

1974

An analysis of reported student satisfaction and student satisfaction as perceived by academic advisors and student affairs staff at Iowa State University

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hallenbeck, Daniel A., "An analysis of reported student satisfaction and student satisfaction as perceived by academic advisors and student affairs staff at Iowa State University" (1974). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 6342.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/6342>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-3306

HALLENBECK, Daniel A., 1942-
AN ANALYSIS OF REPORTED STUDENT SATISFACTION
AND STUDENT SATISFACTION AS PERCEIVED BY
ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1974
Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

An analysis of reported student satisfaction and
student satisfaction as perceived by academic advisors and
student affairs staff at Iowa State University

by

Daniel A. Hallenbeck

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Of Science and Technology
Ames, Iowa

1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
PROCEDURE	21
FINDINGS	28
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	81
Introduction	81
Discussion	85
Summary	108
Recommendations	115
LITERATURE CITED	118
APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTERS	121
APPENDIX B: <u>COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE,</u> DIRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF	128
APPENDIX C: TABLES SHOWING NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SCALES FOR THE SIX HYPOTHESES	137
APPENDIX D: RESPONSES TO SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS 1 AND 3 FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF	188b

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1 RANDOM SAMPLE OF STUDENTS COMPARED TO ACTUAL ENROLLMENT BY COLLEGE, SEX, AND ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION	22
TABLE 2 RANDOM SAMPLE OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS COMPARED TO TOTAL GROUP OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS BY COLLEGE AND SEX	23
TABLE 3 STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF (ACTUAL NUMBERS)	24
TABLE 4 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT SAMPLE	29
TABLE 5 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISOR SAMPLE	30
TABLE 6 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS SAMPLE	31
TABLE 7 INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDENT SUBSCALES WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION	33
TABLE 8 INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF ACADEMIC ADVISOR SUBSCALES WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION	34
TABLE 9 INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF MEMBER SUBSCALES WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION	35
TABLE 10 COEFFICIENT ALPHA	36
TABLE 11 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	37
TABLE 12 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	38
TABLE 13 SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS I	39
TABLE 14 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	40
TABLE 15 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	41
TABLE 16 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	42

TABLE 17	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	43
TABLE 18	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	44
TABLE 19	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	45
TABLE 20	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	46
TABLE 21	SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS II	46
TABLE 22	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	48
TABLE 23	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	49
TABLE 24	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	50
TABLE 25	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	51
TABLE 26	SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS III	52
TABLE 27	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	53
TABLE 28	INTERACTION CHART SHOWING THE MARGINAL AND CELL MEAN SCORES FOR STUDENTS, ACADEMIC ADVISORS, MEN, AND WOMEN FOR THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	54
TABLE 29	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	54
TABLE 30	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	55

TABLE 31	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	56
TABLE 32	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	57
TABLE 33	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	59
TABLE 34	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	60
TABLE 35	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	61
TABLE 36	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	62
TABLE 37	SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS IV	63
TABLE 38	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	64
TABLE 39	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	65
TABLE 40	SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS V	65
TABLE 41	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	67
TABLE 42	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	68
TABLE 43	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	69
TABLE 44	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	70

TABLE 45	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	71
TABLE 46	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	72
TABLE 47	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	73
TABLE 48	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	74
TABLE 49	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	75
TABLE 50	SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS VI	76
TABLE 51	ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	77
TABLE 52	ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	78
TABLE 53	ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	78
TABLE 54	STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	79
TABLE 55	STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	80
TABLE 56	STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS	80
TABLE 57	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	138
TABLE 58	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	138
TABLE 59	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	139
TABLE 60	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	139

TABLE 61	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	140
TABLE 62	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	140
TABLE 63	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	141
TABLE 64	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	141
TABLE 65	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	141
TABLE 66	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	142
TABLE 67	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	142
TABLE 68	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	142
TABLE 69	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	143
TABLE 70	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	143
TABLE 71	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	144
TABLE 72	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	144
TABLE 73	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	145
TABLE 74	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	145
TABLE 75	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	146

TABLE 76	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	146
TABLE 77	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	147
TABLE 78	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	147
TABLE 79	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	148
TABLE 80	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	148
TABLE 81	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	149
TABLE 82	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	149
TABLE 83	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	149
TABLE 84	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	150
TABLE 85	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	151
TABLE 86	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	151
TABLE 87	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	152
TABLE 88	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	152

TABLE 89	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	153
TABLE 90	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	153
TABLE 91	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	153
TABLE 92	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	154
TABLE 93	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	154
TABLE 94	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	154
TABLE 95	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	155
TABLE 96	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	155
TABLE 97	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	156
TABLE 98	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	156
TABLE 99	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	157
TABLE 100	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	157
TABLE 101	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	158

TABLE 102	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	158
TABLE 103	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	159
TABLE 104	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	159
TABLE 105	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	160
TABLE 106	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	160
TABLE 107	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	160
TABLE 108	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	162
TABLE 109	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	162
TABLE 110	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	163
TABLE 111	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	163
TABLE 112	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	164
TABLE 113	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	164
TABLE 114	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	165

TABLE 115	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	165
TABLE 116	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	165
TABLE 117	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	166
TABLE 118	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	166
TABLE 119	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	166
TABLE 120	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	167
TABLE 121	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	167
TABLE 122	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	168
TABLE 123	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> SOCIAL LIFE SCALE	168
TABLE 124	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	169
TABLE 125	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	169
TABLE 126	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	170
TABLE 127	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	170

TABLE 128	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	171
TABLE 129	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	171
TABLE 130	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	172
TABLE 131	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	172
TABLE 132	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	174
TABLE 133	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	175
TABLE 134	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	176
TABLE 135	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> RECOGNITION SCALE	177
TABLE 136	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	178
TABLE 137	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	179
TABLE 138	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE	179
TABLE 139	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	180
TABLE 140	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	181

TABLE 141	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	182
TABLE 142	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	182
TABLE 143	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	183
TABLE 144	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	184
TABLE 145	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	184
TABLE 146	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	185
TABLE 147	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> COMPENSATION SCALE	186
TABLE 148	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE	187
TABLE 149	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE <u>CSSQ</u> TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE	188a

INTRODUCTION

The outlook for higher education has changed drastically in the 1970's. Nationally, during the decade of the '60's, enrollments doubled, budgets for higher education tripled, and the portion of the Gross National Product going to higher education increased from one to over two percent (Glenny, 1973). As Joseph Cosand (1973) writes, "We have been preoccupied with growth and have measured too often our success in terms of size - size of campus, enrollments, and size of budget."

As we have settled into the 1970's, it has become abundantly clear that higher education is no longer a growth industry. Student enrollments are leveling off and, in some cases, decreasing. Some of the factors affecting the enrollment decline are reported by Glenny (1973) as follows:

1. The actual number of five year olds dropped 15 percent between 1960 and 1970.
2. The actual number of births dropped three percent between 1970 and 1971 and nine percent between 1971 and 1972. These are the potential freshmen of 1988 and 1990.
3. The nation's birthrate is at its lowest point in history, at a rate below zero-population growth, and it has not yet stabilized at that rate.
4. The proportion of all males 18 - 19 years of age who are in college has dropped to the level it was back in 1962, down to 37.6 percent from a high in 1969 of 44 percent. This drop can be attributed only partly to the ending of the draft, since the trend downward started at least two years before resolution of the draft issue.
5. The proportion of males 20 to 21 years of age in college has dropped from a high of 44.7 percent in 1969 to 36 percent in 1972, almost a 9 percent difference.

6. Women in the 18 to 19 age group leveled off at about 34 percent in 1969 and those in the 20 to 21 age group seemed to have leveled at 25 percent in the past two years. This occurs despite the ostensible efforts of colleges and universities to increase the proportion of women going to college.
7. In the fall of 1972, the four-year colleges and universities lost about $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent in the first time freshmen enrollment, while the community colleges increased less than 2 percent.
8. In the past two years, 85 percent of all the increase in the number of first-time students entered the community colleges.
9. The Census Bureau estimates a sharp drop in the number of college age youth after 1982, almost paralleling the sharp increases during the 1960's. My own estimate, based on the Census Bureau projections and the data on live births in the U.S. Public Health Service, is that by 1991 we will have about the same number of youth as we had back in 1965 and 1966. Although the U.S. Bureau of Census, the Carnegie Commission, and the U.S. Office of Education all project an increase in this age group after 1990, there is no actual evidence to support this assumption. Unless the number of live births begins to show an increase this year or the next, the projected number of college age youth will, of necessity, show further decline after 1990.

Furthermore, a number of propriety institutions have been recognized and gained status as a viable post-secondary institutions and are successfully competing for the same students as are two and four year colleges and universities. With fewer numbers of available students, institutional competition for students is increasing to levels of alarming intensity. In addition to recruiting students, higher educational institutions are experiencing problems in retaining them from matriculation to graduation. For instance, at Iowa State University four thousand (4000) students dropped out of the university between the fall quarter 1972 and fall quarter 1973. Their reasons were many and varied, but can be summarized by the following statements: (Menne, 1974)

1. Very few students drop because of poor grades.

2. Most reasons for leaving stated by students can be categorized as "general academic dissatisfaction".
3. Some, but not many, say they drop out for financial reasons - to work and then return.
4. Some, but not many, say they drop out for travel - with the intent of returning.

Statistics such as these demand that higher educational institutions closely examine the educational experiences which their students are having while enrolled, and find ways to eliminate or at least minimize the feeling of "general academic dissatisfaction". Concern must be expressed about the student and his life on campus to find ways to decrease his feeling of dissatisfaction and increase his level of satisfaction with his college experience.

It is evident that higher educational institutions have moved from the growth industry phase into a new era of searching for ways to more adequately satisfy their clientele - the currently enrolled students. Rather than searching for creative ways to handle the large influx of students, the emphasis must now be on the quality of experience which the student has while enrolled. This change of emphasis will require reorientation in thinking on the part of many faculty and staff.

One of the least investigated variables in the college setting, according to Betz, Menne, Starr, and Klingensmith (1971), is college student satisfaction. What aspects of the college setting are particularly satisfying or dissatisfying to students? How satisfied are college students with their total college experience, which includes the physical, tangible aspects, such as study and lounge space, food service, and living conditions, and the intangibles, such as relationships with peers and faculty, feelings of belonging or alienation, and

the campus reward system?

What factors affect satisfaction? What types of things can be done within a campus community to increase the level of satisfaction of students? What components of campus environment could be changed to raise the level of student satisfaction? How accurately do those persons in a position to affect student satisfaction actually perceive that level of satisfaction?

Much of the pertinent research in the area of college student satisfaction has been completed by the authors of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (Betz, Menne, Klingensmith) as they have continued to refine their instrument (Appendix B). This research will be reported in the literature review chapter.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the similarities and differences in students' reported level of satisfaction, and that level of satisfaction as perceived by their academic advisors and the professional student affairs staff at Iowa State University as measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. The authors of this instrument, Betz, Menne, and Klingensmith, have approached student satisfaction as an analogue to employee satisfaction in a job setting. The CSSQ was developed on principals and methods derived from research on employee satisfaction in business and industry (e.g. Herzberg, Massner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957; Hoppcock, 1935; Vroom, 1964). In developing this questionnaire, the authors found that educational quality, social life, student living conditions, compensation (study pressures), and recognition are important dimensions of college student satisfaction (1971).

In a job setting, it is management's responsibility to increase or improve employee satisfaction; in the college setting, it is the responsibility of administrators and faculty members to raise the level of college student satisfaction. The two groups of individuals specifically dealt with in this study are academic advisors and members of the student affairs staff.

Academic advisors assist students in planning their academic programs and serve as a source of counsel for problems and concerns relating to academic progress and personal adjustment. Furthermore, advisors have the opportunity to interpret college policies and procedures to their advisees, and, in turn, interpret their advisees' complaints, criticisms, and suggestions to the department head and other colleagues. The departmental faculty are in a position to affect change within the department which can affect the level of student satisfaction, such as, course content, grading practices, curriculum requirements, and other policies and procedures. Satisfaction differences, according to Starr, Betz, and Menne (1972), revolve around the requirements and academic services of the university, and the individual's feeling of worth among faculty and students.

Members of the professional student affairs staff are charged with the responsibility of providing experiences outside the structured classroom setting which will further students' growth and development, as well as, providing a number of support services intended to facilitate the business of learning. The areas included in student affairs are: admissions and records; dean of students office which includes student financial aids, the office of international education

services, advising fraternities and sororities, new student orientation, all-campus student government, and other student activities; the residence department, which includes single, married and graduate housing and food service; student health center; and the student counseling service.

Student affairs staff members must be cognizant of the level of student satisfaction and active in improving their programs and services to enhance that level of satisfaction. They must also be able to interpret this satisfaction accurately so this information can be brought to bear on policy decisions and program planning which can affect the level of students' satisfaction with their job of learning, and their total college experience.

Because of the important positions these two groups of personnel - academic advisors and student affairs staff - have in affecting those factors which can raise or lower student satisfaction, it is important to analyze their perception of the level of student satisfaction.

For the purposes of this study, college student satisfaction is defined as those factors measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, Form C. Academic advisors are those faculty members who have recognized and assigned responsibility for advising undergraduate students on academic matters. The professional student affairs staff members are those persons who work in the areas that report to the Vice President for Student Affairs in the following areas: Admissions and Records, Student Counseling Service, Dean of Students Office, Department of Residence, and Student Health Center.

The objectives of this investigation are as follows:

1. To determine the level of student satisfaction among students.
2. To determine how academic advisors perceive the level of student satisfaction.
3. To determine how members of the student affairs staff perceive the level of student satisfaction.
4. To compare the level of student satisfaction as perceived by academic advisors with the students' reported level of satisfaction.
5. To compare the level of student satisfaction as perceived by student affairs staff members with the students' reported level of satisfaction.
6. To compare the level of student satisfaction perceived by academic advisors and student affairs staff.

The following hypothesis will be tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the level of student satisfaction among students.
2. There are no significant differences in how academic advisors perceive the level of student satisfaction.
3. There are no significant differences in how student affairs staff members perceive the level of student satisfaction.
4. There are no significant differences between student satisfaction and academic advisors perceptions of student satisfaction.
5. There are no significant differences between student satisfaction and student affairs staff members' perceptions of student satisfaction.
6. There are no significant differences in perceptions of student satisfaction between academic advisors and student affairs staff.

LITERATURE REVIEW

An extensive literature review, which included books, journals, abstracts, ERIC documents, and unpublished manuscripts, proved that college student satisfaction has received little attention in the research literature, and appears to be a phenomenon of which there is little understanding. This review will focus on the following possible correlates of college student satisfaction: student-college congruence, student needs, age, academic classification, sex, type of residence, and tenure in college.

The student-college congruence correlate has been examined by several authors. Pervin (1967a,b) developed the Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment (TAPE) questionnaire to study student perception of himself, and his perceptions of his college environment. His contention was that human behavior could be best understood in terms of transactions between the individual and his environment. Pervin's findings indicate that student dissatisfaction with college is related to discrepancies between student perceptions of themselves and their college. A student is satisfied when there is agreement between his perceptions of himself and of his college.

Rand (1968) explored the theory of homogeneous matching of a student to a college. The contention that similarity among students at their chosen school would cause the most satisfaction was not supported. The relationship between satisfaction and matching was found to be minimal and quite complex. Satisfaction with a particular college is

not solely dependent on similarity with peers. In fact, this study questions whether similarity with peers has any effect on satisfaction at all.

Satisfied and dissatisfied students will perceive the institutional environment differently according to a hypothesis tested by Ducanis (1962). The satisfied students perceived the institutional press as being high toward achievement, affiliation, conjunctivity, counter-action, ego, achievement, emotionality, energy, exhibition, objectivity, reflectiveness, understanding, succorance, and scientism. Those less satisfied students scored the school high on abasement and aggression. In addition, Ducanis found that students in small major departments and those with a high number of credits to be more satisfied than those from large major departments and with a low number of credits. This study supports the hypothesis that the institutional environment will be viewed quite differently by students, depending on whether or not they are satisfied with their college experience.

Salzman (1970) discovered a significant relationship between needs and student perceptions of the environment, and satisfaction. Satisfied students perceived the college environment as being friendly and cohesive, as stressing personality enrichment and expressiveness, as emphasizing politeness, consideration, and academic pursuits. Dissatisfied students manifest greater needs to be successful and recognized, to criticize, attack contrary points of view, and to experience novelty and change in daily routine.

In agreement with Salzman, Schultz (1972) found that students who tended to conform, respect authority and submit to persons in

authority, expressed greater satisfaction with college than those students who were more independent, less conforming, and rebellious toward authority.

Korman (1971) designed a questionnaire to measure students' satisfaction with their institution as it related to their perceptions of the environmental correlates - ambiguity and locus of control. It seemed to Korman that the utmost satisfaction would theoretically occur from minimizing ambiguity and maximizing self-directedness. His findings indicate that ambiguity is of less importance as a determinant of satisfaction than are the control aspects of the environment. As a general effect, increasing self-control would increase satisfaction. Apparently ambiguity and change, according to Korman, are not dissatisfying if they are viewed as being consistent with the nature of the world. A feeling of having control over one's life appears to be an important determinant of college student satisfaction.

The differences in satisfaction of students attending public and private higher educational institutions were explored by Betz, Starr, and Menne (1972). The authors hypothesized that the satisfaction of students attending large public universities would differ from that of students attending small, private colleges. Students in public institutions were found to be more satisfied with working conditions and social life than students attending private institutions. The private college students were more satisfied with recognition, quality of education and compensation, i.e., the amount of positive feedback for the amount of input. This study further points up the fact that different institutions are perceived differently by students; different

aspects of the collegiate setting are perceived to be valued or important at different campuses and at different types of institutions. At the small private institution there seems to be greater recognition of student worth than at the large public institution. Working conditions, those physical conditions of the students' life, such as comfortable living space and adequacy of study areas on campus, and social life are seen as more satisfying at the public institution. Ideally, for the most satisfied student, attempts should be made to combine the strengths of the small private and large public institution into one institutional setting.

Richardson (1969) hypothesized that the stronger the congruence between student and institution, the greater would be satisfaction with college. A linear relationship was found between orientation-environment congruence and student satisfaction with faculty, administration, major, and students as measured by part II of the College Student Questionnaire. The trend was for subjects in a state of high congruence with their institutional environment to express more satisfaction than did students of moderate and low congruence.

Although there is not complete agreement and there are some exceptions, the evidence seems to indicate that there is little, if any, relationship between satisfaction and student-college congruence. A student does not necessarily "belong" in one institution and not belong in another. Although it may be a factor, congruence does not determine satisfaction.

The area of student needs and satisfaction is closely related to that of student-college congruence. The concept follows that if a

student's needs are being met, he will be satisfied or, at least, more satisfied than the student whose needs are not being met. Various authors have looked at many different variables ranging from grades and academic potentiality, to the total college environment.

Schmidt and Sedlacek (1972) looked at variables related to student satisfaction at the University of Maryland. In reviewing the literature, they summarized that the evidence for a direct relationship between satisfaction and congruency between an individual and his institution is tentative at best. One of the problems in this area is adequately defining congruency and satisfaction.

The focus of their particular study at the University of Maryland was on satisfaction as it related to the students' feeling of isolation or lack of identity with the institution as a whole. The University Student Census was employed for this study.

They found that new students anticipated significantly more satisfaction than students who had started at the University of Maryland at an earlier time. Satisfaction differed depending upon the number of professors with whom the students were acquainted. The most satisfied students knew six or more and the most dissatisfied students knew no professors. Furthermore, the most dissatisfied students were those indicating difficulty in choosing a major field or career. Satisfaction was also found to vary depending upon the number of dates a student had per month. The more dates per month, the higher the degree of dissatisfaction. The type of counseling services a student was interested in was found to be significantly related to satisfaction. Those students interested in seeking counseling due to emotional or social concerns were the most

dissatisfied group. Those students interested in reading and study skills were significantly less satisfied than those not interested in seeking services.

In summary, the more dissatisfied students knew fewer faculty and felt more need for counseling than their satisfied counterparts.

At Trenton State College, Hecklinger (1972) found that students who were undecided about either long or short range goals were less satisfied than their decided counterparts. This agrees with Schmidt and Sedlacek's findings (1972) at the University of Maryland, where they found dissatisfaction related to difficulty in choosing a major field or career. It would seem that indecision about vocational and career plans could affect grade point average as well as overall satisfaction.

In a study conducted in Great Britian at a provincial University, Startup (1972) found students were dissatisfied by the lack of informal contact with faculty and staff, and the infrequency of opportunities for intellectual exchange with staff. The study further indicated that students were satisfied with the quality of individual help from faculty, but not with the amount of it.

It seems that the Startup study reinforces a finding in the Schmidt and Sedlacek study that dissatisfied students did not know any faculty members. The opportunity to know and interact in an informal setting with faculty and staff appears to be a variable in college student satisfaction which has received little attention, but could have far reaching consequences.

As early as 1944 Berdie found that students who achieve most successfully tend to express the most satisfaction with their curriculum;

however, grades did not seem to play a great part in determining curricular satisfaction.

In studying the interrelationship between measured satisfaction with college and certain academic and personality variables, Almos (1957) found that students who remained enrolled longer had higher total satisfaction scores; "satisfied" students had higher mean ability scores and made better grades than dissatisfied students.

Westlund (1960) investigated the relationship of high potentiality and satisfaction with college experiences. She found that freshmen of high potentiality reported themselves as more satisfied than students of average potentiality, and women freshmen as more satisfied than men.

Seymour (1964) found that agreement between a student's picture of himself and his picture of a successful student was significantly related to satisfaction. If a student views himself as a successful student, he is more satisfied than a student who sees incongruence between the "ideal student" and the student role he is fulfilling. He further found grades and satisfaction to have no significant relationship.

As a part of her study on college student satisfaction, Schultz (1972) explored the relationship between intellectual ability, as measured by the Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test, and satisfaction, as measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. She found no relationship between intellectual ability and satisfaction with the college experience for either high, middle, or low ability groups.

Using the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, Willsey (1971)

examined the relationship between academic performance of students and satisfaction with the college environment. The results of this study indicate that overall satisfaction and satisfaction with faculty were significantly related to grade point average. The higher the grade point average, the greater the degree of satisfaction. These results establish a significant relationship between satisfaction and grade point average for the first time.

Age, academic classification, sex, and place of residence are variables which have also been studied as possible correlates to college student satisfaction. Using the College Student Questionnaire, Martin (1968) explored satisfaction with college as evidenced by the correlation between each students' real and ideal description of the college. His sample included freshmen who were found to be more satisfied with college at the first of the year than at the end. Graduate students and faculty, on the other hand, were less satisfied than freshmen either at the beginning or end of the year. This could indicate, to this writer's way of thinking, that students become less satisfied as they grow older.

In a study of women over twenty-five years of age compared to those in the 18-21 year old group, Sturtz (1971) found those women over twenty-five years of age generally more satisfied than the younger women. These findings conflict with those of the Martin study (1968) mentioned previously. One explanation for this could be that age was the primary factor in the Sturtz study, but not in the Martin study. The age variable requires further study to determine exactly how it affects college student satisfaction.

Betz, Klingensmith, and Menne (1970) looked at the relationship between student satisfaction and sex, type of residence, and year in college. The results of this study indicated that type of residence and year in school are related to several aspects of college student satisfaction. Sex seemed to have little, if any, relationship with satisfaction or any of the dimensions measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire after the effects of residence and year in school were removed. More specifically, type of residence seemed to be related to satisfaction with academic aspects of college as well as with working conditions and social life. Sorority and fraternity residents expressed greater satisfaction with working conditions and social life than did residence hall students. Residence hall students had higher scores on three academically related scales - policies and procedure, compensation, and quality of education - than did fraternity and sorority residents. The results of this study do not clearly indicate the direction or pattern of changes in satisfaction over the college years.

In contrast to the results of the Betz, et al. (1970) study, Schultz (1972) found satisfaction differences between men and women students on three of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire scales - total satisfaction, social life, and recognition. There was no definite explanation for this difference; however, it could have been due to differences in the designs of the studies.

The demographic variable of age, year in college, sex, and type of residence seem to require further investigation to clearly understand their influence and relationship to college student satisfaction.

Student satisfaction and its effect on student tenure in college is an area deserving some consideration. There have been several studies which have looked at this relationship. Robinson (1968) explored the relationship between persistence in college and satisfaction and found that male and female students who were dropped by the university expressed a greater degree of dissatisfaction with advisement, scholastic habits, and faculty than those students who persisted. In fact, those who persisted were more satisfied with their college experience than either those who were dropped by the university or those who withdrew.

Starr, Betz, and Menne (1972) investigated the differences in satisfaction among persisters and academic and non-academic dropouts. The hypothesis investigated indicated that students who remained in college would be more satisfied than students who dropped out, and of those students who dropped out, those who left for non-academic reasons would be more satisfied than those who were dropped for academic reasons. The hypotheses were supported by the data from this investigation. Three scales of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire - compensation, recognition, and quality of education - discriminated between students who persisted and those who dropped out. In general, according to the authors, satisfaction differences revolve around the requirements and academic services of the university and the individual's feelings of worth among faculty and students. These findings suggest that college student satisfaction is an important factor in student tenure. The satisfied student is much more likely to persist from matriculation to graduation than the dissatisfied student.

The review of the literature has explored a number of possible correlates of college student satisfaction; however, this has not led to a definitive consensus regarding those factors which are at the heart of this rather illusive variable.

The first correlate examined, student-college congruence, is based on the premise that the greater the congruence between the student and his chosen college, the higher will be his level of satisfaction.

The studies in this area found little evidence for a direct relationship between satisfaction and student-college congruence. Congruence may be a factor which affects satisfaction; however, it is certainly not the sole cause.

The fulfillment of student needs and its relationship to the level of college student satisfaction is closely related to congruence. In this literature review, one of the most interesting discoveries was the importance that knowing and informally interacting with faculty members and decisiveness regarding career goals played in college student satisfaction. The most dissatisfied students were those who knew no faculty or staff members. Students who were undecided about either long or short range goals were less satisfied than their decided counterparts. Satisfied students perceive the college environment as fulfilling more of their needs than do dissatisfied students. Furthermore, the more successful the student is, the more satisfied he feels. It would seem that student satisfaction could be increased by providing opportunities for out-of-class contact with faculty and staff, providing the student with help in arriving at career goals, and providing services to assist in meeting other needs of students.

The demographic variables of age, academic classification, sex, and place of residence have been studied to determine their effect on college student satisfaction. Age, year in school, and type of residence seem to affect the level of student satisfaction more than does sex of the student. Further work is needed in dealing with these demographic variables to adequately determine their effect on the level of college student satisfaction.

It comes as little surprise that those students who persist from matriculation to graduation are more satisfied than those students who withdraw or are suspended from the institution, or feel incongruent with that particular environment. Furthermore, those students who are suspended for academic reasons are not meeting the expectations of the environment; therefore, one would expect them to be less satisfied than students who are achieving well academically and are having their needs met. Students who withdrew from college were found to be more satisfied than those students who were dropped by the college or university for academic reasons.

One of the most evident difficulties incurred in the study of college student satisfaction is in the definition of satisfaction. How can satisfaction be commonly defined so it has the same meaning to all who approach the topic? Currently, satisfaction is defined by the instrument which is used to measure it. For instance, the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, measures satisfaction on the scales of satisfaction with: faculty, major, students, and administration. The College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire measures satisfaction on five different scales: working conditions, compensation, quality of

education, social life, and recognition. In addition, other authors have developed specific satisfaction scales for their own campuses, in which they have defined satisfaction to meet the particular thrust of their study.

Due to the lack of a standardized definition of satisfaction, various instruments are attempting to discover what factors do in fact contribute to college student satisfaction. Because so many different instruments are used which look at various aspects of satisfaction, it is difficult to generalize from study to study.

It is obvious from this review of the literature that the study of college student satisfaction is in its infancy. The current investigation is an attempt to further our knowledge in this all important area.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire is the instrument being employed. Satisfaction will be measured on the five scales of working conditions, compensation, quality of education, social life, and recognition. In using this instrument, college student satisfaction is being viewed as an analogue to employee satisfaction in a job setting.

Age, sex, type of residence, academic classification, and major area of concentration will be the variables explored in comparing students' level of satisfaction. Perceptions of the level of student satisfaction by academic advisors and student affairs staff members will be explored and compared.

PROCEDURE

Students, academic advisors, and members of the student affairs staff were surveyed in this study.

The student sample was composed of three hundred (300) randomly selected Iowa State University undergraduates. Their names and addresses were obtained from the Registrar's files of currently enrolled students during Winter Quarter 1974. Special students and those enrolled in veterinary medicine were excluded. A letter was sent explaining the project, requesting their assistance and inviting them to one of four different testing centers at any one of seven different times to complete the questionnaire. This method elicited little response; therefore, the non-respondents were mailed another letter which included a questionnaire, answer sheet, and stamped envelope addressed to the writer. The follow up produced a much better response.

The following tables illustrate how the student sample compares with actual student enrollment on the basis of college in which they are majoring, sex, and academic classification.

TABLE 1

RANDOM SAMPLE OF STUDENTS COMPARED TO
ACTUAL ENROLLMENT BY COLLEGE, SEX,
AND ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION

Variable	Sample	Actual
<u>College</u>		
Agriculture	23%	20%
Education	7%	7%
Engineering	16%	16%
Home Economics	14%	16%
Science and Humanities	40%	41%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	65%	62%
Female	35%	38%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Classification</u>		
Freshmen	23%	27%
Sophomore	23%	24%
Junior	27%	24%
Senior	27%	25%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Three hundred (300) academic advisors were randomly selected, through the use of a random number table, from the university list of academic advisors, excluding those in the College of Veterinary Medicine. Permission to use the list of academic advisors was granted by Dr. Edwin Lewis, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. In addition, Dr. George Christensen, Vice President for Academic Affairs was apprised of the project, and a summary of the proposal was presented to the University Academic Advising Committee for their information and support.

A letter of explanation, the questionnaire, answer sheet, and supplemental questions were assembled in a packet for each academic advisor in the sample group. The packets were delivered to the departmental offices by the writer where they were placed in the distribution boxes of the advisors. Two weeks later, the completed questionnaires were picked up at the departmental offices. The non-respondents were sent a letter reminding them of the questionnaire, and requesting that they complete and return it to the author.

The following table illustrates how the academic advisor sample is stratified on the basis of college and sex.

TABLE 2

RANDOM SAMPLE OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS COMPARED TO
TOTAL GROUP OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS BY COLLEGE AND SEX

Variable	Sample	Actual
<u>College</u>		
Agriculture	9%	10%
Education	4%	5%
Engineering	23%	19%
Home Economics	16%	16%
Science and Humanities	49%	50%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	80%	79%
Female	20%	21%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

All ninety-two (92) members of the professional student affairs staff were included in the sample. Each of the Deans and Directors on the Student Affairs Staff were contacted by the writer to explain

the project and enlist their cooperation and assistance in surveying the personnel in their area. A letter of explanation, a questionnaire, answer sheet and supplemental questions were distributed through the Dean or Director of each student affairs area. The completed questionnaires were returned to the respective Dean or Director from whom the writer collected them.

Table 3 is illustrative of those persons composing the student affairs sample.

TABLE 3
STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
(ACTUAL NUMBERS)

Department	Male	Female	Total
Admissions and Records	9	3	12
Dean of Students Office	16	12	28
Department of Residence	9	4	13
Student Health Center	4	13	17
Student Counseling Service	13	7	20
Other	2	0	2
Totals	53	39	92

The instrument employed in this study to measure the level of satisfaction was the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, Form C. The CSSQ is a 70-item questionnaire relating to various aspects of

college life. The five-choice Likert-type scale offers response alternatives ranging from "Very Dissatisfied", through "Satisfied", to "Very Satisfied". Five different scale scores are derived as well as a total satisfaction score. The scale scores are based on the sum of the fourteen item response for each scale. The total satisfaction score is derived by summing all 70 responses.

The CSSQ Manual, (Starr, Betz, Menne, 1971) describes the five scales as follows:

Working Conditions: The physical conditions of the student's college life, such as the cleanliness and comfort of his place of residence, adequacy of study areas on campus, quality of meals, facilities for lounging between classes;

Compensation: The amount of input (e.g., study) required relative to academic outcomes (e.g., grades), and the effect of input demands on the students' fulfillment of his other needs and goals;

Quality of Education: The various academic conditions related to the individual and vocational development, such as the competence and helpfulness of faculty and staff, including advisors and counselors, and the adequacy of curriculum requirements, teaching methods, and assignments;

Social Life: Opportunities to meet socially relevant goals, such as dating, meeting compatible or interesting people, making friends, participating in campus events, and informal social activities;

Recognition: Attitudes and behaviors of faculty and students indicating acceptance of the student as a worthwhile individual.

CSSQ norms have been developed on the basis of administration of

the instrument to 3,121 students attending ten colleges and universities, four private and six public. The norms provide percentile equivalents for raw scores on each CSSQ scale separated by sex and by public and private institution.

Reliability coefficients are reported for each of the two normative groups: public universities and private colleges. Score reliability for public schools range from .78 to .84, with a median of .82. For private schools the score reliability range from .79 to .84 with a median of .82.

The validity of the instrument has been tested through several studies designed to show that student satisfaction can be viewed as an analogue of job satisfaction. The studies have shown a negative correlation with satisfaction and drop-out rate, a positive relation to age, and a positive relation to type of residence.

Students were requested to respond to the questions on the CSSQ in a manner which would reflect their own level of satisfaction. The academic advisors and the student affairs staff members were asked to respond to the CSSQ questions as they would expect the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student to respond. Thus, the students reported their own feelings, and the academic advisors and student affairs staff reported their perceptions of students' level of satisfaction.

In addition, the academic advisors and student affairs staff members were asked to respond to three supplemental questions, copies of which are in the appendix. The purpose of the supplemental questions was to identify variables which these two groups of personnel thought

might affect the level of student satisfaction in the college setting.

The responses to the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire were all scored. For each respondent there were five scale scores and an overall satisfaction score. These scores were then compared, through the use of the single classification analysis of variance test (ANOVA) as described by Popham (1967), for each group: students, academic advisors, and student affairs staff members, and a two-way factorial analysis of variance as described by Kerlinger (1973) was employed to examine the relationship between groups.

The level of significance was set at .05. When any of the F ratios were significant at the .05 level, the Scheffee Test was computed to determine which group means differed significantly from one another.

FINDINGS

As was mentioned in the procedure chapter, three hundred (300) undergraduate students, three hundred (300) academic advisors, and ninety-two (92) students affairs staff members were invited to participate in this study.

The total number of responses received from students was one hundred and ninety-two (192), with one hundred and eighty-nine (189) of those being useable. The size of the useable student sample, 189, represents a 68 percent return.

One hundred and seventy-six (176) responses were received from academic advisors; however, only one hundred and fifty-two (152) were useable. The useable returns represent 50.67 percent of the initial sample. The eight percent who returned non useable returns either did not supply the necessary identifying information or refused to participate for one reason or another.

The student affairs staff returned sixty-seven (67) responses with sixty (60) of those being useable. The total return represented 72.83 percent of the sample; however, the useable returns represent only 65.22 percent. A majority of those who returned unuseable responses refused to participate because they had minimum contact with students and felt unqualified to respond. Several others responded after the data had already been analyzed.

Those individuals who responded to the questionnaire were representative of the random sample which was chosen to participate in

this study. Therefore, it was assumed by the writer that the non-respondents did not differ significantly from the respondents; consequently, there was no attempt to subsample the non-respondents.

The following three tables summarize the demographic characteristics of the three groups of participants - students, academic advisors, and student affairs staff.

TABLE 4
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT SAMPLE

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Age</u>		
17,18	25	13.2
19	46	24.3
20	44	23.3
21	39	20.6
22 - 32	35	18.5
	<u>189</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	113	59.8
Female	76	40.2
	<u>189</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>College</u>		
Agriculture	35	18.5
Education	11	5.8
Engineering	27	14.3
Home Economics	29	15.3
Science and Humanities	87	46.1
	<u>189</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Classification</u>		
Freshman	42	22.2
Sophomore	44	23.3
Junior	49	25.9
Senior	54	28.6
	<u>189</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 4 - Continued

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Place of Residence</u>		
Residence Hall	102	54.0
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	12.7
Off Campus	63	33.3
	<u>189</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 5

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
ACADEMIC ADVISOR SAMPLE

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Age</u>		
23 - 30	19	12.5
31 - 40	57	37.5
41 - 50	48	31.6
51 - 67	28	18.4
	<u>152</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	121	79.6
Female	31	20.4
	<u>152</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>College</u>		
Agriculture	25	16.4
Education	6	3.9
Engineering	38	25.0
Home Economics	24	15.8
Science and Humanities	59	38.8
	<u>152</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 5 - Continued

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Years at ISU</u>		
0 - 4	49	32.2
5 - 9	46	30.2
10 - 32	57	37.6
	<u>152</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 6

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
STUDENT AFFAIRS SAMPLE

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Age</u>		
0 - 30	25	41.7
31 - 40	13	21.7
41 - 63	22	36.6
	<u>60</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	37	61.7
Female	23	38.3
	<u>60</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Departments</u>		
Admissions and Records	10	16.7
Dean of Students	16	26.7
Department of Residence	13	21.7
Student Health Center	10	16.7
Student Counseling Service	11	18.2
	<u>60</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 6 - Continued

Variable	N	Percent of Sample
<u>Years at ISU</u>		
1, 2	28	46.6
3 - 9	19	31.7
10 - 34	13	21.7
	<u>60</u>	<u>100.0</u>

The following three tables show the correlations for each of the five College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ) scales with the total satisfaction score for each of the three sample groups - students, academic advisors, and student affairs staff members.

TABLE 7

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDENT SUBSCALES WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Compensation	1.000					
Social Life	.2340	1.000				
Working Conditions	.3386	.6220	1.000			
Recognition	.5608	.3684	.4634	1.000		
Quality of Education	.5726	.4076	.5350	.6773	1.000	
Total Satisfaction	.6889	.7305	.7791	.7883	.8226	1.000

TABLE 8

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF ACADEMIC ADVISOR SUBSCALES
WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Compensation	1.000					
Social Life	.4724	1.000				
Working Conditions	.4730	.5390	1.000			
Recognition	.6410	.4622	.5336	1.000		
Quality of Education	.6439	.3620	.4628	.7046	1.000	
Total Satisfaction	.8075	.7228	.7649	.8535	.7985	1.000

TABLE 9

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
MEMBER SUBSCALES WITH TOTAL SATISFACTION

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Compensation	1.000					
Social Life	.5007	1.000				
Working Conditions	.5214	.5002	1.000			
Recognition	.5464	.5004	.5019	1.000		
Quality of Education	.6010	.5544	.5897	.6792	1.000	
Total Satisfaction	.7830	.7967	.7651	.7976	.8264	1.000

Coefficient alpha, a reliability measure, is shown for each CSSQ scale in Table 10. A measure of internal consistency, coefficient alpha is the average of all possible split-half reliability coefficients for a given test. A high alpha coefficient indicates a reliable instrument.

TABLE 10

COEFFICIENT ALPHA

CSSQ Scales	Students	Acad. Adv.	St. Affairs
Compensation	.8756	.8695	.8325
Social Life	.9263	.8731	.8971
Working Conditions	.8205	.8490	.8324
Recognition	.8466	.8902	.7967
Quality of Education	.8587	.8571	.7987
Total Satisfaction	.9472	.9514	.9424

Hypothesis I: There are no significant differences in the level of student satisfaction among students on the basis of: age, sex, academic major, academic classification, and place of residence.

No significant differences were found among students of various ages on any of the variables measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. Means for which significant differences were found will be shown in the tables in chapter four. All others will be found in the appendix.

When students were grouped according to sex, a highly significant difference was found on the social life scale of the CSSQ. Female

students expressed significantly greater satisfaction with social life at Iowa State than did male students. There were no other significant differences found on the other scales when the student sample was grouped by sex.

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	42.65	9.90	11.747**
Female	<u>76</u>	<u>47.89</u>	<u>10.88</u>	
TOTAL	189	44.76	10.60	

**Highly significant at the .01 level

There were no significant differences found on any of the CSSQ scales when the students were grouped by college in which they were majoring.

There were no significant differences found in the level of student satisfaction among the various classifications of students - freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior.

A significant difference was found in the level of satisfaction with working conditions among students as they were grouped according to place of residence. The students residing in fraternity/sorority houses reported a higher level of satisfaction with working conditions than did students living in either residence halls or off-campus

accommodations. Significant differences were not found on any of the other CSSQ scales among students based on their place of residence.

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES
GROUPED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE
CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	41.57	7.57	3.311*
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	45.63	7.73	
Off Campus	63	43.68	7.96	
TOTAL	189	42.79	7.82	

*Highly significant at .05 level

A summarization of the findings for hypothesis I is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13
SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS I

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Sex	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
College Major	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Classification	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Place of Residence	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS

NS = No Significant Difference
S = Significant Difference
HS = Highly Significant Difference

Hypothesis II: There are no significant differences in how academic advisors perceive the level of student satisfaction when the academic advisors are grouped by: age, sex, college, and number of years at Iowa State.

A highly significant difference was found among the various groups of academic advisors in their perception of student satisfaction with social life at Iowa State. The academic advisors in the 23 - 30 years of age group perceived students to be more satisfied with social life than those in other age groups. Academic advisors in the 41 - 50 age group perceived students to be least satisfied with social life of all the age groups within the sample. The Scheffe Test revealed a significant difference between the 0 - 30 and the 41 - 50 age groups at the .05 level of significance. Significant differences were not found on any of the other CSSQ scales when academic advisors were

grouped by age.

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	44.74	7.23	4.024**
31 - 40	57	42.75	7.50	
41 - 50	48	39.06	6.20	
51 - 67	28	41.79	6.43	
TOTAL	152	41.66	7.09	

**Highly significant at .01 level

When academic advisors were grouped by sex, a significant difference was found on the compensation scale of the CSSQ. Male academic advisors perceived students to be more satisfied with compensation than did female academic advisors. Significant differences were not found on any of the other CSSQ scales between the academic advisors when grouped by sex.

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	41.78	6.13	4.219*
Female	31	39.23	6.33	
TOTAL	152	41.26	6.24	

*Significant at .05 level

When the academic advisors were grouped by college in which they are employed, a significant difference was found on the working conditions scale of the CSSQ. Academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived students to be most satisfied with working conditions, while those academic advisors in the College of Education perceived students to be least satisfied with this dimension of college student satisfaction. No other significant differences were found on the other CSSQ scales when the academic advisors were grouped by college.

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	40.80	8.41	2.706*
Education	6	33.17	3.54	
Engineering	38	37.18	5.89	
Home Economics	24	35.46	7.38	
Science and Humanities	59	36.86	6.57	
TOTAL	152	37.22	6.95	

*Significant at .05 level

Since there were only six academic advisors in the College of Education, another analysis was performed combining the academic advisors in the College of Education and the College of Science and Humanities. This combination caused significant differences to be realized on three CSSQ scales - social life, working conditions, and total satisfaction.

On the social life scale, academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived students to be more satisfied than academic advisors in the other colleges. Those academic advisors in the College of Engineering perceived the level of satisfaction with social life to be the lowest of all academic advisors.

TABLE 17
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	45.12	7.92	2.713*
Education, Science and Humanities***	65	41.38	7.06	
Engineering	38	40.16	6.39	
Home Economics	24	41.17	6.55	
TOTAL	152	41.66	7.09	

*Significant at .05 level

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

Academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived students to be more satisfied with their working conditions than academic advisors in the other colleges. Academic advisors employed in the College of Home Economics perceived the lowest level of student satisfaction with working conditions.

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	40.80	8.41	3.059*
Education/Science and Humanities***	65	36.52	6.43	
Engineering	38	37.18	5.89	
Home Economics	24	35.46	7.38	
TOTAL	152	37.22	6.95	

*Significant at .05 level

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

A significant difference was found in the total satisfaction scores among the academic advisors from the various colleges. The College of Agriculture's academic advisors perceived students to be more satisfied than academic advisors in the other colleges. Academic advisors in the College of Home Economics perceived students to be least satisfied of all academic advisors.

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	218.32	27.10	2.796*
Education, Science and Humanities***	65	202.88	24.65	
Engineering	38	203.45	29.82	
Home Economics	24	197.92	26.96	
TOTAL	152	204.78	27.25	

*Significant at .05 level

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

When grouped on the basis of numbers of years at Iowa State, a highly significant difference was found among academic advisors only on the social life scale of the CSSQ. Those academic advisors who have been at Iowa State from 0 - 4 years perceived students to be more satisfied with social life than other academic advisors. Those who have been at Iowa State 10 years and over perceived the lowest level of satisfaction with social life. The Scheffe Test substantiated a highly significant difference between the 0 - 4 group and the 10 and over group. A significant difference at the .05 level was also found between the 10 years and over group and the 5 - 9 year group, as well as the 0 - 4 year group.

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

No. of years at ISU	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	43.45	7.48	6.319**
5 - 9	46	42.89	7.02	
10 - 32	57	39.12	6.11	
TOTAL	152	41.66	7.09	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A summarization of the findings for hypothesis II is presented in Table 21.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS II

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Age	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Sex	S	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
College	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS
College***	NS	S	S	NS	NS	S
Years at ISU	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = No Significant Difference

S = Significant Difference

HS = Highly Significant Difference

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

Hypothesis III: There are no significant differences in how student affairs staff members perceive the level of student satisfaction when student affairs staff members are grouped by: age, sex, department within student affairs, and number of years at Iowa State.

There were no significant differences in how the various ages of the student affairs staff perceived the level of student satisfaction.

When grouped by sex, there were no significant differences found in how student affairs staff members perceived the level of student satisfaction.

Highly significant differences were found among the student affairs staff members of the various departments on the following scales: social life, recognition, quality of education, and total satisfaction.

Differences in perceptions of the level of student satisfaction with social life were highly significant. Those staff members who work at the Student Health Center perceived students to be more satisfied with social life than other student affairs staff members. Student Counseling Service staff members perceived satisfaction with social life to be lowest of any of the departments within student affairs. The Scheffe Test substantiated a highly significant difference between the perceptions of the staff members in Student Health and Student Counseling Services.

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
 RESPONSES GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	44.50	6.95	4.283**
Dean of Students	16	43.75	4.97	
Department of Residence	13	47.54	7.76	
Student Health Center	10	51.40	10.42	
Student Counseling Service	11	39.45	4.97	
TOTAL	60	45.18	7.82	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Highly significant differences were found in how student affairs staff members from the various departments perceived student satisfaction with recognition. Personnel working at the Student Health Center perceived a higher level of satisfaction than did staff members in the other student affairs departments. A significant difference was found, using the Scheffe Test, between the perceptions of persons working at the Student Health Center and in the Dean of Students Office. Staff members in the Dean of Students Office perceived the lowest level of student satisfaction with recognition.

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	37.50	5.91	3.973**
Dean of Students	16	33.81	5.71	
Department of Residence	13	37.77	4.99	
Student Health Center	10	41.30	4.60	
Student Counseling Service	11	34.00	5.00	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Perceptions of satisfaction with the quality of education were found to differ significantly at the .01 level among the various student affairs departments. Staff members employed at the Student Health Center perceived the highest level of satisfaction with quality of education of any of the student affairs staff. Personnel at the Student Counseling Service had the lowest perception on this variable of the various departments within student affairs. The Scheffe Test substantiated a significant difference in the levels of perception of satisfaction with quality of education between the staff members employed at the Student Health Center and the Student Counseling Service.

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	45.80	5.18	4.759**
Dean of Students	16	40.12	4.11	
Department of Residence	13	44.62	5.09	
Student Health Center	10	46.90	6.21	
Student Counseling Service	11	39.18	6.75	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Highly significant differences were realized in how staff members in the various student affairs departments perceived the level of total student satisfaction. Personnel employed at the Student Health Center perceived students to be more satisfied than staff members in the other student affairs departments.

At the .01 level of significance, through use of the Scheffe Test, a highly significant difference was found between the scores of those persons employed in the Student Health Center and the Student Counseling Service. At the .05 significance level, significant differences were found between staff members in the Dean of Students Office and the Student Health Center, as well as between those at Student Counseling and Student Health.

TABLE 25

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	211.30	22.87	5.036**
Dean of Students	16	197.37	20.06	
Department of Residence	13	214.62	20.83	
Student Health Center	10	277.40	29.35	
Student Counseling Service	11	188.64	20.94	

**Highly significant at .01 level

No significant differences were found in perceptions of student satisfaction when student affairs staff members were grouped on the basis of number of years at Iowa State.

A summarization of the findings for hypothesis III is presented in Table 26.

TABLE 26

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS III

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Sex	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Department	NS	HS	NS	HS	HS	HS
Years at ISU	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = No Significant Difference
S = Significant Difference
HS = Highly Significant Difference

Hypothesis IV: There are no significant differences between student satisfaction and academic advisors' perceptions of student satisfaction when compared by sex and college.

Highly significant differences were found between students and academic advisors and between men and women on the social life scale of the CSSQ. In addition, a highly significant interaction was found between sex and group.

Students expressed a higher level of satisfaction with social life at Iowa State than the academic advisors perceived. Females, grouping students and academic advisors together, scored higher on this scale than the males.

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR
AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
SEX ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	44.76	10.60	9.98**
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	42.26	8.62	7.78**
Female	107	45.83	9.84	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.66	9.90	7.93**
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.88	7.22	
Female Students	76	47.90	10.88	
Female Academic Advisors	31	40.77	6.56	

**Highly significant at .01 level

In looking at the individual group means on this scale, female students had the highest mean score and female academic advisors the lowest. The group means for male students and male academic advisors were quite comparable, with the male students scoring the higher of the two. Both group means for the two groups of males were higher than the group mean for female academic advisors and lower than the group mean for female students.

TABLE 28

INTERACTION CHART SHOWING THE MARGINAL AND CELL MEAN SCORES FOR STUDENTS, ACADEMIC ADVISORS, MEN, AND WOMEN FOR THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

	Men	Women	
Students	42.66	47.90	44.76
Academic Advisors	41.88 42.26	40.77 45.83	41.66

A highly significant difference was found between the students and academic advisors on the working conditions scale of the CSSQ.

The students reported a significantly higher level of satisfaction with their working conditions than the academic advisors perceived.

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.79	7.82	47.20**
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	40.12	7.35	.0616
Female	107	40.72	7.61	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.65	7.76	2.47
Male Academic Advisors	121	37.75	6.96	
Female Students	76	42.99	7.96	
Female Academic Advisors	31	35.16	6.66	

**Highly significant at .01 level

On the total satisfaction scale of the CSSQ, a significant difference was found between student and academic advisor scores. The students reported a higher level of total satisfaction than was perceived by the academic advisors.

TABLE 30

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	212.74	32.22	5.90*
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	208.94	29.73	.0887
Female	107	209.73	30.79	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	211.36	31.70	2.87
Male Academic Advisors	121	206.68	27.76	
Female Students	76	214.78	33.07	
Female Academic Advisors	31	197.35	24.18	

*Significant at the .05 level

Differences were not significant on the other CSSQ scales when academic advisors and students were grouped by sex.

When grouped by college, analysis was performed to determine the differences between students and academic advisors scores. This analysis was performed twice, once with five colleges and once with four colleges. The College of Education has so few academic advisors and students that it was combined with the Science and Humanities College for the second analysis.

A highly significant difference was realized between students and academic advisors on the social life scale. Students reported a higher level of satisfaction with social life than academic advisors perceived. There were no significant differences among the various colleges on this variable.

TABLE 31

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	44.76	10.60	9.64**
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	45.43	11.15	1.55
Education	17	43.82	6.70	
Engineering	65	40.97	7.06	
Home Economics	53	44.06	8.96	
Science and Humanities	146	43.31	9.42	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	45.66	12.95	.8676
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	45.12	7.92	
Education Students	11	46.82	7.21	
Education Academic Advisors	6	38.33	5.54	
Engineering Students	27	42.11	7.90	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	40.16	6.39	
Home Economics Students	29	46.45	10.53	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	41.47	6.54	

TABLE 31 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group x College</u>				
Science and Humanities Students	87	44.40	10.67	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	41.69	7.16	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A highly significant difference was found between students and academic advisors on the working conditions scale across the five colleges. The students expressed a higher level of satisfaction with working conditions than any of the academic advisors perceived.

TABLE 32

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.79	7.82	47.57**
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	42.78	8.42	1.91
Education	17	39.35	6.10	
Engineering	65	38.85	6.77	
Home Economics	53	39.62	7.41	
Science and Humanities	146	40.30	7.54	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	44.20	8.75	1.02
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	40.80	8.41	

TABLE 32 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group x College</u>				
Education Students	11	42.73	6.36	
Education Academic Advisors	6	33.17	3.54	
Engineering Students	27	41.18	7.15	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	37.18	5.89	
Home Economics Students	29	43.07	8.05	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	35.46	7.38	
Science and Humanities Students	87	42.63	7.78	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	36.86	6.58	
**Highly significant at .01 level				

On the total satisfaction scale, a significant difference was found between students and academic advisors. Students across all five colleges expressed a greater degree of total satisfaction with college than was perceived by any of the academic advisors.

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	212.74	32.22	5.92*
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	218.70	32.32	1.80
Education	17	206.18	32.87	
Engineering	65	205.06	26.73	
Home Economics	53	207.04	30.24	
Science and Humanities	146	208.25	30.05	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	218.97	35.54	.6311
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	218.32	27.10	
Education Students	11	211.82	39.79	
Education Academic Advisors	6	195.83	8.70	
Engineering Students	27	207.33	21.60	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	203.45	29.82	
Home Economics Students	29	214.59	32.70	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	197.92	26.96	
Science and Humanities Students	87	211.40	32.68	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	203.59	25.66	

*Significant at .05 level

No significant differences were found between the groups on the other CSSQ scales.

On the second analysis with the College of Education and the Science and Humanities College combined, significant differences were

again found on the social life, working conditions, and total satisfaction scales.

On the social life scale of the CSSQ, a highly significant difference was found between students and academic advisors. The students reported greater satisfaction with social life than was perceived by the academic advisors across colleges.

TABLE 34

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	44.76	10.60	9.65**
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	45.43	11.15	2.06
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	43.36	9.18	
Engineering	65	40.96	7.06	
Home Economics	53	44.06	8.96	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	45.66	12.95	.6972
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	45.12	7.92	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	44.67	10.34	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	41.38	7.06	
Engineering Students	27	42.11	7.90	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	40.16	6.39	
Home Economics Students	29	46.45	10.53	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	41.17	6.54	

**Highly significant at .01 level

***Academic Advisors and students in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

A highly significant difference between students and academic advisors was found on the working conditions scale. Students were more satisfied with their working conditions than academic advisors perceived them to be.

TABLE 35

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.79	7.82	47.66**
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	42.78	8.61	2.42
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	40.20	7.16	
Engineering	65	38.85	6.44	
Home Economics	53	39.62	7.76	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	44.20	8.75	1.054
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	40.80	8.41	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	42.64	7.60	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	36.52	6.43	
Engineering Students	27	41.18	7.15	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	37.18	5.89	
Home Economics Students	29	43.07	8.05	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	35.46	7.38	

**Highly significant at .01 level

***Academic advisors and students in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together.

A significant difference was found between students' reported level of total satisfaction and the perception of that level of satisfaction by academic advisors. Across all colleges, students were more satis-

fied than academic advisors perceived them to be.

TABLE 36

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	212.74	32.22	5.95*
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	218.70	32.32	2.37
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	208.03	30.17	
Engineering	65	205.06	26.73	
Home Economics	53	207.04	30.24	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	218.97	35.54	.7573
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	218.32	27.10	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	211.45	33.32	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	202.88	24.65	
Engineering Students	27	207.33	21.60	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	214.59	29.82	
Home Economics Students	29	214.59	32.70	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	197.92	26.96	

*Significant at .05 level

***Academic advisors and students in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities are grouped together

A summarization of the findings for hypothesis IV is presented in Table 37.

TABLE 37
SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS IV

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Students	NS	HS	HS	NS	NS	S
<u>Sex</u>						
Male and Female	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group and Sex	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Students	NS	HS	HS	NS	NS	S
College (5 Colleges)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group and College	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Students	NS	HS	HS	NS	NS	S
College (4 Colleges)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group and College	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = No Significant Difference
S = Significant Difference
HS = Highly Significant Difference

Hypothesis V: There are no significant differences between student satisfaction and student affairs staff members' perception of student satisfaction when grouped by sex.

Significant differences were found on only two of the CSSQ scales - social life and recognition - in this analysis.

A highly significant difference was found on the social life scale between males and females; however, not between students and students affairs staff members. Female students reported and female student affairs staff members perceived a higher level of satisfaction with social life than did male students or male members of the student affairs staff.

TABLE 38

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF AND STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	44.76	10.60	.0847
Student Affairs Staff	60	45.18	7.82	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	43.07	9.25	12.69**
Female	99	47.57	10.53	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.65	9.90	1.07
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	44.35	6.80	
Female Students	76	47.89	10.88	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	46.52	9.23	

**Highly significant at .01 level

On the recognition scale, a highly significant difference was found between students and members of the student affairs staff. Students reported a higher level of satisfaction with the amount of recognition they received than the students affairs staff perceived. The group means for males and females across these groups were quite similar and did not approach significance.

TABLE 39

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF AND
STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.01	7.93	23.93**
Student Affairs Staff	60	36.57	5.80	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	40.87	7.42	.2944
Female	99	40.42	7.62	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.32	7.92	.2153
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	36.46	5.61	
Female Students	76	41.54	7.99	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	36.74	6.22	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A summarization of hypothesis V is presented in Table 40.

TABLE 40

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS V

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
<u>Group</u>						
Student Affairs Staff and Students	NS	NS	NS	HS	NS	NS
<u>Sex</u>						
Male and Female	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<u>Group x Sex</u>						
	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = No significance
S = Significance
HS = Highly significant

Hypothesis VI: There are no significant differences in perceptions of student satisfaction between academic advisors and student affairs staff when grouped by: age, sex, and number of years at Iowa State.

When grouped by age, significant differences were found on the social life, working conditions, and recognition scales.

A highly significant difference was found between academic advisors' and student affairs staff members' perceptions of students' satisfaction with social life. Members of the student affairs staff perceived students to be more satisfied with the social life on campus than did academic advisors.

A significant difference was also found between the two age groups' perceptions of the level of student satisfaction with social life. Those academic advisors and student affairs staff in the 21-40 age group perceived students to be more satisfied with the social life dimension of college student satisfaction than those in the 41 years and over age group.

There was no interaction between group and age which reached significance.

TABLE 41

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE
ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	10.28**
Student Affairs Staff	60	45.18	7.82	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	43.89	7.46	5.34*
41 - over	98	41.22	6.90	
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisor				
21 - 40	76	43.25	7.44	2.08
Student Affairs Staff				
21 - 40	38	45.16	7.51	
Academic Advisors				
41 - over	76	40.07	6.38	
Student Affairs Staff				
41 - over	22	45.23	8.51	

**Highly significant at .01 level

*Significant at .05 level

Perceptions of student satisfaction with working conditions produced highly significant differences between academic advisors and student affairs staff members. Student affairs staff members perceived students to be more satisfied with working conditions than academic advisors. There were no significant differences on the basis of age on this variable.

TABLE 42

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE
ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	11.43**
Student Affairs Staff	60	40.78	6.73	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	38.73	7.16	.5298
41 - over	98	37.65	6.60	
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisors				
21 - 40	76	37.80	7.31	.6288
Student Affairs Staff				
21 - 40	38	40.58	6.84	
Academic Advisors				
41 - over	76	36.64	6.58	
Student Affairs Staff				
41 - over	22	41.14	6.69	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Highly significant differences were found on the recognition variable between student affairs staff members and academic advisors. Academic advisors perceived students to have a higher level of satisfaction with the amount of recognition they receive than did the student affairs staff. Age did not cause a significant difference on this variable.

TABLE 43

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE
ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	17.44**
Student Affairs Staff	60	36.57	5.80	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	39.58	7.48	.006
41 - over	98	40.15	6.82	
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisors				
21 - 40	76	41.46	8.06	1.434
Student Affairs Staff				
21 - 40	38	35.81	6.14	
Academic Advisors				
41 - over	76	40.82	7.23	
Student Affairs Staff				
41 - over	22	37.86	5.04	

**Highly significant at .01 level

When grouped by sex, significant differences were found on the following scales: social life, working conditions, and recognition.

A highly significant difference between the perceptions of the student affairs staff and academic advisors on the social life satisfaction scale was found. Student affairs staff members perceived a much higher level of student satisfaction with social life than did academic advisors. There were no significant differences discovered on this variable based on sex.

TABLE 44

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	10.02**
Student Affairs Staff	60	45.18	7.82	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	42.46	7.13	.006
Female	54	43.22	7.80	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.88	7.23	1.82
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	44.35	6.80	
Female Academic Advisors	31	40.77	6.56	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	46.52	9.23	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A highly significant difference between academic advisors and student affairs staff perceptions of student satisfaction with working conditions was found. Students affairs staff members perceived a higher level of satisfaction with working conditions among students than did academic advisors of either sex. There were no significant differences on the basis of sex.

TABLE 45

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	11.57**
Student Affairs Staff	60	40.78	6.73	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	38.37	6.77	1.31
Female	54	37.83	7.14	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	37.75	6.95	2.54
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	40.38	6.10	
Female Academic Advisors	31	35.16	6.66	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	41.43	7.74	

**Highly significant at .01 level

On the recognition scale of the CSSQ, there was a highly significant difference between perception of student satisfaction with recognition by academic advisors and members of the student affairs staff. Academic advisors perceived students to be more satisfied with recognition than did student affairs staff members. Sex did not cause any significant differences on this variable.

TABLE 46

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	17.44**
Student Affairs Staff	60	36.57	5.80	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	40.30	7.35	.695
Female	54	38.50	6.66	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.48	7.79	.666
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	36.46	5.61	
Female Academic Advisors	31	39.81	6.97	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	36.73	6.22	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Significant differences were found on the social life, working conditions, and recognition scales of the CSSQ when academic advisors and student affairs staff members were grouped by the number of years at Iowa State.

On the social life scale, highly significant differences were realized between academic advisors and student affairs staff, and between groups who had been at Iowa State different lengths of time.

Members of the student affairs staff perceived students to have a higher level of satisfaction with social life than did academic advisors. Those individuals, both student affairs staff members and academic advisors, who have been at Iowa State from 1 - 10 years perceived students to be more satisfied with social life than those who have been at Iowa State 11 years and over.

TABLE 47

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.66	7.09	10.37**
Student Affairs Staff	60	45.18	7.82	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	43.67	7.35	7.96**
11 - over	62	40.19	6.78	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	42.89	7.19	1.30
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	45.33	6.12	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	39.15	6.22	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	44.58	3.95	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Highly significant differences were found in perceptions of student satisfaction with working conditions between academic advisors and student affairs staff members. Members of the student affairs staff perceived students to be more satisfied with their working conditions than did academic advisors. There were no significant differences on the basis of the number of years at Iowa State.

TABLE 48

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	37.22	6.95	11.44**
Student Affairs Staff	60	40.78	6.73	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	38.73	7.41	1.45
11 - over	62	37.03	5.45	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	37.64	7.54	.000
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	41.04	7.13	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	36.38	5.55	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	39.75	4.96	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A highly significant difference was found between academic advisors and student affairs staff members perception of student satisfaction with recognition. Academic advisors perceived students to be more highly satisfied with recognition than did members of the student affairs staff. There were no significant differences based on the number of years at Iowa State.

TABLE 49

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	17.44**
Student Affairs Staff	60	36.57	5.80	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	39.73	7.33	.846
11 - over	62	37.03	6.73	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	41.05	7.94	1.58
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	35.85	5.82	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	41.32	7.07	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	39.42	4.96	

**Highly significant at .01 level

A summarization of hypothesis VI is presented in Table 50

TABLE 50
SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS VI

	Compensation	Social Life	Working Conditions	Recognition	Quality of Education	Total Satisfaction
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Student Affairs Staff	NS	HS	HS	HS	NS	NS
Age (21-40; 41-over)	NS	S	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group x Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Student Affairs Staff	NS	HS	HS	HS	NS	NS
Sex (male, female)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group x Sex	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<u>Group</u>						
Academic Advisors and Student Affairs Staff	NS	HS	HS	HS	NS	NS
Years at Iowa State (1-10, 11-over)	NS	HS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Group x Years	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
NS = No significance						
S = Significant						
HS = Highly significant						

The academic advisors and the student affairs staff members were also asked to respond to three supplemental questions in an attempt to determine those factors which they thought affected college student

satisfaction. For questions one and three, only the most frequently mentioned variables are included here. A total listing of all variables mentioned can be found in the Appendix. The questions and their responses follow:

Academic Advisors - Supplemental Questions

1. What variables do you think might affect or cause deviation in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University students?

TABLE 51

ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1
OF SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Response	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Major	36	23.68
Home life before college	29	19.08
Place of Residence	27	17.76
Finances	26	17.10
Age	24	15.79
Sex	22	14.47
Personal maturity	20	13.16
Academic classification	16	10.53
Motivation	16	10.53
Personality	16	10.53
Abilities	13	8.55
I. Q.	13	8.55
Goals	12	7.89
High school background	10	6.58

2. Age, sex, academic classification, major, and place of residence have been mentioned in the literature as some of the variables which might affect the level of college student satisfaction. What level of importance would you attach to each of these variables for Iowa State University students?

TABLE 52

ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2
OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Very Important
Age	13	16	34	55	26
Sex	14	28	55	45	5
Academic Classification	11	13	34	72	17
Academic Major	7	10	26	68	34
Place of Residence	10	15	36	68	18

3. Of the factors which you have mentioned in questions 1 and 2 as important in affecting the level of student satisfaction at Iowa State, which are the most difficult to identify for the students with whom you have contact?

TABLE 53

ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3
OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Response	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Place of Residence	28	18.42
Major	11	7.24
Personality	9	5.92
Financial resources	8	5.26
Academic classification	7	4.61
Age	7	4.61
Maturity level	7	4.61
Motivation	7	4.61
Opinion of peers	7	4.61
Background	6	3.95

Students Affairs Staff - Supplemental Questions

1. What variables do you think might affect or cause deviation in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University students?

TABLE 54

STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1
OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Response	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Place of Residence	14	23.33
Age	13	21.66
Major	13	21.66
Sex	10	16.66
Strong goal orientation - Career objective	10	16.66
Academic classification	9	15.00
Locale or family background	9	15.00
Marital status	7	11.66
Ethnic group	6	10.00
Identity and feeling of worth	6	10.00
Academic advisor	5	8.33
Academic talent	5	8.33
Financial problems or burdens	5	8.33
Quality of prior academic preparation	5	8.33

2. Age, sex, academic classification, major, and place of residence have been mentioned in the literature as some of the variables which might affect the level of college student satisfaction. What level of importance would you attach to each of these variables for Iowa State University students?

TABLE 55

STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2
OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Very Important
Age	2	6	9	28	13
Sex	2	12	25	18	1
Academic classification	1	7	16	22	11
Academic major	2	6	9	23	18
Place of Residence	1	3	13	31	10

3. Of the factors which you have mentioned in questions 1 and 2 as important in affecting the level of student satisfaction at Iowa State, which are the most difficult to identify for the students with whom you have contact?

TABLE 56

STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3
OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Response	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Major	6	10.00
Place of Residence	5	8.33
Self-concept	5	8.33

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Higher educational institutions are no longer in a market where they can disregard or ignore consumer reaction. It is important that the entire university community be concerned with the quality of experience its students are receiving and their reactions to the total university environment. Therefore, it seems imperative to this writer that higher educational institutions learn more about college student satisfaction, and those factors which influence it.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the similarities and differences in students' reported level of satisfaction and that level of satisfaction as perceived by academic advisors and the professional student affairs staff at Iowa State University as measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, referred to as the CSSQ.

Three hundred Iowa State University undergraduate students, three hundred academic advisors, and ninety-two members of the professional student affairs staff comprised the initial sample for this research. Useable responses were received from four hundred and one (401) individuals which represents 58.9 percent of the initial sample.

The data received from this sample were used to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences in the level of satisfaction among students.
2. There are no significant differences in how academic advisors perceive the level of student satisfaction.

3. There are no significant differences in how student affairs staff members perceive the level of student satisfaction.
4. There are no significant differences in students' reported level and academic advisors' perceived level of student satisfaction.
5. There are no significant differences in students' reported level and student affairs staff members' perceived level of student satisfaction.
6. There are no significant differences in perceptions of student satisfaction between academic advisors and student affairs staff members.

None of these hypotheses were supported by the data. In each case, some significant differences were found among and within the groups included in this investigation.

The ambiguity of the term student satisfaction is evident in the literature, as well as through discussion with others. The typical response when student satisfaction is mentioned is, "Satisfaction with what?" In reviewing the literature, it became evident that the definition of student satisfaction is determined by the instrument employed for measurement. In this research, the instrument used was the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. The five scales of the CSSQ encompass the total college environment and experience, both inside and outside the classroom. The student responses provide a benchmark by which a comparison of the academic advisors' and the student affairs staff members' perceptions can be made.

It is seldom that faculty and staff in the university attempt to take a global view of the student and his existence on campus. Most of the time each looks at their own area, i.e., how the student is doing in a particular course, if he is content with his living conditions, how much he is growing through a particular activity, or how effectively

he is dealing with some emotional or developmental problem.

Faculty and staff members seem to become so engrossed in their own areas that they begin generalizing from their individual vantage points as to the worth of the students' total college experience. Therefore, they often do not think or become concerned about students' development through all activities, both in and out of classes. Students cannot be segmented; however, there is a tendency for both faculty and staff to segment their concern for the students' total educational experience. Because faculty and staff are each specialists in their own areas, it is difficult for either group to have a global view of students' satisfaction with their university experience.

Some individuals who returned the questionnaire, but refused to participate, indicated that they did not have enough student contact on which to base their opinions or they could not generalize from the few students they knew to the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student.

It is little wonder that there were differences in perceptions of the level of student satisfaction found between academic advisors and student affairs staff members. Each group of individuals sees students for different reasons, and has specialized concerns for different segments of the student's life. Furthermore, differences were found within those two groups of individuals. Academic advisors as a total group do not have the same perceptions of student satisfaction. Differences were found between the perceptions of male and female academic advisors, between the colleges in which they were employed, and based on the number of years they had been at Iowa State.

Within the student affairs staff, highly significant differences were found in the perceptions of student satisfaction between the various departments in student affairs. The area of specialization within student affairs may be more pronounced than in the academic arena when one thinks of the departments such as the Student Health Center and the Student Counseling Service.

Both groups, academic advisors and student affairs staff, did not accurately perceive the level of satisfaction which the students reported. In all cases, on the scales for which a significant difference was realized, the students reported a higher level of satisfaction than was perceived by academic advisors, and in all but one case for the student affairs staff. As a generalization, it can be said that the student affairs staff more accurately perceived the level of student satisfaction which students reported than did the academic advisors.

Fewer differences were found among students' reported levels of satisfaction than was expected from a review of the literature and previous studies using the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The writer feels the following questions are important in furthering the knowledge of college student satisfaction. The reader should keep these questions in mind as the findings are discussed.

1. What aspects of the college setting are particularly satisfying or dissatisfying to students?
2. How satisfied are college students with their total college experience, which includes the physical, tangible aspects, such as study and lounge space, food service, and living conditions, and the campus reward system?
3. What factors affect satisfaction?

4. What types of things can be done within a campus community to increase the level of satisfaction?
5. What components of the campus environment could be changed to raise the level of student satisfaction?
6. How accurately do those persons in a position to affect student satisfaction actually perceive that level of satisfaction?

For the purpose of further clarification, the discussion will be divided into the categories determined by the six hypotheses previously stated. These categories are: students, academic advisors, student affairs staff, academic advisors and students, student affairs staff and students, and academic advisors and student affairs staff.

Discussion

Students

There were more similarities in the level of reported student satisfaction than differences found in this investigation. In comparing the raw scores on the six CSSQ scales with the percentile equivalents presented in the CSSQ Manual (1971) for students at public colleges and universities, Iowa State University students ranked from the 50th to the 65th percentiles. This indicates that they are not highly satisfied or dissatisfied, but in the middle range of satisfaction compared with other students attending public institutions, who participated in the normative group.

Differences in the level of satisfaction were found between male and female students on the social life scale, and between fraternity/and sorority, residence hall, and off-campus students on the working conditions scale.

The social life scale, according to the CSSQ Manual (1971), measures opportunities to meet socially relevant goals, such as dating, meeting compatible or interesting people, making friends, and participating in campus events and informal social activities.

Female students reported a significantly higher level of satisfaction with social life at Iowa State than did the male students. Historically speaking, Iowa State has had a curriculum which appealed to more men than women. This has created an imbalance in the undergraduate enrollment between men and women. There are still more male undergraduates than female, with the proportion being 60 percent male and 40 percent female. This difference in sheer numbers creates more opportunities for women to socialize with persons of the opposite sex than for men. The writer would theorize that women students are more satisfied with the social life at Iowa State because they are in a minority and, therefore, have a greater opportunity to meet persons of the opposite sex. The competitive dating situation is in their favor. The men, on the other hand, are at a disadvantage in this competitive setting, and, therefore, would tend to be less satisfied.

This finding is in agreement with the study by Schultz (1972) reported in Chapter 2 in which she found sex to effect the level of student satisfaction with social life. However, it is in disagreement with the Betz, Klingensmith and Menne study (1970) in which they found sex to have no effect on the level of student satisfaction.

Because college student satisfaction is not static, the time differences in which these studies were conducted could offer an explanation for the differences in the affect of sex on satisfaction.

Different student populations would be expected to react differently to the questionnaire, and would be satisfied by different things.

These differences in findings, when the same instrument was used at the same institution, indicate that further study is needed to determine more accurately the effect of sex on college student satisfaction.

The CSSQ Manual (1971) states that the working conditions scale measures the students' satisfaction with the physical conditions of his college life, such as cleanliness and comfort of his place of residence, adequacy of study areas on campus, quality of meals, and facilities for lounging between classes.

Students living in fraternity/sorority houses expressed significantly greater satisfaction with their working conditions than did students living in residence halls or in off-campus housing. Off-campus students expressed more satisfaction on this scale than residence hall students; however, the difference was not significant. This finding is supported by the 1970 Betz, Klingensmith, and Menne study which also found students living in fraternity/sorority houses to be more satisfied with working conditions than those students living in residence halls.

It could have been further expected from this previous study to find differences in satisfaction between fraternity/sorority and residence hall students on the social life, compensation, and the quality of education scales. However, the data from the present investigation does not indicate that place of residence affects the level of satisfaction for any dimension other than working conditions.

It is plausible to expect that those living in smaller groups, i.e., fraternity/sorority houses and off-campus, would be more satisfied

with working conditions since the opportunities for privacy and solitude would be greater than in a residence hall of several hundred students.

There were no significant differences found among students when grouped by age, major, or classification on any of the CSSQ scales. From the studies conducted by Martin (1968) and Sturtz (1971) reported in the literature review, differences in satisfaction based on classification and age could have been expected. Although a representative distribution of both classifications and age were present in this sample, no differences were found.

The demographic variables of age, sex, academic major, academic classification, and place of residence require further investigation before it will be clearly evident what effect they have on the level of college student satisfaction.

In responding to several of the questions raised earlier regarding the aspects of the college setting that are particularly satisfying or dissatisfying to students and the factors affecting satisfaction, the findings indicate that sex and place of residence affect satisfaction. Females are more satisfied with social life than males, and those students living in fraternity/sorority houses are more satisfied with working conditions than those students living off-campus or in residence halls.

Overall, there seems to be more similarity than difference in the level of student satisfaction at Iowa State; furthermore, that satisfaction is in the middle range of the normative CSSQ group - neither extremely satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Academic Advisors

The academic advisors included in this sample were instructed to respond to the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire as they thought the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student would respond. Their responses represent their perceptions of the level of college student satisfaction at Iowa State University. As the findings indicate, there is no unanimity of perceptions among the academic advisors. Significant differences in perceptions were found on the social life, compensation, working conditions, and total satisfaction scales of the CSSQ.

Significant differences were found on the social life scale when the academic advisors were grouped by age, number of years at Iowa State, and college in which they were employed.

The youngest group of academic advisors, the 23-30 age group, perceived students to be most satisfied with their social life while those academic advisors in the 41-50 age group perceived them to be least satisfied. When grouped by the number of years they had been at Iowa State, those academic advisors who had been at the institution the fewest number of years perceived students to be more satisfied than those advisors who had a longer tenure. In fact, the longer an academic advisor had been at Iowa State, the less satisfaction with social life he perceived. Significant differences were also found when the academic advisors were grouped by college, with the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities combined, on the social life scale. The academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived the highest level of satisfaction on this variable, and the College of

Engineering the lowest.

There are no obvious explanations for these differences in perceptions; however, it could be that the youngest group of academic advisors, which would include those with the shortest tenure, may have closer contact with students, and the students may feel more comfortable and open in discussing social life matters with them. In addition, it may be that the younger academic advisors frequent many of the same places and activities as the students and, therefore, are more aware of the students' level of satisfaction with social life. It is interesting to note that the social life scale was the only one on which there were differences when the academic advisors were grouped by age and number of years at Iowa State. The perceptions of the academic advisors do not differ as much by age as might be commonly expected.

The writer is somewhat perplexed by the finding that the academic advisors in the College of Agriculture and those in the College of Engineering differed so much in their perceptions of the level of satisfaction with social life, since both colleges have predominately male enrollments, and female students reported the higher level of satisfaction on this scale. The writer would have expected the academic advisors from the College of Home Economics to have perceived the highest level of satisfaction with social life since they have a predominately female enrollment. When the students were grouped by college, the scores of the Agriculture and Engineering students differed on the social life scale, but not significantly.

The findings on this scale lead the writer to conclude that academic advisors do not accurately perceive the level of student

satisfaction with social life regardless of their age, the number of years they have been at Iowa State, or the college in which they work, and the students with whom they have contact.

The compensation scale, according to the CSSQ Manual (1971), measures the level of satisfaction with the total amount of input (e.g., study) required relative to academic outcomes (e.g., grades) and the effect of input demands on the students' fulfillment of their other needs and goals. When grouped by sex, academic advisors differed significantly in how satisfied they perceived students to be with the amount of compensation they received. The male academic advisors perceived students to be more satisfied with compensation than did the female academic advisors.

A possible explanation for this difference in perception could be that female faculty members and students have voiced concern about a subtle discrimination against women in the university community. The argument expressed is that because Iowa State is predominately a male institution, both as far as students and faculty are concerned, women students have to produce at a higher level to get the same grades as their male counterparts. This explanation is tentative at best since there was no significant difference between male and female students reported on this scale.

It is interesting that the perceptions of the male and female academic advisors differed only on the compensation scale. The writer would have predicted significant differences on the social life scale as well, since the students differed significantly on that particular scale.

Significant differences were found in academic advisors perceptions of student satisfaction with working conditions when the advisors were grouped by colleges in which they were employed. Due to the small number of academic advisors in the College of Education, an analysis was computed with the College of Education by itself, and another when its advisors were combined with those in the College of Science and Humanities. In both analyses, the academic advisors employed in the College of Agriculture perceived the highest level of student satisfaction with their working conditions. The advisors in the College of Education perceived the least amount of satisfaction on the first computation, and the Home Economics advisors perceived the least amount on the second computation when the advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities were combined.

Since there were no significant differences realized on this scale when students were grouped by colleges in which they are majoring, it is difficult to explain the differences perceived on this scale by the academic advisors. Obviously the College of Agriculture academic advisors perceived students as being more satisfied with working conditions than academic advisors in other colleges. Perhaps the students with whom the Agriculture academic advisors have the most contact express positive feelings about their working conditions.

On the total satisfaction scale, which is a summation of the other five scales, the academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived a significantly higher level of satisfaction than academic advisors in the other colleges. This result is not too surprising

since these same advisors perceived a significantly higher level of satisfaction on several of the other CSSQ scales.

Although there is nothing in the data to explain it, the academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceive students to be significantly more satisfied than do academic advisors in other colleges.

Student Affairs Staff

When grouped by the department within student affairs in which they are employed, significant differences were found among student affairs staff members on four of the CSSQ scales: social life, recognition, quality of education, and total satisfaction.

On each of these four scales, personnel employed at the Student Health Center perceived the highest level of student satisfaction. On three of the scales, the personnel at the Student Counseling Service perceived the least amount of satisfaction. Personnel employed within the Dean of Students Office perceived the least amount of student satisfaction on the remaining scale.

The personnel at the Student Counseling Service perceived the least amount of student satisfaction on the social life, quality of education, and the total satisfaction scales. The CSSQ Manual (1971) indicates that the quality of education scale measures satisfaction with the various academic conditions related to the individual's intellectual and vocational development, such as the competence and helpfulness of faculty and staff, including advisors and counselors, and the adequacy of curriculum requirements, teaching methods, and assignments.

The most obvious explanation for the personnel at the Student Counseling Service perceiving the least amount of student satisfaction with social life and quality of education would come from their dealing day in and day out with students who are having problems with social life and/or problems related to career choice and academic progress. Since counseling is a problem oriented service, it can be expected that most of the counselor's time is spent dealing with students who have problems. Furthermore, it can be expected that the counselor's view of students in general is going to be strongly influenced by the students with whom the counselor's time is spent.

In addition, students view the Counseling Service as a place to go with complaints and concerns about social and educational matters; therefore, the personnel at the Counseling Service are more likely to hear complaints and criticisms in these areas than some of the other student affairs departments.

Personnel in the Dean of Students Office perceived the lowest level of student satisfaction on the recognition scale. This scale, according to the CSSQ Manual (1971) measures student satisfaction with attitudes and behaviors of faculty and students indicating acceptance of the students as a worthwhile individual.

Members of the Dean of Students Staff spend a great deal of time working with students who are dissatisfied or upset in some manner about their life at the university. In addition, a thrust of that office has been in the area of human relations programming in an attempt to improve relations between students and students, students and faculty, and students and administrative staff. As a result of this emphasis, this

staff may deal with more students who are dissatisfied with the amount of recognition they receive than other departments within student affairs.

Although their perceptions were not as low as the perceptions of personnel at the Student Counseling Service, the Dean of Students Staff members differed significantly with the Health Center personnel in their perceptions of the satisfaction with the quality of education and total satisfaction.

This indicates to the writer that the Dean of Students Staff, as well as the Counseling Service Staff, spend a lot of time dealing with student problems and concerns relative to educational quality. Students tend to view both offices as places where they can take problems.

There is no apparent reason for the positive perceptions of student satisfaction expressed by the Student Health Center staff. Since they deal primarily with "ill" students, it is surprising that they perceived such a high level of satisfaction in so many different areas. One possible explanation could be that students do not view the Health Center as a place to take problems and concerns which could be categorized in the social life, recognition, or quality of education areas; therefore, they do not "unload" these concerns on that group of people. This could give those persons an unrealistically positive impression of students' actual level of satisfaction.

No significant differences were found in the perceptions of student satisfaction when the student affairs staff were grouped by age, sex, and number of years at Iowa State.

Students and Academic Advisors

The student and academic advisor responses to the CSSQ were compared on all scales. In addition, comparisons were made grouping the students and academic advisors by sex, and by the college in which they were enrolled and employed respectively.

Significant differences were found between the students' reported level and the academic advisors' perceived level of student satisfaction on the social life, working conditions, and total satisfaction scales. In each case, the students reported a higher level of satisfaction than the academic advisors perceived.

On the social life scale significant differences were found between students and academic advisors, between men and women, and a significant interaction between the groups was also discovered.

Female students reported the highest level of satisfaction on the social life scale, and the female academic advisors perceived the lowest level of satisfaction. As was discovered when analyzing the responses of male and female students, females were significantly more satisfied on the social life scale of the CSSQ than males. When the perceptions of male and female academic advisors were analyzed, no significant differences were found in their perception of the level of satisfaction with social life.

The big difference was that the female academic advisors perceived a much lower level of satisfaction with social life than the female students. Why do the female academic advisors differ so much in their perceptions from what the female students report? It is possible that the female advisors in this sample have contact with advisees and other

students who are dissatisfied with their social life, and having problems meeting persons of the opposite sex. Since female advisors were not asked to respond to the CSSQ as they thought female students would respond, but as they thought the typical or average Iowa State student would respond, it is also possible that they may have been thinking about the level of male satisfaction since male students are in the majority on campus.

As discussed earlier, a possible explanation for a higher reported level of satisfaction by female students than males is that the female students are in the minority and, therefore, in greater demand than the men for dating types of activities.

The other differences found were not attributable to either sex or college, but to differences between students and academic advisors.

Differences were also found between students' reported level of satisfaction and academic advisors' perceived level of student satisfaction on the working conditions scale of the CSSQ. The students were significantly more satisfied with the working conditions, i.e., the physical conditions of college life, such as the cleanliness and comfort of place of residence, adequacy of study areas on campus, than the academic advisors perceive them to be. A plausible explanation for this might be that students complain about the physical conditions of college life, such as institutional food services and noise in their place of residence, which could definitely give academic advisors the feeling that students are not satisfied with their working conditions. Although students readily complain about such things, when asked to respond to a questionnaire or to find other alternatives to the things

about which they complain, they tend to react more positively. Complaints of this nature are an acceptable part of the student sub-culture, and are many times offered out of habit rather than cause. In other words, students may be projecting an attitude of dissatisfaction when in fact they are relatively satisfied.

Overall student satisfaction, as measured by the total satisfaction scale, was reported higher by the students than perceived by the academic advisors.

In looking at colleges individually, the students and academic advisors in the College of Agriculture have the least difference in their mean scores on each of these scales. The students consistently reported a slightly higher level of satisfaction than the advisors perceived; however, the reported and the perceived levels of satisfaction are very close. The greatest difference between reported and perceived levels of satisfaction by students and academic advisors was in the College of Education for the social life and working conditions scales and in the Home Economics College on the total satisfaction scale.

When the comparison was made with the combination of the Education and Science and Humanities Colleges, the College of Home Economics showed the largest discrepancies between students reported level and advisors perceived level of satisfaction on the social life, working conditions, and the total satisfaction scales. The College of Agriculture continued to have the least difference between students' reported level and advisors' perceived level of satisfaction.

Since the academic advising programs are somewhat different in

each college, it is possible that some academic advisors have a clearer perception of students' level of satisfaction as a result of the structure of their college program. The approach to academic advising used by each of the colleges may also differ. Emphasis in one college may be placed on registration, in another on academic progress, and in yet another on the personal life of the advisees. The differences in emphasis could cause a difference in perception of the level of student satisfaction.

However, the reader should remember that no significant differences were found between colleges, only between students and academic advisors across all colleges. When the academic advisors were looked at separately, some differences were found between colleges; however, this was not the case when looking at students separately.

This leads the writer to theorize that in some colleges the academic advisors "get closer" to their advisees than in other colleges; therefore, the advisors' perceptions of students' satisfaction do vary from college to college. However, in a general sense, the academic advisors do not accurately perceive the level of student satisfaction.

Students and Student Affairs Staff

The responses of the student and student affairs staff members were compared on all of the CSSQ scales. In addition, a comparison was made with the students and student affairs staff members grouped by sex. Significant differences were realized on the social life and recognition scales.

On the social life scale, a highly significant difference was found between males and females; however, no significant differences

were found between students and members of the student affairs staff. Female students reported and female students affairs staff members perceived a higher level of satisfaction with social life than did male students and male student affairs staff members. As was reported in the discussion of students' responses, male and female students reported significantly different levels of satisfaction on the social life scale, with the females reporting greater satisfaction. When the responses of the student affairs staff members were analyzed, no significant differences were discovered on the social life scale when the respondents were grouped by sex. Therefore, the differences reported here are attributable primarily to the reportedly higher level of satisfaction of female students. In addition, the mean score for the female student affairs staff members was higher than the mean score of the male staff members.

Possible explanations for the female students' level of satisfaction with social life have been presented earlier. Female student affairs staff members may be reflecting the satisfaction they perceive from female students and generalizing that to all students.

In the findings discussed for student affairs staff members, highly significant differences were found on the social life scale between the various departments with students affairs, with the Health Center personnel perceiving the highest level of satisfaction. Since a majority of the Health Center respondents were female, their perceptions could have definitely contributed to or possibly caused the differences which were found in comparison between students and student affairs staff on the social life scale.

A highly significant difference was found between students and student affairs staff members on the recognition scale of the CSSQ; however, there were no significant differences when the grouping was by sex. It is interesting that the students report a significantly higher level of satisfaction with this variable than is perceived by student affairs staff members. No doubt the students with whom many of the student affairs personnel work are dissatisfied with those factors which contribute to recognition, while those students who responded to the CSSQ seem fairly satisfied. The perceptions of the student affairs staff will be influenced by the students with whom they have the most contact, and since they have a great deal of contact with students having problems or difficulties of one kind or another, it may not be too surprising that they perceived less satisfaction than the students reported.

In general, the student affairs staff members perceived fairly accurately the students reported level of satisfaction.

Academic Advisors and Student Affairs Staff

Significant differences were found between the perceptions of academic advisors and student affairs staff members on three of the CSSQ scales - social life, working conditions, and recognition. On both the social life scale and the working conditions scale, the student affairs staff members perceived a higher level of student satisfaction than did the academic advisors.

From the earlier discussion it will be remembered that the academic advisors' perceptions of student satisfaction with social life

were significantly lower than the students reported, and the student affairs staff perceived a slightly higher level of satisfaction than the students reported.

Many of the student affairs staff members work in an advisory capacity with the students who plan and implement a number of the organized social activities on campus. If these staff members felt students were dissatisfied with these activities, it would be their responsibility to assist the students in developing some other alternatives; therefore, the student affairs staff may be biased in a positive direction, which could lead to a misperception of the level of student satisfaction with social life.

When the variables of age and number of years at Iowa State were introduced, it was found that the younger academic advisors and student affairs staff members and those individuals with the shortest tenure at Iowa State perceived the level of student satisfaction with social life to be significantly higher than did the older academic advisors and student affairs staff members with longer tenure. As has been discussed previously, a possible explanation is the probability that the newer, younger faculty and staff get more involved with students in social life situations, either through advising groups that sponsor activities, or attendance at some of the same social functions than do the older, longer tenured faculty and staff; therefore, their sensitivity to and perceptions of the undergraduate social scene would tend to be more accurate.

Student affairs staff members perceived a higher level of student satisfaction on the working conditions scale than the academic advisors.

Students reported and student affairs staff members perceived a similar level of satisfaction with working conditions; however, students and academic advisors differed significantly with the students reporting a higher level of satisfaction than perceived by the academic advisors.

Why do academic advisors perceive such a low level of satisfaction with students' working conditions? It could well be that they hear students complaining about their working conditions, i.e., their place of residence, study spaces, and lounge facilities, and base their perceptions on these complaints. As was mentioned earlier, this writer feels that many students complain about working conditions as a matter of habit rather than actual dissatisfaction. It is very acceptable in the student subculture to complain about institutional food services, group living situations, and study facilities. However, when pressed on any of the above issues to elaborate on complaints, many admit that it is not as bad as they first said. Those hearing such complaints, however, could easily perceive dissatisfaction with student working conditions.

The students affairs staff, on the other hand, is responsible for many of the facilities which relate to the working conditions of the student. Therefore, it could almost be expected that they would perceive a higher level of satisfaction with working conditions than the academic advisors. If the student affairs staff perceived a low level of satisfaction with this variable, they would definitely be expected to make the necessary changes to increase that level of satisfaction.

Academic advisors perceived a higher level of student satis-

faction on the recognition scale, which measures students' feelings of acceptance by the faculty and other students. The mean score for students on this scale was slightly higher than for academic advisors but not significantly so. Students are more satisfied with the amount of recognition they received than was perceived by either academic advisors or students affairs staff. One possible explanation for the perceived low level of satisfaction by the student affairs staff is that they work with many students in a counseling setting who are dissatisfied with their acceptance by faculty and other students. In addition, student affairs staff members may perceive faculty members as being unconcerned with students as individuals, and also unwilling to spend much informal time with students. This could be reflected in their perceptions of students' satisfaction with recognition.

There are rather large discrepancies in the perceptions of student satisfaction by both academic advisors and student affairs staff members. Neither group accurately perceived student satisfaction, and, furthermore, they disagree with each other in their misperceptions.

The academic advisors and the student affairs staff members were asked to respond to three supplemental questions in an attempt to determine those factors which they thought affected college student satisfaction, and which of those factors were difficult to determine about the students with whom they worked. Questions one and three were open-ended, and question two required a rating of importance for five factors.

Question one asked, What variables do you think might affect or cause deviations in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University

students? In comparing the responses of the academic advisors and the student affairs staff on this question, both groups ranked three of the same factors in the five most important and six of the same factors in the ten most important. The degree of importance was determined by the frequency with which the factor was mentioned. The most frequently mentioned factor by the academic advisors was a student's major, while the student affairs staff most often mentioned place of residence as affecting student satisfaction. The second most frequently mentioned factor by the academic advisors was a student's home life before coming to college, while that same factor tied with sixth place in the frequency ranking by the student affairs staff. A student's age and major tied for the second most frequently mentioned factor in the student affairs staff's responses to this question. The remainder of the five most frequently mentioned factors by academic advisors were place of residence, finances, and age. Sex and strong goal orientation - career objectives were both mentioned frequently by the student affairs staff and would be included in the five most frequently mentioned factors affecting student satisfaction.

There were differences between the two groups in what factors they thought have the most effect on student satisfaction; however, there was agreement on some factors. For instance, both groups agreed that major, place of residence, and age were among the five most frequently mentioned factors influencing student satisfaction. Furthermore, both groups acknowledged that sex, academic classification, and home life/family background were among the ten most frequently mentioned factors.

Since it is not possible to quantify the similarities or differences between these two groups, it is important to look at the trends, or more concisely, those factors which both groups feel affect the level of college student satisfaction.

The second question required the respondents to attach a level of importance ranging from very unimportant to very important to the variables of age, sex, academic classification, major, and place of residence. For purposes of comparison the responses marked important and very important were combined into a single category. For three of the five variables - age, major, and place of residence - a larger percentage of the student affairs staff than the academic advisors responded that the items were important. Sex and academic classification were seen as important by a larger percentage of academic advisors than student affairs staff members. The rankings in this question were quite similar to those mentioned frequently in question one. On the basis of percentage of the sample that responded to these items as either important or very important, the variables would be ranked from most to least important as follows for the academic advisors: major, academic classification, place of residence, age, and sex. For the student affairs staff the ranking from most important to least important would be as follows: (the first three received the same percentage response) age, major, place of residence, academic classification, and sex.

These rankings indicate that the two groups were fairly consistent in their impression of the importance of each of these variables as they relate to college student satisfaction. The emphasis is a little

different but the similarities are strong.

The third question asked the respondents to indicate which of the variables they mentioned in both questions one and two as having an important impact on satisfaction were the most difficult to identify for the student with whom they have contact.

The three most frequently mentioned variables by academic advisors were place of residence, major, and personality. The student affairs staff mentioned major, place of residence, and self-concept as the most difficult variables to identify for students with whom they have contact.

The purpose of this question was to determine if either group needed additional information to effectively work with students and assist in raising their level of satisfaction. The response to the question indicated to the writer that neither academic advisors nor student affairs staff members are hampered by a lack of information about the students with whom they work.

These questions have shown that academic advisors and student affairs staff members hold fairly similar perceptions of those factors which affect the level of student satisfaction.

Furthermore, neither group has a firm grasp of or understanding of the whole area of college student satisfaction. Finally, both groups of individuals are able to identify or obtain the information they think is necessary to affect a student's satisfaction while working with that individual.

Summary

The results of this study have not supported any of the original six hypotheses which were tested. Significant differences were found among the students' reported level of satisfaction, and among the perceptions of the academic advisors and student affairs staff members. Significant differences were also found between the groups as they were compared with one another.

When students were grouped by age, sex, academic classification, academic major, and place of residence, it was discovered that differences existed only when the grouping was by sex, and place of residence. Female students reported more satisfaction with social life at Iowa State than did male students and students residing in fraternity/sorority houses reported a higher level of satisfaction with their working conditions than did students residing either off-campus or in residence halls.

Differences were not found between students when they were grouped by age, academic classification, or academic major. This is contrary to what could have been expected from the literature which reviewed previous studies on college student satisfaction.

In response to several of the questions raised earlier in this discussion, it would seem that sex and place of residence are two factors which affect satisfaction. However, these two components only affect two aspects of satisfaction - social life and working conditions. The level of satisfaction varies little when students are grouped by age, sex, academic classification, academic major,

and place of residence. This study indicates that the aforementioned demographic variables have little affect on college student satisfaction.

Academic advisors were grouped by age, sex, college in which they are employed, and number of years they have been at Iowa State to compare their perceptions of college student satisfaction. Significant differences were found with each grouping. The youngest group of academic advisors, 23 - 30 years old, perceived a higher level of student satisfaction with social life than the other age groups. Male academic advisors perceived a greater amount of student satisfaction with compensation than female advisors. When the academic advisors were grouped by college in which they are employed, with all five colleges represented, academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived greater satisfaction with working conditions than did the advisors in the other colleges. The academic advisors in the College of Education perceived the lowest amount of satisfaction with working conditions. A further analysis was computed combining the academic advisors from the College of Education with those from the College of Science and Humanities. From this analysis, differences in perception were found on the social life, working conditions, and total satisfaction scales among the academic advisors in the different colleges. On each of these three scales, the academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived a higher level of satisfaction than the advisors in the other colleges. A significant difference was found among academic advisor's perceptions of student satisfaction with social life when the advisors were grouped by number of years at Iowa State. Those advisors who had been at Iowa State from 0-4 years perceived a

higher level of satisfaction than the advisors who had been at Iowa State a longer period of time.

From this analysis it is evident that different academic advisors perceive the level of student satisfaction differently. Age, years at Iowa State, sex, and college will affect the perceptions of student satisfaction.

The most significant findings in this particular analysis were the differences in the perceptions of the academic advisors employed in the College of Agriculture with the advisors employed in other colleges. Consistently, the College of Agriculture academic advisors perceived a higher level of satisfaction than the other advisors.

Age and number of years at Iowa State both affected the perceptions of student satisfaction with social life. These seem to be rather closely related since the youngest academic advisors and those at Iowa State the fewest number of years perceived the highest level of satisfaction. In many cases these would be the same persons. Many of the younger academic advisors have been at Iowa State a shorter time than the older advisors.

Student affairs staff members were grouped by age, sex, department within student affairs, and number of years at Iowa State to compare their perceptions of college student satisfaction. Significant differences in perceptions were found only when the grouping was by department within student affairs. Staff members at the Student Health Center perceived a significantly higher level of student satisfaction on the social life, recognition, quality of education, and total satisfaction scales than staff members in the other students affairs depart-

ments. Personnel at the Student Counseling Service perceived the lowest level of satisfaction on the social life scale, the quality of education scale and the total satisfaction scale. The Dean of Students staff perceived the lowest level of satisfaction on the recognition scale.

It is interesting that differences were not found among the student affairs staff where they were grouped by age, sex, and number of years at Iowa State. Furthermore, it is interesting to note the consistency with which the Health Center personnel perceived a higher level of student satisfaction than personnel in the other student affairs departments.

When academic advisors' perceptions of college student satisfaction were compared with the students' reported level of satisfaction significant differences were found on the social life, working conditions, and total satisfaction scales. In each case, the students reported a greater amount of satisfaction than was perceived by the academic advisors. When the advisors and students were grouped together by sex, a significant difference was found between males and females with significant interaction taking place on the social life scale. The female students expressed the greater amount of satisfaction on the social life scale and the female academic advisors perceived the lowest amount of satisfaction.

No significant differences were found when the academic advisors and students were grouped by college.

In response to one of the questions raised earlier, how accurately do those persons in a position to affect student satisfaction actually

perceive that level of satisfaction, it seems that academic advisors perceive students to be less satisfied than they are. What causes this discrepancy? How can it be corrected?

When student affairs staff members' perceptions of student satisfaction were compared with students' reported level of satisfaction, significant differences were found on the recognition scale of the CSSQ. Students reported a higher level of satisfaction with recognition than the student affairs staff perceived. Significant differences were not found on any of the other scales between students and student affairs staff. When these two groups were grouped by sex, a significant difference was found between males and females on the social life scale. The females scored higher on this scale than the males primarily due to the high level of satisfaction reported by the female students.

With the exception of one scale, the student affairs staff perceived the level of student satisfaction quite accurately.

When the perceptions of the academic advisors were compared with the perceptions of the student affairs staff, differences were found on the social life, working conditions, and recognition scales. Student affairs staff members perceived a higher level of student satisfaction with social life and working conditions than did academic advisors. The academic advisors perceived greater student satisfaction with recognition than did the student affairs staff.

When academic advisors and student affairs staff members were grouped by age, and number of years at Iowa State, significant differences were realized on the social life scale. Those persons in the 21 - 40 years of age group perceived a higher level of satisfaction

with social life than the 41 years and over group. Similarly, those persons who had been at Iowa State from 1 -10 years perceived a higher level of satisfaction with social life than those who had a longer tenure.

There were no differences between the groups attributable to sex.

It is interesting that the student affairs staff perceived greater student satisfaction with social life and working conditions since these are two broad areas for which the student affairs staff assumes some responsibility. In the same vein, academic advisors probably have more of an influence in the recognition area and they perceived greater satisfaction on that scale than did the student affairs staff. It's possible that each group's perceptions are influenced by the areas for which they feel some responsibility.

Students reported less variation in their level of satisfaction than was perceived by either the academic advisors or the student affairs staff members. There was greater disagreement between the reported and perceived satisfaction when the students were compared with the academic advisors than when the students were compared with the student affairs staff members.

Significant differences were found in the perceptions of academic advisors when compared by college and in the student affairs staff when compared by college and in the student affairs staff when compared by department. It seems that the college or department in which a person is employed may affect his perception of student satisfaction more than any other factor. However, the same cannot be said for students since no significant differences were found when students were grouped by college.

Academic advisors in the College of Agriculture and student affairs staff members in the Student Health Center perceived greater student satisfaction than advisors or staff in other colleges or departments.

The student affairs staff seems to perceive the level of student satisfaction more accurately than academic advisors.

Although the academic advisors and student affairs staff identified a number of variables which they felt affected college student satisfaction, most of these variables did not seem to cause a difference in reported satisfaction by the students in this sample. For instance, the academic advisors listed academic major as one of the most important determinants of college student satisfaction; however, when students were grouped by major, no significant differences were found in their level of reported satisfaction. The student affairs staff did list place of residence as an important factor in determining satisfaction, and it did prove significant on the working conditions scale, but not on any of the others. Sex of the student was assumed to have little effect on the level of student satisfaction by the academic advisors and the student affairs staff; however, it was found to be significant on the social life scale.

These findings substantiate the fact that academic advisors and student affairs staff members are not aware of the factors which affect college student satisfaction.

Throughout each of these comparisons differences were realized on the social life scale. This was not true for any of the other scales. It seems there were more discrepancies regarding the level of

satisfaction with social life than any other variable measured by the CSSQ.

Female students are satisfied with the social life at Iowa State while males are less than satisfied, and those students residing in fraternity/sorority houses are more satisfied with their working conditions than other students.

On the whole, Iowa State University students do not vary greatly from one another on the variables measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. However, their level of satisfaction is not accurately perceived by their academic advisors and the student affairs staff - two groups of individuals who could do a great deal to alter those factors which affect college student satisfaction.

Recommendations

1. Since students reported differences on the social life and working conditions scale, further study needs to be done to determine specifically what factors caused the differences on each scale. This would provide the information necessary to manipulate the variables that could raise the level of student satisfaction.
2. Although there were not wide differences in the level of satisfaction reported by students, they reported a rather neutral level of satisfaction when compared with the normative group. Therefore, more study is warranted to determine specifically what things could be done to increase the level of Iowa State students' satisfaction.

3. Because the results of this study and several of those cited in the literature differed on the affect that the demographic variables of age, sex, major, academic classification, and place of residence have on a student's level of satisfaction, the need for further study is indicated to determine if, in fact, any or all of them influence the level of satisfaction.
4. Studies on students' satisfaction should be replicated in the same university community at fairly short intervals because the student population is constantly changing, and satisfaction is not static.
5. The affect that factors, such as family background and the students' financial situation, have on the students' level of satisfaction should be explored. There may be a number of "outside" variables that affect college student satisfaction over which the university faculty and staff have no control.
6. The university community needs to be sensitized to the importance of student satisfaction and a concern for students' needs to be expressed throughout the community.
7. During the course of this study, a number of differences were discovered between perceptions of student affairs staff and academic advisors. A program needs to be developed to insure open and accurate communication between these two groups of individuals regarding students and their frustrations and satisfactions with the university community. This program should strive to provide a total rather than a segmented perspective of student life in the university community.

8. Further investigation into the similarities and differences of the academic advising programs in the various colleges is warranted. There were wide discrepancies between students reported and advisors perceived levels of satisfaction by colleges.
9. Individual colleges should pair academic advisors and students and administer the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire to each. This would provide a clear picture of the accuracy of perceptions and could provide information on which to base changes in approach or technique if needed.
10. Since the academic advisors in the College of Agriculture perceived a consistently higher level of student satisfaction and their perceptions accurately matched students reports, it would be well to attempt to determine the reasons behind this so it could be shared with other colleges whose advisors had perceptions at the other end of the scale.

LITERATURE CITED

- Almos, Kermit Odell. 1957. A study of interrelationships between measured satisfaction with college and certain academic and personality variables. *Dissertation Abstracts* 17, No. 3: 561.
- Berdie, Ralph F. 1944. The prediction of college achievement and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 28: 239-245.
- Betz, Ellen L.; Klingensmith, John E.; and Menne, John W. 1970. The measurement and analysis of college student satisfaction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance* 3: 110-118.
- Betz, Ellen L.; Menne, John W.; Starr, Ann M.; and Klingensmith, John E. 1971. A dimensional analysis of college student satisfaction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance* 4, No. 2: 99-106.
- Betz, E. L.; Starr, A. M.; and Menne, J. W. 1972. College student satisfaction in ten public and private colleges and universities. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 13: 456-461.
- Cosand, Joseph. 1973. Tomorrow's students, tomorrow's colleges - who plans? Selected Major Speeches and Excerpts from the National Association of Student Personnel Administrator's 55th Annual Conference. Monograph No. 4.
- Ducanis, Alex J. 1962. An investigation of institutional environment and student satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts* 22, No. 11: 3935.
- Glenny, Lyman A. 1973. The '60's in reverse. *The Research Reporter* 8, No. 3. Berkeley, California: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
- Hecklinger, Fred J. 1972. The undecided student - is he less satisfied with college? *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 13: 247-251.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. 1973. *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated.
- Korman, Abraham K. 1971. Environmental ambiguity and focus of control as interactive influences on satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 55: 339-342.
- Martin, Roger D. 1968. Freshman satisfaction with college. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 9, No. 6: 382-383.

- Menne, Jack. 1974. Undergraduate dropouts at I.S.U. Unpublished Report #74-03, Student Counseling Service, Iowa State University.
- Pervin, L. A. 1967a. Satisfaction and perceived self-environment similarity: a semantic differential study of student-college interaction. *Journal of Personality* 35: 623-634.
- Pervin, Lawrence. 1967b. A twenty-college study of student x college interaction using TAPE (transactional analysis of personality and environment): rationale, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 58: 290-302.
- Popham, W. James. 1967. *Educational Statistics*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Rand, Leonard P. 1968. Effect on college choice satisfaction of matching student and colleges. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 47, No. 1: 34-38.
- Richardson, Thomas Edward. 1969. The relationship of congruence between student orientation toward higher education and campus environment to student satisfaction on selected campuses. *Dissertation Abstracts* 29, No. 7: 2360.
- Robinson, Lehmann Franklin. 1968. Relation of student persistence in college to satisfaction with environmental factors. *Dissertation Abstracts* 28, No. 8A: 2959.
- Salzman, Murray. 1970. Perceptions of the college environment and need dispositions as related to expressed satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts* 31, No. 3: 1023.
- Schmidt, DuMont K., and Sedlacek, William E. 1972. Variables related to university student satisfaction. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13, No. 3: 233-237.
- Schultz, Lynda Kay. 1972. Personality correlates of college student satisfaction. Unpublished M. S. Thesis, Iowa State University.
- Seymour, John Carey. 1964. The relationship of student role concept and self concept to academic success and satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts* 25, No. 1: 301.
- Starr, Ann M.; Betz, Ellen L.; and Menne, John W. 1971. *College student satisfaction questionnaire manual*. Ames, Iowa: Central Iowa Associates, Incorporated.
- Starr, A.; Betz, E. L.; and Menne, J. W. 1972. Differences in college student satisfaction: academic dropouts, non-academic dropouts, and non-dropouts. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 19: 318-322.

- Startup, Richard. 1972. Student satisfaction with academic services. Educational Research 14, No. 2: 135-140.
- Sturtz, Sue. 1971. Age differences in college student satisfaction. Journal of College Student Personnel 13: 220-222.
- Westlund, Ruth E. 1960. Students of high academic potentiality and their satisfaction with college experiences. Dissertation Abstracts 20, No. 7: 2685.
- Willsey, Alan Douglas. 1971. College student satisfaction and academic performance. Dissertation Abstracts International 32, No. 6: 3063A.

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTERS

January 30, 1974

Dear

You have been selected, through a random selection process, to participate in a research study on college student satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to compare students' reported level of satisfaction with the perceptions of that level of satisfaction by academic advisors and student affairs staff members at Iowa State.

Your participation will require only 15 - 20 minutes of your time to respond to the seventy items on the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. This questionnaire will give you a chance to tell how you feel about your university -- what things you are satisfied with, and what things you are not satisfied with. Your responses will be strictly confidential. The data received from this project will be used for the author's dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D. in Education.

A schedule indicating the times and places that the CSSQ will be available to you has been enclosed. Please select the time and location most convenient to you.

This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Bryan, Head of the Department of Professional Studies in Education; Dr. Milton D. Brown, Associate Professor of Education; Dr. Wilbur L. Layton, Vice-President for Student Affairs; Dr. Anton Netusil, Associate Professor of Education; and Dr. Richard D. Warren, Professor of Sociology and Statistics.

Your participation and cooperation in this study will certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
Assistant Director of Residence
C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons

SCHEDULE FOR TAKING THE COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

February 1, Friday	4:15 - 5:15	C3115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons
February 2, Saturday	11:00 - 1:00	C3115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons
February 4, Monday	11:30 - 1:00 5:00 - 6:45 8:30 - 9:45	206 Memorial Union Friley Hall Conference Room - 1204 C3115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons
February 5, Tuesday	11:00 - 12:45 4:30 - 6:00	C3115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons C1265 Wallace-Wilson Commons

If you are unable to fill out the questionnaire at any of the above times, it will be available at my office, C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons, between 8AM and 5PM February 4 through February 8. Please drop in at your convenience.

February 6, 1974

Dear ISU Student,

Since you were unable to attend any of the sessions for administration of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, I have enclosed a copy for your convenience, and ask that you please take 15 minutes to fill it out. I have also enclosed, for your convenience, a stamped, self-addressed envelope, and ask that you return the questionnaire and answer sheet in the envelope by Friday, February 15, 1974.

As I have mentioned in my first communication to you, the data gathered will be held in strict confidence. It will be used in a comparative, descriptive manner in the author's Ph.D. dissertation.

Your help and cooperation in this project is highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
Assistant Director of Residence
C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons

January 30, 1974

Dear Academic Advisor:

You have been selected to participate in a research study on college student satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to compare students' reported level of satisfaction with the perceptions of that level of satisfaction by academic advisors and student affairs staff at Iowa State.

Your participation will require only 15 - 20 minutes to respond to the seventy items on the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, and about five additional minutes to respond to the four supplemental questions. Your responses will be strictly confidential. The data received from this project will be used for the author's dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D. in Education.

This research study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Bryan, Head of the Department of Professional Studies in Education; Dr. Milton D. Brown, Associate Professor of Education; Dr. Wilbur L. Layton, Vice-President for Student Affairs; Dr. Anton Netusil, Associate Professor of Education; and Dr. Richard D. Warren, Professor of Sociology and Statistics.

Dr. George Christensen, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and the University Academic Advising Committee have been apprised of this project.

Please return the questionnaire, answer sheet, and supplemental questions, in this same envelope, to your departmental office by Wednesday, February 13, 1974. I will pick them up from there.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
Assistant Director of Residence
C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons

February 14, 1974

Dear Academic Advisors:

I realize that you have been besieged by questionnaires from aspiring doctoral students recently, and regret that mine has to be added to your work load.

I am writing to ask that you will take the 15 minutes necessary to fill out the CSSQ (College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire). Please return the answer sheet, questionnaire, and supplemental questions to me via campus mail.

As I mentioned in my first communication with you, the data gathered will be held in strict confidence. It will be used in a comparative, descriptive manner in the author's Ph.D. dissertation.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to help me in this project.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons

March 4, 1974

Dear Student Affairs Staff Member:

You have been selected to participate in a research study on college student satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to compare students' reported level of satisfaction with the perceptions of that level of satisfaction by academic advisors and student affairs staff at Iowa State.

Your participation will require only 15 - 20 minutes to respond to the seventy items on the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, and about five additional minutes to respond to the four supplemental questions. Your responses will be strictly confidential. The data received from this project will be used for the author's dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph.D. in Education.

This research study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Bryan, Head of the Department of Professional Studies in Education; Dr. Wilbur L. Layton, Vice-President for Student Affairs; Dr. Anton Netusil, Associate Professor of Education; and Dr. Richard D. Warren, Professor of Sociology and Statistics.

Please return the questionnaire, answer sheet, and supplemental questions to the Dean or Director of your division of Student Affairs. I will pick them up there.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Hallenbeck
Assistant Director of Residence
C2115 Maple-Willow-Larch Commons

APPENDIX B: COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE,
DIRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS
FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE - FORM C

By Betz, Menne, Klingensmith

Copyright 1971 - Central Iowa Assoc. Inc.

DIRECTIONS FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS

This questionnaire includes 70 items regarding satisfactions and dissatisfactions of college students. Respond to the questions as you would expect the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student to respond.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Record the following information in the appropriate blanks at the top of your answer sheet:
 - a. Your name
 - b. Your age and sex
 - c. In the blank labeled "school" write the name of the college (agriculture, education, engineering, home economics, or science and humanities) in which you are employed.
 - d. Omit the blank labeled "City".
 - e. In the blank labeled "Grade or Class", indicate the number of years you have been at Iowa State.
2. In the questionnaire booklet you will find 70 statements dealing with College Student Satisfaction.

RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS AS YOU WOULD EXPECT THE "TYPICAL" OR "AVERAGE" IOWA STATE STUDENT TO RESPOND.

3. Mark your answers on the answer sheet by blackening the space numbered 1,2,3,4, or 5 which best represents how satisfied you perceive students to be. Use the following key:
 1. Very Dissatisfied
 2. Somewhat Dissatisfied
 3. Satisfied, no more, no less
 4. Quite Satisfied
 5. Very Satisfied

NOTE: Use a number 2 or soft pencil (not a pen).

THE ITEMS ON THE ANSWER SHEET ARE NUMBERED ACROSS THE PAGE FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, NOT FROM TOP TO BOTTOM.

COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE - FORM C

By Betz, Menne, Klingensmith

Copyright 1971 - Central Iowa Assoc. Inc.

DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

This questionnaire includes 70 items regarding satisfactions and dissatisfactions of college students. Respond to the questions as you would expect the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student to respond.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Record the following information in the appropriate blanks at the top of your answer sheet:
 - a. Your name
 - b. Your age and sex
 - c. In the blank labeled "school" write the name of the division of student affairs (Admissions and Records, Dean of Students Office, Department of Residence, Financial Aids, Minority Student Program, Office of International Educational Services, Student Counseling Service, or Student Health Service) in which you are employed.
 - d. Omit the blank labeled "City".
 - e. In the blank labeled "Grade or Class", indicate the number of years you have been employed at Iowa State.
2. In the questionnaire booklet, you will find 70 statements dealing with College Student Satisfaction.

RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS AS YOU WOULD EXPECT THE "TYPICAL" OR "AVERAGE" IOWA STATE STUDENT TO RESPOND.

3. Mark your answers on the answer sheet by blackening the space numbered 1,2,3,4, or 5 which best represents how satisfied you perceive students to be. Use the following key:
 1. Very Dissatisfied
 2. Somewhat Dissatisfied
 3. Satisfied, no more, no less
 4. Quite Satisfied
 5. Very Satisfied

NOTE: Use a number 2 or soft pencil (not a pen).

THE ITEMS ON THE ANSWER SHEET ARE NUMBERED ACROSS THE PAGE FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, NOT FROM TOP TO BOTTOM.

DIRECTIONS

This booklet contains 70 items regarding satisfactions and dissatisfactions of college students. Its purpose is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your university -- what things you are satisfied with, and what things you are not satisfied with.

How to Fill Out the Questionnaire

1. First, record the following information in the appropriate blanks at the top of your answer sheet.

- a. Your name
- b. Your age and sex
- c. In the blank labeled "school", write the subject you are majoring in.
- d. In the blank labeled "City", indicate where you live while at college, choosing one from the following list: Dormitory, Sorority, Fraternity, Rooming House, Apartment, At Parent's Home, or Other.
- e. In the blank labeled "Grade or Class", write in your class (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, or Graduate Student).

2. In the questionnaire booklet, you will find 70 statements about your university.

Read each statement carefully.

Decide how satisfied you are with that aspect of your school described in the statement.

3. Mark your answers on the answer sheet by blackening the space numbered 1,2,3,4, or 5 which best represents how satisfied you are. Use the following key:

- 1 -- if you are VERY DISSATISFIED
- 2 -- if you are SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 3 -- if you are SATISFIED, no more, no less
- 4 -- if you are QUITE SATISFIED
- 5 -- if you are VERY SATISFIED

NOTE: Be sure to use a number 2 or soft pencil (not a pen).

THE ITEMS ON THE ANSWER SHEET ARE NUMBERED ACROSS THE PAGE FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, NOT FROM TOP TO BOTTOM.

COLLEGE STUDENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE - Form C
By Betz, Menne, Klingensmith
Copyright 1971 - Central Iowa Associates, Inc.

<u>Key</u>	1 means: I am VERY DISSATISFIED
	2 means: I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
	3 means: I am SATISFIED, no more, no less
	4 means: I am QUITE SATISFIED
	5 means: I am VERY SATISFIED

INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOU ARE WITH:

1. The opportunity to make close friends here.
2. The amount of work required in most classes.
3. The way teachers talk to you when you ask for help.
4. The competence of most of the teachers in their own fields.
5. The amount of study it takes to get a passing grade.
6. The chances of getting a comfortable place to live.
7. The chance you have of doing well if you work hard.
8. The amount of personal attention students get from teachers.
9. The chance "to be heard" when you have a complaint about a grade.
10. The friendliness of most students.
11. The help that you can get when you have personal problems.
12. The availability of good places to live near the campus.
13. The ability of most advisors in helping students develop their course plans.
14. The cleanliness of the housing that is available for students here.
15. The chance to take courses that fulfill your goals for personal growth.
16. The kinds of things that determine your grades.
17. The preparation students are getting for their future careers.

<u>Key:</u>	1 means: I am VERY DISSATISFIED
	2 means: I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
	3 means: I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
	4 means: I am QUITE SATISFIED.
	5 means: I am VERY SATISFIED

INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOU ARE WITH:

18. The chance to have privacy when you want it.
19. The chance to work on projects with members of the opposite sex.
20. Teachers' expectations as to the amount that students should study.
21. The availability of good places to study.
22. The fairness of most teachers in assigning grades.
23. The interest that advisors take in the progress of their students.
24. The places provided for students to relax between classes.
25. The social events that are provided for students here.
26. Teachers' concern for students' needs and interests.
27. The chance to get scheduled into the courses of your choice.
28. The activities and clubs you can join.
29. The difficulty of most courses.
30. The chance to get help in deciding what your major should be.
31. The chance to get acquainted with other students outside of class.
32. The availability of your advisor when you need him.
33. The chances to go out and have a good time.
34. The pressure to study.
35. The chance of getting a grade which reflects the effort you put into studying.
36. The quality of the education students get here.
37. The number of D's and F's that are given to students.
38. The concern here for the comfort of students outside of classes.

Key: 1 means: I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
 2 means: I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
 3 means: I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
 4 means: I am QUITE SATISFIED.
 5 means: I am VERY SATISFIED.

INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOU ARE WITH:

39. The things you can do to have fun here.
40. The chance for a student to develop his best abilities.
41. The chance of having a date here.
42. The chances of getting acquainted with the teachers in your major area.
43. The chance to explore important ideas.
44. The quality of the material emphasized in the courses.
45. The chance of getting into the courses you want to take.
46. The noise level at home when you are trying to study.
47. The amount of time you must spend studying.
48. The availability of comfortable places to lounge.
49. The chances for men and women to get acquainted.
50. The counseling that is provided for students here.
51. The chance to prepare well for your vocation.
52. The chance to live where you want to.
53. The chance you have for a "fair break" here if you work hard.
54. The friendliness of most faculty members.
55. The chances to meet people with the same interest as you have.
56. What you learn in relation to the amount of time you spend in school.
57. The choice of dates you have here.
58. The amount of study you have to do in order to qualify someday for a job you want.

<u>Key:</u>	1 means: I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
	2 means: I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
	3 means: I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
	4 means: I am QUITE SATISFIED.
	5 means: I am VERY SATISFIED.

INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOU ARE WITH:

59. The kinds of things you can do for fun without a lot of planning ahead.
60. The willingness of teachers to talk with students outside of class time.
61. The places where you can go just to rest during the day.
62. The campus events that are provided for students here.
63. The practice you get in thinking and reasoning.
64. Your opportunity here to determine your own pattern of intellectual development.
65. The chance to participate in class discussions about the course material.
66. The activities that are provided to help you meet someone you might like to date.
67. The sequence of courses and prerequisites for your major.
68. The availability of quiet study areas for students.
69. The chance you have to substitute courses in your major when you think it is advisable.
70. The appropriateness of the requirements for your major.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS
AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

DIRECTIONS: After you have responded to the CSSQ as you expect the "typical" or "average" Iowa State University student to respond, please answer the following questions, giving your own opinions.

1. What variables do you think might affect or cause deviations in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University students?

2. Age, sex, academic classification, major, and place of residence have been mentioned in the literature as some of the variables which might affect the level of college student satisfaction. What level of importance would you attach to each of these variables for Iowa State University students?

1. means Very Unimportant
2. means Unimportant
3. means Neutral
4. means Important
5. means Very Important

Circle the number which most adequately describes the importance you attach to each variable.

Age	1	2	3	4	5
Sex	1	2	3	4	5
Academic Classification	1	2	3	4	5
Academic Major	1	2	3	4	5
Place of Residence	1	2	3	4	5

3. Of the factors which you have mentioned in questions 1 and 2 as important in affecting the level of student satisfaction at Iowa State, which are the most difficult to identify for the students with whom you have contact?

4. Send me a summary of the results of this study. _____ YES _____ NO

If yes, please give name and address.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

APPENDIX G: TABLES SHOWING NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
ON THE CSSQ SCALES FOR THE SIX HYPOTHESES

TABLE 57

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
17, 18	25	39.16	8.03	.340
19	46	40.26	8.55	
20	44	40.55	7.22	
21	39	40.28	7.06	
22 - 32	35	41.57	9.43	
Total	189	40.43	8.02	

TABLE 58

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
17, 18	25	47.28	11.48	.751
19	46	43.61	11.72	
20	44	45.98	9.68	
21	39	43.92	9.05	
22 - 32	35	43.89	11.21	
Total	189	44.76	10.60	

TABLE 59

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
17, 18	25	44.28	7.74	.492
19	46	42.85	7.75	
20	44	43.11	8.51	
21	39	42.56	6.75	
22 - 32	35	41.49	8.38	
Total	189	42.79	7.82	

TABLE 60

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
17, 18	25	41.92	7.12	.754
19	46	41.41	7.59	
20	44	42.52	7.86	
21	39	40.69	7.61	
22 - 32	35	43.66	9.35	
Total	189	42.01	7.93	

TABLE 61

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	S	F-value
17, 18	25	42.76	6.60	.234
19	46	42.89	8.11	
20	44	41.80	7.40	
21	39	43.44	7.47	
22 - 32	35	43.00	10.28	
Total	189	42.75	8.03	

TABLE 62

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
AGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
17, 18	25	215.40	28.52	.126
19	46	211.02	31.13	
20	44	213.95	32.97	
21	39	210.90	27.71	
22 - 32	35	213.60	40.42	
Total	189	212.74	32.22	

TABLE 63

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY SEX ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	40.76	8.05	.482
Female	76	39.93	8.00	
Total	189	40.43	8.02	

TABLE 64

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY SEX ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	42.65	7.76	.081
Female	76	42.99	7.96	
Total	189	42.79	7.82	

TABLE 65

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY SEX ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	42.32	7.92	.437
Female	76	41.54	7.99	
Total	189	42.01	7.93	

TABLE 66

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY SEX ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	42.97	8.32	.215
Female	76	42.42	7.64	
Total	189	42.75	8.03	

TABLE 67

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY SEX ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	113	211.36	31.70	.508
Female	76	214.78	33.07	
Total	189	212.74	32.22	

TABLE 68

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	41.26	8.38	.357
Education	11	40.55	9.42	
Engineering	27	39.44	5.65	
Home Economics	29	39.34	7.94	
Science and Humanities	87	40.75	8.44	
Total	189	40.43	8.02	

TABLE 69

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	45.66	12.95	.793
Education	11	46.82	7.21	
Engineering	27	42.11	7.90	
Home Economics	29	46.45	10.53	
Science and Humanities	87	44.40	10.67	
Total	189	44.76	10.60	

TABLE 70

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	44.20	8.75	.581
Education	11	42.73	6.36	
Engineering	27	41.19	7.15	
Home Economics	29	43.07	8.05	
Science and Humanities	87	42.63	7.78	
Total	189	42.79	7.82	

TABLE 71

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	43.60	7.98	.685
Education	11	39.73	10.94	
Engineering	27	42.26	6.77	
Home Economics	29	42.28	9.00	
Science and Humanities	87	41.48	7.50	
Total	189	42.01	7.93	

TABLE 72

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	44.26	8.69	.525
Education	11	42.00	9.13	
Engineering	27	42.33	6.81	
Home Economics	29	43.45	7.67	
Science and Humanities	87	42.14	8.17	
Total	189	42.75	8.03	

TABLE 73

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	35	218.97	35.55	.575
Education	11	211.82	39.79	
Engineering	27	207.33	21.60	
Home Economics	29	214.59	32.70	
Science and Humanities	87	211.40	32.68	
Total	189	212.74	32.22	

TABLE 74

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshman	41	38.61	7.83	1.472
Sophomore	44	40.30	8.00	
Junior	49	40.37	7.48	
Senior	54	42.07	8.56	
Total	188	40.46	8.03	

TABLE 75

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshman	41	44.71	11.21	.165
Sophomore	44	44.82	11.54	
Junior	49	44.08	10.41	
Senior	54	45.56	9.72	
Total	188	44.81	10.60	

TABLE 76

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshman	41	42.22	7.62	.822
Sophomore	44	43.68	8.03	
Junior	49	41.63	8.26	
Senior	54	43.63	7.47	
Total	188	42.81	7.83	

TABLE 77

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshman	41	40.51	6.76	.835
Sophomore	44	42.39	7.59	
Junior	49	41.84	9.15	
Senior	54	43.06	7.93	
Total	188	42.03	7.95	

TABLE 78

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshmen	41	42.83	6.34	.962
Sophomore	44	42.20	8.36	
Junior	49	41.67	7.72	
Senior	54	42.22	9.16	
Total	188	42.78	8.04	

TABLE 79

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED BY
CLASSIFICATION ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Classification	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Freshman	41	208.88	29.23	.937
Sophomore	44	213.39	29.65	
Junior	49	209.59	34.17	
Senior	54	218.54	34.57	
Total	188	212.89	32.23	

TABLE 80

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	40.36	8.02	1.424
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	38.17	7.35	
Off-Campus	63	41.40	8.20	
Total	189	40.43	8.02	

TABLE 81

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	44.40	10.49	2.880
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	49.46	9.43	
Off-Campus	63	43.56	10.86	
Total	189	44.76	10.60	

TABLE 82

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	42.08	8.15	.056
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	41.50	6.90	
Off-Campus	63	42.08	8.06	
Total	189	42.01	7.93	

TABLE 83

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	43.20	7.75	.338
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	42.17	6.29	
Off-Campus	63	42.25	9.08	
Total	189	42.75	8.03	

TABLE 84

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT RESPONSES GROUPED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Place of Residence	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Residence Hall	102	211.61	32.31	.264
Fraternity/Sorority House	24	216.92	27.51	
Off-Campus	63	212.97	34.02	
Total	189	212.74	32.22	

TABLE 85

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	42.11	4.62	2.180
31 - 40	57	42.11	7.01	
41 - 50	48	39.37	5.58	
51 - 67	28	42.18	6.16	
Total	152	41.26	6.24	

TABLE 86

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	39.00	6.54	.738
31 - 40	57	37.40	7.56	
41 - 50	48	36.25	7.11	
51 - 67	28	37.32	5.60	
Total	152	37.22	6.95	

TABLE 87

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	41.58	6.73	1.802
31 - 40	57	41.42	8.51	
41 - 50	48	39.31	6.89	
51 - 67	28	43.39	7.20	
Total	152	41.14	7.64	

TABLE 88

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	42.11	6.40	1.575
31 - 40	57	43.09	7.60	
41 - 50	48	43.19	4.74	
51 - 67	28	45.82	6.94	
Total	152	43.50	6.58	

TABLE 89

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
23 - 30	19	209.53	21.91	1.984
31 - 40	57	206.77	32.49	
41 - 50	48	197.19	21.81	
51 - 67	28	210.50	25.60	
Total	152	204.78	27.25	

TABLE 90

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	41.88	7.23	.604
Female	31	40.77	6.56	
Total	152	41.66	7.09	

TABLE 91

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	37.75	6.95	3.480
Female	31	35.16	6.66	
Total	152	37.22	6.95	

TABLE 92

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	41.48	7.79	1.184
Female	31	39.81	6.97	
Total	152	41.14	7.64	

TABLE 93

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	43.79	6.65	1.113
Female	31	42.39	6.25	
Total	152	43.50	6.58	

TABLE 94

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	121	206.68	27.76	2.924
Female	31	197.35	24.18	
Total	152	204.78	27.25	

TABLE 95

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	42.76	5.70	.894
Education	6	40.17	4.71	
Engineering	38	41.29	6.69	
Home Economics	24	39.50	7.03	
Science and Humanities	59	41.42	5.95	
Total	152	41.26	6.24	

TABLE 96

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	45.12	7.92	2.356
Education	6	38.33	5.54	
Engineering	38	40.16	6.39	
Home Economics	24	41.17	6.55	
Science and Humanities	59	41.69	7.16	
Total	152	41.66	7.09	

TABLE 97

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	44.68	8.03	1.708
Education	6	41.17	5.34	
Engineering	38	40.76	8.85	
Home Economics	24	39.83	7.35	
Science and Humanities	59	40.41	6.69	
Total	152	41.14	7.64	

TABLE 98

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	44.96	5.32	.737
Education	6	43.00	5.90	
Engineering	38	44.05	8.02	
Home Economics	24	41.96	6.68	
Science and Humanities	59	43.20	6.08	
Total	152	43.50	6.58	

TABLE 99

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	218.32	27.10	2.203
Education	6	195.83	8.70	
Engineering	38	203.44	29.82	
Home Economics	24	197.92	26.96	
Science and Humanities	59	203.59	25.66	
Total	152	204.78	27.25	

TABLE 100

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	42.76	5.70	1.123
Education/Science and Humanities***	65	41.31	5.82	
Engineering	38	41.29	6.69	
Home Economics	24	39.50	7.03	
Total	152	41.26	6.24	

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and Humanities grouped together.

TABLE 101

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	44.68	8.03	2.273
Education/Science and Humanities***	65	40.48	6.54	
Engineering	38	40.76	8.85	
Home Economics	24	39.83	7.35	
Total	152	41.14	7.64	

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and
Humanities grouped together.

TABLE 102

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

College	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Agriculture	25	44.96	5.32	.988
Education/Science and Humanities***	65	43.18	6.02	
Engineering	38	44.05	8.02	
Home Economics	24	41.96	6.68	
Total	152	43.50	6.58	

***Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and Science and
Humanities grouped together.

TABLE 103

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED
BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	42.65	6.19	2.07
5 - 9	46	40.13	6.46	
10 - 32	57	40.96	5.97	
Total	152	41.26	6.24	

TABLE 104

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED
BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE
CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	38.98	6.51	2.351
5 - 9	46	36.30	8.26	
10 - 32	57	36.46	5.94	
Total	152	37.22	6.95	

TABLE 105

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED
BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE
CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	42.37	7.96	1.039
5 - 9	46	40.17	7.72	
10 - 32	57	40.86	7.28	
Total	152	41.14	7.64	

TABLE 106

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED
BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE
CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	44.18	7.30	1.783
5 - 9	46	41.98	6.71	
10 - 32	57	44.14	5.66	
Total	152	43.50	6.58	

TABLE 107

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES GROUPED
BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE ON THE
CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 4	49	211.63	26.70	2.328
5 - 9	46	201.48	30.24	

TABLE 107- Continued

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
10 - 32	57	201.54	24.41	
Total	152	204.78	27.25	

TABLE 108

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	41.52	5.67	.099
31 - 40	13	41.62	6.16	
41 - 63	22	40.86	5.78	
Total	60	41.30	5.73	

TABLE 109

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	46.36	8.24	.860
31 - 40	13	42.85	5.43	
41 - 63	22	45.23	8.51	
Total	60	45.18	7.82	

TABLE 110

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	40.52	6.03	.049
31 - 40	13	40.69	8.46	
41 - 63	22	41.14	6.69	
Total	60	40.78	6.73	

TABLE 111

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	35.88	5.45	.867
31 - 40	13	35.69	7.53	
41 - 63	22	37.86	5.05	
Total	60	36.57	5.80	

TABLE 112

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	41.64	5.67	1.159
31 - 40	13	43.46	5.91	
41 - 63	22	44.27	6.51	
Total	60	43.00	6.06	

TABLE 113

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Age	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
0 - 30	25	205.92	24.93	.182
31 - 40	13	204.31	27.98	
41 - 63	22	209.36	25.65	
Total	60	206.83	25.51	

TABLE 114

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	40.97	5.47	.312
Female	23	41.83	6.21	
Total	60	41.30	5.73	

TABLE 115

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	44.35	6.80	1.094
Female	23	46.52	9.23	
Total	60	45.18	7.82	

TABLE 116

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	40.38	6.10	.345
Female	23	41.43	7.74	
Total	60	40.78	6.73	

TABLE 117

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	36.46	5.62	.031
Female	23	36.74	6.22	
Total	60	36.57	5.80	

TABLE 118

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	43.08	5.71	.015
Female	23	42.87	6.72	
Total	60	43.00	6.06	

TABLE 119

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Sex	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Male	37	205.24	22.82	.371
Female	23	209.39	29.69	
Total	60	206.83	25.51	

TABLE 120

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	40.90	5.45	1.321
Dean of Students	16	41.19	5.09	
Department of Residence	13	42.85	5.81	
Student Health Center	10	43.20	6.97	
Student Counseling Service	11	38.27	5.18	
Total	60	41.30	5.73	

TABLE 121

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
GROUPED BY DEPARTMENT ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Department	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
Admissions and Records	10	42.60	6.20	2.272
Dean of Students	16	38.50	6.19	
Department of Residence	13	41.85	6.80	
Student Health Center	10	44.60	5.64	
Student Counseling Service	11	37.73	7.31	
Total	60	40.78	6.73	

TABLE 122

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	42.18	5.88	.740
3 - 9	19	40.11	6.28	
10 - 34	13	41.15	4.51	
Total	60	41.30	5.73	

TABLE 123

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ SOCIAL LIFE SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	45.14	7.73	.330
3 - 9	19	46.16	7.49	
10 - 34	13	43.85	8.89	
Total	60	45.18	7.82	

TABLE 124

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	40.29	6.91	.698
3 - 9	19	42.26	7.65	
10 - 34	13	39.69	4.75	
Total	60	40.78	6.73	

TABLE 125

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	35.68	6.43	1.288
3 - 9	19	36.37	4.99	
10 - 34	13	38.77	5.29	
Total	60	36.57	5.80	

TABLE 126

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	42.21	5.38	1.017
3 - 9	19	42.74	7.59	
10 - 34	13	45.08	4.77	
Total	60	43.00	6.06	

TABLE 127

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS AT IOWA STATE
 ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Number of Years	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
1 and 2	28	205.50	26.15	.074
3 - 9	19	207.63	28.37	
10 - 34	13	208.54	21.09	
Total	60	206.83	25.51	

TABLE 128

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	40.43	8.02	1.096
Academic Advisors	152	41.26	6.24	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	41.29	7.09	2.734
Female	107	39.73	7.31	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	40.76	8.02	.902
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.78	6.13	
Female Students	76	39.93	8.00	
Female Academic Advisors	31	39.23	6.33	

TABLE 129

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.01	7.93	1.04
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	41.88	7.83	1.38
Female	107	41.04	7.49	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.32	7.92	.210
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.48	7.79	
Female Students	76	41.54	7.99	
Female Academic Advisors	31	39.81	6.97	

TABLE 130

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.75	8.03	.855
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	234	43.39	7.78	.918
Female	107	42.41	7.37	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.97	8.32	.207
Male Academic Advisors	121	43.79	6.65	
Female Students	76	42.42	7.64	
Female Academic Advisors	31	42.39	6.25	

TABLE 131

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	40.43	8.02	1.079
Academic Advisors	152	41.26	6.24	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	41.88	6.78	.924
Education	17	40.41	7.48	
Engineering	65	40.52	7.32	
Home Economics	53	39.41	7.57	
Science and Humanities	146	41.02	7.62	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	41.26	8.38	.162
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	42.76	5.70	

TABLE 131 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
Group x College				
Education Students	11	40.55	9.42	
Education Academic Advisors	6	40.17	4.71	
Engineering Students	27	39.44	5.65	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	41.29	6.69	
Home Economics Students	29	39.35	7.94	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	39.50	7.03	
Science and Humanities Students	87	40.75	8.44	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	41.42	5.95	

TABLE 132

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.01	7.93	1.044
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	44.05	7.97	1.849
Education	17	40.24	9.13	
Engineering	65	41.38	7.72	
Home Economics	53	41.17	8.17	
Science and Humanities	146	41.05	7.09	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	43.60	7.98	.479
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	44.68	8.03	
Education Students	11	39.73	10.94	
Education Academic Advisors	6	41.17	5.35	
Engineering Students	27	42.26	6.77	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	40.76	8.85	
Home Economics Students	29	42.28	9.00	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	39.83	7.35	
Science and Humanities Students	87	41.48	7.50	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	40.41	6.69	

TABLE 133

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR RESPONSES
 GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.75	8.03	.849
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	44.55	7.34	.815
Education	17	42.35	7.27	
Engineering	65	43.34	7.72	
Home Economics	53	42.77	7.20	
Science and Humanities	146	42.57	7.39	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	44.26	8.69	.380
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	44.96	5.32	
Education Students	11	42.00	9.13	
Education Academic Advisors	6	43.00	5.90	
Engineering Students	27	42.33	6.81	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	44.05	8.02	
Home Economics Students	29	43.45	7.67	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	41.96	6.68	
Science and Humanities Students	87	42.14	8.17	
Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	59	43.20	6.08	

TABLE 134

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	40.43	8.02	1.084
Academic Advisors	152	41.26	6.24	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	41.88	7.25	1.208
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	40.96	7.36	
Engineering	65	40.52	6.03	
Home Economics	53	39.42	7.48	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	41.26	8.38	.191
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	42.76	5.70	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	40.72	8.50	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	41.31	5.82	
Engineering Students	27	39.44	5.65	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	41.29	6.69	
Home Economics Students	29	39.35	7.94	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	39.50	7.03	

***Students and Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and
Science and Humanities combined.

TABLE 135

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ RECOGNITION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.01	7.93	1.05
Academic Advisors	152	41.14	7.64	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	44.05	8.01	2.42
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	40.96	7.37	
Engineering	65	41.38	7.73	
Home Economics	53	41.17	8.19	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	43.60	7.98	.520
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	44.68	8.03	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	41.29	7.91	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	40.48	6.54	
Engineering Students	27	42.26	6.77	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	40.76	8.85	
Home Economics Students	29	42.28	9.00	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	39.83	7.35	

***Students and Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and
Science and Humanities combined.

TABLE 136

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISOR
RESPONSES GROUPED BY COLLEGE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.75	8.03	.855
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	
<u>College</u>				
Agriculture	60	44.55	6.97	1.09
Education/Science and Humanities***	163	42.55	7.21	
Engineering	65	43.34	7.63	
Home Economics	53	42.77	7.09	
<u>Group x College</u>				
Agriculture Students	35	44.26	8.70	.510
Agriculture Academic Advisors	25	44.96	5.32	
Education/Science and Humanities Students	98	42.12	8.23	
Education/Science and Humanities Academic Advisors	65	43.19	6.02	
Engineering Students	27	42.33	6.81	
Engineering Academic Advisors	38	44.05	8.02	
Home Economics Students	29	43.45	7.67	
Home Economics Academic Advisors	24	41.96	6.68	

***Students and Academic Advisors in the Colleges of Education and
Science and Humanities combined.

TABLE 137

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	40.43	8.02	.696
Student Affairs Staff	60	41.30	5.73	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	40.81	7.07	.191
Female	99	40.37	7.13	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	40.76	8.05	.535
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	40.97	5.47	
Female Students	76	39.93	8.00	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	41.83	6.21	

TABLE 138

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.79	7.82	3.170
Student Affairs Staff	60	40.78	6.73	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	42.09	7.08	.263
Female	99	42.63	7.82	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.66	7.76	.098
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	40.38	6.10	

TABLE 138 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Female Students	76	42.99	7.96	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	41.43	7.74	

TABLE 139

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	42.75	8.03	.048
Student Affairs Staff	60	43.00	6.06	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	43.00	7.27	.227
Female	99	42.53	7.19	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	42.97	8.32	.022
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	43.08	5.71	
Female Students	76	42.42	7.63	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	42.87	6.72	

TABLE 140

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR STUDENTS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX
ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Students	189	212.74	32.22	1.67
Student Affairs				
Staff	60	206.83	25.51	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	150	209.85	28.88	.808
Female	99	213.53	31.49	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Students	113	211.36	31.70	.006
Male Student				
Affairs Staff	37	205.24	22.82	
Female Students	76	214.78	33.07	
Female Student				
Affairs Staff	23	209.39	29.69	

TABLE 141

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.26	6.24	.002
Student Affairs Staff	60	41.30	5.73	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	41.92	6.17	2.86
41 - over	98	40.51	5.86	
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisors				.280
21 - 40	76	42.10	6.46	
Student Affairs Staff				5.76
21 - 40	38	41.55	5.76	
Academic Advisors				5.92
41 - over	76	40.41	5.92	
Student Affairs Staff				5.78
41 - over	22	40.86	5.78	

TABLE 142

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON
THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	.261
Student Affairs Staff	60	43.00	6.06	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	42.65	6.53	2.841
40 - over	98	44.18	6.09	

TABLE 142 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	S	F-values
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisors				
21 - 40	76	42.84	7.29	.119
Student Affairs Staff				
21 - 40	38	42.26	5.74	
Academic Advisors				
41 - over	76	44.16	5.75	
Student Affairs Staff				
41 - over	22	44.27	6.51	

TABLE 143

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY AGE ON
THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	.254
Student Affairs Staff	60	206.83	25.51	
<u>Age</u>				
21 - 40	114	206.76	28.13	.591
41 - over	98	203.72	24.67	
<u>Group x Age</u>				
Academic Advisors				
21 - 40	76	207.46	30.08	1.246
Student Affairs Staff				
21 - 40	38	205.37	25.65	
Academic Advisors				
41 - over	76	202.09	23.99	
Student Affairs Staff				
41 - over	22	209.36	25.65	

TABLE 144

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisor	152	41.26	6.24	.002
Student Affairs Staff	60	41.30	5.73	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	41.59	5.97	1.813
Female	54	40.33	6.24	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	41.78	6.13	2.843
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	40.97	5.47	
Female Academic Advisors	31	39.23	6.33	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	41.83	6.21	

TABLE 145

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	.259
Student Affairs Staff	60	43.00	6.06	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	43.62	6.21	.870
Female	54	42.59	6.39	

TABLE 145 - Continued

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	43.78	6.65	.305
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	43.08	5.71	
Female Academic Advisors	31	42.39	6.25	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	42.87	6.72	

TABLE 146

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY SEX ON
THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	.256
Student Affairs Staff	60	206.83	25.51	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	158	206.34	25.13	1.059
Female	54	202.48	26.35	
<u>Group x Sex</u>				
Male Academic Advisors	121	206.68	27.76	2.295
Male Student Affairs Staff	37	205.24	22.82	
Female Academic Advisors	31	197.35	24.18	
Female Student Affairs Staff	23	209.39	29.69	

TABLE 147

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ COMPENSATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-value
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	41.26	6.24	.002
Student Affairs Staff	60	41.30	5.73	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	41.25	6.37	.004
11 - over	62	41.31	5.09	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	41.29	6.44	.121
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	41.17	6.12	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	41.18	5.85	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	41.83	3.95	

TABLE 148

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ QUALITY OF EDUCATION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	43.50	6.58	.261
Student Affairs Staff	60	43.00	6.06	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	42.87	6.77	2.839
11 - over	62	44.55	5.28	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	43.09	7.04	.568
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	42.40	6.23	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	44.34	5.47	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	45.42	4.81	

TABLE 149

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-VALUES FOR ACADEMIC ADVISOR AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS STAFF RESPONSES GROUPED BY NUMBER OF YEARS
AT IOWA STATE ON THE CSSQ TOTAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Source	N	\bar{X}	s	F-values
<u>Group</u>				
Academic Advisors	152	204.78	27.25	.253
Student Affairs Staff	60	206.83	25.51	
<u>Years at Iowa State</u>				
1 - 10	150	205.91	27.92	.161
11 - over	62	204.03	21.97	
<u>Group x Years</u>				
Academic Advisors				
1 - 10	102	205.96	29.08	.804
Student Affairs Staff				
1 - 10	48	205.79	26.79	
Academic Advisors				
11 - over	50	202.36	23.17	
Student Affairs Staff				
11 - over	12	211.00	19.99	

**APPENDIX D: RESPONSES TO SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS
1 AND 3 FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS
AND STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF**

Academic Advisor Responses to Supplemental Question 1: What variables do you think might affect or cause deviation in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University students?

Major

Home life before college

Place of residence

Finances

Age

Sex

Personal maturity

Academic classification

Motivation

Personality

Abilities

I.Q.

Goals

High school background

Relationship with academic advisor

Quality of instruction

Marital status

College

Extracurricular activities

Quality of social life

Relations with peers

Academic department

Race

G.P.A.

Motivation to study and succeed

Size of classes

Reason for being at ISU

Career prospects

Grades

Parental attitude toward college

In-state vs out-of-state

Interpersonal relations

Self-concept

Availability of teaching staff

Response to pressure, choices, and challenges

Experiences

Cost and availability of recreational opportunities

Interests

High school and junior college requirements of academic accountability

Relative academic standing in previous classes

Being an individual

Job opportunities

Enthusiasm for an education

Socio-economic level

Opinions of peers

Faculty

Facilities

Independence
 Classroom competition
 Nationality
 Home influence re: choice of major
 Poor high school counseling re: major field of study
 Common sense
 Ego
 Employment opportunities within the field of study during school years
 Nature and nurture
 Departmental unity
 Pressure at the end of a quarter
 Travel
 Religion
 Size of the city
 Reputation of Iowa State
 Career orientation
 Failure to relate performance standards with learning
 Individual initiative
 Interest in course content
 Individual problems
 Academic success
 Psychological make-up
 Time of year
 Shortness of time on the quarter system
 Summer job experiences
 Help sessions with instructors
 Department
 Aggressiveness of student
 Academic environment
 Career goals
 Social level
 Length of residency
 Need for more expressed concern for each student in the classroom
 Teach students how to become real scholars
 Academic control
 Personal controls
 Advising
 Weather
 Family problems
 Health
 Fear of talking with faculty
 Gregariousness
 Unclear class objectives
 Instructor's personality
 Meaningful interaction on campus
 Appropriateness of courses
 Excessive prerequisites
 Draft
 Sex life
 Previous exposure to new situations
 Overall performance at ISU

More talented faculty
More individual attention
Better laboratory equipment
Student life-style
Not being aware of all that is available
Unrealistic attitudes toward course content, curriculum and the
function of advisors
Self expectations
Polarity of liberal arts and sciences
Physical appearance
Small library
Outside job experience
Social adjustment
Availability of dates for men
Academic load
Student interest
Ability to read
Memory span

Student Affairs Staff Responses to Supplemental Question 1: What variables do you think might affect or cause deviation in the level of satisfaction for Iowa State University students?

Place of residence

Age

Major

Sex

Strong goal orientation - career objective

Academic classification

Locale or family background

Marital status

Ethnic group

Identity and feeling of worth

Academic advisor

Financial problems or burdens

Quality of prior academic preparation

Reasons for attending ISU

G. P. A.

Independence/dependence factor

Academic progress

Dating situation

Involvement in student activities

Emotional maturity - self-concept

Academic talent

Commitment to major

Differences between colleges and majors

Personality and/or social adaptability

Level of maturity

Past experience with teachers

Developmental level of student

Self-awareness

Amount of participation in leisure time activities

Parental pressure

Influence of peers

Social interaction

Physical handicap

Veteran/non-veteran

Home state

Emotional maturity

Ability to get along with instructors

Amount of praise which the student receives

Personal relationship with faculty members

Interest in school

Transfer from smaller or larger institution

Time lag between social practice and implementation

Lack of social activities

Religious background

Rational thinking

National and international political and economic affairs

Weather

Teacher availability
Indiscriminate prerequisite courses
Level and type of intelligence
Motivation level
Expectations of college life
Individual frustration level
Social preparation
Social goals
Uncertainty of own potential
Uncertainty of own need satisfaction
Job market potential following graduation
Personal goals and values
Off-campus housing
Bad experience with a person or office representing the university
Bureaucracy
Loneliness
Interpersonal relationships
Perceived levels of self-determinate behavior
Understanding the total role of education
Quality of life
Integrity
Outside experience
Exposure to change through past experiences
Time of quarter
Aggressiveness of individual
Availability and quality of academic and personal counseling
An individual's attitude and experience
Desire to achieve personal goals
Attitude of faculty and administration toward students
Academic potential
Distance between hometown and ISU

Academic Advisor Responses to Supplemental Question 3: Of the factors which you have mentioned in questions 1 and 2 as important in affecting the level of satisfaction at Iowa State, which are the most difficult to identify for the students with whom you have contact?

Place of residence

Major

Personality

Financial resources

Academic classification

Age

Maturity level

Motivation

Opinion of peers

Background

Clarity of goals

Career or vocational goals

Sex

Social level

Relative academic standing in previous classes

Parental attitudes

Financial pressures

Basic attitude

Desire to learn

Ability - I.Q.

Academic success

Quality of instruction

Family ideals and expectations

Social factors

Previous experiences

Interest

Failure to identify with major or profession

Failure to relate performance standards with learning

Home life

Initiative

Relationship with academic advisor

Departmental peer group

Quality of personal and social life outside the classroom

Poor high school counseling re: choice of major

Poor home counseling re: choice of major

Personality and responses to pressures, choices and challenges

Advising

Dedication

Resident or non-resident of Iowa

How to become a real scholar

Quality and availability of teaching staff

Family problems

G. P. A.

Ambition

Capability

Size of high school

Class objectives
Teaching style
Understanding of why the student is at ISU
Interest in their major area
Intellectual concern
Life-style
Self-confidence
Priorities
Emotional problems
Interpersonal relationships
Quality of previous intellectual environment
Advising system

Student Affairs Staff Responses to Supplemental Question 3: Of the factors which you have mentioned in questions 1 and 2 as important in affecting the level of student satisfaction at Iowa State, which are the most difficult to identify for the students with whom you have contact?

Major

Place of residence

Self-concept

Aggressiveness

Academic classification

Parental pressures

Advisor competence

Reasons for attending ISU

Level of emotional and social maturity

Personal goals

Academic potential

Independence/dependence

Resourcefulness

Academic talent

Marital status

Academic progress

Establishment of career and life goals

Quality of previous academic preparation

Social adaptability

Emotional maturity

Family influences

Relationship with siblings

Dating situation

Academic quality

Indiscriminate prerequisite courses

Level and type of intelligence

Motivational level

Success or failure in past social experiences

Bad experience with a person or office representing the university

Age

Degree of social exposure or sophistication

Understanding of the quality of life concept

Understanding the role of education

Leisure activities

Interpersonal relationships

Integrity

Personal preference to be involved

Ability to become involved in that which is beyond the academic

Exposure to "change" through past experience

Exactly what satisfies an individual

Why the student came to college

Commitment to academic program

Sense of vocational direction

Attitude of faculty and administration towards students

Dedication to career choice

Financial status of the student

Extracurricular interests of the student
Social interaction
Ability to get along with others