(41)	30.2(26)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	22.7 (5)	50.0(11)	27.3 (6)	0	0
Mean of Application Items					
First year	13.5(14)	50.3(50)	31.0(31)	5.3 (5)	0.5 (1)
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	54.8(20)	24.3 (9)	2.0 (1)	0
Second year	21.5(19)	52.3(45)	24.1(21)	1.8 (2)	0.3 (0)
Third year	27.3 (6)	50.0(11)	21.6 (5)	1.1 (0)	0
Analysis Items					
..to assess interrelationships between topics					
First year	18.0(18)	45.0(45)	31.0(31)	3.0 (3)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	40.5(15)	32.4(12)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Second year	14.0(12)	54.7(47)	25.6(22)	4.7 (4)	1.2 (1)
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	18.2 (4)	4.5 (1)	0

..to make assessments of  
every-day problems

First year	17.0(17)	43.0(43)	31.0(31)	7.0 (7)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	56.8(21)	21.6 (8)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	15.1(13)	54.7(47)	26.7(23)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	40.9 (9)	13.6 (3)	9.1 (2)	0

Mean of Analysis Items

First year	17.5(18)	44.0(44)	31.0(31)	5.0 (5)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	21.6 (8)	48.7(18)	26.9(10)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	14.6(13)	54.7(47)	26.2(23)	4.1 (4)	0.6 (1)
Third year	34.1 (8)	43.2(10)	15.9 (4)	6.8 (2)	0

Synthesis Items

..to combine elements of  
knowledge into new  
perspectives

First year	19.0(19)	50.0(50)	24.0(24)	6.0 (6)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	56.8(21)	24.3 (9)	2.7 (1)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Second year	17.4(15)	48.8(42)	32.6(28)	1.2 (1)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	31.8 (7)	22.7 (5)	9.1 (2)	0
..to come up with new interpretations of what I have been taught					
First year	14.0(14)	49.0(49)	26.0(26)	11.0(11)	0
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	48.6(18)	27.0(10)	8.1 (3)	0
Second year	17.4(15)	45.3(39)	33.7(29)	2.3 (2)	1.2 (1)
Third year	9.1 (2)	59.1(13)	31.8 (7)	0	0
..to be original and come up with my own ideas					
First year	18.0(18)	42.0(42)	28.0(28)	10.0(10)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	45.9(17)	27.0(10)	10.8 (4)	2.7 (1)
Second year	26.7(23)	40.7(35)	24.4(21)	3.5 (3)	4.7 (4)
Third year	36.4 (8)	45.5(10)	18.2 (4)	0	0
..to combine information from a number of sources					
First year	24.0(24)	48.0(48)	24.0(24)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	56.8(21)	13.5 (5)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	27.9(24)	45.3(39)	26.7(23)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Third year	22.7 (5)	59.1(13)	13.6 (3)	4.5 (1)	0
Mean of Synthesis Items					
First year	18.8(19)	47.3(47)	25.5(25)	7.8 (8)	0.8 (1)
First year accelerated	18.2 (7)	52.0(19)	23.0 (9)	6.1 (2)	0.7 (0)
Second year	22.4(19)	45.0(39)	29.4(25)	1.8 (2)	1.5 (1)
Third year	26.2 (6)	48.9(11)	21.6 (5)	3.4 (1)	0
Evaluation Items					
..to examine my own abilities critically					
First year	19.0(19)	51.0(51)	22.0(22)	7.0 (7)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	48.6(18)	29.7(11)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	24.4(21)	43.0(37)	24.4(21)	8.1 (7)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	59.1(13)	4.5 (1)	0	4.5 (1)
..to evaluate what I read and sometimes disagree					
First year	22.0(22)	46.0(46)	26.0(26)	6.0 (6)	0
First year accelerated	21.6 (8)	48.6(18)	18.9 (7)	10.8 (4)	0
Second year	26.7(23)	46.5(40)	17.4(15)	9.3 (8)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Third year	31.8 (7)	50.0(11)	13.6 (3)	0	4.5 (1)
Mean of Evaluation Items					
First year	20.5(20)	48.0(48)	24.0(24)	6.5 (7)	0.5 (1)
First year accelerated	20.3 (8)	48.6(18)	24.3 (9)	6.8 (3)	0
Second year	25.6(22)	44.8(39)	20.9(18)	8.7 (8)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	54.6(12)	9.1 (4)	0	4.5 (1)
Value Complex Items					
..to value myself as a prospective employee					
First year	29.0(29)	55.0(55)	11.0(11)	4.0 (4)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	37.8(14)	43.2(16)	16.2 (6)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	45.3(39)	36.0(31)	16.3(14)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	54.5(12)	27.3 (6)	13.6 (3)	0	4.5 (1)
..to value the work skills I have learned					
First year	28.0(28)	53.0(53)	15.0(15)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	32.4(12)	45.9(17)	21.6 (8)	0	0
Second year	40.7(35)	44.2(38)	12.8(11)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	50.0(11)	36.4 (8)	9.1 (2)	0	4.5 (1)

(table continues)



Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..to value the Business Division					
First year	20.0(20)	52.0(52)	26.0(26)	1.0 (1)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	59.5(22)	18.9 (7)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	19.8(17)	48.8(42)	22.1(19)	5.8 (5)	3.5 (3)
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	22.7 (5)	0	0
..to value others					
First year	23.0(23)	48.0(48)	20.0(20)	6.0 (6)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	45.9(17)	21.6 (8)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	32.6(28)	47.7(41)	15.1(13)	4.7 (4)	0
Third year	50.0(11)	36.4 (8)	9.1 (2)	0	4.5 (1)
..to increase my interpersonal skills					
First year	27.0(27)	52.0(52)	15.0(15)	5.0 (5)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	48.6(18)	27.0(10)	0	0
Second year	25.6(22)	51.2(44)	20.9(18)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	45.5(10)	54.5(12)	0	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..to expand my opportunities for further education (e.g., university)					
First year	37.0(37)	33.0(33)	20.0(20)	5.0 (5)	4.0 (4)
First year accelerated	45.9(17)	29.7(11)	18.9 (7)	2.7 (1)	2.7 (1)
Second year	28.2(24)	32.9(28)	24.7(21)	11.8(10)	2.4 (2)
Third year	36.4 (8)	45.5(10)	4.5 (1)	4.5 (1)	9.1 (2)
..to become a more informed citizen					
First year	28.0(28)	47.0(47)	17.0(17)	6.0 (6)	2.0(2)
First year accelerated	45.9(17)	32.4(12)	18.9(7)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	24.4(21)	41.9(36)	26.7(23)	7.0 (6)	0
Third year	27.3 (6)	31.8 (7)	36.4 (8)	0	4.5 (1)
..to acquire marketable skills					
First year	26.0(26)	51.0(51)	19.0(19)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	32.4(12)	45.9(17)	18.9 (7)	0	2.7 (1)
Second year	32.6(28)	47.7(41)	18.6(16)	1.2 (1)	0
Third year	40.9 (9)	36.4 (8)	22.7 (5)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..to acquire more vocational skills and less general skills					
First year	12.0(12)	42.0(42)	37.0(37)	8.0 (8)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	64.9(24)	16.2 (6)	0	2.7( 1)
Second year	24.4(21)	34.9(30)	30.2(26)	10.5 (9)	0
Third year	18.2 (4)	68.2(15)	4.5 (1)	4.5 (1)	4.5 (1)
..to acquire more awareness of global issues					
First year	14.0(14)	36.0(36)	36.0(36)	10.0(10)	4.0 (4)
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	37.8(14)	24.3 (9)	8.1 (3)	2.7 (1)
Second year	10.5 (9)	30.2(26)	39.5(34)	17.4(15)	2.3 (2)
Third year	9.1 (2)	31.8 (7)	27.3 (6)	27.3 (6)	4.5 (1)
..to acquire understanding of the disabled and minorities					
First year	14.0(14)	28.0(28)	33.0(33)	18.0(18)	7.0 (7)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	32.4(12)	35.1(13)	13.5 (5)	5.4 (2)
Second year	10.5 (9)	23.3(20)	33.7(29)	24.4(21)	8.1 (7)
Third year	18.2 (4)	27.3 (6)	31.8 (7)	13.6 (3)	9.1 (2)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Mean of Value Complex Items					
First year	23.5(24)	45.2(45)	22.6(23)	7.3 (7)	2.3 (2)
First year accelerated	29.2(11)	44.2(16)	21.6 (8)	3.4 (1)	1.5 (1)
Second year	26.8(23)	39.9(34)	23.7(20)	8.2 (7)	1.5 (1)
Third year	34.7 (8)	40.1 (9)	16.5 (4)	4.5 (3)	4.1 (1)

#### Overall Evaluation

Overall, I am satisfied with my  
program in the Division of  
Business

First year	26.0(26)	53.0(53)	17.0(17)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	54.1(20)	13.5 (5)	5.4 (2)	2.7 (1)
Second year	18.6(16)	53.5(46)	20.9(18)	5.8 (5)	1.2 (1)
Third year	40.9 (9)	31.8 (7)	27.3 (6)	0	0

Note. The mean value for number of students has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 = Definitely Agree, 2 = Mostly Agree, 3 = Neutral,  
4 = Mostly Disagree, 5 = Definitely Disagree.

<sup>a</sup>n = 100

<sup>b</sup>n = 37

<sup>c</sup>n = 86

<sup>d</sup>n = 22

#### Objective 4: Quality of Life

Quality of Life was measured using the theoretical framework developed by previous researchers (Williams & Batten, 1981; Clifton et al., 1987; Boak & Ellis, 1991). Satisfaction, dissatisfaction, opportunity, status, identity and professors were the constructs used and a discussion of the theoretical background to these was included in Chapter 2. The students responded on a five-point Likert-type scale. Information on the overall student perceptions of QOL is shown in Table 12; QOL by year is presented in Table 13.

A majority of students (66%) felt satisfaction with their QOL (Table 12). The highest score, 72.3%, was given to the item I find it easy to get to know other people and the lowest to I really like to go each day (59.2%). There was a large neutral score (33.5%) for the item I find that learning is a lot of fun; however, there were still 61.2% of students who definitely or mostly agreed that it was. First Year Accelerated (75%) and Third Year (74.5%) (Table 13) felt the greatest satisfaction (74.5% positive) and the First Year students showed the lowest positive responses (61.0%).

Only 13.5% of students reported that they were lonely, upset, restless, depressed or worried (Table 12). There was a very low neutral score for the item I feel lonely and

79.2% of students mostly or definitely disagreed with the statement. The Dissatisfaction Items showed no particular pattern over the various years (Table 13).

The Status Items received the lowest mean positive response rate (60.3%), and the highest neutral response (33.1%, Table 12). On the item people look up to me only 33% of students definitely or mostly agreed. The item I get on well with the other students in my class elicited a positive response from 88.6% of students. The First Year students showed the lowest positive feelings on the Status Items, with only 54.3% definitely or mostly agreeing with the Status Items. There were positive responses regarding what students thought of themselves, for instance, I feel proud of myself, where positive scores ranged from 67% First Year to 90.9% for Third Year. The lowest percentages were for items where students had to answer regarding what people thought of them, namely people look up to me, where positive responses for First, First Year Accelerated, Second and Third Year were 30%, 24.3%, 39.6%, and 36.4% respectively. Third Year students believed overwhelmingly that they were treated with respect (90.9%) whereas only 55% of First Year, 62.2% of First Year Accelerated and 74.5% of Second Year believed they were (Table 13).

The percentage mean of the Identity Items was 76.3% positive and only 4.1% of students mostly or definitely disagreed that they were a success or were accepted by other

students (Table 12). The highest percentage within the Identity Items was in response to the things I learn are important to me, where 88.2% definitely or mostly agreed. The lowest score was for the item mixing with other people helps me to understand myself: 62.1% definitely or mostly agreed but there was a large neutral response of 34.3%. First Year were the least positive on the Identity Items where only 71.5% definitely or mostly agreed whereas 81.9% of Third Year did (Table 13).

The Professor Items received the second lowest positive responses, namely, 60.6% (Table 12). The item professors treat me fairly got the highest positive response with 69.7% of students definitely or mostly agreeing. The lowest response was to the item professors help me to do my best where 52.2% of students definitely or mostly agreed but 35.1% gave a neutral response. Within the Professor Items, professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work received the highest negative response with 15.1% of students definitely or mostly disagreeing with the statement. There were varying responses for the differing years attitudes towards professors. First Year were least positive (52.6%) , First Year Accelerated more positive (64.4%), Second Year (64%) and the Third Year the most positive (77.3%).

The Opportunity Items, as shown in Table 12, received the highest positive mean response of all the QOL items

(89.4%). Students definitely or mostly agreed (90.2%) that they had acquired skills that would be of use to them. Other high positive responses related to items such as I like learning, the things I learn will help me in my life, I know I can do well enough to be successful, the things I am taught are worthwhile learning and the work I do is good preparation for my future. The lowest positive mean score was in response to I am given the chance to do work that really interests me (63.3%), and 11.8% of students definitely or mostly disagreed with the statement. The mean for the neutral category on the Opportunity Items was the lowest for all neutral scores on the QOL. The Opportunity Items were regarded as positive by 73.2% of First Year and in 80% range for all other groups including First Year Accelerated (Table 13).



Table 12: Quality of Life Responses <sup>a</sup>

The Business Division is a place where...

Questions	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Satisfaction Items</b>					
..I find it easy to get to know other people	29.0	43.3	22.0	5.3	0.4
..students are very friendly	24.5	46.1	24.1	4.5	0.8
..I get enjoyment from being there	20.0	46.5	28.2	3.7	1.6
..I really like to go each day	15.5	43.7	30.2	7.8	2.9
..I find that learning is a lot of fun	20.0	41.2	33.5	2.9	2.4
Mean Satisfaction Items	21.8	44.2	27.6	4.8	1.6
<b>Dissatisfaction Items</b>					
..I feel depressed	3.7	5.7	23.7	31.0	35.9
..I feel restless	5.7	12.7	30.2	32.2	19.2
..I feel lonely	1.2	7.3	12.2	30.2	49.0
..I get upset	5.3	10.6	29.4	31.8	22.9
..I feel worried	6.1	9.4	26.5	31.8	26.1
Mean of Dissatisfaction	4.4	9.1	24.4	31.4	30.6
<b>Status Items</b>					
..I feel proud to be a student	22.5	48.4	22.1	4.9	2.0
..people look up to me	7.3	25.7	50.6	10.2	6.1

(table continues)

Questions	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..people care about what I think	14.3	42.9	34.7	6.5	1.6
..I am treated with respect	19.2	46.9	28.2	3.3	2.4
..people think a lot of me	5.7	33.1	54.3	5.3	1.6
..I feel important	9.8	42.9	42.0	4.5	0.8
..I feel proud of myself	29.8	45.7	22.4	1.6	0.4
..I get on well with other students in my class	43.7	44.9	10.6	0.4	0.4
Mean of Status Items	19.0	41.3	33.1	4.6	1.9
Identity Items					
..the things I learn are important to me	38.0	50.2	10.2	1.6	0.0
..mixing with other people helps me to understand myself	13.9	48.2	34.3	2.4	1.2
..I am a success as a student	27.8	47.3	21.2	3.3	0.4
..I learn to get along with other people	21.6	58.0	16.3	2.4	1.6
..other students accept me as I am	27.8	55.1	13.5	3.7	0.0
..I have learned to work hard	29.4	40.4	22.0	5.3	2.9
Mean of Identity Items	26.4	49.9	19.6	3.1	1.0
Professors					
..professors treat me fairly	22.4	47.3	23.3	4.5	2.4
..professors give me the marks I deserve	22.0	40.4	26.1	7.3	4.1

(table continues)

Questions	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work	22.0	35.9	26.9	10.6	4.5
..professors help me to do my best	16.3	35.9	35.1	9.8	2.9
..professors are fair and just	15.5	45.7	30.6	6.5	1.6
..professors listen to what I say	17.1	42.9	29.4	6.9	3.7
Mean of Professors Items	19.2	41.4	28.6	7.6	3.3
Opportunity Items					
..I really get involved in my work	22.9	44.5	26.9	4.9	0.8
..I like learning	36.7	48.6	11.0	2.9	0.8
..I have acquired skills that will be of use to me	38.4	51.8	9.8	0.0	0.0
..I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	26.2	50.4	20.9	1.6	0.8
..the things I learn will help me in my life	32.2	51.8	14.7	1.2	0.0
..I know how to cope with work	21.6	51.8	20.8	4.9	0.8
..I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	20.0	43.3	24.9	10.6	1.2
..I know I can do well enough to be successful	41.6	44.5	13.1	0.8	0.0
..the things I am taught are worthwhile learning	31.0	52.7	15.1	1.2	0.0
..the work I do is good preparation for my future	31.4	52.2	13.1	2.9	0.4

(table continues)

Questions	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%
Mean of Opportunity Items	30.2	49.2	17.0	3.1	0.5

Note. 1 = Definitely Agree, 2 = Mostly Agree, 3 = Neutral,  
4 = Mostly Disagree, 5 = Definitely Disagree.

n = 245

Table 13: Comparison of Student Perceptions Regarding Quality of Life by Year of Program \*

The Business Division is a place where...

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Satisfaction Items</b>					
<b>..I find it easy to get to know other people</b>					
First year	28.0(28)	44.0(44)	23.0(23)	5.0 (5)	0
First year accelerated	21.6 (8)	56.0(21)	21.6 (8)	0	0
Second year	32.6(28)	36.0(31)	24.4(21)	5.8 (5)	1.2 (1)
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	9.1 (2)	13.6 (3)	0
<b>..students are very friendly</b>					
First year	28.0(28)	39.0(39)	29.0(29)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	21.6 (8)	59.5(22)	10.8 (4)	5.4 (2)	2.7 (1)
Second year	22.1(19)	47.7(41)	25.6(22)	3.5 (3)	1.2 (1)
Third year	22.7(5)	50.0(11)	18.2 (4)	9.1 (2)	0
<b>..I get enjoyment from being there</b>					
First year	17.0(17)	45.0(45)	30.0(30)	5.0 (5)	3.0 (3)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	43.2(16)	21.6 (8)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	14.0(12)	51.2(44)	31.4(27)	2.3 (2)	1.2 (1)
Third year	40.9 (9)	40.9 (9)	18.2 (4)	0	0

..I really like to go each  
day

First year	14.0(14)	36.0(36)	35.0(35)	10.0(10)	5.0 (5)
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	40.5(15)	24.3 (9)	5.4 (2)	2.7 (1)
Second year	9.3 (8)	54.7(47)	26.7(23)	8.1 (7)	1.2 (1)
Third year	27.3 (6)	40.9 (9)	31.8 (7)	0	0

..I find that learning is a  
lot of fun

First year	16.0(16)	38.0(38)	38.0(38)	6.0 (6)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	48.6(18)	16.2 (6)	0	8.1 (3)
Second year	17.4(15)	43.0(37)	38.4(33)	1.2 (1)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	36.4 (8)	22.7 (5)	0	4.5 (1)

Mean of Satisfaction Items

First year	20.6(21)	40.4(40)	31.0(31)	6.0 (6)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	25.4 (9)	49.6(18)	18.9 (7)	3.2 (1)	2.7 (1)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Second year	19.1(16)	46.5(40)	29.3(25)	4.2 (4)	1.0 (1)
Third year	31.8 (7)	42.7 (9)	20.0 (4)	4.5 (1)	0.9 (0)

#### Dissatisfaction Items

##### ..I feel depressed

First year	7.0 (7)	5.0 (5)	22.0(22)	29.0(29)	37.0(37)
First year accelerated	0	10.8 (4)	29.7(11)	29.7(11)	29.7(11)
Second year	1.2 (1)	4.7 (4)	25.6(22)	33.7(29)	34.9(30)
Third year	4.5(1)	4.5 (1)	13.6 (3)	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)

##### ..I feel restless

First year	8.0 (8)	14.0(14)	27.0(27)	30.0(30)	21.0(21)
First year accelerated	2.7 (1)	8.1 (3)	27.0(10)	35.1(13)	27.0(10)
Second year	3.5 (3)	14.0(12)	38.4(33)	32.6(28)	11.6(10)
Third year	9.1 (2)	9.1 (2)	18.2 (4)	36.4 (8)	27.3 (6)

##### ..I feel lonely

First year	1.0 (1)	8.0 (8)	11.0(11)	29.0(29)	51.0(51)
First year accelerated	2.7 (1)	5.4 (2)	18.9 (7)	32.4(12)	40.5(15)
Second year	1.2 (1)	5.8 (5)	11.6(10)	30.2(26)	51.2(44)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Third year	0	13.6 (3)	9.1 (2)	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)
..I get upset					
First year	5.0 (5)	10.0(10)	30.0(30)	29.0(29)	26.0(26)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	13.5 (5)	29.7(11)	29.7(11)	18.9 (7)
Second year	4.7 (4)	9.3 (8)	30.2(26)	34.9(30)	20.9(18)
Third year	4.5 (1)	13.6 (3)	22.7 (5)	36.4 (8)	22.7 (5)
..I feel worried					
First year	7.0 (7)	6.0 (6)	25.0(25)	29.0(29)	33.0(33)
First year accelerated	5.4 (2)	2.7 (1)	32.4(12)	37.8(14)	21.6 (8)
Second year	4.7 (4)	14.0(12)	26.7(23)	33.7(29)	20.9(18)
Third year	9.1 (2)	18.2 (4)	22.7 (5)	27.3 (6)	22.7 (5)
Mean of Dissatisfaction Items					
First year	5.6 (6)	8.6 (9)	23.0(23)	29.2(29)	33.6(34)
First year accelerated	3.8 (1)	8.1 (3)	27.5(10)	32.9(12)	27.5(10)
Second year	3.1 (3)	9.6 (8)	26.5(23)	33.0(28)	27.9(24)
Third year	5.4 (1)	11.8 (3)	17.3 (4)	32.7 (7)	32.7 (7)

(table continues)



Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
<b>Status Items</b>					
<b>..I feel proud to be a student</b>					
First year	15.0(15)	45.0(45)	32.0(32)	5.0 (5)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	64.9(24)	16.2 (6)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	31.4(27)	44.2(38)	16.3(14)	4.7 (4)	3.5 (3)
Third year	36.4 (8)	50.0(11)	9.1 (2)	4.5 (1)	0
<b>..people look up to me</b>					
First year	6.0 (6)	24.0(24)	53.0(53)	11.0(11)	6.0 (6)
First year accelerated	2.7 (1)	21.6 (8)	62.2(23)	5.4 (2)	8.1 (3)
Second year	10.5 (9)	29.1(25)	43.0(37)	12.8(11)	4.7 (4)
Third year	9.1 (2)	27.3 (6)	50.0(11)	4.5 (1)	9.1 (2)
<b>..people care about what I think</b>					
First year	12.0(12)	42.0(42)	38.0(38)	7.0 (7)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	45.9(17)	32.4(12)	2.7 (1)	5.4 (2)
Second year	11.6(10)	45.3(39)	33.7(29)	9.3 (8)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	31.8 (7)	27.3 (6)	0	4.5 (1)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..I am treated with respect					
First year	13.0(13)	42.0(42)	38.0(38)	3.0 (3)	4.0 (4)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	54.1(20)	35.1(13)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	23.3(20)	51.2(44)	18.6(16)	4.7 (4)	2.3 (2)
Third year	50.0(11)	40.9 (9)	9.1 (2)	0	0
..people think a lot of me					
First year	4.0 (4)	30.0(30)	58.0(58)	5.0 (5)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	2.7 (1)	29.7(11)	64.9(24)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	5.8 (5)	34.9(30)	50.0(43)	8.1 (7)	1.2 (1)
Third year	18.2 (4)	45.5(10)	36.4 (8)	0	0
..I feel important					
First year	5.0 (5)	40.0(40)	48.0(48)	6.0 (6)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	2.7 (1)	43.2(16)	51.4(19)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	14.0(12)	45.3(39)	34.9(30)	4.7 (4)	1.2 (1)
Third year	27.3 (6)	45.5(10)	27.3 (6)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..I feel proud of myself					
First year	22.0(22)	45.0(45)	29.0(29)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	51.4(19)	24.3 (9)	0	0
Second year	34.9(30)	46.5(40)	17.4(15)	0	1.2 (1)
Third year	54.5(12)	36.4 (8)	9.1 (2)	0	0
..I get on well with the other students in my class					
First year	43.0(43)	46.0(46)	10.0(10)	1.0 (1)	0
First year accelerated	40.5(15)	51.4(19)	8.1 (3)	0	0
Second year	47.7(41)	43.0(37)	9.3 (8)	0	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	36.4 (8)	22.7 (5)	0	4.5 (1)
Mean of Status Items					
First year	15.0(15)	39.3(39)	38.3(38)	5.3 (5)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	45.3(17)	36.8(14)	2.7 (1)	1.7 (1)
Second year	22.4(19)	42.4(37)	27.9(24)	5.5 (5)	1.8 (2)
Third year	33.5 (7)	39.2 (9)	23.9 (5)	1.1 (0)	1.7 (1)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Identity Items					
..the things I learn are important to me					
First year	40.0(40)	47.0(47)	12.0(12)	1.0 (1)	0
First year accelerated	37.8(14)	45.9(17)	10.8 (4)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	36.0(31)	54.7(47)	8.1 (7)	1.2 (1)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	54.5(12)	9.1 (2)	0	0
..mixing with other people helps me to understand myself					
First year	12.0(12)	48.0(48)	37.0(37)	2.0 (2)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	51.4(19)	37.8(14)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	19.8(17)	45.3(39)	32.6(28)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	9.1 (2)	54.5(12)	22.7 (5)	4.5 (1)	9.1 (2)
..I am a success as a student					
First year	20.0(20)	51.0(51)	25.0(25)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	40.5(15)	27.0(10)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	33.7(29)	44.2(38)	17.4(15)	4.7 (4)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	54.5(12)	9.1 (2)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..I learn to get along with other people					
First year	17.0(17)	58.0(58)	21.0(21)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	16.2 (6)	67.6(25)	10.8 (4)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	26.7(23)	57.0(49)	15.1(13)	1.2 (1)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	9.1 (2)	0	13.6(3)
..other students accept me as I am					
First year	25.0(25)	53.0(53)	18.0(18)	4.0 (4)	0
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	67.6(25)	8.1 (3)	0	0
Second year	30.2(26)	54.7(47)	9.3 (8)	5.8 (5)	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	45.5(10)	18.2 (4)	0	0
..I have learned to work hard					
First year	24.0(24)	34.0(34)	32.0(32)	7.0 (7)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	32.4(12)	43.2(16)	16.2 (6)	5.4 (2)	2.7 (1)
Second year	29.1(25)	47.7(41)	16.3(14)	4.7 (4)	2.3 (1)
Third year	50.0(11)	36.4 (8)	9.1 (2)	0	4.5 (1)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Mean of Identity Items					
First year	23.0(23)	48.5(49)	24.2(24)	3.3 (3)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	24.8 (9)	52.7(20)	18.5 (7)	3.6 (1)	0.5 (0)
Second year	29.3(25)	50.0(20)	16.5(14)	3.2 (3)	0.4 (0)
Third year	33.4 (7)	48.5(11)	12.9 (3)	0.8 (0)	4.5 (1)
Professors					
..professors treat me fairly					
First year	17.0(17)	48.0(48)	30.0(30)	2.0 (2)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	18.9 (7)	56.8(21)	10.8 (4)	10.8 (4)	2.7 (1)
Second year	22.1(19)	48.8(42)	22.1(19)	4.7 (4)	2.3 (2)
Third year	54.5(12)	22.7 (5)	18.2 (4)	4.5 (1)	0
..professors give me the marks I deserve					
First year	14.0(14)	45.0(45)	30.0(30)	7.0 (7)	4.0 (4)
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	40.5(15)	24.3 (9)	8.1 (3)	2.7 (1)
Second year	25.6(22)	36.0(31)	27.9(24)	7.0 (6)	3.5 (3)
Third year	40.9 (9)	36.4 (8)	4.5 (1)	9.1 (2)	9.1 (2)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work					
First year	16.0(16)	33.0(33)	36.0(36)	11.0(11)	4.0 (4)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	48.6(18)	32.4(12)	8.1 (3)	2.7 (1)
Second year	24.4(21)	38.4(33)	19.8(17)	10.5 (9)	7.0 (6)
Third year	63.6(14)	18.2 (4)	4.5 (1)	13.6 (3)	0
..professors help me to do my best					
First year	8.0 (8)	34.0(34)	43.0(43)	12.0(12)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	45.9(17)	35.1(13)	10.8 (4)	0
Second year	23.3(20)	38.4(33)	29.1(25)	7.0 (6)	2.3 (2)
Third year	40.9 (9)	18.2 (4)	22.7 (5)	9.1 (2)	9.1 (2)
..professors are fair and just					
First year	11.0(11)	47.0(47)	33.0(33)	6.0 (6)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	8.1 (3)	51.4(19)	32.4(12)	8.1 (3)	0
Second year	18.6(16)	41.9(36)	31.4(27)	7.0 (6)	1.2 (1)
Third year	36.4 (8)	45.5(10)	13.6 (3)	4.5 (1)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..professors listen to what I say					
First year	11.0(11)	32.0(32)	47.0(47)	5.0 (5)	5.0 (5)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	62.2(23)	13.5 (5)	8.1 (3)	2.7 (1)
Second year	16.3(14)	50.0(43)	20.9(18)	9.3 (8)	3.5 (3)
Third year	54.5(12)	31.8 (7)	9.1 (2)	4.5 (1)	0
Mean of Professor Items					
First year	12.8(13)	39.8(40)	36.5(37)	7.2 (7)	3.7 (4)
First year accelerated	13.5 (5)	50.9(19)	24.8 (9)	9.0 (3)	1.8 (1)
Second year	21.7(19)	42.3(36)	25.2(22)	7.6 (7)	3.3 (3)
Third Year	48.5(11)	28.8 (6)	12.1 (3)	7.6 (2)	3.0 (1)
Opportunity Items					
..I really get involved in my work					
First year	16.0(16)	39.0(39)	38.0(38)	5.0 (5)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	40.5(15)	24.3 (9)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	25.6(22)	52.3(45)	18.6(16)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	31.8 (7)	45.5(10)	13.6 (3)	9.1 (2)	0

(table continues)



Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..I like learning					
First year	30.0(30)	50.0(50)	15.0(15)	4.0 (4)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	43.2(16)	48.6(18)	2.7 (1)	2.7 (1)	2.7 (1)
Second year	39.5(34)	47.7(41)	10.5 (9)	2.3 (2)	0
Third year	45.5(10)	45.5(10)	9.1 (2)	0	0
..I have acquired skills that will be of use to me					
First year	34.0(34)	55.0(55)	11.0(11)	0	0
First year accelerated	37.8(14)	51.4(19)	10.8 (4)	0	0
Second year	38.4(33)	52.3(45)	9.3 (8)	0	0
Third year	59.1(13)	36.4 (8)	4.5 (1)	0	0
..I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work					
First year	21.0(21)	51.0(51)	24.0(24)	3.0 (3)	1.0 (1)
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	43.2(16)	24.3 (9)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	28.2(24)	54.1(46)	17.6(15)	0	0
Third year	36.4 (8)	45.5(10)	13.6 (3)	0	4.5 (1)

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..the things I learn will help me in my life					
First year	30.0(30)	52.0(52)	17.0(17)	1.0 (1)	0
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	54.1(20)	13.5 (5)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	33.7(29)	53.5(46)	12.8(11)	0	0
Third year	45.5(10)	40.9 (9)	13.6 (3)	0	0
..I know how to cope with work					
First year	13.0(13)	50.0(50)	28.0(28)	7.0 (7)	2.0 (2)
First year accelerated	24.3 (9)	56.8(21)	16.2 (6)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	24.4(21)	55.8(48)	16.3(14)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	45.5(10)	36.4 (8)	13.6 (3)	4.5 (1)	0
..I am given the chance to do work that really interests me					
First year	15.0(15)	38.0(38)	31.0(31)	13.0(13)	3.0 (3)
First year accelerated	10.8 (4)	67.6(25)	16.2 (6)	5.4 (2)	0
Second year	23.3(20)	45.3(39)	22.1(19)	9.3 (8)	0
Third year	45.5(10)	18.2 (4)	22.7 (5)	13.6 (3)	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
..I know I can do well enough to be successful					
First year	38.0(38)	46.0(46)	14.0(14)	2.0 (2)	0
First year accelerated	37.8(14)	48.6(18)	13.5 (5)	0	0
Second year	44.2(38)	44.2(38)	11.6(10)	0	0
Third year	54.5(12)	31.8 (7)	13.6 (3)	0	0
..the things I am taught are worthwhile learning					
First year	26.0(26)	51.0(51)	21.0(21)	2.0 (2)	0
First year accelerated	27.0(10)	59.5(22)	10.8 (4)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	34.9(30)	55.8(48)	9.3 (8)	0	0
Third year	45.5(10)	36.4 (8)	18.2 (4)	0	0
..the work I do is good preparation for my future					
First year	25.0(25)	52.0(52)	19.0(19)	3.0 (3)	1.0(1)
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	56.8(21)	10.8 (4)	2.7 (1)	0
Second year	31.4(27)	57.0(49)	8.1 (7)	3.5 (3)	0
Third year	63.6(14)	27.3 (6)	9.1 (2)	0	0

(table continues)

Question	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Mean of Opportunity Items					
First year	24.8(25)	48.4(48)	21.8(22)	4.0 (4)	1.0(1)
First year accelerated	29.7(11)	52.7(20)	14.3 (5)	3.0 (1)	0.3(0)
Second year	32.4(28)	51.8(45)	13.6(12)	2.2 (2)	0
Third year	47.3(10)	36.4 (8)	13.2 (3)	2.7 (1)	0.5(0)

Note. The mean value for number of students has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 = Definitely Agree, 2 = Mostly Agree, 3 = Neutral,

4 = Mostly Disagree, 5 = Definitely Disagree.

<sup>a</sup>n = 100.

<sup>b</sup>n = 37.

<sup>c</sup>n = 86.

<sup>d</sup>n = 22.

### Objective 5: General Comments from Students

Students were asked on the final page of the questionnaire if they might like to make any comments or suggestions. Comments were made by 53 students (21.6% of sample). Responses were made by 22.8% of the female and 20.2% male students (Appendix C). The First Year students made 58.5%; Second Year 34% and the Third Year 7.5% of the qualitative remarks. Comments were thus made by 22.5% of the First Year students who answered the Questionnaire, 21.2% of the Second Year and 19% of the Third Year.

The comments were broken down into the following areas: professors, program, social environment, motivation, questionnaire, university/college conflict, administration and financial. The listing of topics is in order of importance the students mentioned concerns or suggestions relating to the different issues. Some students referred to more than one area of concern. It is interesting to note that professors received the most comments and thus one might assume that the student/teacher interaction is a key area of concern for students.

There were 19 comments regarding professors, 11 from female students and 8 from male. The 11 comments from First Year students indicated they thought there was a broad range of teachers, "some teachers were excellent, but some were

not." Some students thought the courses might be taught in a more challenging way, for instance, "more difficult and thought provoking," "more intellectually challenging," "will we be spoon fed for the rest of our lives?": while one student stated that teachers "want to teach us at a university level, which many of us don't appreciate." Students were generally asking for more challenging course work.

The seven Second Year responses regarding professors also covered a broad range of opinions, from "excellent" to "not qualified to teach," or "biased." In general, there were more negative comments regarding professors than positive. These students also suggested "teach at a level that is more beneficial to students." However, they did not say whether this was at a higher or lower level.

There was only one Third Year comment regarding professors with the criticism that some faculty "spoon-fed" students. However, it was also stated that "professors were very supportive and encouraging."

Positive feelings towards teachers appear to be judged by whether a student feels understood, respected, or is given the marks he/she think he/she deserves: whether the teacher appears qualified, patient and supportive, fair and caring, is willing to individually tutor and listen to what students say. The teacher's ability to "control" the class also appears to be an important determinant of a good

teacher. One student in Second Year defined an excellent teacher as one who is "considerate, caring and understanding."

When the qualitative comments are compared to the quantitative questions regarding professors, it is interesting to note that the comments are borne out by the high neutral scores for items regarding professors being "fair," "giving marks I deserve," "fair and just," and "taking a personal interest." The neutral response to these items ranged from 30% to 36% for the First Year but rose to 43% and 47% for the items help me to do my best and listen to what I say. The Second Year students gave the highest neutral rating to the item professors are fair and just and this again ties in with the overall negative comments regarding professors.

There were 15 comments regarding the business programs, ten from female and five from male students. There was a feeling that there were "too many courses" which led to a heavy workload, and a Second Year student stated that "we do have a life outside school." There were contradictory statements regarding co-op courses where students work in business as part of their training. One student thought it should be "voluntary" and another said co-op was "great." One student thought that teachers might co-operate on test dates, as sometimes there were too many on one day. Screening of students and arranging classes according to

ability level was suggested by two students. There was a statement by a Second Year student that the "program is academically sound" and this reinforces the quantitative results that state the students consider the QOP to be high.

The social environment was mentioned by 12 students, six female and six male students. Unlike all other topics where the majority of comments were made by First Year students, this topic received seven comments from Second Year, and only three from First Year and two from Third Year. The underlying theme is that there needs to be an improved "school spirit," "school pride," "school identity" and more organized social activities. Suggestions range from living on campus to the college arranging more social events. Students generally felt it was easy to make friends and really felt attached to their classmates, "we have now become a family." The positive comments about friends back up the Satisfaction Items in the qualitative data which were strongly positive for I find it easy to get to know other people and students are very friendly. The Dissatisfaction Items in the QOL were strongly negative, for example, I feel lonely and this is reinforced by the qualitative comments. The Status and Identity Items also reflected the social environment and how the friendly atmosphere at Niagara College, as mentioned in the comments, contributes to a high QOL.

Motivation was discussed by seven students, four male



and three female. There were varied comments with some students stating they were highly motivated to do the challenging work they were given, and others not motivated to do the unchallenging courses.

Five students commented on the questionnaire itself and suggested better timing so it might not take up their time at the end of the year.

There were four students who mentioned a comparison between university and college. They mentioned a feeling of "inferiority" attached to attending college. One student, however, commented that the "program is academically sound and comparable to university (if not higher)." The lack of self-esteem is substantiated by the quantitative results for the Status Items where only 33% of students think people look up to me and 38.8% people think a lot of me.

The Administration was criticised in the comments for not enforcing a code of behaviour for students while they were in the public areas of the college and for the enforcement of the no-smoking rules. There was also concern about the lack of parking spaces when a parking season ticket had to be purchased by students. One student thought there might be more courses offered during the spring term.

Financial problems relating to the cost of text books and inadequate funding were only mentioned by two students.

## Interpretation of Results

The rationale underlying this thesis began from a general belief that students at Niagara College had a negative attitude towards their college experience. According to Vision 2000 (OMCU, 1990, p.20), problems relate "to quality of education, faculty, staff and student morale, and institutional vitality." The research objectives were formulated to investigate the attitudes of students regarding their college experience. The general findings of this thesis appear to contradict the initial premise that students had a negative attitude to their college experience. The students who answered the questionnaire considered their QOP and QOL to be extremely positive.

### Objective 1: The Entering Characteristics

The entering characteristics show that the typical student is a female, 20 years of age (median) who is single with no dependent children. She has come directly from high school and taken no previous courses at the college. She has no learning or health problems and no physical disability. Her roots are British and her mother probably

completed high school while her father only had some high school education. Her mother is probably a homemaker and her father a skilled craft or tradesman. She felt that her high school education had prepared her well for college.

The other studies on QOP and QOL were conducted with a majority of female participants. However, this study has the highest percentage of male respondents (45.55%) and thus a comparison of their answers with the female (55.5%) answers was carried out. There appear to be very few differences to the answers based on sex. The female students had higher neutral scores on nearly all items and felt less positive on items such as having acquired marketable skills, or feelings that professors were fair, getting along with others or learning being fun. Females were more positive on learning to work hard, and valuing others.

There were only a few married students but a larger number with dependent children; thus, some students were single parents and had the added responsibility of children to cope with and this may have affected their QOL.

Most students came to college directly from high school and this highlights a failure on the part of the college to successfully market many of their programs to adults who have been out of high school for some time. This may be due to the lack of user-friendly hours offered by the college where classes go from 8.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. and then

students must do homework and studying after class. This may be a difficult load for a married person with children. Ethnic minorities are not well represented within the study and this may indicate that the college is not attracting these groups.

Students have parents from a broad range of educational backgrounds and occupational categories. Many mothers were homemakers but other occupations ranged over all levels as did the fathers' occupations. It is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding the students' SES based on parental background.

According to the students, they felt that the high schools had prepared them exceedingly well for college and only 32 students felt they were not prepared. Usually, high schools are being criticised for inadequate preparation of students and these student comments are indirect praise for the school system.

### Objective 2: The Intervening Variables

The hypothetical average student discussed above considers herself to be very motivated, and spends 23 hours attending classes and 10 hours studying. She is employed for about 9 hours a week and spends about 12 hours a week on

recreation. Her grades for the current term are B+ and her cumulative marks are a B. She considers her work to be a little above average and on graduation expects to work in the field in which she graduates.

The student motivation levels were very high and this may go in hand with a high QOP and QOL. Whether the students enter college with a high motivation level or this is engendered while at college is not obvious but is an interesting question.

It is unusual to note that many students have no paid employment. It might be thought that most students work to supplement their income while attending college, but nearly half of the respondents were not employed and this is perhaps an indication of the intensive course of study that is required for success in the Business programs or the unavailability of part-time jobs. In the qualitative comments from students, it was stated that they had a heavy course load and this may mean they had little time to seek part-time employment. Twenty-six students even stated they had no time for recreation which might be a slight exaggeration but seems to support the above premise.

Students reported that they were mostly B or A students and this again may be a contributing cause or effect of positive QOL and QOP. However, 74 students believed that they were only average students but many of these must have answered positively on the QOL and QOP: Thus, marks may not

be an important determinant of a students perceptions.

Over half the respondents wanted to work in the field in which they graduate and this shows a reinforcement of their career choice and might be indicative that the program was of sufficient quality to encourage their continuance in that field. A more interesting point was that 66 students in the survey wanted to work in the field of study and continue their education. This backs up responses that stated many liked to learn.

The intervening variables may thus have a large impact on the determination of QOP and QOL but it is extremely difficult to measure to what extent. The high motivation level and high marks achieved by students are part of the complex mix that contributes to QOL.

### Objective 3: Quality of Program

The high positive response to the Knowledge Items in the questionnaire are an indication that the Business Division students are satisfied with their program. However, the slightly lower responses for the remaining items in the cognitive domain, namely, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation might

indicate that the students do not acknowledge they are acquiring abilities in the higher range of educational objectives or that these higher level cognitive objectives are more difficult to measure. The Comprehension Items to speak in a clear and concise manner and to write in a precise manner which got low positive responses from First Year students, may be a function of the nature of the First Year program at Niagara College. The Business Administration students, who make up the largest number of First Year, take a common first year where they sample the specialist areas which they will enter in Year Two and Three. There is an emphasis on knowledge acquisition within large classes and this does not give the opportunity for interactive teaching. There really is little opportunity for the students to work on speaking and writing skills. The majority of evaluation is by multiple choice, true/false, short answer, with little or no essay answers and few assignments that require verbal or writing skill. As the student progresses through the program, this format changes and the higher level learning is emphasised and evaluated; there is an emphasis on exposing the students to specific subject areas and not on general education.

The Value Complex Items in general were answered very positively especially the items relating to work skills and suitability for employment which are particularly appropriate for a community college. The First Year

students, who were less positive on many items within the QOP responses, stated overwhelmingly (84%) that they valued themselves as prospective employees and valued the work skills they had learned (81%). They may not have thought they were learning comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis or evaluation skills but they were confident that the Business Division was equipping them for the workforce. Throughout the study the First Year students tended to give lower positive responses to many items; however, in the overall evaluation of the business program the First Year students gave the highest positive response with 79% satisfied with their program, perhaps because they see it as providing them with the skills to get a good job. The First Year Accelerated were 78.4%, Second Year 72.1% and Third Year 72.7% satisfied with their program. This is indicative of the high opinion the students have of their program and the fact that they see it as essential for their careers.

#### Objective 4: Quality of Life

There was a very positive assessment of QOL within the Business Division. The lowest positive scores within the entire study were Status Items, namely, people look up to me and people think a lot of me where only 33% and 38.8% definitely or mostly agreed, respectively. The study



records very high overall QOP and QOL and very low scores on these two items. This large divergence may be indicative of the way students perceive themselves relative to university students and comments in the qualitative remarks reinforce this assumption. Students at Niagara College seem to think people do not hold them in high esteem. The current initiative by Niagara College to seek cross credits with universities might raise the morale in this area. It has to be further considered, however, whether this lack of self-regard is related to Niagara College or a more general malaise in how the students perceive themselves. In analysing the question as to how people think of students, a marked increase in positivism occurs between First and Third Years and may suggest, therefore, that the college plays a large part in student self-esteem and external self-perception. Corroboration of this interpretation is perhaps demonstrated in answer to the question I am treated with respect where First Year were 55%, First Year Accelerated 62.2%, Second Year 74.5% and Third Year were 90.9% positive. Status Items, generally, exhibit increasing positivism from First to Third Years. The reasons for this trend may be due to increased feelings of self-worth as more knowledge is acquired; or as knowledge is acquired the inherent career value of the program increases. Perhaps professors treat higher level students with more respect and value; and the increasingly smaller class sizes at the Second and Third

Year level may engender a sense of intrinsic worth, almost elitism. It is also conceivable that by Second or Third Year a sifting process has occurred that leaves only those students who have valued the particular programs, and the factors that influence the QOL, for instance, making "connections" with the faculty. No matter what explains this internal sense of respect, when students answer the question of how others perceive them outside the college, there remains a lower sense of value. This difference in value is perhaps no more than any member of an institution, whether educational or otherwise, feels as she or he progresses through the "ranks." There remains, however, the one anomalous response to the item people look up to me where only 36.4% of Third Year actually agreed with the statement. We are left to assume that regardless of all the positive feelings Third Year exhibited, this is an area where students are really not sure how they are perceived as 50% gave a neutral response.

Another area of concern in QOL was Professor Items. Although the various years in the study answered this item differently, the First Year students show that a lack of empathy between students and professors may exist. Perhaps the First Year have not had time to get to know their professors. There is a program for faculty advisors of students but this appears to be an inadequate opportunity for students to get to know the professors who teach them.

The reason for this may be the large class size, however, generally classes are around 35 students per professor. Students perhaps do not make connections with the institution as they do not feel part of a small cohesive group as they have not chosen their specialisation. Professors do not have the time to make contact with large groups of students. This ties in with the discussion on QOP and the emphasis that is placed on knowledge acquisition and the teaching methods used in the First Year. The large neutral responses given by the First Year on the Professor Items may be indicative of the failure of the college to allow teaching structures that give time for teacher/student interaction. One might interpret the 47% neutral response to the item professors listen to what I say as a function of the class size, lecture format of classes, or lack of a sense of belonging to a small unit or coterie. All other years, even First Year Accelerated which has all the inherent problems of being First Year, are small groups and were very positive about this item. This First Year problem may not seem as relevant to First Year Accelerated who are a mature, cohesive and motivated group. This group felt professors treated them fairly, gave them the marks they deserved, and listened to what they have to say. However, they did show some concern for professors being fair and just, helping them to do their best and taking a personal interest in helping with their work. Therefore,

there were mixed opinions by the First Year Accelerated regarding professors.

When a student enters the second year of the Business Administration program he/she chooses a specialization and is thus attached to a more specific program. Maybe at this point students feel committed to the faculty and the faculty see the students as belonging to their own program and this leads to better student/teacher relationships.

Within the Opportunity Items, the First Year respondents gave significantly lower scores to only two items I really get involved in my work (55% positive) and I am given the chance to do work that really interests me (53% positive), and the inference here may be similar to what was stated earlier, that the students do not feel a chance to participate in the educational process. First Year are 89% sure they are "acquiring skills" but it is questionable if they feel they are contributing to the educational program in a way that is meaningful to them. This can be related to the student comments regarding their desire for more challenging work and not being "spoon-fed" the necessary skills, which they predominantly agree they are acquiring.

The Business Division can be proud they are fostering the desire for life-long learning in their students, which is a major goal of adult education (Knowles, 1980). The item I like learning which was answered by all years with an extremely high positive response (80% to 91%) suggests that

the QOP and QOL in the Business Division must be overwhelmingly positive.

Other areas where the present study shows high positive scores are in the acquisition of skills, learning that will be helpful in life, doing work that they find interesting, and the belief that the things being taught are worthwhile. There seems to be a positive assessment of the college's ability to equip students for the world of work and, as this is a vocational institution where students expect to graduate equipped and ready to take up an occupation they have been trained for, this has led to a positive QOL assessment. The First Year students tended to have a lower response to QOL and perhaps have not been exposed to the Niagara College environment long enough to build up this positive outlook. To counter this argument, however, are the positive results of the First Year Accelerated program who tended to respond with positive scores closer to Second Year than the remaining First Year students. Faculty in the college look upon the Accelerated group as an "elite" group of hard working, mature students who are, generally, a pleasure to teach and this may, in turn, affect the perceptions of the First Year Accelerated students.

Objective 5: General Comments from Students

There was on balance more criticism of professors contained in the comments rather than praise and this may be representative of the negative feelings students felt. However, students may not be as motivated to write and praise professors as they are to criticise. One of the First Year students made the point that she felt positive about some professors and not so positive about others. This is difficult to convey in a questionnaire type response and in the general comments one student even mentioned that it was only two professors she was complaining about. Some of the criticisms are levelled at different teaching techniques and are negative for some students while perhaps positive to those who have different learning styles. First Year students who were particularly less positive regarding professors might not yet have adapted to the different style of teaching at college as opposed to high school, they might not be accustomed to the less rigid policies regarding attendance and the more self-directed approach to learning which occurs at post-secondary institutions. As mentioned earlier, teachers may be constrained by the program format and large student numbers.

It is difficult to decide if comments on course work being too "easy" is the province of the program co-ordinator

or the teachers. There were many comments saying the work might be more challenging. Is this the responsibility of individual teachers or are they constrained by the course outline and method of evaluation set out for them? Some teachers have a major input into the course content and method of evaluation, but on some courses where there are many teachers delivering the same course this is not so. Thus, some of the criticism levelled at the teachers is invalid and might be directed higher up in the college administration. There is the interesting question of whether the programs might be more challenging or whether the methods of teaching need to challenge the student more.

The major value of the general comments is where the students have made suggestions regarding programming, social issues and everyday running of the college. There are several areas where the administration might make improvements. There were suggestions regarding college preparation while at high school where students might be better informed of career choices and which educational route was necessary to facilitate their career. Mature students wished a broader choice of electives with perhaps the opportunity of choosing an elective in the business field to broaden their subject base in that field. Students wanted more classes offered in Spring, perhaps to speed up their program or up-grade their marks. The college might perhaps look into a common testing policy as students

mentioned the uneven spread of tests throughout their calendar. The social side of college life seems to be of interest to many students and the comments suggest that a major effort is required to engender some school spirit.

In relation to the total (n=245) sample size, there were relatively few negative comments on any of the aspects this study considered. This gives validity to the QOP and QOL measures which were so positive in nearly all areas. A few students felt inferior to university students and hated the "pressure of feeling inferior." There may be a problem in public perception of community colleges and until there is an improvement in this area, students will continue to feel "inferior."

"Positive reactions to school may increase the likelihood that students will stay in school, develop lasting commitment to learning, and use the institution to advantage" (Epstein & McPartland, 1976, p.27). According to the survey sample, students appear to have a positive college experience and, if this is representative of the college as a whole, then these positive reactions might lead to an effective educational establishment.



### Summary

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire which was distributed to 245 students in the Business Division of Niagara College. The entering characteristics which a student possessed prior to entry into the business program, namely, age, sex, marital status, number of dependents, prior education, health and learning problems, ethnicity, parental SES, and academic preparedness were reported.

The intervening variables, factors which have been influenced by their experiences at Niagara College, namely, motivation and commitment and evidence of this aspect in the form of marks attained and post-college expectations were reported and discussed.

The results of the QOP items were reported and the students exhibited an overall very positive satisfaction regarding their program. However, the First Year students showed less satisfaction than Second or Third Year students and the First Year Accelerated scores were similar to both Second and Third Years. The Knowledge Items received the most positive responses which may be partly due to the difficulty of measuring items such as synthesis or evaluation: It might also show a lack of these other cognitive domain constructs within the various programs, particularly for First Year. The Value Complex Items generally received very high positive scores and exhibit

that the Business Division, in the students' opinion, is equipping them well for a career. The overall evaluation of the programs was extremely high with 75.9% of the students feeling they were satisfied to very satisfied.

The results of the QOL responses were reported and they showed a very positive perception on the part of most students to the QOL at Niagara College. Few students felt dissatisfaction regarding their QOL. Most students were satisfied, Third Year more than First Year, with their QOL. All years showed a high degree of uncertainty regarding how they were perceived by others. The Status Items, in general, were answered less positively by First Year. The Professor Items received the second lowest positive responses on the QOL questions with First Year the least positive. There may be some question as to whether First Year students are treated by professors in the same manner as First Year Accelerated, Second or Third Year, and whether this is possible given the program and course structures presently in place. The Opportunity Items received high positive responses over all years and contributed to the very high overall QOL responses.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The fundamental objective of this study was to investigate the prevalent belief that students at Niagara College, in general, had a relatively low perception of their college experience. This impression in the community at large appeared to be valid considering the general level of attrition that community colleges in Ontario appeared to experience (OMCU, 1990). However, according to the sample studied, the general findings of this thesis appear to contradict the initial premise.

In order to examine this general objective, five main objectives were pursued to ascertain:

1. the entering characteristics of the sample group, namely, age, sex, ethnic origin, educational background, academic preparedness, parental SES, health and learning problems (Part 3 of Questionnaire);

2. the intervening variables, namely, motivation and commitment and evidence of this aspect in the form of marks attained and post-college expectations, and how they impact upon the QOL domain and vice versa (Part 3 of Questionnaire);

and to ascertain and analyse:

3. the students' perceptions regarding the quality of their program (QOP). This was measured over the Cognitive sub-domain items - knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation; and the Affective sub-domain item-value (Part 1 of Questionnaire);

4. the students' perceptions of quality of life (QOL); this includes their well-being in the form of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and the college climate measured over opportunity, identity, status and professorial interaction (Part 2 of Questionnaire);

5. students' comments upon their QOL and QOP or the Questionnaire.

To expedite these research objectives, a questionnaire was adapted and, following modification, was administered to

First, First Year Accelerated, Second and Third Year students of the Business Division in Niagara College. After compilation, 245 questionnaires were analysed using standard statistical analyses.

Data for Objectives 1 and 2 were tabulated and from them a general picture of the students in the sample population was obtained. The typical student is a female, 20 years of age (median) who is single with no dependent children. She has come directly from high school and taken no previous courses at the college. She has no learning or health problems and no physical disability. Her roots are British and her mother probably completed high school while her father only had some high school education. Her mother is probably a homemaker and her father a skilled craft or tradesman. She felt that her high school education had prepared her well for college.

This average or standard profile obtained from the sample population is of value when considering the individual student's perceptions of QOP and QOL and in using this average profile as a criterion and mirror against which other students' responses may be viewed (Burt et al., 1978). It may also be the case that the 'average student' conditions the nature of the perceived QOL and QOP of students, professors and administrators within the Business Division of Niagara College and affects and impacts upon each of these three interacting groups to evolve and form a

quasi "campus climate" that predicates and acts as a social feedback effect on student QOL and QOP (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965; Cantril, 1965; Campbell et al., 1976; Argyle, 1987; Upcraft et al., 1990).

In analysing Objectives 3 and 4, the individual responses of each student were tabulated and grouped according to the response to each question asked and the response within each year of the program to each question. Further analyses by gender, age, or other individualising characteristic or parameter were not attempted due to the small sub-sample population numbers but are worthy of future research (Sudman, 1976; Borg & Gall, 1989).

The students who answered the questionnaire considered their QOP and QOL to be extremely positive. There are only two main areas of concern expressed by the students, namely, Professors and Status. When examining the results by year of program, First Year students appear to be less positive than the other groups (Upcraft et al., 1990). The areas of concern are for Professors where the mean positive response was only 52.6% and also in the Status Items where the mean positive response for the First Year was only 54.3% (Table 13). Positive feelings of QOP and QOL tended to increase with the length of time spent at the college except, however, for the First Year Accelerated group which on many items scored apparently anomalously positive responses close to the Third Year.

As previously mentioned in Chapters 3 and 4, the First Year Accelerated students are students who will complete the first year of their program by taking classes from January until July, instead of September to April as do the typical First Year students. This group's scores tended to be similar to Second and Third Years which may be explained by reason of their small group and class size, the closer contact with professors, the positive attitude of the professors toward the group, the perception by the group of their own special nature which may verge upon an elitist style mentality in some, or simply that this small group from the whole sample population are peculiar to this particular study. Only with further examination of future Accelerated groups will this exception be confirmed or rejected. It is appealing to suggest that a small group of highly motivated students perceived by their instructors as special may exhibit higher scores than a broader and larger amorphous group but more research is required.

Although much of this study has concentrated upon positive and negative scores, in some instances neutral scores (3 on the Likert-type scale) may have some significance. In analysing scores where neutral values were  $\geq 35\%$ , several significant responses occur. In particular, within the Satisfaction Items, I really like to go each day, First Year responded with 35% neutral. To the item I find that learning is a lot of fun both First and Second Years

responded with scores of 38 and 38.4%, respectively. Under the Dissatisfaction Item I feel restless received a 38.4% score from Second Year. Responses concerning Status Items people look up to me, people think a lot of me where all years responded with high neutral scores and to the items people care about what I think, I am treated with respect, and I feel important, neutral scores as high as 64.9% occurred. Under the Mean of Status Items, both First Year and First Year Accelerated responded with high neutral scores. Within the Professor Items responses to professors take a personal interest in helping me. First Year were 36% neutral; however, to professors help me to do my best, both First Year groups were highly neutral. Interestingly, only the First Year had a distinctly different response and high neutral score of 47%, as compared to Third Year's 9.1% , to the item professors listen to what I say. Finally, under Opportunity Items to the item I really get involved in my work only the First Year scored a high neutral score of 38%.

It is difficult to speculate on the meaning of neutral scores but many of the above responses may be the result of inadequate time at college for the respondent to decide on a definite response or the response may reflect the passage of opinion moving from negative to positive or vice versa with lingering doubts still persisting, or the score merely reflects lack of opinion or interest in the question posed. The First Year groups exhibit the greatest tendency to



indecision but that in itself may be viewed as a positive or at least uncommitted perception. These particular neutral scores do not negate the conclusions or implications derived from this study but are deserving of future research.

Finally, Objective 5 was based upon unsolicited responses written in the space provided at the end of each student's questionnaire. In all, 53 students responded (Appendix C). The responses were mixed in their level of seriousness and candour but give some corroborative indications of responses already illicit within the questionnaire. The comments were not all negative but by the nature of such volunteered responses tended to stress areas and aspects of concern rather than appreciation. The two main areas of comment were professors and administrative aspects of daily life in and around the college. The former drew a wide range of comment from the congratulatory to the senseless derogatory. However, several comments were reasoned attempts to express concerns and satisfaction with professors and their programs. The comments, however, derived from such a small number are too equivocal from which to generalise or develop implications.

For example, it is difficult to decide if comments on course work being too "easy" is the province of the program co-ordinator or the teachers. There were many comments saying the work might be more challenging. Is this the responsibility of individual teachers or are they

constrained by the course outline and method of evaluation set out for them? Some teachers have a major input into the course content and method of evaluation, but on some courses where there are many teachers delivering the same course this is not so. Thus, some of the criticism levelled at the teachers is invalid and might be directed higher up in the college administration. There is the interesting question of whether the programs might be more challenging or whether the methods of teaching need to challenge the student more.

Several comments related to social aspects of college life and the need for some improvement and administrative leadership in providing either facilities or partial funding and organising of social events.

### Conclusions

In considering the conclusions that this study has realized, a statement of the problem situation needs reiteration. With the publication of the Vision 2000 report (OMCU, 1990) and the demand for a re-structuring of the community college system in Ontario, a basic question regarding student college experience within the colleges was raised. The fundamental conclusion of this study of the Business Division at Niagara College is that the students'

perceptions of their QOL and QOP are very positive. This conclusion stands in somewhat stark contrast to the apparently misplaced idea that Colleges were places of low student self-esteem and poor QOL and QOP. The analyses of the data derived from the questionnaires when considered from both the individual student's perspective and the grouped responses by year of program study confirm the overall sense of a rewarding college experience in terms of instructors, course content and delivery, administration, and "campus climate." However, this study was conducted in the last month of the college year by which time many students had already quit the program and presumably those who had persisted to this date were relatively satisfied with their college experience. It is interesting to note that the attrition rate for the next semester following this study was 32% for both First Year groups returning to second year, whereas in the year prior to this study the attrition rate for First Year groups was 43.35% (Gilmore, personal communication 1992). Whether this lower level of attrition was a result of the general economic situation, or a more motivated group than in the previous year or as a result of the new initiatives being undertaken at Niagara College in response to a new President and Vice-President Academic and a policy to increase retention which includes Faculty Advisors and peer mentoring, remains speculative.

As noted in Chapter 2, only a few studies of a similar

nature have been conducted in Canada within faculties of Education at Manitoba, Memorial and Brock Universities. The comparability of these studies with this study has several limitations but these past studies can act as criteria against which the Niagara College study can be considered. For instance, the overall level of QOL and QOP at Niagara College was generally higher which was surprising considering that students in all the other institutions already had degrees or were enrolled in degree programs which led to a relatively secure and salaried career in contrast to the uncertainty facing many of the Niagara College students. Only a deeper and better constructed psychological study, beyond the purview of this existing thesis, of comparable student groups can hope to secure an explanation for this seemingly rational anomaly.

When comparing the three university studies with this study in terms of QOP, it is worth noting that the lower positive responses obtained at Niagara College for the Comprehension through Evaluation Items were still very positive when compared to findings at the University of Manitoba (Clifton et al., 1987) and Memorial University of Newfoundland (Bulcock & Mendoza, 1988) where the positive responses in the perceived QOP were as low as 49.8%. The study into QOP and QOL at Brock University (Boak & Ellis, 1991) had the highest positive ratings in nearly all areas, but only had a 67.3% positive response to the Knowledge

Items which, again, supports the premise that the Business Division students surveyed were positive in their assessment of the QOP (74.1%).

The overall assessment of Satisfaction question was used to judge the cumulative attitude to QOP. The results from the other QOP studies varied greatly with Manitoba (38.1% positive and 39.7% negative), Memorial (53.7% positive and 31.5% negative), and Brock (76.3% positive and 8.4% negative). The Business students gave 75.9% positive and 5.3% negative responses to the overall evaluation of their program. This reinforces the conclusion that, according to the perceptions of surveyed students, the Business Division has an excellent QOP comparable to that at Brock University and far higher than the other two universities where previous QOP research has been undertaken.

In specific terms when comparing these university studies with this study, the items in the QOL section of the questionnaire were identical to those in the other QOL studies at Manitoba, Memorial and Brock and are thus comparable. The Professor Items were consistently lower than Brock by up to as much as 22.5% on the item professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work.

However, the overall evaluation of Professor Items from this study tend to fall just below those derived at Brock University and comparable or slightly above those from

Manitoba and Memorial. In making interpretations from this thesis, several cautions must be borne in mind. First, the students who completed the questionnaire were not chosen randomly as this was a convenience sample and any results stemming from this sample can only, in strictest terms, pertain to the 245 students. Secondly, the questionnaire was administered at the end of the winter term when some student attrition from the various programs had already taken place. Finally, the questionnaires administered to Third Year students were distributed and collected by one of their professors and this may have influenced the results.

#### Implications

An implication of this study pertinent to educational theory, demonstrates that, perhaps, class size, group interaction over time, time for individual and group acclimatization within an educational institution, close faculty-student interaction, and a proactive role on the part of professors may lead to more positive college experience. This study further attests to the value of special groups or coteries as evidenced by the First Year Accelerated group in establishing a sense of esprit de corps rather than blunt elitism. Such a group may possess no more than a sense of worth or internalised high self-esteem but the reciprocal effect upon those in contact with the group

reinforces this sense of worth, thus maintaining and strengthening an already evolved positive QOL and QOP. Another aspect of the smaller groups, as represented in this study, may be that all groups other than the large amorphous First Year have either more specific educational demands put upon them as is typical in higher years in any educational establishment in the case of Second and Third Years or that a more intense level of general broad-based learning is demanded at an earlier stage, in the case of the First Year Accelerated group. In both instances, a quicker or more demanding or more specifically intense level of involvement and interaction is required. If the individual student rises to this demand, then a level of perceived positive QOL and QOP may be the inevitable outcome. It is interesting to reiterate that the First Year Accelerated has the greatest level of attrition of any group in the College. The implications of this study are both complex and non-linear but indicate that small groups studying at demanding levels of achievement within an institution where their perceived external goals are fostered by close contact with educators who are themselves perceived as helpful, just and interested in students as individuals are likely to derive a highly positive QOL and QOP. A final aspect of this study indicates the need for increasing student awareness beyond the bounds of their own perceived educational and career goals. Where students appreciate and comprehend a wider

knowledge of the world, whether as part of a global issues or current issues course, this sense of awareness and of potentially playing a significant part in society where previously a passive role was perceived further adds to a positive college experience (Upcraft et al. 1990).

### Recommendations

This study has perhaps raised more questions than it has answered in terms of how the study was conducted, how the data were analysed and what other questions might have been asked. It might have been beneficial to survey the students near the beginning of the school year rather than the end. A longitudinal study might have been performed by following several designated groups through college programs from beginning to end; and whether a broader population base of students might be sampled in a future study.

The data analyses relied on standard descriptive techniques but, with a larger sample, more sophisticated analyses may be performed, thus establishing a sounder quantitative base for related future studies.

Finally, given the constraints of time, more specific questions tailored to programs or groups might be constructed or questions establishing a greater background portrayal of students.



Several recommendations for future research can be generated, namely:

1. Further studies into the QOP and QOL of students within other Divisions at Niagara College to examine the generalizability of the results of this study to the total college population;

2. Comparative studies of Business Divisions in other Ontario Community Colleges to establish if they have a similar college climate and concerns in the areas of Professors and self-esteem;

3. A longitudinal study of a larger number of students within a Division to assess changes in perceptions over the period of their studies;

4. Associated with these above recommended studies, a more detailed analysis of the relationships between entering characteristics and intervening variables namely, gender, age, educational experience, academic preparedness, motivation with reference to achieved marks, and group size, be undertaken to establish the effect of these variables on a student's college experience;

5. The use of qualitative interviews with randomly selected students to illicit more in-depth responses to key areas of concern namely, professors and self-esteem. This might be valuable to supplement the findings of this study and highlight areas that a largely quantitative study omits.

Recommendations directed towards the college focus on the following:

1. Vision 2000 (OMCU, 1990, p.134) recommended "constructive evaluation methods for employees of community colleges," and there have been problems with undertaking such a complex task. It is recommended here that student evaluation of teachers be instigated whereby students are given the opportunity to anonymously state their concerns regarding professors in areas such as course delivery, grading and interpersonal skills;

2. Instructional development might be provided as an ongoing service throughout the college, new professors could undertake a period of instruction; existing professors could avail themselves of the services of the instructional development unit when they felt a need to explore innovative ideas in teaching;

3. First Year class sizes might be reduced to create cohesive groups in order to develop group loyalty and peer motivational synergy, as well as allowing more effective professor/student interaction.

In conclusion, this study reiterates the need as embodied in the Vision 2000 Report in their First Recommendation for the college system to adapt to external indicators, be learner-driven and subsequently to internally restructure rather than expect individual students to adapt to an outmoded system. Any intervention by college

administration in an attempt to improve QOL and QOP must be subtle and oblique perhaps providing latent facilitation of group-style format in teaching and in acting as catalysts for social and other forms of socio-educational acclimatization on campus. All QOL literature suggests that where education occurs within a structure of positive QOL a reciprocal and more effective and successful learning process is achieved.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, F. M. (1974). Social indicators of perceived life quality. Social Indicators Research, 1, 279-299.
- Andrews, F. M. & Withey, S. B. (1976). Social indicators of well-being. New York: Plenum Press.
- Andrews, F. M. & McKennell, A. C. (1980). Measures of self-reported well-being: Their affective, cognitive and other components. Social Indicators Research, 8, 127-155.
- Argyle, M. (1987). The psychology of happiness. London: Methuen.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.) (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Book 1 cognitive domain. New York: David McKay.
- Boak, T. & Ellis, M. (1991). Student perceptions of quality of life in the Faculty of Education: Results of a survey. Brock Education, 1 (2), 1-7.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bradburn, N. M. & Caplovitz, D. (1965). Reports on happiness. Chicago: Aldine.
- Braxton, J. M. & Brier, E. M. (1989). Melding organizational and interactional theories of student attrition: Path analysis study. Review of Higher Education, 13, 47-61.
- Bubolz, M. M., Eicher, J. B., Evers, J. & Sontag, S. (1980). A human ecological approach to quality of life: Conceptual framework and results of a preliminary study. Sociological Indicators Research, 7, 103-136.

- Bulcock, J. W. & Mendoza, L. P. (1988). The quality of student life in the Faculty of Education. Unpublished Research Proposal, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Bulcock, J. W., Mendoza, L. P., Crane, R. & Lee, T. (1989) The quality of student life in the Faculty of Education: the undergraduate case. Unpublished report, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Burgess, E. W. & Cottrell, L. S. (1939). Predicting success or failure in marriage. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Burt, R. S., Wiley, J. A., Minor, M. J. & Murray, J. R. (1978). Structure of well-being: Form, content, and stability over time. Sociological Methods and Research, 6, 365-407.
- Cameron, K. S. (1981). Domains of organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 25-47.
- Campbell, A. & Converse, P. E. (1972). The human meaning of social change. New York: Russell Sage.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E. & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). The quality of American life. New York: Russell Sage.
- Cantril, H. (1965). The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Cherlin, A. & Reeder, L. G. (1975). The dimensions of psychological well-being: A critical review. Sociological Methods and Research, 4, 189-214.
- Clifton, R. A., Jenkinson, D., Marshall, S., Roberts, L.W. & Webster, J.B. (1987). Report of the sub-committee on students. Unpublished Report, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

- Coleman, J., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., Mcpartland & Hood, A.M. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity: Summary report. Washington D.C. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare.
- Dennison, J. (1984). The Canadian community college in the 1980s : Strategies for survival. Canadian Journal of Education, 9, 139-153.
- Diener, E., Sandvik, E. & Larsen, R. J. (1985). Age and sex effects for emotional intensity. Developmental Psychology, 21, 542-546.
- Epstein, J.L. & McPartland, J.M. (1976) The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.
- Gerson, E. M. (1976). On 'Quality of Life'. American Sociological Review, 41, 793-806.
- Grosset, J. (1989). A conceptual framework for describing the causes of student attrition. Institutional Research Report #44. ED 310 819.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D. & Ginties, H. (1972). Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Juster, F. T., Courant, P. N., Dow, G. K. (1981). The theory and measurement of well-being: A suggested framework for accounting and analysis. In Juster, F.T. & Land, K. C. (Eds.), Social Accounting Systems. New York: Academic Press, 23-94.
- Kammann, R. & Flett, R. (1983). Affectometer 2: A scale to measure current level of general happiness. Australian Journal of Psychology, 35, 259-265.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980) The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to androgogy. New York: Cambridge Books.

- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S. & Masia, B. B. (1964) Taxonomy of educational objectives:Book 2 affective domain. New York: Longman.
- Land, K. C. (1983). Social indicators. Annual Review of Sociology, 9, 1-26.
- McKennell, A. C. & Andrews, F. M. (1980). Models of cognition and affect in perceptions of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 8, 257-298.
- Michalos, A. C. (1980). Satisfaction and happiness. Social Indicators Research, 8, 385-422.
- Mitchell, D. E. & Spady, W. G. (1983). Authority, power, and the legitimation of social control. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, 5-33.
- Morgan, W. R. (1983). Learning and student life quality of public and private school youth. Sociological Education, 56, 187-202.
- Noel, L., Levitz, R., Saluri, D. & Associates (1985). Increasing student retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities (OMCU) (1990). Vision 2000: Quality and opportunity, Toronto.
- Pineo, J. P., Porter, J. & McRoberts, H. (1977) The 1971 census and the socioeconomic classification of occupations. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 14.
- Roberts, L. W. & Clifton, R. A. (1991). Measuring the quality of life of university students. Unpublished Report, University of Manitoba.
- Rodgers, W. L. (1977). Work status and the quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 4, 267-287.

- Schuessler, K. & Fisher, G. (1985). Quality of life research and sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 129-149.
- Spady, W. E. & Mitchell, D. E. (1979). Authority and the management of classroom activities. In Duke, D.L. (Ed.) Classroom management. 78th Yearbook National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stodt, M. M. & Klepper, W. M. (Eds.) (1987). New directions for higher education, No.60.
- Sudman, S. (1976). Applied sampling. New York: Academic Press.
- Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. Journal of Higher Education, 53, 687-700.
- Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 438-453.
- Upcraft, M. L., Gardner, J. N. & Associates (1990). The freshman year experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Voorhees, R. A. (1987). Toward building models of community college persistence : A logit analysis. Research in Higher Education, 26, 115- 129.
- Webb, M. (1989). A theoretical model of community college student degree persistence. Community College Review, 16, 42-49.
- Winter, G. M. & Fadale, L. M. (1986). Non completers/ successful leavers. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research & Practice, 10, 101-111.



Williams, J. & Batten, M. (1981). The quality of school life. Hawthorn, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbey, A. & Andrews, F. M. (1985). Modelling the psychological determinants of life quality. Social Indicators Research, 16, 1-34.
- Anon. (1989, 3rd Ed.). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Astin, A. W. (1982). Why not try some new ways of measuring quality? Educational Record, Spring 1982, 10-15.
- Atkinson, T. (1982). The stability and validity of quality of life measures. Social Indicators Research, 10, 113-132.
- Benin, M. H., Stock, W. A. & Okun, M. O. (1988). Positive and negative affect: A maximum-likelihood approach. Social Indicators Research, 20, 165-175.
- Chamberlain, K. (1988). On the structure of subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 20, 581-604.
- Dennison, J. D., Forrester, G. & Jones, G. (1982). A study of students from academic programs in British Columbia's community colleges. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 12, 29-41.
- Dietsche, P. (1988). Describing and predicting freshman attrition in a College of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, OISE.
- Edwards, J. E. & Waters, L. K. (1983). Predicting university attrition: A replication and extension. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43, 233-236.
- Emmons, R. A. & Diener, E. (1985). Factors predicting satisfaction judgements: A comparative examination. Social Indicators Research, 16, 157-167.

- Horley, J. & Lavery, J. J. (1991). The stability and sensitivity of subjective well-being measures. Social Indicators Research, 24, 113-122.
- Larsen, R. J., Diener, E. & Emmons, R. A. (1985). An evaluation of subjective well-being measures. Social Indicators Research, 17, 1-17.
- McGinty Stodt, M. (1987). Educational excellence as a prescription for retention. In McGinty Stodt, M. & Klepper, W. (Eds.) Increasing retention: Academic and student affairs administrators in partnership. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 60, 5-13.
- McKennell, A. C. (1978). Cognition and affect in perceptions of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 5, 389-426.
- Moum, T. (1988). Yea-saying and mood-of-the-day effects in self-reported quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 20, 117-139.
- Pace, C. R. & Stern, G. G. (1958). An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, 269-277.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437-453.
- Shmotkin, D. (1990). Subjective well-being as a function of age and gender: A multivariate look for differentiated trends. Social Indicators Research, 23, 201-230.
- Smith, L. N. et al. (1981). Mobilizing the campus for retention: An innovative quality of life model. Iowa City: American College Testing program, National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practice.
- Stassen, M. A. & Staats, S. R. (1988). Hope and happiness: A comparison of some discrepancies. Social Indicators Research, 20, 45-58.

Wideen, M. F. & Holborn, P. (1986). Research in Canadian teacher education: Promises and problems. Canadian Journal of Education, 11, 557-583.

Yardley, J. K. & Rice, R. W. (1991). The relationship between mood and subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 24, 101-111.

Zapf, W. (1987). German social report. Social Indicators Research, 19, 5-171.

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A

## QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION\*

This questionnaire is about your life in, and your attitudes towards, Niagara College. There are no right or wrong answers - we are just trying to find out how students feel about their experience at college. Your answers to all of the questions are **CONFIDENTIAL** and the **THERE IS NO WAY TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS**. We need this information in order to make statistical comparisons between the types of students in different programs.

### P A R T 1

Different people have different ideas about the overall quality of education received at Niagara College. Listed below are some things that are usually considered to be important. Please remember that we are interested in your honest and frank opinions.

Assess each statement by checking the response which best describes your experiences. Please remember that the phrase "At Niagara College I have learned.." applies to each item. That is, we want you to respond in terms of your experience at Niagara College.

	(Check one line for each statement)				
	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
<b>IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION, I HAVE LEARNED</b>					
a considerable amount about the subjects I plan to use	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
familiarity with the language of business	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
narrow job-specific skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
knowledge of the important principles in the program	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to communicate effectively	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to write in a precise manner	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to speak in a clear and concise manner	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to reason clearly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
broad skills I can apply to many jobs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to interpret new problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to think critically	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

\* Adopted from questionnaires developed by Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

(Check one line for each statement)

Definitely Mostly  
Agree Agree Neutral Mostly Definitely  
Disagree Disagree Disagree

IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION, I HAVE LEARNED

to apply knowledge gained to different situations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to use a variety of ways to solve a problem	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to assess interrelationships between topics	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to make assessments of every-day problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to come up with new interpretations of what I have been taught	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to be original and come up with my own ideas	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to examine my own abilities critically	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to evaluate what I read and sometimes disagree	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to value myself as a prospective employee	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to value the work skills I have learned	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to value the Business Division	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to value others	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to increase my interpersonal skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to expand my opportunities for further education e.g. university	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to become a more informed citizen	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to acquire marketable skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to combine information from a number of sources	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to acquire more vocational skills and less general skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to acquire more awareness of global issues	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
to acquire understanding of the disabled and minorities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall, I am satisfied with my program in the Division of Business	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____



PART 2

Each item below says that the Business Division at Niagara College is a place where some particular thing happens to you or you feel a particular way. We would like you to respond to each statement by checking one of the response categories provided. Please remember that we are interested in your honest and frank opinions.

Please read each item carefully and check the answer which best describes how you feel. Please remember that the phrase "The Business Division at Niagara College is a Place Where" applies to each item.

	(Check one line for each statement)				
	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
<b>THE BUSINESS DIVISION IS A PLACE WHERE....</b>					
I feel proud to be a student	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
the things I learn are important to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
people look up to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors treat me fairly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel depressed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I find it easy to get to know other people	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I really get involved in my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I like learning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I get enjoyment from being there	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
students are very friendly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel restless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors give me the marks I deserve	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I have acquired skills that will be of use to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
people care about what I think	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I am treated with respect	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Check one line for each statement)  
 Definitely Mostly Neutral Mostly Definitely  
 Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree

THE BUSINESS DIVISION IS A PLACE WHERE..

mixing with other people helps me to understand myself	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel lonely	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
the things I learn will help me in my life	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
people think a lot of me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I know how to cope with work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors help me to do my best	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I get upset	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I know I can do well enough to be successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
the things I am taught are worthwhile learning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel important	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors are fair and just	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I am a success as a student	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I really like to go each day	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I learn to get along with other people	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel worried	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
the work I do is good preparation for my future	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel proud of myself	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
other students accept me as I am	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I have learned to work hard	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I get on well with the other students in my class	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I find that learning is a lot of fun	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
professors listen to what I say	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

### PART 3

In this part of the questionnaire we ask for some factual information about yourself. As stated at the beginning your answers to all of the questions are **CONFIDENTIAL** and the **THERE IS NO WAY TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS**. We need this information in order to make statistical comparisons between the types of students in different programs.

1. What is your educational background? Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. What program are you registered in?

Business - Accounting (Academic) \_\_\_\_\_

Business - Accounting (Co-op) \_\_\_\_\_

Business - Sales \_\_\_\_\_

Business Administration - Accounting (Academic) \_\_\_\_\_

- Accounting (Co-op) \_\_\_\_\_

- Human Resources Management \_\_\_\_\_

- Information Systems \_\_\_\_\_

- Marketing Management \_\_\_\_\_

- Operations Management \_\_\_\_\_

Computer Programmer \_\_\_\_\_

Retail Management \_\_\_\_\_

General College \_\_\_\_\_

Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3. What are you most likely to be doing within six months of completing your diploma?

I don't expect to complete my diploma \_\_\_\_\_

Work in the field I will graduate in \_\_\_\_\_

Further education \_\_\_\_\_

Staying at home \_\_\_\_\_

Other things  
(Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many years of college do you have? \_\_\_\_\_ Years

5. If you have been a part-time student, then give the number of credit courses you have taken at college.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Courses

6. How good are you at your college work compared to other students in your year level?

- A lot above average \_\_\_\_\_
- A little above average \_\_\_\_\_
- Above average \_\_\_\_\_
- A little below average \_\_\_\_\_
- A lot below average \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is your college percentage mark? - Current Term \_\_\_\_\_%

- Cumulative \_\_\_\_\_%

8. How much time do you spend on each of the following activities during a typical week? (estimate the number hours)

- Attending classes \_\_\_\_\_
- Studying \_\_\_\_\_
- Paid employment \_\_\_\_\_
- Recreation \_\_\_\_\_

9. Please check how motivated you are to do well in your courses this year.

Unmotivated \_\_\_\_\_ Very motivated

10. What sex are you? Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

11. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_

12. What is your ethnic origin?

- British \_\_\_\_\_ Polish \_\_\_\_\_ Chinese \_\_\_\_\_
- French \_\_\_\_\_ Scandanavian \_\_\_\_\_ Hungarian \_\_\_\_\_
- Italian \_\_\_\_\_ Ukrainian \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- German \_\_\_\_\_ Native Indian \_\_\_\_\_

13. What was the highest level of education that your parents received? (Check one line for each parent)

	Mother	Father
Elementary school	_____	_____
Some high school	_____	_____
Completed high school	_____	_____
Some technical, vocational training	_____	_____
Completed community college	_____	_____
Some university	_____	_____
Completed a Bachelor's degree (e.g. B.Ed., B.A.)	_____	_____
Some education at the graduate level	_____	_____
Completed graduate degree (e.g. M.Ed., Ph.D)	_____	_____

14. What are your parents' occupations? (If they are retired or deceased, please indicate the occupations they held.)

Mother \_\_\_\_\_

Father \_\_\_\_\_

15. Marital Status - please specify: Single \_\_\_\_\_ Married \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced \_\_\_\_\_  
 Separated \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed \_\_\_\_\_

16. Do you have any children living at home? Yes ( ) No ( )  
 If Yes, indicate age(s) \_\_\_\_\_

17. Do you have health problems? Yes ( ) No ( )  
 Maybe specify.

18. Do you have a physical disability? Yes ( ) No ( )  
 Maybe specify.

19. Do you have a learning disability? Yes ( ) No ( )  
 Maybe specify.

20. Do you feel you were academically prepared for college? Yes ( ) No ( )  
 If No - Please specify.

**P A R T 4**

**THANK YOU SINCERELY. WE REALLY APPRECIATE THE TIME AND EFFORT YOU HAVE GIVEN IN ANSWERING OUR QUESTIONS.**

**IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS, PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO JOT THEM DOWN.**

APPENDIX B

## CONSENT FORM

### THE QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION, NIAGARA COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND TECHNOLOGY

Having been informed of the purpose of this study and the importance of your participation, please indicate your willingness to take part by signing your name below.

As already indicated all answers in the Questionnaire will be treated as confidential. The completed Report based on this study will be available in the Business Division Office by December 1991, and you are welcome to read it.

If you do not wish to take part in this study, please return this form without signing it. Remember, even though you sign this form you may still withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_



## INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDY ASSISTANTS

It is important that if the data is to be of any value that all questions in all parts of the Questionnaire be completed. The following steps should help with the time constraints.

1. Read Information for Students to the class.
2. Distribute the Consent Forms and ask the students to read, sign and return the Form. They must leave if they do not wish to participate (see 6 below). Collect the Consent Forms.
3. Distribute Questionnaires. Again remind students, verbally, of the total confidentiality of all their answers in the Questionnaire.
4. Allow adequate time for all students to complete the Questionnaire.  
DO NOT ALLOW DISCUSSION.
5. If any question arises from the Questionnaire give an adequate reply  
BUT DO NOT INFLUENCE THEIR ANSWER.
6. If anyone wishes to leave, have them do so in a quiet and orderly manner. Ask them to hand in their Questionnaire so that it can be immediately destroyed.
7. Have all remaining Questionnaires handed in when complete.

Thanks for your help.

INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS TO BE READ OUT BY STUDY ASSISTANTS

1. The purpose of this study is to investigate the Quality of Life as perceived by Students in the Business Division at Niagara College. This is an important piece of research that can only succeed with your kind assistance. This study forms part of the requirement for an M.Ed. degree at the College of Education, Brock University.
2. We are asking you to complete a questionnaire which includes questions in the following areas:
  - a. Student entering characteristics e.g. Sex, Age, and Ethnic origin. Parental Education etc.
  - b. Average grades, motivation level etc.
  - c. What you feel about the quality of your program.
  - d. What you feel about the quality of life at Niagara College.
  - e. There is a final section where we would encourage you to write any pertinent comments regarding your quality of life at Niagara College, or any comments you have about the Questionnaire. These comments may be quoted verbatim in the Report.
3. YOU ARE NOT ASKED FOR YOUR NAME OR STUDENT NUMBER. THERE IS NO WAY TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS THUS ALL REPLIES ARE ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL.
4. All Questionnaires after completion will be viewed solely by the Researcher and University Supervisor. All Questionnaires will be carefully stored and will be destroyed once the data has been extracted from them.
5. A Report containing the results of this study will be made available for you to read, if you wish, in the Business Division Office by December 1991.

APPENDIX C

VOLUNTARY COMMENTS BY STUDENTS  
PART 4 OF QUESTIONNAIRE

(F = Female, M = Male Comments)

FIRST YEAR RESPONSES

It was hard to answer some questions because you don't feel the same way about all of your teachers or the subjects that they teach. F

\*\*\*

The prices of text books are too high. I don't like spending \$60 on a book and not even use it. M

\*\*\*

I wasn't even motivated to do this. M

\*\*\*

I found that for someone that has completed their Grade 13 will be very prepared even too prepared. I found that my first year at Niagara College in Business was exceptionally easy, too easy causing me to be not motivated. I would like a little more of a challenge to motivate me. M

\*\*\*

I feel the overall program is taught well; however, there are a few teachers I have not learned anything from. I will not name them, but these teachers have caused me to reconsider the major I have chosen. F

\*\*\*

I feel first year accounting should be better screened on entry level. e.g. if you've had accounting before be put in a three hour mode. If not a five hour mode with the extra help needed. F

\*\*\*

Students can be less noisy when socializing in sitting areas. This disrupts classes in progress. I'm sure that by the time they come to college they should be mature and considerate of others. Teachers should actually come out and be able to tell them to be quiet. F

\*\*\*

Some of the teachers expects us to teach ourselves then give us a test when they decide to come back. F

\*\*\*

I enjoy going to college much more now than I did seven years ago. I feel that I want to learn new things, and find what I am learning is very interesting and will be useful to me. F

\*\*\*

There are too many courses for first year students for such a short period of time to learn them. Therefore I cannot retain as much information as I would like to. F

\*\*\*

Certain teachers however want to teach us at a university level, which many of us don't appreciate. F

\*\*\*

In reference to any comments that may reflect on the teachers, I would like to say that most are understanding of how we feel as students. A few on the other hand seem to have no respect for us and could care less if we receive the marks we initially felt we could achieve. F

\*\*\*

My understanding of the purpose of taking courses not related to your program is to round out the younger students. I wish mature students had the option of taking related courses for electives as I myself will be coming back to school for them. Two year business accounting should contain courses on computer programming. F

\*\*\*

I think High School students should be made aware of educational importance with a full time career course. The difference between university and college isn't made clear enough. F

\*\*\*

Should have more courses offered during the spring term. F

\*\*\*

I am in the accelerated business program. I feel the program is good but the accelerated programs still have some flaws like scheduling of tests is very poor. Every teacher gives tests all at the same time. Some material of the programs like law and accounting is just very hard to understand for first year business students. M

\*\*\*

Overall the business programs at Niagara are well planned. However some of the structures, formats, outlines of particular teachers are not in flow with other teachers. M

\*\*\*

Subjects have in general been taught well. Subject matter requires a mature attitude as it need to be worked at, many students want to be spoon-fed. Teachers are qualified and generally are patient and will give support if they note a sincere desire on the part of the student. M

\*\*\*

I feel that the college should not have given us operations management in the first term as it gave us too much to work on since that gave us eight courses this term. M

\*\*\*

I find being a parent, where my husband is also a student, very hard on family life. Financial situations also factor my school work. F

\*\*\*

I find some of the teachers unfair and uncaring. They said they didn't have time to tutor or just didn't care what you had to say. If you weren't doing well in a lot of classes, the teacher had no interest in helping you. Some teachers were excellent, but some were not. F

\*\*\*

I have enjoyed college very much. I would like to see more organized activities for students other than parties and getting drunk. I would like to see school spirit improved. I hate the pressure of feeling inferior to "university" students. M

\*\*\*

The questionnaire asked the same question different ways too many times. F

\*\*\*

I shouldn't be here but it's better than university because I find my own co-op employer. If I don't like that job I'll go to university for two years, get two degrees cheaper than four years of university. I can't believe it - no final exams - its too. easy! M

\*\*\*

One thing which has concerned me this year is the lack of respect exhibited by many students for each other. Particularly in the way they speak to each other and about each other. I don't view myself as a prude, but I feel that the values and attitudes exhibited by many students is distressing and doesn't bode well for the future of business. F

\*\*\*

I felt the first semester was motivating and helped me to do well. The teachers helped too. This semester I felt no motivation, lack of school involvement and hardly any teacher input.

Some courses, people are spoon fed, instead of working at it. Other courses, you actually have to work to get something achieved. Is that no what you do when you reach the working world, or will we be spoon fed for the rest of our lives! F

\*\*\*

I feel students should be screened more upon application at the college. The college should have a higher selection policy for entrance, so that students who are inclined to work at their educations will be here. There seems to be a lot of warm or cold bodies occupying seats, and producing nothing for themselves or anyone else.

There should be a system for grading people coming in on their abilities on English, math, computers and then a class built around their needs. F

\*\*\*

I wish they wouldn't treat us like babies!! M

\*\*\*

Courses should be more intellectually challenging, without much increase in workload, more difficult and thought provoking. (People tend to apply themselves only as much as they need). M

\*\*\*

People in the college are very friendly (students and teachers). I met a lot of new friends. F

\*\*\*

Some teachers pick out a few people in classes to favour or pick on and do not include the rest of the class who want to be included. (They ignore some people who want to participate in the discussion). F

\*\*\*

## SECOND YEAR RESPONSES

All the teachers that I have had at Niagara College have been excellent (considerate, caring, understanding). F

\*\*\*

Teachers should be assessed on how well they can do their jobs. There are two present teachers that the students think should not be teaching at all. M

\*\*\*



I am basically happy with the program that I am enrolled in. Everything seems to be fine with me. F

\*\*\*

Social life and school pride and spirit is lacking, the intensity is here but we lack in pride. If we had it school would be more enjoyable and highly motivated.

Some teachers are concerned others aren't. People are more interested in themselves so are the teachers.

I have fun here because I start it and we need more people to break the ice and relax. M

\*\*\*

I am basically happy with the program though some teachers are biased and base their marks on personality, not work. Some tests and test methods are irrelevant and some grades are unjustifiable.

First year people were more friendly and less competitive, there were more outside activities and chances to relate with all in the class. F

\*\*\*

Teachers and staff should be careful of religious discrimination. On page four of the questionnaire it reads "I have learned to work hard". This is a self motivated action. The school has not brought this on because in comparison to Redeemer, I feel exams should be incorporated as well as more homework. With the work load we have now, too much free time is given which is filled by work hours. This is a danger because this encourages procrastination and memorization instead of really learning. Thank-you. F

\*\*\*

The business program at Niagara is very informative and adequate to prepare one for a career. However, the social atmosphere has much to be desired. There is not enough identity with the college and very little in the way of togetherness outside of your own circle of friends. Student apathy is very high and it has a contagious effect on the rest of the student body. There must be some attempt made by the college administration to correct this problem. Perhaps if Niagara students lived on campus (as in university) there would be more social contact and a school identity created. As it stands now, it's every student for himself/herself. Once again though, the program is academically sound and comparative to university (if not higher) courses. M

\*\*\*

Overall, Niagara College offers us, the students, a great deal in terms of knowledge, expertise and tacit knowledge.

However, I feel that they have been unsuccessful in balancing a students course load, at times it is more than a student can handle. (They fail to realize that even though we are students, we do have a life outside of school).

Also, a lot of teachers seem unable to "control" their own class and I personally feel that a few of the teachers are not qualified to teach. If they can't set a good example, ho do they expect us to learn from them?

Ever since I started this school, I have learned that everyone is willing to accept you for who you are and they seek to socialize with you.

In regards to my class alone, I feel as if we have now become a family. Only problem is now that the ties have become so strong but are sure to break apart. F

\*\*\*

I feel that some teachers could teach at a level that is more beneficial to students. M

\*\*\*

I think the co-op term should be voluntary, not a requirement for graduation. F

\*\*\*

College life is beneficial to everyone, especially when the program is co-op.

If another survey is required, better timing is also needed. At this time, we are very busy finishing the year. F

\*\*\*

I think Niagara is a good school. It is better than I had anticipated. The students are nice and very sociable. M

\*\*\*

Business is very stressful, a lot of time must be put into it to achieve high marks, standards from it. M

\*\*\*

I find your question about ethnic origin ridiculous. I am Canadian and British is not the same thing. If that is what you are trying to imply. M

\*\*\*

The Niagara College Business Division does a reasonably good job preparing students for the life after school. I feel that most problems are a result of the type of people who go to college. As a whole, most college students, in my opinion, lack motivation towards their studies and usually have a negative (inferior?) attitude towards their own intelligence and learning abilities. I feel this is something that has carried over from secondary school. It's a shame that this is the case because it brings a bad attitude towards the college system which I believe is an important and could be an even more important element in the educational system. College is viewed as a low-grade substitute for university and I feel this need not be the case.

As far as Niagara is concerned, the social aspect is quite weak. Most people live in a relatively close proximity and therefore, tend to go their own way once school is finished for the day. I wish camaraderie level was a little higher.

Overall, I feel the program is adequate but suffers from a major inferiority complex. M

\*\*\*

I enjoy the social aspect of college very much. I like going to the pubs and other school activities. Because of my participation in these activities, I have made a lot of friends. F

\*\*\*

There is a huge difference in the teaching abilities of the different instructors. Some courses are extremely easy, with average attendance in a class hovering around 10%, while other courses are demanding (but fair) with attendance near 100% all the time. M

\*\*\*

I feel that smokers at Niagara College are treated unfairly. We pay to be here just like anyone else but we are forced to go outside in the middle of winter to have a cigarette. There should be a designated smoking area. M

\*\*\*

## THIRD YEAR RESPONSES

I have become aware that you may not necessarily be interested in the field that you graduate in. However, the only way you can determine this is by working in the field. I have worked in the accounting field for a year and left it because it does not appeal to me. This is why I decided to further my education and using my college diploma get credits in a related, but broader field. F

\*\*\*

Nice and thorough. F

\*\*\*

As a mature student I was hesitant about coming back to school - afraid I wouldn't learn, wouldn't fit in. However, from the first term the professors were very supportive and encouraging and made me feel that I had made the right decision. They certainly boosted my confidence.

The only complaint I have is that some faculty tend to "spoon-fed" their students. I don't feel that this prepares students for the "real world". F

\*\*\*

I can't remember, but if I paid any dues for SAC, it was one of the biggest wastes of money. Something has to be done about it. I am not a quiet individual but in three years of college, I have never attended one SAC activity.

Paying for parking is a joke. We do not live in Toronto. I would not mind paying for parking if I was guaranteed a parking spot. I also feel that the parking superintendent should not be draining students cash flow even more.

I feel that the bookstore is geared for big business. Books are changed for no apparent reason. M

\*\*\*