77

A COMPARISON OF SOME ASPECTS OF ON-CAMPUS AND OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT LIFE AT GRAMBLING COLLEGE, LOUISIANA

by

ESTELLE HART MAYO

M. A., Teachers College
Columbia University, 1949

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Approved by:

Major Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of on-campus versus off-campus housing is by no means a new one. Several court suits have been filed. Just within the past two years, the Federal District Court of Louisiana ruled that certain students must live in campus residence halls. It seems that the problem here was related more to finding ways of paying for dormitories than to the benefits that would accrue to students.

It appears that if a student lives on campus in the center of activities, his whole college experience would be enhanced. The fact that the student does not always feel this way is what is important.

The question then arises, does where a student live make a difference in academic performance, utilizing student services, and developing wholesome relationships with various personnel?

It is probable that a study to identify differences might also reveal areas of strengths and weaknesses that need to be rectified in areas encompassing student personnel services and others.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem - The purpose of this study was to identify differences between on- and off-campus students in terms of the following factors: (1) grade point averages; (2) faculty-

staff-student relations; and (3) rating of college student services.

More specifically, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What are differences in fall semester grade point averages between students living on campus and those living off campus?
2. Are there any noted differences in faculty-staff-student relations between students living on campus and those living off campus?
3. Are there differences between on- and off-campus students as revealed by their ratings of college student services?

Procedure

This study was conducted as an investigation, for it seemed to be the most appropriate method of getting answers to the specific questions indicated above. Small random samples of the on-campus and off-campus populations were used.

Population and Sample

Samples of 132 and 68 students were randomly selected from the on- and off-campus populations respectively. Responses were received from 130 students, but only 100 were usable for this study. The sample was characterized by heterogeneity in sex, marital status, scholastic standing, and classification.

Data and Instrumentation

Data included research already done by others. Additional data were collected by use of a questionnaire constructed by the writer which contained two major questions with several sub-questions. Respondents were asked to rate assistance they received from

the faculty and staff and the effectiveness of college student services they received.

Analysis of Data

Tables were used to organize and analyze the data.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following terms have been defined:

Student is defined as one who attends an educational institution of higher learning.

On-campus students is defined as persons attending college and who do occupy campus residence.

Off-campus students is defined as persons attending college and who do not occupy campus residence.

Student life is defined as all of the activities that the students engage in, such as class attendance, dormitory life, religious life, organizational membership, faculty-student relations, staff-student relations, and student-relations.

CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written concerning on-campus and off-campus student life, but only literature related to the problem is summarized or quoted in the following part of this report.

Housing

According to Williamson and Matson,[1] the first American colleges were modeled after the British system of separate residential units within a single university. Within these units, little took place that could be characterized as intellectual development. Rather, rioting and disruptive activities were not uncommon. In more modern times, however, personnel deans and dormitory counselors have supplied counseling services that contribute directly to the academic life of students through such means as organized forums on current social, political, and academic issues, thereby helping students develop the best study methods for college-level work.

Today, in part, through personnel services for students, dormitories and some rooming houses are being transformed from shelter units solely into living, learning auxiliaries to the classroom with personnel workers serving as adjunct teachers.

---

[1] E. G. Williamson and Jane C. Matson, "Student Personnel Services," Encyclopedia of Education, Cromwell-Collier Educational Corporation, 534, 1971.

The next portion of related literature was made as an investigation exploring the relation of student residence to academic performance or achievement in five colleges of an upper mid-western state. Students were matched on the basis of ACT composite standard scores and class standing. The results showed that the combined group of students living in residence halls had higher grade point averages (GPA's) than did students residing off campus. When the data were analyzed by individual colleges, however, some non-significant differences were found, although some trends were noted. Significant differences were found in GPA and ACT scores among the total groups of students enrolled in the five colleges.[2]

Tim Devlin, a reporter for The New York Times, said:

> There are too many students in dreary digs. A three-pronged drive to give students better housing was called for by Lord Jellicoe, Deputy Opposition Leader in the House of Lords, when he spoke to the Women's National Commission . . . He called for financial help from the government, local authorities, and private enterprise.[3]

Listing inadequate housing as one of the main causes for student unrest, Devlin reported:

> Far too many students are forced to fend for themselves in the dreariest and dingiest of digs - a terribly long way from where they should study and only too often providing hopelessly poor conditions for study.

---

[2]P. T. Hountras and K. R. Brandt, "Relations of Student Residence to Academic Performance in College," Journal of Educational Research, 8:351-354, April, 1970 (Microfilm).

[3]Tim Devlin, "Too Many Students in Dreary Digs," The New York Times (Education Supplement), 2865:7, April, 1970.

> For far too long this really important and potentially explosive hot potatoe of student accommodation has floated in a semi-vacuum between the stools of the Department of Education and Science and of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.
>
> The Universities had not been able to keep up to the Robbin's two-thirds residential target. Because of economic stringency and the pace of the student population explosions, they had fallen back to housing only 35 per cent of their students . . . they need more halls of residence, especially mixed halls of residence . . . Local authorities and central government must include student housing as part and parcel of their housing problems . . . if we are to have 800,000 students by 1980, their housing problems will be a sizable slice of the nation's housing problem.[4]

Another newspaper article related to the problem in this country appeared in a recent issue of The Shreveport Times. It stated that:

> Men and women students at The University of Michigan will share the same room in an off-campus experiment that started this weekend . . . The co-op house, called Xonadu, has 64 residents, 29 of whom are joining in the experiment of males and females sharing the same room. It will continue for two weeks when a decision on extending it will be made.[5]

David L. Mussey, a sophomore from Urbana, Illinois, said:

> The trial is not being made by a bunch of hippie freaks trying to break down morality standards. We're just normal people trying to learn how to live with members of the opposite sex.[6]

Seventeen of the experimenters are men and twelve are women. Some of the rooms will be shared by two men and one woman. All the students range in age from 18 to 22.

---

[4]Ibid.

[5]The Shreveport Times, 101:6 (Section 2-A), March 2, 1972.

[6]Ibid.

Several University of Michigan dormitories have been co-educational for several years, with men and women living on the same floors, but in separate rooms. This is believed to be the first time that any group has announced publicly that it will establish co-educational rooms.

Faculty-Student Relations

The matter of faculty-student relations, as discussed by Wellner,[7] is one of the major concerns on college and university campuses. Instruments have been used with the students to determine their response to this relationship. Student personnel workers have a great interest in the campus climate of students and their rapport with their teachers.

The quality of faculty-student relations can contribute to the personal growth of the student. Junior colleges place great emphasis on good teaching and the interest of their faculty in the students.

Students generally look upon the faculty members as knowing little about them other than their names and scholastic records. Few teachers know of their students' ambitions, interests, friends, or families.

It is of utmost importance for students to sense that the faculty members are concerned about their welfare beyond school work.

---

[7]William C. Wellner, "Faculty-Student Relations in the Public Junior College," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 10:152-155, May, 1969.

More research in this area will afford the student personnel worker additional information, so that a more favorable climate will exist between faculty and students, and thereby, bring about a campus environment conducive to student development.

Administration-Student Relations

There has not been too much research that has thrown light on the subject of management and administration of colleges and universities. Even so, this information did not result from an involvement of the administrators and students of these institutions of higher learning.

Berdie,[8] in an article on this matter, stated:

> . . . Those doing research on students must learn how to identify in advance the decisions the university will make regarding students, and to gather, analyze, and interpret information relevant for decisions.
>
> The purpose of this article is to examine the university and its relationships with students in light of the recent experience of members of a student personnel staff responsible for research on students.

Some recommendations made by Berdie were as follows:

> The university, like every other social institution, can endure only if individuals within the institution are able to maintain an adequate level of trust and confidence in one another. . . .
>
> The university requires a survey of opportunities available for students to help resolve social problems. . . . Students, faculty, and the office for student affairs might cooperatively establish a division designed for this specific purpose. . . .

---

[8]Ralph F. Berdie, "The Study of University Students: Analyses and Recommendations," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:4, January, 1972.

Continuing programs should be established which can systematically survey students to identify institutional sources of frustration. At various points within administrative procedures students can be interviewed to learn more of their experiences and of possible frustrations evolving from them. . . .

. . . . . .

Students and staff working together should develop programs designed to identify entering students who have the potential to assume leadership in the government of the university and to plan programs that will develop and use this potential. . . .

Functional and organizational charts of the university should be examined carefully to identify points having no or inadequate student representations, and decisions regarding the desirability of such representation should result from careful discussions with students.

Improved means of communication with students should be developed. Mass communication as now practiced is only partially effective. Individualized communication . . . may be established with selected target groups of students.

. . . . . .

An attempt should be made to use programs of research on students not only to inform the university, including administrators, faculty, and students, about students, but also to inform students about the university. The primary purpose of student services is to advance the education of students.[9]

Counseling

Morris L. LeMay had this to say on the subject of counseling involuntary and reluctant students:

> It is generally recognized that the most favorable condition for successful counseling exists when the client himself feels ready to seek help for his problems. This article reports the results of a pilot project designed to investigate the feasibility of individual counseling sessions with involuntary clients.

---

[9]Ibid., pp. 10-11.

> The project was proposed as a practical method of assisting college males referred to a dean's office for misconduct. The major objectives were to see if the academic achievement, the college attrition rate, and the disciplinary recidivist rate of male college students referred for disciplinary problems would be affected by the following special attention and counseling in techniques: (a) confidential personal-social counseling in a university counseling center; (b) supportive counseling by a disciplinary counselor in the office of the dean of students; (c) directive counseling, designed as an authoritarian, advice-giving session by a member of the staff of the dean of students; or (d) no counseling - only a brief discussion of the disciplinary offense.
>
> . . . It was assumed that individual counseling can be effectively used to increase academic achievement and to promote personal adjustment. Considerable research has been reported on the effects of counseling; however, while these studies in the main have been positive, they have not been concerned with involuntary clients. . . .
>
> Despite the accumulation of knowledge of both general counseling methods and specific techniques for changing behavior, we still have . . . to learn about effective specific methods. Williamson's theory of the fusion of discipline and counseling in the educative process has not been tested. His thesis is that discipline must be infused with counseling.
>
> Discipline as punishment is no corrective of misbehavior unless it is a part or a consequence of a counseling relationship. Alone, punishment is repressive and growth arresting. With counseling, it can become educative, corrective, and growth producing.[10]

It seems that while there is much more research to be read that is related to the overall problem, the above literature may serve as a good start toward further research.

---

[10]Morris L. LeMay, "Counseling Involuntary and Reluctant Students: An Obsolete Pilot Project," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 12:6:422, November, 1971.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

After the data were collected, it was necessary to organize them into some practical, orderly arrangement. Data from the questionnaire described in Chapter I were summarized and organized into Tables. They included (1) analysis of distribution of responses according to the students' fall semester grade point averages, (2) analysis of differences of distributed responses according to faculty-student associations and relationships, and (3) analysis of the effectiveness of the services of the professional staff.

Distribution of Responses

Of the 100 completed questionnaires returned, 66 were from on-campus students and 34 from off-campus students. These figures represent 50 per cent each of the on- and off-campus students to whom the questionnaire was sent.

The Tables on the following pages were prepared in order to show the reactions of the respondents to the various items on the questionnaire.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS WHOSE GRADE POINT AVERAGES FELL INTO CERTAIN CATEGORIES

Grade Point Average	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
1.00 - 1.49	3	5	2	6
1.50 - 1.99	3	5	2	6
2.00 - 2.49	2	2	2	6
2.50 - 2.99	3	5	19	56
3.00 - 3.49	45	67	4	12
3.50 - 3.99	5	8	4	12
4.00	5	8	1	2
Totals	66	100	34	100

Table I showed the distribution of the fall semester grade point averages of the responding students. It was interesting to note that 56 per cent of the off-campus students earned grade point averages between 2.50 and 2.99, while only 5 per cent of the on-campus students fell in this bracket.

Even though the number of on-campus students who returned completed questionnaires doubled the number of off-campus students who returned completed questionnaires, the on-campus students earned far better grades, per cent-wise, than did those living off

campus. This supported the statement that "students living in residence halls had higher grade point averages (GPA's) than did students residing off campus."[11]

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING ASSISTANCE WITH PERSONAL PROBLEMS RENDERED BY ADMINISTRATORS

Degree Of Assistance	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Good	0	0	0	0
Good	45	68	12	35
Fair	16	24	17	50
Poor	5	8	5	15
Totals	66	100	34	100

Table II showed that 68 per cent of on-campus students considered the assistance with personal problems given them by Administrators as "Good," while 50 per cent of off-campus students considered such assistance as "Fair." Perhaps the element of confidence was a factor in the relationship of on-campus students with Administrators. Support for the value of such a relationship was pointed out in Berdie's first recommendation that "the university

[11] Supra, p. 5.

. . . can endure only if individuals within the institution are able to maintain an adequate level of trust and confidence in one another."[12]

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING ASSISTANCE WITH PERSONAL PROBLEMS RENDERED BY PROFESSORS

Degree Of Assistance	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Good	12	18	3	9
Good	41	62	12	35
Fair	7	11	9	27
Poor	6	9	10	29
Totals	66	100	34	100

In Table III, it was noted that 62 per cent of on-campus students considered the assistance given them by Professors as "Good" and only 9 per cent of the same group considered the Professors' assistance as "Poor." In sharp contrast, 35 per cent of off-campus students rated Professor's assistance as "Good" and 29 per cent rated the assistance as "Poor." The data indicated

[12] Supra, p. 9.

that all of the students went to their teachers for assistance with their personal problems, and this relationship should exist at the college so as to create a favorable climate in which the students can live and learn. As noted earlier in this study, "it is of utmost importance that the students sense that the faculty members are concerned about their welfare other than their school work."[13]

TABLE IV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING ASSISTANCE WITH PERSONAL PROBLEMS RENDERED BY MINISTERS

Degree Of Assistance	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Good	12	18	9	27
Good	35	53	15	44
Fair	19	29	10	29
Poor	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	100	34	100

Table IV revealed that a large per cent of students who reside on campus and off campus went to Ministers for help with

[13] Supra, p. 8.

personal problems and considered the assistance as "Good." The per cent of off-campus students rating the assistance "Very Good" was 27 per cent as compared with 18 per cent for on-campus students.

Perhaps, since the Ministers lived in the off-campus community, their assistance was more often sought by off-campus students than by on-campus students. The data in Table IV also indicated the high regard that all students had for assistance rendered by Ministers.

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING ASSISTANCE WITH PERSONAL PROBLEMS RENDERED BY NURSES

Degree Of Assistance	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Good	0	0	0	0
Good	40	61	20	59
Fair	20	29	10	29
Poor	6	10	4	12
Totals	66	100	34	100

The information in Table V by on- and off-campus students indicated very little difference, per cent-wise, in rating assistance rendered by Nurses as "Good." It was very significant that

no students rated assistance by Nurses "Very Good," and 39 and 41 per cent of on- and off-campus students respectively rated Nurses' assistance as "Fair" and "Poor."

TABLE VI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING ASSISTANCE WITH PERSONAL PROBLEMS RENDERED BY COUNSELORS

Degree Of Assistance	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Good	7	10	6	18
Good	10	16	20	59
Fair	49	74	8	23
Poor	0	0	0	0
Totals	66	100	34	100

Table VI showed that 74 per cent of on-campus students considered the assistance of counselors as "Fair" in contrast to 23 per cent of off-campus students who rated assistance by counselors "Fair." More than half of the off-campus students considered this assistance as "Good."

The unfavorable response by the students who lived on campus was perhaps due, at least in part, to their constant contact with counselors whose training was questionable.

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF HOUSING REGULATIONS

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	30	45	7	21
Somewhat Effective	36	55	21	61
Not At All Effective	0	0	6	18
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of off-campus students reporting the housing regulations as "Somewhat Effective" was slightly higher than that reported by on-campus students. The per cent of on-campus students who indicated these regulations were "Very Effective" more than doubled the per cent of off-campus students who rated the housing regulations in the same category.

It appeared that housing regulations were considered "Effective" to some degree by all the students who live on campus where they can be helped to "develop the best study methods for college-level work."[14]

[14] Supra, p. 4.

TABLE VIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT CONDUCT REGULATIONS

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	25	38	5	15
Somewhat Effective	30	45	25	73
Not At All Effective	11	17	4	12
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of reporting off-campus students rating the effectiveness of regulations governing student conduct as "Somewhat Effective" was considerably higher than that of on-campus students. On the other hand, 38 per cent of on-campus students rated these regulations "Very Effective," while only 15 per cent of off-campus students checked this category.

TABLE IX

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSELING SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	10	15	10	29
Somewhat Effective	50	76	21	62
Not At All Effective	6	9	3	9
Totals	66	100	34	100

A larger per cent of on-campus students considered the counseling services as "Somewhat Effective" than did the off-campus students as revealed in Table IX.

The data above which showed that 76 per cent of on-campus students considered counseling services "Somewhat Effective" substantiated the data in Table VI where on-campus students rated assistance rendered by counselors "Fair."

TABLE X

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF ORIENTATION SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	11	17	10	29
Somewhat Effective	45	68	20	59
Not At All Effective	10	15	4	12
Totals	66	100	34	100

Even though the per cent of on-campus students who considered the effectiveness of the orientation services as "Somewhat Effective" in the table above was higher than that of the off-campus students, the per cent of off-campus students who rated orientation services "Very Effective" was much higher than the per cent of on-campus students rating the services in the same category.

Generally, on-campus students rated orientation services less effective than did off-campus students.

TABLE XI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF EXTRA-CURRICULAR ADVISING SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	20	29	10	29
Somewhat Effective	40	61	20	59
Not At All Effective	6	10	4	12
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of on-campus students who considered the effectiveness of the extra-curricular advising services as "Somewhat Effective" in Table XI was slightly higher than that of the off-campus students. Actually, there was very little difference in the per cents of the responding students as well as in the degrees of effectiveness.

Perhaps there should be more careful advising of all the students in this area of the college to make certain that their interests and abilities are channeled in the proper manner and direction.

TABLE XII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF FINANCIAL AID SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	50	76	5	15
Somewhat Effective	10	15	15	44
Not At All Effective	6	9	14	41
Totals	66	100	34	100

In Table XII, the per cent of on-campus students who considered the effectiveness of financial aid services as "Very Effective" was considerably higher than that of the students who live off campus.

The very high percentage of off-campus students rating financial aid services "Not At All Effective" indicated the need to study the matter of financial needs of students living off campus.

TABLE XIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF HEALTH SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	50	76	7	21
Somewhat Effective	16	24	19	56
Not At All Effective	0	0	8	23
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of on-campus students who considered the effectiveness of the health services "Very Effective" in the table above was very much higher than that of the off-campus students.

The data in Table XIII indicated a somewhat higher rating for health services than degree of assistance from Nurses shown in Table V. This was probably due to the fact that there were fewer choices by which the students could make their opinions known on the questionnaire.

It was noted that all of the on-campus students considered the health services effective to some degree while 23 per cent of off-campus students rated these services "Not At All Effective."

TABLE XIV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REMEDIAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Degree Of Effectiveness	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
Very Effective	15	23	11	32
Somewhat Effective	45	68	22	65
Not At All Effective	6	9	1	3
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of on-campus students who considered the effectiveness of the remedial educational services as "Somewhat Effective" in the table above was only slightly higher than that of the off-campus students.

It was interesting to note that both groups of students indicated that they consider this important service of some significance.

TABLE XV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS RATING
NON-COMPULSORY CLASS ATTENDANCE RULE
FOR JUNIORS AND SENIORS

Opinion Concerning Non-Compulsory Class Attendance Rule	Number Of On-Campus Students	Per Cent	Number Of Off-Campus Students	Per Cent
In Favor Of	56	85	30	88
Not In Favor Of	3	5	4	12
No Response	7	10	0	0
Totals	66	100	34	100

The per cent of off-campus students in favor of the non-compulsory class attendance rule was only slightly higher than that of the students who resided on campus.

It was interesting to note in the table above that all of the off-campus students responded to this question, and almost all of the students were in favor of this new ruling.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In this study, an attempt was made to investigate differences between on- and off-campus students in terms of the following factors: (1) grade point averages; (2) faculty-staff-student relations; and (3) rating of college student services. More specifically, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are differences in fall semester grade point averages between students living on campus and those living off campus?
2. Are there any noted differences in faculty-staff-student relations between students living on campus and those living off campus?
3. Are there differences between on- and off-campus students as revealed by their ratings of college student services?

The report was conducted as an investigation for it seemed to be the most appropriate method of getting answers to the specific questions indicated above. The investigation consisted of a random sample taken of the population.

Information from the population was gathered by use of a questionnaire that was sent to 200 students living on campus and off campus at this college. Of this number, 130 questionnaires were returned, but only 100 were completed and usable for this report. Completed forms were returned by 66 on-campus students and 34 off-campus students which represented 33 and 17 per cent

of the on-campus and off-campus respectively.

These students were selected at random and represented heterogeneity in sex, marital status, scholastic standings, and classifications.

Sources of data were research in related areas, and a questionnaire sent to each of the 200 persons in the sample. A letter explaining the study was sent with each questionnaire.

For purpose of this study, certain terms were defined in Chapter I.

In reviewing the literature, special emphasis was placed on housing, relation of students' residence to academic performance, faculty-student relations, administration-student relations, and counseling.

The data from the questionnaires were classified, organized, and presented in 15 Tables.

Differences between on-campus and off-campus students were identified in terms of the factors in the summary.

Findings

The study partially substantiated the notion that students who live on campus tended to earn better grade point averages than those who live off campus.

The study showed further that, by and large, on-campus students benefitted more from their relationships with all types of personnel than did off-campus students. However, there were few categories where off-campus students indicated better

relationships. Both groups showed evidence of a need for the services of trained counselors.

On-campus and Off-campus students rated the effectiveness of student services generally weak; however, there were some special areas of strength indicated.

The findings did not provide conclusive evidence, but they did indicate such evidence.

Recommendations

On the basis of this investigative study, it is recommended that Grambling College:

1. Incorporate more information in the College Bulletin pertinent to the needs and problems of students who live off campus.
2. Strengthen its counseling service, both quantitatively and qualitatively.
3. Encourage students to live on campus at least for a part of their tenure in college.
4. Foster cooperation among Counselors, Administrators, Ministers, and community leaders in meeting the counseling needs of all college students.
5. Give more attention to the financial needs of off-campus students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberti, Robert E., "Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:18-23, January, 1972.

Berdie, Ralph F., "The Study of University Students: Analyses and Recommendations," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:1:4-11, January, 1972.

Bergen, G. R. and others, "Do Scholarships Affect Academic Achievement?," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 11:383-384, September, 1970.

DeBlassie, R. R., "Personality Differences Between College Counselees and non-Counselees: A Review of the Literature," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 34:88-94, Winter, 1971.

Devlin, Tim, "Too Many Students in Dreary Digs," The New York Times (Education Supplement), 2865:7, April 17, 1970.

Feinberg, Lawrence, "Faculty-Student Interaction: How Students Differ," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:1:24-27, January, 1972.

George, R. L., "Resident or Commuter: A Study of Personality Differences," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 12:216-219, May, 1971.

Hountras, P. T. and K. R. Brandt, "Relation of Student Residence to Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Research, 8:351-354, April, 1970 (Microfilm).

LeMay, Morris L., "Counseling Involuntary and Reluctant Students," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 12:422-426, November, 1971.

Ryan, J. T., "College Freshmen and Living Arrangements," NASPA, J8:127-130, October, 1970.

Seligman, Richard, "An Instrument to Measure Institutional Stance on Matters of Student Conduct," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 12:417-421, November, 1971.

Switzer, L., "Home is Not Just Housing, Students Tell ACUHO Convention," College and University Business, 49: 94+, September, 1970.

The Shreveport Times, Shreveport, Louisiana, 101:6 (Section 2-A), March 2, 1972.

Wellner, William C., "Faculty-Student Relations in the Public Junior College," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 10:3:152-155, May, 1969.

"What's Happening in Student Housing?," College and University Business, 50:37-52, April, 1971.

Williamson, E. C. and Jane C. Watson, "Student Personnel Services," Encyclopedia of Education, Cromwell-Collier Educational Corporation, 8:534, 1971.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF EXPLANATION

P. O. Box 268
Grambling, LA 71245
March 10, 1972

Dear _____:

We are making a study of the comparisons of some aspects of off-campus and on-campus student life at Grambling College. We believe that you are especially qualified to give us some important information concerning this comparison.

Kindly react to the items on the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us by mail, on or before Wednesday, March 15, in the self-addressed and stamped envelope.

Your assistance in making this study a success will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

(Dr.) Ruth D. Bradford
Faculty Advisor
Professor of Education
Grambling College

(Mrs.) Estelle H. Mayo
Graduate Student

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name_____ Sex: F____ M____

On-campus Student____ Off-campus Student____ Class____

Married ____ Single ____ Divorced____

Instructions

UNDERSCORE OR FILL IN THE BLANKS WITH THE MOST APPROPRIATE WORD THAT YOU FEEL WILL ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. In considering a place to go for help with personal problems, how would you rate the assistance usually given by the persons listed below? (Very Good) (Good) (Fair) (Poor)

   a. Ministers_____
   b. Nurses_____
   c. Administrators_____
   d. Professors_____
   e. Counselors_____

2. How would you rate the student services pointed out in the questions below?

   a. How effective are the housing regulations (living in apartments, off-campus rooms, on-campus dormitory room, etc.)?

      (Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

   b. How effective are regulations governing student conduct?

      (Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

   c. How effective is the counseling service?

      (Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not All Effective)

APPENDIX B (continued)

d. How effective is the orientation service?

(Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

e. How effective is the extra-curricular advising service?

(Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

f. How effective is the financial aid service (assistance in obtaining a scholarship, loan, part-time job, assistance in budgeting and controlling expenses)?

(Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

g. How effective is the health service?

(Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

h. How effective is the remedial educational service?

(Very Effective) (Somewhat Effective) (Not At All Effective)

i. Do you agree with the non-compulsory class attendance rule for juniors and seniors?

(Yes) (No) (No Response)

A COMPARISON OF SOME ASPECTS OF ON-CAMPUS AND OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT LIFE AT GRAMBLING COLLEGE, LOUISIANA

by

ESTELLE HART MAYO

M. A., Teachers College
Columbia University, 1949

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

ABSTRACT

The Problem

Statement of the Problem - The purpose of this study was to identify differences between on- and off-campus students in terms of the following factors: (1) grade point averages; (2) faculty-staff-student relations; and (3) rating of college student services.

More specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are differences in fall semester grade point averages between students living on campus and those living off campus?
2. Are there any noted differences in faculty-staff-student relations between students living on campus and those living off campus?
3. Are there differences between on- and off-campus students as revealed by their ratings of college student services?

Procedure

This study was conducted as an investigation; for it seemed to be the most appropriate method of getting answers to the specific questions indicated above. Small random samples of the on-campus and off-campus populations were used.

Population and Sample

Samples of 132 and 68 students were randomly selected from the on- and off-campus populations respectively. Responses were received from 130 students, but only 100 were usable for this

study. The sample was characterized by heterogeneity in sex, marital status, scholastic standing, and classification.

Findings

The study partially substantiated the notion that students who live on campus tended to earn better grade point averages than those who live off campus.

The study showed further that, by and large, on-campus students benefitted more from their relationships with all types of personnel than did off-campus students. However, there were few categories where off-campus students indicated better relationships. Both groups showed evidence of a need for the services of trained counselors.

On-campus and off-campus students rated the effectiveness of student services generally weak; however, there were some special areas of strength indicated.

The findings did not provide conclusive evidence that it is more advantageous to live on campus than off campus, but they did indicate such evidence.

Conclusions

It is reasonably safe to conclude that there are differences in some aspects of student life as they relate to on-campus and off-campus living.

Recommendations

On the basis of this investigative study, it is recommended that Grambling College:

1. Incorporate more information in the College Bulletin pertinent to the needs and problems of students who live off campus.
2. Strengthen its counseling service, both quantitatively and qualitatively.
3. Encourage students to live on campus at least for a part of their tenure in college.
4. Foster cooperation among Counselors, Administrators, Ministers, and community leaders in meeting the counseling needs of all college students.
5. Give more attention to the financial needs of off-campus students.