

1955

An Attempt to Identify Attitudes Related to Student Drop Outs at Central Washington College of Education

Robert Joseph Kuss
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuss, Robert Joseph, "An Attempt to Identify Attitudes Related to Student Drop Outs at Central Washington College of Education" (1955). *All Master's Theses*. 152.
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/152>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

AN ATTEMPT TO IDENTIFY ATTITUDES RELATED TO
STUDENT DROP OUTS AT
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Central Washington College of Education

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Robert Joseph Kuss

August 1955

LD
5771.3

K93a



SPECIAE
COLLECTIO

79413

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Maurice L. Pettit, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Perry H. Mitchell

E. E. Samuelson

Dedicated to my young daughter
Kristina, who can claim as her first
home, the House Counselor's quarters at
Munson Hall

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED .	1
The Problem	2
Statement of the problem	2
Purpose of the study	4
Limitations of the study	6
Definitions of Terms Used	6
Student attrition	6
Student mortality	6
Drop outs	6
Mean	7
Attitude	7
II. SOURCES OF DATA AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE	9
Sources of Data	9
Method of Procedure	9
III. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED STUDIES	13
IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS	20
Physical Factors	22
Living conditions evaluated	22
Munson Hall	26
Munro Hall	26
Montgomery Hall	28
Alford Hall	30

CHAPTER	PAGE
Carmody Hall	30
Kamola Hall	32
Kennedy Hall	35
Sue Lombard Hall	37
Elwood Hall	37
Dining conditions evaluated	46
Sue Lombard Cafeteria	47
Munson Cafeteria	50
Walnut Street Cafeteria	52
Social Factors	60
Overall social atmosphere on campus	61
Campus clubs, organizations and social functions . .	65
Dormitories and living groups	67
Financial Factors	71
Evaluation of fees charged all students by Central Washington College of Education	73
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	82
Physical Conditions and Living Accommodations	83
Food and Dining Conditions	83
Social Conditions	84
Financial Conditions	85
General Recommendations	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
APPENDIX	93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Central Washington College of Education Enrollment for School Year 1950-1951	3
II. Grade Level of Respondents at Time of Dropping Out of Central Washington College of Education	21
III. Volunteered Reasons for Leaving Central Washington College of Education	23
IV. Evaluation of Munro Hall	27
V. Evaluation of Montgomery Hall	29
VI. Evaluation of Alford Hall	31
VII. Evaluation of Carmody Hall	31
VIII. Evaluation of Kamola Hall	33
IX. Evaluation of Kennedy Hall	36
X. Evaluation of Sue Lombard Hall	38
XI. Summary of Respondents and Residences	40
XII. Evaluation of Sue Lombard Cafeteria	51
XIII. Evaluation of Munson Cafeteria	51
XIV. Evaluation of Walnut Street Cafeteria	54
XV. Summary of Respondents and Places Where They Took Meals	59
XVI. Responses to Question to Whether Living or Dining Conditions Affected Decision to Leave Central Washington College	59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Central Washington College of Education Enrollment for School Year 1950-1951	3
II. Grade Level of Respondents at Time of Dropping Out of Central Washington College of Education	21
III. Volunteered Reasons for Leaving Central Washington College of Education	23
IV. Evaluation of Munro Hall	27
V. Evaluation of Montgomery Hall	29
VI. Evaluation of Alford Hall	31
VII. Evaluation of Carmody Hall	31
VIII. Evaluation of Kamola Hall	33
IX. Evaluation of Kennedy Hall	36
X. Evaluation of Sue Lombard Hall	38
XI. Summary of Respondents and Residences	40
XII. Evaluation of Sue Lombard Cafeteria	51
XIII. Evaluation of Munson Cafeteria	51
XIV. Evaluation of Walnut Street Cafeteria	54
XV. Summary of Respondents and Places Where They Took Meals	59
XVI. Responses to Question to Whether Living or Dining Conditions Affected Decision to Leave Central Washington College	59

TABLE	PAGE
XVII. Evaluation of Social Factors	69
XVIII. Responses to Question as to Whether Social Conditions Affected Decision to Leave Central Washington College	72
XIX. Evaluation Financial Factors	78

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. A Comparison of Mean Attitudes Regarding the Physical Factors in the Various Dormitories	41
2. A Comparison of Mean Attitudes Regarding the Dining Conditions in the Various Cafeterias	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The problem of student attrition is one which is of importance to every institution of higher learning. One is never really certain as to the reasons for a students leaving a college or university before completing his educational objectives. Some of course get married, some take regular employment, some change goals and go to other colleges. Some enter the military services, others are short of finances. Many fail their subjects and are denied further educational opportunities. It's difficult to know who really failed. Did the student fail the college or did the college fail the student? If the college could better assess the capacities and attitudes of the students perhaps measures could be taken to give better direction, assistance and guidance to college students.

Some advocates of certain academic standards argue that there should be a high student mortality. They reason that by this process the deserving students graduate. Others point out that student attrition continues at institutions of higher learning at a relatively unchanged figure regardless of standards. The fact that good academic risks are numerous among the drop outs gives reason to initiate inquiries into the reasons students leave school. During the period from October 1950 to June 1951, the Central Washington College of Education suffered a serious drop in enrollment. A total of 494 persons

left the college or transferred to other institutions.¹ Concern for such a condition is evidenced in the following paragraph of a publication of the Personnel Office of Central Washington College:

The fact that the enrollment at C.W.C.E. has sharply declined, while understandable, does suggest concern for the holding power of the college. It is apparent that underclass drop outs from year to year constitute a serious loss; this year new enrollment has failed to make up this loss. In any event the situation is an important personnel problem. It is recommended that an extensive study be made of this problem to ascertain the nature of causes for student drop outs.²

Table I, compiled by the office of the Registrar at Central, graphically illustrates the drop in enrollment during the school year 1950-1951. Of a total of 1488 students in the fall quarter in 1950, only 1235 remained in the spring quarter of the following year. This represents a loss of 253 students, without taking into consideration the losses replaced by new students who registered during the winter and spring quarters.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The causes for student drop outs are manifold. Reasons volunteered by students in other studies of student mortality are many and varied. However, these reasons can seldom be

¹Infra, p. 9

²Central Washington College Personnel Office, "What is Happening to Our Student Drop Outs?" (Evaluation of Autumn Quarter Opening Activity, 1951).

TABLE I
 CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
 ENROLLMENT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1950-1951³

Classification	Fall			Winter			Spring		
	men	women	totals	men	women	totals	men	women	totals
Sub-Freshmen	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Freshmen	296	230	526	213	193	406	160	161	321
Sophomores	194	154	348	175	146	321	137	124	261
Juniors	173	104	277	161	94	255	135	93	228
Seniors	182	85	267	217	103	320	221	131	352
Fifth Year Students	16	2	18	14	3	17	14	2	16
Special Students	4	30	34	17	84	101	3	28	31
Graduate Students	11	7	18	13	5	18	19	7	26
Totals			1488			1439			1235

³Central Washington College of Education roster sheets 1950-1951, Office of Registrar.

accepted at their face value according to Feder⁴, owing to the rationalizations usually employed by the student. Some other method must be found by which to deduce the causes of student drop outs.

The writer, having chosen to specialize in the field of personnel and guidance for advanced study, accepted the task of investigating a limited area of the problem. It was reasoned that should a large group of those students who had left the institution be given the opportunity to evaluate and give their own subjective judgments on certain aspects of that institution, both positive and negative opinion trends would appear. With some indication of the attitude toward the school of those individuals who had left it and a consideration of their reasons, it might then be possible that further study by administrative and personnel officers could bring about improvements in those areas judged negatively and accentuate those aspects of the school situation reacted to positively by ex-students, thereby increasing the holding power of the college.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of the study was not to determine all those attitudes which affect a student's decision to remain in or leave the college. It was rather to survey the attitudes and opinions of the members of a group which had already left the

⁴Walter S. Monroe (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 1296.

college before completion of their studies insofar as Central Washington College was concerned. Three factors were determined on the basis of their proximity to the lives of the students and their concomitant effect on the attitudes of those students. The position of the writer as house counselor and supervisor of a men's dormitory at Central Washington College, in touch at all hours of the day and night with young men students, exerted a strong influence on the writer with respect to those aspects of the total school situation which were included in the present study.

Three areas were chosen for former-student evaluation:

1. The first area, termed "Physical Factors", was selected on the basis of the importance to the student of the place where he lives, eats, sleeps, and carries on the large portion of his out of class activities, the conditions of which are in large measure controllable by the staff of the college.

2. Social climate; the interaction of the student and his social environment, and his attitude toward the conditions which prevailed, gave rise to the second area subjected to ex-student judgment; that of "Social Factors".

3. The wallet, purse, or bank book of the student form the bases for the third division. How well did he feel his money was spent during his residence at Central Washington College? He was given the opportunity to testify thereto in the "Financial Factors" section.

Limitations of the study. The study is limited to those students who dropped out of Central Washington College before completing their studies during the school year 1950-1951. It is further limited to a sample of those who responded to the mailed questionnaire which formed the basis for the study. The evaluation or opinions of the members of the group are as they were at the time of responding to the questionnaire.

Attitudes often govern actions. Such might be the philosophy with which this project was undertaken. Throughout the interpretation and the conclusions of this study it must be borne in mind that an attempt was made to measure only attitudes and opinions held by the members of the sample. These attitudes and opinions were not necessarily based on established fact. This last has often been found to be the case such as in, as an example, the problem of racial, religious, or for that matter, any type of prejudice. Even the knowledge of the facts will sometimes fail to alter an established attitude pattern. However, a knowledge of the general attitude toward any situation is needed, and any attempt to change that situation in order to create a change of that attitude is worthy of consideration.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Student attrition, student mortality, and drop outs. These terms were used in this study to describe the permanent withdrawal of students from colleges or universities.

Mean. The term "mean" throughout the paper was interpreted as the simple average, or the quotient of the sum of the ratings divided by the number of ratings.

Attitude. A very adequate definition, in terms of this study, for the word "attitude" was found in Lundberg⁵. He states,

The behavior which we define as attitudinal or as an attitude is a certain observable set of the organism or a reaction tendency preparatory to, and indicative of, more complete adjustment.

The total manifestation of attitudes he calls, "the subjective side of human behavior."⁶

⁵George A. Lundberg, Social Research (New York: Longmans-Green and Company, 1949), p. 212.

⁶Ibid.

CHAPTER II

SOURCES OF DATA AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Sources of data. Sources of data for this study included the roster sheets for the Central Washington College for fall, winter and spring quarters of 1951 and 1952, as well as the file of personal information cards in the Registrar's office of the college, and the Central Washington College Catalog. Books and periodicals concerning the use of a questionnaire were consulted, and a questionnaire was devised to acquire the desired information.¹ Books and periodicals concerning student mortality were studied.

Method of procedure. Because of the inadequacy of the records of names and addresses of students who had dropped out or transferred from the college, the writer was compelled to secure the names through a devious and time consuming technique. The roster sheets for the college with names and classifications of all people enrolled for fall, winter and spring quarters of 1951 and 1952 were searched. Each name was followed through the subsequent roster lists. In the event that any name disappeared (indicating a drop out) and failed to reappear (indicating re-registration in some subsequent quarter) that student,

¹A copy of the questionnaire will be found in the Appendix.

unless a notation of graduation was shown, was listed as lost to the college. In this way, 494 names were found. No special accuracy is claimed for this method, however, and the reader's reference to the recommendations of this paper will find a strong recommendation that some efficient record be kept, and some type of follow-up be made on mortality cases.

Since the questionnaire was to be sent to a total of 300 cases, a random elimination of a portion of the names was necessary. This was partially accomplished by the simple expedient of removing every third name on the alphabetized name list. The 330 remaining names were reduced even further by the next step.

Addresses for the limited sample were the next problem. The file of personal information cards in the Registrar's Office was consulted and from these the addresses were copied onto the master list. Any case wherein a card was not found, or the date shown on the card did not correspond to the time limits of the study, or the address was incomplete or illegible was struck off the master list. In this manner, the list was reduced to 300 cases.

Questionnaires were sent to the 300 former students, and a follow-up card was later sent to those who had not returned it. In this way a return of forty-two per cent was achieved. At this point the tabulations were closed.

Some concern was expressed as to whether the total response of forty-two per cent represented an adequate cross-section of the attitudes

of all the people to whom the questionnaire was sent. It is well known that people vary in the amount of stimulus required to cause them to respond to a questionnaire and hence might also vary somewhat in their responses to the items on that questionnaire. How they vary is extremely difficult to determine. According to Lundberg, " ... the results actually achieved in different studies vary so widely and are conditioned upon so many variables as to make any generalization of dubious value."²

Nonetheless the problem relative to the sample of respondents remained. How was it possible to be reasonably assured that the people who answered were not significantly different in their attitudes to this survey than those who did not?

Toops, in discussing the amount of follow-up necessary to assure representativeness, offered a solution in the following statement:

One should compute daily the cumulative averages or percentages on the four or five most significant and essential questions of the questionnaire. When these significant averages or percentages vary but little from week to week, one has some reasonable assurance that the follow-up has proceeded far enough.³

It followed then, that were an informal comparison made of the results of several of the items as answered by all the respondents of

²George A. Lundberg, Social Research (New York: Longmans-Green and Company, 1949), p. 206.

³H. A. Toops, "Validating the Questionnaire Method", Journal of Personnel Research, 2:151-58, 1923, cited by Lundberg, op cit., p. 203.

the questionnaire with the results on those same items as answered by those respondents who required a reminder in the form of a follow-up card, some indication would be had as to whether an actual difference existed between these two groups or whether for the purposes of this study, they were the same. If a drastic variation were found, the assumption would then be that the responses of the people who did not answer at all might vary as much or to an even greater degree. If, however, they varied but little, one would be fairly safe in saying that a greater response to the questionnaire would not have materially affected the results of the over-all survey.

Since the questionnaires were tabulated and assigned a case number in the sequence in which they returned, and the point in this sequence at which the follow-up card was dispatched was known, it was a simple matter to separate the "volunteers" from the "coerced". Three items from each of the three essential sections of the questionnaire were selected for use in running the comparison. The choice of the nine items was based upon their having been answered by the greatest number of respondents. The mean mean of the nine ratings as computed for the entire sample was then compared with the mean mean of the same nine items as answered by the follow-up respondents as follows: the actual difference between the two means was compared with the standard error of the difference between them. By this procedure a ratio of two was found to exist. Using tables of alienation a ratio of two was found to predict that in ninety-five cases out of one hundred no real

difference would be possible. Therefore, it would seem safe to assume, with such a small variation between these two groups, that any variation between the group of people who responded to the study and those who did not would have been too small to reflect materially upon the results of the study. Hence the return of forty-two per cent was accepted as adequate.

In addition to the 126 usable responses, nineteen were returned by the mails as unclaimed. Three completed questionnaires arrived too late to be of use.

CHAPTER III

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED STUDIES

In a survey of the literature related to the problem of student mortality no author was found who dealt with it in terms of the attitudes of the students affected. Several related studies were found, however, which investigated causes, incidence and other factors concerning drop outs.

By far the most extensive project in this area was conducted by McNeely, who followed some 15,000 freshmen in twenty-five universities through their first academic years work. By means of data collected from the institutions which they attended, analyses were made of the extent to which these students remained in college, their scholastic success and the causes of their withdrawals. According to this study, causes of student attrition were, in descending order, 18.4 per cent, failure in their studies; 12.4 per cent, financial reasons; 12.2 per cent, miscellaneous reasons; and 6.1 per cent, lack of interest. Illness was responsible for 3.4 per cent of the drop outs in the group studied, and 1.1 per cent were dismissed for disciplinary reasons, while 0.8 per cent were lost to the colleges because they were needed at home. Death took 0.6 per cent, and the remaining 45 per cent were attributed to unknown causes.¹

¹John H. McNeely, College Student Mortality, United States Office

Other factors were also found to have had varying amounts of effect on students as to whether they remained in college or withdrew. Age seemed to have a definite bearing on the mortality of college students; the study found that only 47 per cent of the relatively immature seventeen year old freshmen withdrew, while 72 per cent of those over twenty years of age left the college. The probability of drop out increased with the age of the freshman.²

Remaining in attendance was also affected by the distance of the colleges from the homes of the students. In twenty-one of the twenty-five universities studied, a higher percentage of out of state students left than those whose homes were in the same county. A relationship was found between the students' places of lodging and their success in college life. Approximately three-fourths of the universities had higher percentages of drop outs among students who lived in rooming houses or college dormitories than of students residing at home or in a sorority or fraternity house. Extra-curricular activities and outside work were found to hold freshmen in the universities rather than to cause them to leave. Academically, high grades were positively related to persistence. Grade point averages were divided into decile groups; 99.5 per cent of the lowest decile grouping dropped out of

of Education Bulletin 11 (Washington Government Printing Office, June, 1937), p. 45.

²Ibid., p. 30.

college, but only 26.4 per cent of the highest decile grouping left. The incidence of mortality increased as the grade point average fell.³

Several researchers emphasized the scholastic failure and success of college students in the continuance of their studies. Eurich analyzed the records of all students registered during the fall term of 1930 in the colleges of science, literature and the arts, and education at the University of Minnesota. He designated as failures those students who failed the same course two or more times or who failed three or more separate courses. He found that only a small proportion of failing students reached junior or senior status; from a probability standpoint, the chances were only four out of a hundred that they could do so. Failing students also tended to rank lower in college ability tests, in high school rank, and in college ability rating. Grade point averages were relatively low, indicating not only failure in specific courses but also general low scholarship.⁴

In a study of mortality and scholastic rank, Coffee made a comparison of students of high aptitude ratings with those of average aptitude, as determined by the college aptitude test and percentile rank in high school. The findings showed clearly that the greater the academic success of the student, the less chance there was of his

³Ibid.

⁴Alvin C. Eurich, "College Failures", School and Society, 37:692-96, May 27, 1933.

leaving the college. Of the average group, 71.6 per cent withdrew, while only 29 per cent of the group designated as high dropped out of school.⁵

A study by Haas compared the scholastic success of two groups of students. His subjects were two freshman classes. One entered the college in 1936 during pre World War II, while the second, in 1940, was considered a war time class. Data was gathered from college achievement records from the Registrar's Office, high school percentile ranks, and Henmon-Nelson College Aptitude examinations. The entire analysis aimed at the following:

1. To determine scholastic success of classes
2. To determine at which stage mortality was largest
3. A comparison of college achievement with high school percentile rank and Henmon-Nelson percentile rank
4. To find correlation of factors predictive of college success and actual achievement and the relationship between the two factors.

The study determined that of the 199 members of the class of 1936 and the 282 members of the war time class of 1940-1944 the latter held the edge on scholarship assuming that standards were unchanged. The war time group graduated 50 per cent of its pupils with "B" or

⁵Walter Coffee, Jr., "The Mortality and Academic Careers of Two Groups of College Students", School and Society, 52:269-71, September 28, 1940.

better while the pre war group put out 43.3 per cent with the same standing.

The focal point of highest mortality was found to be the end of the sophomore year with, unfortunately, the highest class students leaving or transferring. He also found that high school rank is one of the best predictive factors for college success. Hammon-Nelson percentiles were not as accurate an indication of college success as high school standing.⁶

An investigation of the collegiate success of students who graduated in the lower third of their high school classes was made by Munger wherein he studied 891 students of the University of Toledo. In order to ascertain the relationship between their pre college scholarship and their ability to remain in college, he divided the sample into seven persistence groups. Group seven consisted of those students who withdrew after their first semester, group six after the second semester, and so forth. These groupings were then related to college grades in English, history, mathematics, social science and science.

Munger found a definite relationship between the college grade average for the first semester and the persistence of the freshman

⁶Leonard Haas, "Four Year Studies of the Freshman Classes of 1936 and 1940 at the Eau Claire Teachers College," Journal of Educational Research, 42:54-61, September, 1948.

student. Also noted was a close connection between the grades in those college courses mentioned above and ability or desire to remain in college. Finally, it was found that students who graduated in the lower third of their high school class and who earned an average of better than "C" in social science, history and overall grade point stood better than average chances of persisting.⁷

The adjustment of students to a college is intimately associated with their desire to remain in or leave the college. Segel and Proffitt, in a comprehensive study of a group of students, related these factors to the college adjustment of the group:

1. Articulation of high school and college subjects
2. High school marks
3. Aptitude and achievement test results
4. Delayed admission
5. Age
6. Self support⁸

They found a need for a more adequate guidance program in college to enable the entering student to make a more ready transition to work on the college level. High school marks were seen as the most valuable index to probable college success. Tests were extremely valuable

⁷Paul F. Munger, "Length of Residence and First Courses of Unpromising College Students," School and Society, 81:120-122, April 16, 1955.

⁸David Segel and Maris M. Proffitt, "Some Factors in the

guidance tools in working with the entering student. It was found that individuals whose admission to college was delayed for any reason tended to make better marks than those who went directly from high school to college, but the age of college entrance correlated negatively with success in college; the older the student was on graduation from high school, the fewer were his chances for success. Self support was found to affect scholarship but little, although it did prevent the student's participation in extra-curricular activity.⁹

Several other similar pieces of research were done in the field of student mortality. All were concerned with academic survival and success and derived their information from student records and tests. All found scholastic success to be highly related to survival, and considering the evidence seen in the preceding review much work should be done on the subject of student grades and mortality at Central Washington College.

Since this study concerned itself not with scholarship but with student attitudes toward the college, one recommendation seemed inevitable. A detailed study should be made on the campus of Central Washington College of the academic factors related to the mortality of students at that college.

Adjustment of College Students", United States Office of Education Bulletin 12 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937), p. 12.

⁹Ibid., p. 15.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Of the one hundred twenty-six respondents to the survey, sixty were men and sixty-six were women. The men left the college at a median age of 18.9 years while the median age for women drop outs was 19.5 years.

Twenty-three of the members of the sample transferred to other colleges. Seven of these had completed the work offered in their field at Central. Six individuals indicated that they intended to return after a period of interrupted training. The remaining ninety-seven former students of the college as of the time of answering the questionnaire, were either employed, married, or idle and were no longer enrolled in any type of higher education.

Of considerable interest is the grade level at which the respondents departed from the institution. Table II graphically illustrates the high incidence of lower class drop outs as compared to upper class mortality.

In the case of both men and women, considerably more than two-thirds of the students who left the college were freshmen and sophomores. This would seem to indicate the necessity for a closer study of the needs of the younger student in achieving a satisfactory adjustment to the college situation.

This project, as has been previously mentioned, placed the major

TABLE II
GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS AT TIME OF DROPPING OUT OF
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

	Men	Women
Freshman	27	22
Sophomore	20	26
Junior	12	8
Senior	1	9
No response	0	1
Total	60	66

emphasis upon factors which might be controlled by the college administration in its attempt to lower the percentage of students leaving the college.

There are, however, many possible reasons why students drop out of school. Therefore, it was necessary to ascertain to some extent those volunteered by the respondents for their failure to return to Central Washington College. For this purpose the next item on the questionnaire asked the respondent to cite, in his own words, why he dropped out of the college. Table III is a compilation of the frequency with which the various reasons occurred. Of the reasons given, the starred responses amounted to 22.5 per cent of the total. These were felt by the writer to be in some measure controllable by the college administrative staff. Almost one-fourth of the causes for drop out volunteered had as a basis some aspect of the college itself which the student said he did not like.

I. PHYSICAL FACTORS

Living Conditions Evaluated

In the general catalog for 1950-1951 of Central Washington College is stated, "Central Washington College is well-equipped to house its students."¹ On the assumption that the living conditions at

¹General Catalog 1950-1951, Central Washington College of Education, July 1950, Vol. 42, p. 22.

TABLE III
VOLUNTEERED REASONS FOR LEAVING
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Reasons	Number
Called into or entered service (men only)	27
Lack of adequate finances	23
Marriage	22
To seek or accept employment	10
* Found course offerings too limited	9
To be nearer home	7
To transfer to another institution	7
* Disinterested in college work	7
Ill health	7
To accept teaching position	6
* Undecided as to course	4
Had not planned to attend longer	3
* Disliked living conditions	2
* Disliked study conditions	2
Low grades	2
* Disliked social atmosphere	2
Needed at home	2
* Tired of Central Washington College	1
* Felt student guidance inadequate	1
* Was too cold	1
* Disliked food served in cafeteria	1
* To avoid the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps	1
Desired a change	1
* Disliked the general attitude of student body	1
* Felt that favoritism governed grading	1
* Disliked student-faculty relationship	1
Total	151

*The items starred and the attitudes they expressed were felt by the writer to be in some measure controllable by the personnel and advisory staff of the college.

the college exert an effect upon student morale it was decided to subject the above statement to an evaluation by former students who had personally experienced those living conditions. Certain aspects of living conditions peculiar to the campus of Central and to the various dormitories and living arrangements for the student body were selected for evaluation. In order to further pinpoint conditions assigned either a low or high rating, the ratings for each residence hall were compiled separately. A check list covering the names of all on-campus and types of off-campus residences was used in the determination of the facility being evaluated. By means of a four point rating scale, eleven statements concerning living conditions were to be graded by the respondents; A - excellent, B - good, C - fair, D - poor.²

1. Sufficient light for study provided
2. Living quarters free from abnormal noise or unnecessary disturbance
3. Furniture and equipment in my room adequate for my needs
4. Rooms maintained comfortable and healthful temperature
5. Rooms provided reasonable degree of privacy
6. Rooms clean and easy to keep clean
7. Sanitary facilities clean, uncrowded, well maintained

²See the questionnaire, section on Physical Factors, in the Appendix.

8. Reasonable policy in allowing students to decorate or make rooms homelike
9. Adequate, inexpensive facilities for clothes washing, ironing, and drying
10. Repairs to facilities which affected me promptly and efficiently carried out
11. Fulfillment of duties by supervisors, housemother or other authority with respect to overall living conditions

During tabulation the various grades assigned the above items were converted into numerical values as follows: A - 4, B - 3, C - 2, D - 1. Frequency counts on the ratings given each item were then made. In the computing of mean attitude ratings for each item the total scores were divided by the number of respondents to the item. Where a respondent or respondents failed to make an item evaluation a notation to the effect was shown and the number of those individuals was not computed into the mean evaluation of the item.

With a four point rating scale with an upper limit of four (A) and a lower limit of one (D), the arithmetical mean provided by an unlimited sample would be 2.50. However, the survey sample did not yield such a result and no norms were available for a study of this type. In order to accurately interpret the evaluations in the absence of a true midpoint it was necessary to compare the ratings in similar areas. Relative highs and lows then became evident and provided a basis for interpretation.

Any comments volunteered by respondents with respect to living conditions in the various halls or dormitories were inserted in the appropriate location in the item interpretation. The comments were copied verbatim. Their inclusion provided an opportunity for the respondents to the study to speak for themselves.

Munson Hall, permanent men's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of 120 students. Of the sixty men respondents to the study, none evaluated the living conditions in Munson Hall. This may be partly due to the fact that Munson was, at the time covered by the survey, a traditionally upper classmen's dormitory and the incidence of respondents who dropped out of college as upper classmen was extremely low.

Munro Hall, temporary men's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of sixty-five students. Ten evaluations were given of Munro Hall. Table IV indicates the responses. Provision for adequate lighting in Munro Hall was rated as midway between fair and good. According to the respondents the hall ranked very poorly with respect to freedom from noise and disturbance. Furniture and room equipment adequacy was evaluated as between excellent and good. A low opinion was registered concerning the maintenance of a comfortable and healthful temperature. No respondent adjudged the degree of privacy which he had had as poor, the mean rating being nearer to good. Opinions on the cleanliness of rooms and ease of keeping them clean ran slightly higher than good. Good plus was also the consensus

TABLE IV
EVALUATION OF MUNRO HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	2.50
Free from noise	1.60
Furniture and equipment	3.50
Temperature	1.70
Privacy	2.80
Rooms clean	3.10
Sanitary facilities	3.20
Decorating policy	3.20
Clothes washing facilities	2.90
Repairs	3.20
Supervisor duties	3.80

concerning both the next two items on sanitary facilities and policy toward allowing students to decorate or make their rooms more homelike. Facilities for clothes washing, drying, and ironing were rated slightly below good. Apparently the respondents felt that repairs to facilities which affected them were reasonably quickly and efficiently done, for the item rated good plus. The housemother of Munro Hall at the time rated the highest of any item, being judged very near excellent.

Montgomery Hall, temporary men's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of sixty-five students. Eight evaluations of Montgomery Hall were returned. Table V indicates the answers given by the respondents. The ex-residents of Montgomery Hall felt that the lighting provided was only fair. One freshman stated, "It was almost imperative to have an additional study lamp." Freedom from noise fell at the mid point of fair to good while furniture and equipment rated well above good. Although no one rated the maintenance of a healthful and comfortable temperature as poor, the mean rating was just at the mid point. A good rating was given item six with respect to privacy. Cleanliness of rooms was also judged as good, but the sanitary facilities fell to somewhat less than good. The policy with regard to room decoration was evaluated at slightly less than good. Clothes washing equipment was adjudged at slightly above the mid point with repairs to the facilities rating somewhat less than good. Fulfillment of duties by supervisory personnel rated very high.

TABLE V
EVALUATION OF MONTGOMERY HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	2.37
Free from noise	2.50
Furniture and equipment	3.25
Temperature	2.50
Privacy	3.00
Rooms clean	3.00
Sanitary facilities	2.75
Decorating policy	2.87
Clothes washing facilities	2.62
Repairs	2.75
Supervisor duties	3.87

Alford Hall, temporary men's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of sixty-five students. The replies of the ten respondents concerning Alford Hall are shown in Table VI. Noise appears to have been a problem in this dormitory, the rating falling at the mid point of fair and poor. Lighting was given a grade of fair, and maintenance of a comfortable temperature and assurance of a certain degree of privacy only slightly better. Repairs to facilities were still below the mid point as were the attitudes regarding sanitary facilities. Rooms were rated closer to good than fair with regard to cleanliness, equipment and clothes washing facilities. Decorating policy and supervisory personnel were the sole items judged by former members of this dormitory which rated above good, the latter approaching excellent.

Carmody Hall, temporary men's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of sixty-five students. Nine evaluations were received of Carmody Hall, and are indicated in Table VII. The supervisor rated highest here, midway between good and excellent. In a tie for second highest rating at good plus were the room equipment and cleanliness. Residents felt there was a good policy toward room decorations, but gave the sanitary facilities a somewhat lower grade. Opinion was slightly above the mid point regarding a reasonable degree of privacy and slightly below on the adequacy of clothes washing, drying, and ironing facilities. Promptness and efficiency of repair work rated exactly at fair. Lighting fell well short of fair and temperature and noise tied for the lowest evaluation, at 1.78. A sophomore had the following

TABLE VI
EVALUATION OF ALFORD HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	2.00
Free from noise	1.50
Furniture and equipment	2.70
Temperature	2.10
Privacy	2.10
Rooms clean	2.60
Sanitary facilities	2.40
Decorating policy	3.20
Clothes washing facilities	2.80
Repairs	3.20
Supervisor duties	3.60

TABLE VII
EVALUATION OF CARMODY HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	1.89
Free from noise	1.78
Furniture and equipment	3.44
Temperature	1.78
Privacy	2.77
Rooms clean	3.44
Sanitary facilities	3.89
Decorating policy	3.00
Clothes washing facilities	2.44
Repairs	2.00
Supervisor duties	3.55

comment:

Although I understand that living quarters are much better now, the room that I had in Carmody Hall was on a par with some of the "flop houses" that are found in Seattle. I wasn't warm once during the winter quarter of 1949-1950; (the students could sit on the radiators and not get burned) when the temperature outside was sometimes down below 20° below zero. This had a direct bearing on my studying as some of the fellows installed electric heaters in their rooms to help compensate for the lack of warmth and this overloaded the electrical circuit causing the lights in the dorm to flicker on and off like neon signs. Needless to say, this had an adverse affect on studying conditions. Thinness of walls, doors, and drafts coming under doors and around windows were other poor conditions existing at that time.

Kamola Hall, permanent women's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of 189 students. Table VIII shows the responses concerning Kamola Hall. Of the twenty-eight women respondents who evaluated this dormitory, the highest opinion held was that concerning room equipment and furniture at well above good. The housemother rated next with good plus, while the item covering privacy was adjudged very slightly above good. The ex-residents felt that they were given a good chance to make their rooms homelike and the temperature was held at a comfortable level. However, a freshman stated:

I found that the rooms in Kamola Hall were on the average quite lacking in attractiveness. As far as decorations went there were practically none. When measures were taken to paint the room by the girls themselves, they were met with disapproval.

The facilities for clothes washing, at 2.60, were midway between fair and good. The opinion of the respondents placed the items concerning noise and disturbance and efficiency of repair work at the mid point also.

TABLE VIII
EVALUATION OF KAMOLA HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	2.29
Free from noise	2.50
Furniture and equipment	3.36
Temperature	2.89
Privacy	3.07
Rooms clean	2.14
Sanitary facilities	2.10
Decorating policy	2.96
Clothes washing facilities	2.60
Repairs	2.50
Supervisor duties	3.14

An ex-sophomore recommended:

Dormitory rules should be followed. Quiet during the evening should be maintained but never was during my two years at Central. 1:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. noise was quite common in Kamola. Also, the study room in Kamola is too small for anyone to use and I think the telephone in that particular room should be taken out and put elsewhere.

Lighting was felt to be only somewhat better than fair while the cleanliness of rooms and adequacy of sanitary facilities dropped to only fair. One junior stated:

We two juniors, my roommate and I, lived in the freshman wing. It was very difficult to study in the evening. The girls did not take care of their rooms. Our room was so dirty when we moved in, we painted against school regulations. The sinks were always dirty. We asked for cleaners to clean out the sinks and I tried to start up a campaign to keep them cleaner. It didn't work.

A sophomore who had resided at Kamola and Sue Lombard said,

One thing that bothered me was the fact that we had only a pay telephone in the hall. It seemed to me that we could have had the regular type. Also, we should have had more of them. We had one (for incoming calls) to serve nearly 200 girls.

A Kamola senior offered: "Fluorescent lights were very hard on the eyes after a short period of study ... living quarters were near the door and very crowded." The noise caused by the other students during study time caused this girl to move out of a college dorm at some time previous to leaving school.

Another Kamola senior said:

Room Six in Kamola to my opinion is not a desirable room for living quarters for any students because (1) it was too near the front door, (2) too many crowded into it, (3) noise from everywhere drifts in more than anywhere in the dorm, and at certain times it is impossible to study.

Kennedy Hall, permanent women's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of ninety-eight students. Table IX indicates the replies of the seventeen respondents from Kennedy. The relative newness of Kennedy Hall, at the time covered by the study, the most recently constructed dormitory operated by the college, seemed to be reflected in the various ratings assigned it. Only two items, freedom from noise and disturbance and a comfortable and healthful degree of temperature fell below the rank of good, according to ex-residents. All other facilities were adjudged good plus. Furniture and room equipment were assigned near excellent ratings.

A freshman stated:

Since we were required to eat our Sunday supper out, I think that facilities for preparing food at the dorm were very insufficient, especially since electrical equipment was prohibited.

Other comments were as follows:

The layout of the dorm echoed all noises from the three wings. The walls of the rooms were too thin to shut out the slightest noises from neighbors.

The suggestion was made several times of the floors being covered with linoleum to aid in keeping them clean. Bare wood floors are dirt catchers and impossible to keep as clean as you would like.

I found conditions crowded in the morning and noon when everyone had a certain amount of time to do chores.

There were no good facilities for drying clothes. They could use more ironing space, also.

TABLE IX
EVALUATION OF KENNEDY HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	3.12
Free from noise	2.47
Furniture and equipment	3.53
Temperature	2.88
Privacy	3.12
Rooms clean	3.23
Sanitary facilities	3.44
Decorating policy	3.47
Clothes washing facilities	3.06
Repairs	3.35
Supervisor duties	3.00

Sue Lombard Hall, permanent women's dormitory operated by the college, capacity of 126 students. Of the sixteen evaluations, the sole item rated below average at Sue Lombard Hall was the condition of the sanitary facilities. Table X shows the responses for this hall. The housemother and her fulfillment of the duties of her office rated at just the mid point of the scale. A sophomore commented: The housemother could be extremely rude and nasty at times; she paid no attention to the girls except to bawl them out for something."

A step higher, at 2.62, was the judgment on facilities for the washing and drying of clothing. Equal, slightly higher evaluations were assigned the repairs item and freedom from noise. A sophomore stated, "I often wished there could have been less disturbance during study hours." Lighting was given a place at slightly below good, as reflected by the sophomore who said, "Not enough outlets for desk lamps." Furniture and equipment and privacy were felt to have been good. Items definitely above good were room temperature, cleanliness and policy toward residents decorating rooms.

Elwood Hall, women's dormitory operated by the college. Three evaluations of Elwood Hall were received, but since it was no longer in operation and owing to the unrepresentative number of respondents who evaluated living conditions there, no real purpose would be served by the inclusion of the data.

Five other residence categories were to have been checked by

TABLE X
EVALUATION OF SUE LOMBARD HALL

Item	Mean Rating
Sufficient light	2.81
Free from noise	2.75
Furniture and equipment	2.94
Temperature	3.31
Privacy	2.94
Rooms clean	3.19
Sanitary facilities	2.43
Decorating policy	3.25
Clothes washing facilities	2.62
Repairs	2.75
Supervisor duties	2.50

respondents. These were (1) Vetville (married veterans' housing operated by the college), (2) Parents' home, (3) Private home or boarding house, (4) Y.M.C.A., and (5) Others, which included auto courts and apartments. As Table XI indicates, the number of respondents making judgments on college operated residences was too small to be representative, therefore the final six residence categories were excluded from tabulation of physical factors. Attitudes regarding off-campus housing conditions were excluded because at this writing those conditions are not controllable in any way by the college itself. A recommendation may be made, however, that at some future date, certain members of the personnel staff of the institution concern themselves with the off-campus conditions under which members of the student body are living.

Figure 1 compares the mean attitudes regarding the physical factors in the various dormitories, in graphical form.

TABLE XI
SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS AND RESIDENCES

On-Campus Residences	Number of Evaluations
Munson Hall	0
Munro Hall	10
Montgomery Hall	8
Alford Hall	10
Carmody Hall	9
Kamola Hall	28
Kennedy Hall	17
Sue Lombard Hall	16
<hr/>	
Off-Campus Residences	Number of Evaluations
Elwood Hall	3
Vetville	1
Parents' home	0
Private home or boarding house	19
Y.M.C.A.	0
Other	5
<hr/>	
Total	126

Sufficient light for study provided

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				2.50
Montgomery Hall				2.50
Alford Hall				2.00
Carmody Hall				1.89
Kamola Hall				2.29
Kennedy Hall				3.12
Sue Lombard Hall				2.81

Living quarters were free from abnormal noise or unnecessary disturbance

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				2.50
Montgomery Hall				2.50
Alford Hall				1.50
Carmody Hall				1.78
Kamola Hall				2.50
Kennedy Hall				2.47
Sue Lombard Hall				2.75

Furniture and equipment in my room were adequate for my needs

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.50
Montgomery Hall				3.25
Alford Hall				2.70
Carmody Hall				3.44
Kamola Hall				3.36
Kennedy Hall				3.53
Sue Lombard Hall				3.31

FIGURE 1

A COMPARISON OF MEAN ATTITUDES REGARDING THE
PHYSICAL FACTORS IN THE VARIOUS DORMITORIES

Rooms maintained a comfortable and healthful temperature

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				1.70
Montgomery Hall				2.50
Alford Hall				2.10
Carmody Hall				1.78
Kamola Hall				2.89
Kennedy Hall				2.88
Sue Lombard Hall				3.31

Rooms provided a reasonable degree of privacy

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				2.80
Montgomery Hall				3.00
Alford Hall				2.10
Carmody Hall				2.77
Kamola Hall				3.07
Kennedy Hall				3.12
Sue Lombard Hall				2.94

Rooms were clean and easy to keep clean

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.10
Montgomery Hall				3.00
Alford Hall				2.60
Carmody Hall				3.44
Kamola Hall				2.14
Kennedy Hall				3.23
Sue Lombard Hall				3.19

FIGURE 1 (continued)

Sanitary facilities were clean, uncrowded, and well maintained

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.20
Montgomery Hall				2.75
Alford Hall				2.40
Carmody Hall				2.89
Kamola Hall				2.10
Kennedy Hall				3.44
Sue Lombard Hall				2.43

Reasonable policy in allowing students to decorate or make rooms homelike

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.20
Montgomery Hall				2.87
Alford Hall				3.20
Carmody Hall				3.00
Kamola Hall				2.96
Kennedy Hall				3.47
Sue Lombard Hall				3.25

Adequate, inexpensive facilities for clothes washing, drying, and ironing

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				2.90
Montgomery Hall				2.62
Alford Hall				2.80
Carmody Hall				2.44
Kamola Hall				2.60
Kennedy Hall				3.06
Sue Lombard Hall				2.62

FIGURE 1 (continued)

Repairs to facilities which affected me promptly and efficiently done

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.20
Montgomery Hall				2.75
Alford Hall				2.30
Carmody Hall				2.00
Kamola Hall				2.50
Kennedy Hall				3.35
Sue Lombard Hall				2.75

Fulfillment of duties by supervisor, housemother, or other authority with respect to overall living conditions

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Munro Hall				3.80
Montgomery Hall				3.87
Alford Hall				3.60
Carmody Hall				3.55
Kamola Hall				3.14
Kennedy Hall				3.00
Sue Lombard Hall				2.50

FIGURE I (continued)

In order to determine the number of people who withdrew from dormitory service and for what reasons, the following fill-in question was inserted in the questionnaire: "I moved out of a college dormitory at some time previous to leaving school because ..."

Fourteen people (twelve women and two men) answered this question affirmatively, giving the following reasons for having chosen to live off-campus. Five women and one man moved into other than college operated quarters because of marriage. One young man moved from Alford because he desired a larger, more private room. A young lady from Kennedy Hall also sought more privacy. Financial reasons were stated by a girl from Kamola who said she could not afford the room and board and found it cheaper to live off-campus with a roommate. Another girl from Kamola Hall moved out because she desired to work for her room and board. The closure of Elwood Hall caused one young lady to choose off-campus residence. She did not want to live in another hall, and she wanted to be "on her own."

Negative reaction to some aspect of dormitory life itself was the reason that three of the twelve women took up residence elsewhere. A girl from Kamola found that there was too much noise for study during study hours. A woman who left Kamola during summer session felt that "The dormitory hours were unsatisfactory for summer living as it was too hot to stay inside." A Kennedy Hall girl who would have had to stay in Sue Lombard because of a summer closure of Kennedy, " ... refused to live at Sue Lombard during summer quarter". The reason she gave was

the housemother.

Dining Conditions Evaluated

Central Washington College of Education provides dining service to a large percentage of its student body. Of the 126 members of the ex-student sample, 120 had taken their meals in the three college dining halls.

Of the physical factors, nourishing food and the conditions under which it is eaten are of as great importance to the students' academic well being and health, as well as attitudes, as any other item which might be evaluated. Considering the number of voluntary comments made by the members of the sample, it will be seen that feelings were very definite in regard to this aspect of college life.

Opinions with respect to eating conditions on the campus of Central Washington College were gathered in an identical manner to those in the foregoing section on living conditions. A check list established the place where most of the respondents' meals were eaten. The three college operated dining halls, the home of parents, private home, boarding house, restaurant, or other locations were possibilities.

Following are eleven statements concerning eating conditions which were evaluated by the respondents.

1. Quality and nutritive value of food served
2. Food charges (cost from standpoint of value received)
3. Quantity of food served
4. Food portions of reasonably equal quantity to all students
5. Variety of the menu
6. Service efficient and speedy

7. Dining hall personnel courteous and helpful
8. Unnecessary dining hall noise held at a minimum
9. Crowded conditions or long waiting lines held at a minimum
10. Dining hall atmosphere conducive to pleasant and healthful mealtimes
11. Sanitary measures practiced in food cooking, handling and serving

Sue Lombard Cafeteria, serving men and women. There were sixty evaluations of Sue Lombard cafeteria. The men and women had eaten the majority of their meals at Sue Lombard cafeteria and felt that they received good quality food. One young lady, a senior, said, "Meals at Sue were very good. Summers were the only time I ate there." One of the men, replying while in the service, admitted, "Compared to the food I enjoy now, conditions at Central are very fine and it's too bad I did not realize how good they were while in school." However, a dissenting woman sophomore volunteered the following:

There was not enough attention paid the vegetables. The cooked vegetables were usually over cooked. The vegetable salads had so much vinegar that they made me ill. The fish for Fridays was very poor grade.

This latter comment is repeated in the words of a sophomore girl:

There was only one time each week that I really couldn't tolerate the food and that was Fridays. I'm not a Catholic so I didn't feel as though I had to eat fish but the overpowering smell of the fish really took away all my appetite because it not only was evident as you came into the cafeteria but also in the whole building itself. Could you have meat also for the Protestants on Friday?

The consensus on the value received by students in this dining hall was well above good. On the other hand some important exceptions were volunteered. A senior woman said:

Quite a few students were of the opinion that forcing students

who did not eat breakfast to pay for it whether we ate it or not is not fair. They know who plans to eat breakfast when the meal tickets are purchased at the beginning of the quarter and can plan accordingly. I did not eat breakfast and it was a perfect waste of money as far as I was concerned.

Also, a sophomore boy adds: "The breakfasts weren't worth getting up for and I resented having to pay for them anyway." A girl who left as a sophomore suggested: "Some provisions should be made for Sunday evening supper."

Between good and excellent was the judgment concerning the quantity of food served, but a very critical comment on this item was made by a sophomore girl who stated:

Those of us who ate heavily never had enough to eat, and had to fill up on between meal snacks. By the end of spring quarter, I was ten pounds underweight and had a vitamin deficiency.

A large number of the respondents felt that an attempt to serve reasonably equal portions was made, for this item scored well above good.

Variety in the menu fell below good to 2.74 and an ex-junior girl commented:

While I couldn't object to the menu or to the actual food served, I didn't care for the way in which a lot of the foods were combined, such as in the salads. I know that many people have individual tastes and that it is hard to please everyone. I think that if a survey were taken in which you asked students what combination of food they liked that the majority would have definite suggestions.

The speed and efficiency of the dining hall service received a rating of good plus.

Courtesy and helpfulness of dining hall personnel also was held

of better than good quality.

Dining hall noise was not altogether held to a minimum, results on this item showing it to be above mid point of the scale, but still less than good. One young lady, a one time sophomore ~~maintained~~, however, "I think the noise and conduct of the students depend a lot on the students themselves."

The lowest rating assigned dining conditions in Sue Lombard cafeteria was in regard to the crowded conditions and long waiting lines. This item earned only slightly above fair average opinion and an ex-freshman girl's comment was, "I hope that since I left Central the crowded conditions of the waiting lines have been greatly improved." A senior man who had lived off-campus complained of, "Too long a line and too much cutting in."

General dining hall atmosphere fell somewhat short of good in being conducive to pleasant and healthful mealtimes, according to the mean rating of 2.84. Numerous comments and suggestions were as follows:

The aluminum tray service in Sue Lombard Cafeteria lended no atmosphere.

Inside the dining hall the atmosphere was very good but while we were waiting outside, the smell from the kitchen was enough to kill a starving man's appetite.

I think some provision should be made in the dining hall for the use of manners. A person with a college degree should know how to act at a table.

The table manners were deplorable, showing the lack of culture among the students. What kind of teachers will these cave people be?

The lack of any formality in dining facilities was not conducive to the development of the gracious manners requisite in a well rounded educational background.

Being a little older than most students I was able to observe the table manners of others. Nine out of ten do not know what table manners are. Some type of a system should be adopted to give these men and women a sense of values at the table.

Sanitary practices in Sue Lombard dining hall as observed and evaluated by former students were placed at good plus. However, a young sophomore suggested that, "It's a very poor idea to allow any animals such as dogs in the dining hall, but nevertheless, it was common practice." Another comment, by a junior girl, stated, "The only objection I had would be when the pork wasn't cooked enough."

Table XII indicates the evaluation of the Sue Lombard cafeteria.

Munson Cafeteria, serving 110 male residents of Munson Hall and a small varying number of off-campus men students. The small number of evaluations (four in all) made of dining conditions relative to the Munson Hall cafeteria was because only Munson Hall residents, plus a small number of men residing in other than campus operated quarters, took their meals in this cafeteria. Since no former Munson Hall residents responded to the survey, the evaluations here are those of a small number of off-campus men. No comments were volunteered from the group and no interpretation of the evaluation was felt to be necessary as the number of responses was too small to be of any significance. Table XIII is included for reasons of completeness only.

TABLE XII
EVALUATION OF SUE LOMBARD CAFETERIA

Item	Mean Rating
Quality of food	3.04
Value received	3.43
Quantity	3.43
Equal portions	3.33
Variety	2.74
Service	3.10
Dining hall personnel	3.42
Minimum of noise	2.84
Minimum of crowding	2.42
Pleasant atmosphere	2.84
Sanitary measures	3.11

TABLE XIII
EVALUATION OF MUNSON CAFETERIA

Item	Mean Rating
Quality of food	2.75
Value received	3.15
Quantity	3.00
Equal portions	3.75
Variety	2.50
Service	3.00
Dining hall personnel	3.15
Minimum of noise	3.15
Minimum of crowding	3.00
Pleasant atmosphere	3.15
Sanitary measures	3.75

Walnut Street Cafeteria, serving men and women. The fifty-six men and women who made an evaluation of eating conditions in the Walnut Street cafeteria assigned somewhat lower mean ratings to them than were given those of Sue Lombard cafeteria. The quality of food served was felt to be considerably less than good. A biting criticism, reflecting a negative attitude toward the cafeteria, was received from an ex-freshman who said:

My rating of the food service at Central may seem a bit hard, but believe me, the food which was served in the Walnut Street cafeteria was not to be bragged about. It was the feeling of many of the students that they would rather pay more and receive better food. I'm sure the meals could have been made more appetizing and a more sanitary condition maintained in the cafeteria. The students often wondered how they were able to get away with such poor conditions.

Another reply, however, from a junior girl, stated:

Concerning the food in the cafeteria, I realized that high standards of service were connected with serving so many people twice a day. I liked the fact that emphasis was placed on a high protein diet.

A 3.29 rating, well above the good category was given the value of the food considering its cost to the student, while the quantity of food, according to the respondents fell short of good by a small margin. Most of the students felt that portions were usually of equal size. An interesting question was asked here by a sophomore girl:

Why is it that when hamburgers, for instance, were served, we girls, although we paid just as much for our food as the boys did, received only one while the boys got two?

The variety of the menu was evaluated at midway between fair and good, with speed and efficiency of dining hall service slightly higher.

Personnel performing duties in the cafeteria were rated good in courtesy and helpfulness. The attitude regarding a minimum of unnecessary noise was not good, falling at 2.70. A senior girl entered a sharp criticism on this item, saying:

The dining conditions were very bad at Walnut Street cafeteria; much noise, bad language, and so forth, including on occasion, drinking in the dining hall and students who had been drinking in the cafeteria.

Many respondents felt that crowded conditions prevailed in this cafeteria, for this item received the lowest mean attitude score of any in this group, being only slightly better than fair. Said one junior woman:

I found Walnut Street cafeteria much too noisy and boisterous for the enjoyment of a pleasant meal. I also noticed that if the meals were started being served the minute 11:30 came around that the congestion was at a minimum. If they serve the students who have no fourth hour class, then by the time everyone gets in from classes you eliminate a long line; consequently, you can eat in peace.

A rating of 2.76, well under the good opinion was given the maintenance of a pleasant atmosphere. Suggestion for improvement in this area was made by a sophomore girl who said, "I think you should try to get plates and table clothes and flowers at least for Sunday dinner. It makes a much more pleasant atmosphere." Sanitary measures were one of the few dining conditions items judged to be higher than good for Walnut Street cafeteria. However, a senior man commented, "I noticed mangy animals in the dining hall which spoiled many meals for me."

Table XIV tabulates the responses to the questionnaire which

TABLE XIV
EVALUATION OF WALNUT STREET CAFETERIA

Item	Mean Rating
Quality of food	2.83
Value received	3.29
Quantity	2.89
Equal portions	3.25
Variety	2.67
Service	2.71
Dining hall personnel	2.99
Minimum of noise	2.70
Minimum of crowding	2.14
Pleasant atmosphere	2.76
Sanitary measures	3.22

concern the Walnut Street cafeteria. Figure II gives a comparison in the form of a graph of the average attitudes regarding dining conditions in the various cafeterias.

On the questionnaire check list pertaining to places where students took their meals, there were five off-campus possibilities. They were: (1) Parents' home, (2) Private home, (3) Boarding house, (4) Restaurant, and (5) Other. Since the evaluation of conditions encountered at any of the above would be of no value to the study other than to demonstrate the large percentage of students who availed themselves of college dining facilities, interpretations and tables of the responses of the six people concerned will be omitted.

Table XV shows the number of respondents who took their meals at each eating place.

Item twenty-six on page two of the questionnaire requested the respondent to testify whether he felt that living or eating conditions during his residence at Central Washington College of Education influenced in any way his decision not to return. He was given three choices of responses: "Yes", "No", or "Undecided."

The objective of the question, (and this same question was included at the end of each of the three main sections of the questionnaire was to derive some idea of the percentage of ex-students upon whom the foregoing living and eating conditions had had such adverse effect that they felt obliged not to return to the institution.

The response to the question was tabulated in Table XVI.

Quality and nutritive value of the food served

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.70
Munson Cafeteria					2.75
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.83

Food charges cost from standpoint of value received

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.43
Munson Cafeteria					3.15
Walnut Street Cafeteria					3.29

Quantity of food served

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.43
Munson Cafeteria					3.00
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.89

Food portions of reasonably equal quantity to all students

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.33
Munson Cafeteria					3.75
Walnut Street Cafeteria					3.25

FIGURE 2.

A COMPARISON OF MEAN ATTITUDES REGARDING THE DINING
CONDITIONS IN THE VARIOUS CAFETERIAS

Variety of the menu

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					2.74
Munson Cafeteria					2.50
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.67

Service efficient and speedy

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.10
Munson Cafeteria					3.00
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.71

Dining hall personnel courteous and helpful

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					3.42
Munson Cafeteria					3.15
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.99

Unnecessary dining hall noise held at a minimum

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					2.84
Munson Cafeteria					3.15
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.70

Crowded conditions or long waiting lines held at a minimum

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria					2.42
Munson Cafeteria					3.00
Walnut Street Cafeteria					2.14

FIGURE 2 (continued)

Dining hall atmosphere conducive to pleasant and healthful mealtimes

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria				2.84
Munson Cafeteria				3.15
Walnut Street Cafeteria				2.76

Sanitary measures practiced in food cooking, handling, and serving

	<u>1.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	Mean Rating
Sue Lombard Cafeteria				3.11
Munson Cafeteria				3.75
Walnut Street Cafeteria				3.22

FIGURE 2 (continued)

TABLE XV

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS AND PLACES WHERE THEY TOOK MEALS

Dining Hall or Eating Place	Number of Evaluations
Sue Lombard Cafeteria	60
Walnut Street Cafeteria	56
Munson Cafeteria	4
Parents' home	0
Private home	2
Boarding house	0
Restaurant	1
Other	0
Total	126

TABLE XVI

RESPONSES TO QUESTION AS TO WHETHER LIVING OR DINING

CONDITIONS AFFECTED DECISION TO LEAVE

CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE

	Yes	No	Undecided	No Response
Number	16	102	6	2
Per cent	12.7	82.0	3.7	1.6

It will be noted that over twelve per cent indicated that these conditions affected their decisions, while eighty-two per cent said that they did not.

II. SOCIAL FACTORS

A residence college is a student's "home away from home". In some instances it is the first occasion of his being away from close friends, relatives, or a social sphere in which he finds ready acceptance. The transition to college life is at times difficult to make. However, warm friendly relationships with other students, with faculty members, and the discovery of and association with active, organized groups having similar interests to his own do much to create a feeling of belonging. Thus the student becomes a part of a much larger social world, and is on his way to becoming a truly educated person.

This section of the study sought to evaluate the attitudes of students who left Central prematurely regarding the social aspects of their college life. It was concerned, mainly, with three areas of social life on campus:

1. Overall social atmosphere on campus
2. Campus clubs, organizations, and social functions
3. Dormitory and living groups

Several statements in each group were to have been graded by the respondent. The grades were to be assigned according to the respondent's experience with and opinion about the social atmosphere, the social

activities, and the opportunities for social growth.

Overall Social Atmosphere on Campus

Absence of snobbishness or cliqueishness shown at Central. The college seemed to rate good with regard to being socially "open". In the words of a sophomore boy, "From the first day on I was treated as if I were most welcome. Relationships among and between students was very warm and created a feeling that most schools wish they could have." But a freshman girl said, "Cliques are present in any large group of people, especially younger ones such as we. I was just the unhappy middle-man in several disputes." On the negative side, a junior man commented:

The friendly, interested 'Good Neighbor' policy which is found at Seattle University (the school in which I am now enrolled) is not as prevalent at Central as it is here. At Central I felt that too many of the individuals were striving for self-righteous personal gain, without due regard for the interests and welfare of the whole group.

Attitudes among and relationships between all students and faculty. This item rated very good. Several comments regarding this item were as follows:

The relationship between faculty and students was very good.

The faculty for the most part was exceptionally fine and most were understanding. I believe, however, that the student body was rather resentful of the many practices of a few housemothers. Also, the narrow mindedness and lack of understanding on the part of the Dean of Women was resented.

I would like to add a word about some housemothers at Central. I knew the Walnut Street "moms" quite well, and they deserve a pat on the back. They have a hard job and do some wonderful work

for the students. I can truthfully say that whenever I had a problem away from home, my house "mom" was always there to help me or anyone else.

Degree of welcome extended to students in campus social activities. This item was rated very good by the respondents. The general attitude regarding this item was given by a junior who said, "In my opinion the whole social setup at Central makes the person feel as though he is accepted by one and all from the first day he arrives." Another boy, a freshman, volunteered, "I liked the social conditions very much and they made college life much more complete."

Attractiveness of social activities to draw students to school functions. The response to this item dropped considerably below good, giving some indication of shortcomings in that area.

Attractiveness of weekend activities to prevent excessive trips home. This item also fell considerably in the estimation of the respondents, showing a rating only slightly above the fair category. The comments received offered more detailed reasons for the rather low rating of the two items:

They seem to lack ideas for different activities. Each weekend it was the same old thing, dances or shows. Have talked to many students since leaving Central. They say there is nothing to do so they go home for the weekend.

Even dancing becomes the 'same old stuff' after a year of three dances a week.

Too many dances.

Something seemed to lack on weekend dances as there was usually a shortage of dancing partners.

An excellent attempt was made by students and faculty to provide interesting weekends but I will always maintain that if a student feels like going home nothing will keep him on campus.

There weren't nearly enough assemblies at Central. No 'Artists and Lectures Series' and so on. The student programs were good in my opinion and I still don't think that other schools come up to Central in producing a variety show exchange assembly.

During the time I lived at Central, I believe that there was only one formal dance. The weekend activities offered were certainly not sufficient to prevent trips home. The social functions offered were noticeably bereft of variety, formality and imagination.

Very fine dances. A chance to become acquainted with other students. Also, the number of dances was very good.

Needed more school activities. Shows become tiresome.

The social functions were not planned for enough variety and in a way in which to get students interested. This is a big factor in my leaving Central.

I felt the social functions were very limited. The entertainment was mainly dances and this was the main thing I disliked about the school.

Social activities on the campus were not sufficient to keep the students occupied with their free time. The campus club at that time offered only a cup of coffee, a card game and a 'bull session'. Activities here could have included the following: pool tables, a place to dance and other activities that interest the majority of the campus. The dances were pathetic as attendance proved. Being a follower of music, I was always disappointed to hear that a band would provide music for the usual weekend dance, as I thought the caliber of music these bands played was below normal and their repertoire was small. Juke box music with good danceable records would have filled the bill better.

Desire to learn and practice good manners among students. This item, felt by the writer to be an important aspect of the training to be gained in a residential college, was rated by ex-students as midway between fair and good. Some respondents were distressed at the manners

at table demonstrated by a few of their number, as the following testifies:

Dining hall manners of most students are sadly lacking.

The manners of the students at Central were extremely poor. There could have been some valuable training put across in the dorms and other living groups but no such thing was ever attempted. Perhaps this was because there was no one to teach it.

Adequate facilities for all campus social activities. A noticeable shortcoming in this area was seen by the respondents who assigned it a rating of only fair or better. This item well may be viewed at the same time as the next.

An attractive social center for the use of all students. The lowest scores in the entire social factors area occurred in these two items. The survey sample had left Central in advance of the completion of the Student Union Building and their ratings and the following comments will give some idea of the drastic need filled by this new structure.

Since my year at Central the Union Building and the new campus club have been opened and returning on a visit, I found a tremendous improvement.

Student Union Building not yet completed when I left Central and conditions were exceedingly crowded. Now I imagine things are eased a lot.

It would appear that the Student Union Building was a valuable addition to Central's campus.

Campus Clubs, Organizations and Social Functions

Opportunities for interested students for participation. The clubs, other organizations, and functions received a valuation of good and the ex-students felt that very good opportunities were provided for participation, because they rated this item at good plus.

All members of clubs and organizations actively worked for their club. Although the preceding item was rated high, apparently the consensus among the members of the sample was, however, that the active work of the clubs was limited to a small number of the members, for this statement received only fair or better. Comments were as follows:

Some students were such leaders that other didn't have a chance.

Many girls are shy and won't speak up and volunteer for jobs which they would really like to do; consequently, you find the same people doing everything.

Definite statement of purposes of each organization available to all. Any organization or club should have a reason for being, and its members or prospective members should know the philosophy of their group. A grade of good was given this item.

Club activities largely the result of student planning. Students seemingly were the mainsprings of the planning for the major part of the activities as this item rated good.

Faculty and administrative advisors acting solely in advisory capacity. The students seemed to be very capably advised by faculty and administrative advisors who remained within their advisory capacity,

and this item was highly valued at good plus.

Mixers were really mixers. A rating about midway between fair and good was assigned this item which sought to shed light on the problem of the individual who find difficulty in "fitting in". Perhaps the following comments were volunteered by such individuals:

These turned out to be a place where you would go to see who was going with whom this week. Very few people really mixed. Also was used by freshmen as a Wednesday night excuse to go down to the club or somewhere else just to get out of an extra hour of study.

Old gym seemed to be constantly used for social dances and space and ventilation were poor. During basketball season new gym could rarely be used.

Better organization of mixers would improve their value as mixers.

Students were given freedom to manage their own social functions.

Student management of social life seems to have been readily sanctioned as its rating of good plus would indicate a good attitude toward it by the average former student member of this survey.

Cost of attending reasonably within the means of the students.

The cost of extra-curricular activities is an important item in the budget of almost all students and here, as was noted in every item concerned with the outlay of money, Central seems to have rated very high in the eyes of those who had been students at the college. The highest rating given any item in the series on social factors was assigned to this statement.

Degree of variety and imagination used; all functions not the "same old stuff". A slightly negative attitude toward this item seems

to indicate room for improvement.

Sufficient publicity given functions so that everyone "got the news". Publicity was apparently well enough handled that it was rated very good by the respondents to the survey.

Dormitory and Living Groups

Attitude among and between dormitories - social harmony. The inter-dormitory and intra-dormitory attitude on the campus of Central Washington College appears to have been slightly below good. One ex-student suggested, "I would like to see the dorms having more of their own parties, and so on".

Members considered the dormitory a social experiment in democratic living. This statement also earned a rating of only slightly less than good.

Conduct among members showed respect for the rights of others. This item dropped down to substantially below the good rating. A specific criticism in this area was, "Noise was terrific at times."

Social unity of house group was unhampered by cliques or closed factions. Cliques within the dormitories would seem to have been a small problem because ex-residents of those dormitories evaluated the situation at good.

All house members took part in and shared responsibility for house activities. There appears here to have been a reasonable doubt in the average respondent's mind that the majority of house members

took an active part in house activities for the statement was evaluated at only midway between fair and good. The same problem seems to have existed within the clubs on the campus. As one young lady volunteered, "I think house councils should know their girls better and push those who are shy to give them a chance to shine."

House members formulated and followed intelligent rules for group living and conduct. According to the members of the sample, the various houses made a good attempt at agreeing upon and adhering to high standards of dormitory conduct.

House councils or governing bodies active in dealing with house problems. The students did a very good job with regard to their own problems according to the survey. However, one freshman girl said:

I think drinking in the dorms should be checked and absolutely nothing was done about it. I believe other parts of the dorm and other dorms are better in this respect than the particular part I lived in so my criticism may be of only one section of the dorms and not Central dorms as a whole.

Minimum faculty interference in house council decisions and activities. The members of the various dormitories would appear to have been given reasonable freedom in handling their own problems and planning their own activities. A value of good was placed on this item.

Healthy competitive spirit shown between dorms or living groups shown by intramural teams, and so forth. Competition seems to have been keen and healthfully active between the dormitories. A very good rating was assigned this area.

Table XVII tabulates the evaluations of social factors by those

TABLE XVII
EVALUATION OF SOCIAL FACTORS

Overall Social Atmosphere of the Campus	
Item	Mean Rating
Absence of snobbishness	3.12
Attitude among students, faculty	3.35
Degree of welcome	3.32
Attractiveness of functions	2.70
Attractiveness of weekend activities	2.37
Good manners practiced	2.56
Facilities for social activities	2.36
Attractive social center	2.22
Campus Clubs, Organizations, and Social Functions	
Item	Mean Rating
Clubs active	2.86
All interested students participated	3.08
All club members active	2.40
Club purposes well known	2.90
Activities largely student planned	3.07
Faculty as advisors only	3.11
Mixers really mixers	2.67
Student-managed social functions	3.09
Cost of attending	3.50
Variety	2.64
Publicity	3.10

TABLE XVII (continued)

Dormitory and Living Groups

Item	Mean Rating
Social harmony	2.95
Democratic living	2.94
Respect for others	2.80
Absence of cliques	2.88
House activities shared by all	2.50
Principles for group living	3.02
House councils active	3.23
Minimum faculty interference	3.08
Competitive spirit	3.27

who took part in the study.

The final item of this section, as in the other sections of the questionnaire, asked the respondents to rate themselves with regard to the following statement: "Keeping your above answers in mind, do you feel that social conditions as they affected you during your residence at Central influenced in any way your decision not to return." The three choices; "Yes", "No", or "Undecided" were to be checked and a tabulation of the replies to this statement is shown in Table XVIII.

III. FINANCIAL FACTORS

It is a difficult task to evaluate the monetary worth of an education. For most individuals, however, attendance at a college does cost money. According to McNeely's² study, money troubles constitute the second most serious cause of student mortality.

The questionnaire section covering attitudes regarding the financial aspects of attendance at Central sought to determine the opinions of ex-students on the general problem of whether they felt their money was well-spent or not.

With this in mind, a rating scale was constructed similar to that in the preceding sections and the various fees, charges for service,

²John H. McNeely, College Student Mortality, United States Office of Education Bulletin 11, (Washington: Government Printing Office, June, 1937), p. 20.

TABLE XVIII
RESPONSES TO QUESTION AS TO WHETHER SOCIAL CONDITIONS
AFFECTED DECISION TO LEAVE
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COLLEGE

	Yes	No	Undecided	No Response
Number	16	103	5	2
Per cent	12.7	82.2	3.5	1.6

and other expenses were opened to evaluation by ex-students. Accompanying the title of each fee charged by the college was the quarterly and yearly amount charged. The amounts were taken from the College Bulletin of the time covered by this survey and therefore were those actually paid by the respondents during their time of attendance.

Eight of the fees were paid by all students. They were:

	<u>Per Quarter</u>	<u>Per Year</u>
1. Health fee	\$3.00	\$9.00
2. Library fee	3.00	9.00
3. Miscellaneous fee	5.00	15.00
4. Student Government Association fee	13.50	40.50
5. Hyakem fee	5.00	5.00
6. General Course fee	2.50	7.50
7. Board (food service)	96.00 or 88.00	272.00
8. Room and Linen fee	42.00 or <u>38.50</u>	<u>119.00</u>
	\$170.00 or \$162.00	<u>\$477.00</u>

Following were five additional categories of costs and expenses including text books, supplies (bought at the Campus Bookstore), and campus functions such as dances, movies, concerts, and games. Also included here were items wherein community services and functions were to be evaluated with respect to whether the returns were equivalent to the investment.

Evaluation of Fees Charged All Students by Central Washington College

Health fee. This charge, entitling the student to the use of the college infirmary and nurse and doctor service, was rated very highly by ex-students at midway between good and excellent. One suggestion was made by a freshman girl who said, "I feel the health

fee should have been on the basis of your personal needs. Although these fees are slight, I think they should be discussed by the research group."

Library fee. The 124 respondents who rated the value of their access to the books and equipment of the college library placed it well above good. However, a freshman woman commented, "The only fee that I did not think should have been listed for all students was the library fee, as during my entire year, I did not use the library facilities over three or four times." Another misunderstanding regarding fees is reflected by a freshman boy who said, "I don't think freshmen and sophomores should have to pay as much as upper classmen."

Miscellaneous fee. This fee levied by the college for the support of special lectures, assemblies and other services merited a good opinion by members of the sample.

Student Government Association fee. The Student Government Association fee, which supported the Student Building fund, the Alumni fund, the Campus Club and General Association fees, was placed at good on the opinion scale. A senior girl stated however, "I feel there is an overbalance of fees going to athletics and not enough to good music, concerts, and so forth; the ratio is wrong."

Hyakem fee. This charge entitled the students to a copy of Hyakem, the college yearbook, and earned a mean attitude rating of good plus as far as its value was concerned. However, three respondents, apparently the victims of errors of distribution, made the following

statements.

Since I did not get my Hyakem, I feel rather cheated and if at all possible, I would like either to get the book or my money.

After paying my Hyakem fee at the entrance of the school term, I believe it would only be fair that I get it. I have made attempts to contact the persons involved, but have had no response.

The only investment from which I didn't get a return was the Hyakem fee.

General Course fee. The value per dollar invested in the courses offered at Central was felt to be high as manifested by the good plus rating assigned it. As one junior girl commented, "The school finances are very reasonable. At the University of Washington, it is \$46.00 a quarter. There is quite a difference in just the entrance fee."

Board (food service) fee. This, the largest single item in the series of fees charged each student by the college, met with warm approval by members of the sample. Its mean rating stood significantly above the good category. Yet, according to one ex-senior woman, "The cost of breakfast is unnecessary for those who do not wish it."

Room and Linen fee. Also a big item in the students' budget, this charge was rated as a "best buy" by the survey respondents, at midway between good and excellent, but prompted one freshman boy to comment, "Expenses at Central were very reasonable, but if a small amount more were charged and better service given, it would be worth it."

The above ratings evaluated fees and costs which were essentially

identical for each member of the student body. Following are items whose cost varied to the individual student depending upon his needs and desires. The emphasis, however, still remains upon the return for the investment made.

Textbooks bought in the College Bookstore. Of all the costs evaluated by ex-customers of the college, this was given the lowest rating at somewhat less than good.

Classroom supplies bought in the College Bookstore. A rating slightly above good was given these expenses. A comment concerning the bookstore at that time criticized not the prices so much as the service with the following: "I think it is a crime the way the Bookstore is handled; in line (sic) and spotty service."

Campus functions. Most respondents felt that their money was well spent for campus entertainment. The item was given a rating of considerably better than good. A sophomore who left Central during that period volunteered the following:

I have found that fees at Central were far below those of other schools, and I feel that every penny spent at Ellensburg was well spent. The majority of functions were well planned and the price of admission was in a price range that everyone could meet.

Community functions (movies, clubs, and so forth) in the city of Ellensburg. This item, included because of the fact that a certain amount of student money is spent in the city itself, received the lowest rating of any of the financial factors being graded. It was assigned a place only somewhat higher than the midpoint of the scale.

Community services (cafes, cleaning establishments, shops, and stores) in Ellensburg. The per dollar value of the services and goods received by the students in their dealings with merchants and service people of this town, like its companion above, also fell below the rank of good. It would appear that a town such as Ellensburg, with a large potential number of customers from the ranks of college people would do well to make every effort to raise its rating in this particular area.

Table XIX indicates the evaluation of financial factors by the ex-students.

A question check of former students made the statement: "A satisfactory attempt was made to inform all students as to how their various fees were used." It was to be answered "Yes", "No", or "Undecided." The item was included on the premise that the buyer prefers to see where his money is going and to determine how well the institution publicized the allocation and use of student fees. Seventy per cent or eighty-eight of the 126 respondents felt that more effort could be made to relay financial information to the student in order to improve his understanding of the breakdown of costs.

The final five items connected with financial factors of Central Washington College were devoted not to evaluation of expenses and value received, but to questions designed to uncover personal financial difficulties in order to ascertain whether the college in its guidance

TABLE XIX
EVALUATION OF FINANCIAL FACTORS

Item	Mean Rating
Health fee	3.43
Library fee	3.26
Miscellaneous fee	3.02
Student Government Association fee	3.08
Hyakem fee	3.28
General Course fee	3.35
Board fee	3.39
Room and Linen fee	3.46
Textbooks	2.96
Classroom supplies	3.06
Campus functions	3.34
Community functions	2.82
Community services	2.90

function might be of some aid to the individual student in resolving such problems and thereby keeping him in attendance.

With this in mind the most obvious question would ask what percentage of respondents were forced to leave the college because of such difficulties. This item, to be answered "Yes", "No", or "In part" made the following statement: "My education at Central was curtailed because of insufficient funds." A total of thirty-one per cent or nearly one-third of the 126 members of the responding group testified that financial problems were either wholly or partially responsible for their giving up their studies at Central Washington College. Twelve per cent gave a definite "Yes" answer.

The next question, a companion to the above and to be answered only by those who had made an affirmative response to that item stated, "Had suitable employment on or off-campus been available, I would have been able to remain in college." Four of the fifteen people who could answer this question replied "Yes" while seven gave a "No" answer and four were undecided as to whether or not the availability of employment would have solved their problem. One of the men who answered "Yes" on this item made the following criticism:

I needed a job, expressed my earnest desire for one, but got none. I did the same this year at Western, and they immediately (within one hour) put me to work on a library project. Because of the friendliness offered me by the Student Personnel Director, who is also my advisor, I knew whom to call upon and obtain results.

Another girl, then a sophomore, countered with:

I feel there is enough work available if there is necessity for

extra money; or, in fact, half-day jobs downtown for those who must work their way through, as I did. Ellensburg's Central Washington College is a wonderful school.

An enlightening comment regarding on-campus employment was made by another young lady, also a sophomore, who said:

I worked part time for a professor, but was unable to earn as much as I liked because I was allowed only so many hours per month and also because of the poor hourly rate paid to students.

Concerning the sources of the major part of funds, forty-nine per cent or sixty-two persons (nearly half) of the respondents to the study were spending their own funds for college attendance. Thirty-nine per cent or forty-eight respondents (slightly over a third) received the major part of their monetary needs from parents or relatives, while five per cent of the remainder (seven people) were financed through the aid of the G.I. Bill of Rights. One person in the group enjoyed the assistance of a scholarship during his time spent at Central, while a small group of eight people (six per cent) felt that they and their parents were sharing the financial responsibility for schooling.

The item which stated, "I had a part or full-time job during my residence at Central" was answered affirmatively by forty-four people, or thirty-five per cent of the respondents. Sixty-two per cent (seventy-seven people) were unemployed during their college residence. Five persons made no response to the item.

The final item in connection with financial factors at Central

Washington College of Education summed up fairly the attitudes of ex-students. It asked the respondent, keeping his answers in mind, whether the college could have reasonably altered its financial policy in any way so as to have prevented the necessity for his leaving school. The response reflects a very positive attitude toward financial aspects of the college. While there were people forced out of school by financial troubles, those troubles could hardly be traced to their inability to pay school costs. The feeling was put into words by a junior girl who volunteered, "The financial factor at Central is excellent. Most any child from a middle class family, or even those who may not be able to afford the full expense can find a place at Central." A senior girl said, "I think Central has done very well in keeping down costs for the students."

Only one person replied that he could have remained in school only under altered financial conditions. Ninety-five respondents, or seventy-five per cent felt that school costs were in no way responsible for their leaving college. Nineteen people (fifteen per cent) were undecided and eleven, approximately ten per cent, made no response to the item.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Other than the reasons volunteered by the respondents themselves, no definite conclusions could be drawn as to any single or multiple cause for their failure to complete their studies at Central Washington College of Education, and Feder's¹ admonition to treat such volunteered reasons with caution made it undesirable even to accept them at their face value.

The original assumption was that since the survey sample had left school and had not returned, those aspects of the school situation which it judged negatively must have had some degree of importance and the writer felt reasonably certain on concluding the study, that the areas receiving low ratings did contribute to the students' desire to withdraw and did affect drop outs at the Central Washington College of Education. Therefore, the following discussion will for the most part concern itself with the areas and subjects rated below the general level of the average opinion and recommendations will be made from these findings.

¹Walter S. Monroe (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 1296.

I. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS AND LIVING ACCOMMODATIONS

As might have been expected, the temporary dormitories were rated low in many departments. It would appear that the criticism was not leveled so much at the individual rooms, since they were felt to be reasonably clean, well furnished and equipped, but rather toward the structure, the installations as a whole.

Winter seems to have been a severe strain on any academic activity here. During dark, cold days with everyone indoors, it would appear that morale and study habits could suffer from the inadequate light, heat and quiet which these buildings afforded. Supervision on the other hand was rated here much higher than that of the three permanent women's dormitories. The housemother at Sue Lombard was repeatedly criticized. The ex-residents seemed to have had reason to be quite critical of all the housemothers of the women's dormitories with regard to their fulfillment of supervisory duties.

Kamola Hall was criticized by the young ladies who had lived there concerning room cleanliness and ease of cleaning. This only fair rating contrasts strongly with those of the other halls, and would bear investigation.

II. FOOD AND DINING CONDITIONS

The study pointed out several significant factors concerning the dining facilities and food enjoyed by students at the college cafe-

terias. From the standpoint of the food itself, the only definite criticism which could be singled out was a tendency toward lack of variety in the menu, understandable in an institutional cooking situation, but perhaps open to a certain degree of improvement.

Attitudes on value, quantity, food handling, and service, all seemed to have been very high. Only long waiting lines and crowding were felt to have been a problem.

The factors strongly criticized by the respondents were, strangely enough, leveled at the habits and manners of the diners themselves. Some of the students who ate in the cafeterias, not the cafeterias themselves, created negative attitudes on the part of many. As examples, dining hall noise, the lack of table manners of some students, and general atmosphere were rated low and certainly seem to merit careful consideration.

III. SOCIAL CONDITIONS

The campus of Central Washington College of Education was generally rated well by the members of the survey. Attitudes regarding faculty - student relationships and the welcome extended toward all students stood very close to excellent and received the highest of all ratings in this area.

Almost all of the severely critical attitudes toward the areas of social atmosphere and activity were closely related to a drastic lack of facilities for social activities.

The lack of an attractive social center was responsible for the lowest evaluation in the section, while facilities for social activities, attractiveness of functions and attractiveness of weekend activities and variety of functions were only slightly higher. Mixers as a social function were rated low in the estimation of the survey group.

The assumption can be made that, since almost all of the activities and functions mentioned above are related in some way to the place in which they were held, the lack of a social center created the shortcomings. When it is recalled that, at the time, the gymnasium or some other makeshift location was used, the basis for the low ratings becomes clear.

The completion of the Student Union Building in 1951 very probably alleviated many of the negative attitudes mentioned above, which on the basis of this study would merit recommendation for the construction of a social center for the college.

IV. FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

In all areas of value received, Central Washington College of Education can be proud of the attitude which those who left the institution held toward the financial aspect of life there. While a small number of the individuals who left the college were forced to leave because of money problems, only one person felt that there was anything the college could have done about it.

A significant criticism, however, was made of the lack of

orientation of students as to the breakdown of costs, almost one-sixth of the sample requesting more information as to the distribution made of their fees.

For reasons that they apparently felt were sufficient, the respondents' average evaluation of costs of College Bookstore materials was somewhat below the other relatively high ratings assigned other areas of financial factors.

The city of Ellensburg, its stores, services, and accommodations was judged somewhat unfavorably by the college students insofar as value received in return for the student's dollar.

With very few exceptions, the survey manifested a definitely positive attitude toward the "economics" of attending Central Washington College of Education.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, it is recommended by the writer:

1. That further research be done in the field of attitudes of college students toward their institution, as well as academic factors.

2. That interviews with departing students be conducted by the Deans to determine the possible reasons for students leaving school.

3. That some future researcher perform a study wherein a random sample of students still attending Central is compared to a sample of those who had left with the aim of showing further the effect of prevailing attitudes.

4. That the college concern itself with the conditions under which its students live in boarding houses, and other off-campus quarters in or near Ellensburg.

5. That the temporary dormitories be used only in the most extreme emergency, and every effort made to avoid their use during cold weather unless they can be insulated.

6. That dormitory supervision be constantly evaluated, laying emphasis upon the selection of personnel trained for the position and having the acceptance of the larger number of dormitory members.

7. That a planned program be instituted to further develop a knowledge of acceptable manners among the students as well as to improve general dining hall atmosphere. This could be a part of a freshman orientation program and is of as great importance to a college-educated

person as his academic orientation.

8. That study be given the problem of the feeling of lack of variety in the menu in the cafeterias.

9. That newly entering students be oriented as to the fees they are charged so that they will be cognizant of how these fees are used.

10. That the relatively critical attitude of the respondents to this study with regard to the prices and values received in the city of Ellensburg be made known to those concerned. A college community will always do well to create the best possible attitudes in a large consumer group such as the student body of the college.

11. That whenever misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the true facts occur, giving rise to detrimental attitudes, every effort be made to investigate the circumstances of the complaint, determining whether it has basis in fact. Following the investigation, not only is it important to act upon the findings, but even more important, in order to bring about an improvement in those negative attitudes, to make known the fact that action is being or has been taken.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Lundberg, George A. Social Research. New York, London, Toronto: Longmans-Green and Company, 1949.

B. PERIODICALS

- Coffee, Walter, Jr. "The Mortality and Academic Careers of Two Groups of College Students," School and Society, 52:269-71, September 28, 1940.
- Douglass, Harl R. and L. H. Elliot. "What Will Happen After the Veterans Leave?," School and Society, 66:465-67, December 20, 1947.
- Eurich, Alvin C. "College Failure," School and Society, 37:692-96, May 27, 1933.
- Haas, Leonard. "Four Year Studies of the Freshman Classes at Eau Claire State Teachers College," Journal of Educational Research, 42:54-61, September, 1948.
- Hale, Wyatt W. "Comparative Holding Power of Junior Colleges and Regular Four Year Colleges," Phi Delta Kappan, 13:69-74, October, 1930.
- Johnson, George B. "Proposed Technique for the Analysis of Drop Outs at a State College," Journal of Educational Research, 47:381-87, January, 1954.
- Kelly, Fred J. Continuity of College Attendance, United States Office of Education Bulletin 24. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937.
- Long, Louis and James D. Perry, "Mortality Study of College Students," School and Society, 77:103-5, February 14, 1953.
- McNeely, John H. College Student Mortality, United States Office of Education Bulletin 11, Washington: Government Printing Office, June, 1937.

Munger, Paul F. "Length of Residence and First Courses of Unpromising College Students," School and Society, 81:120-22, April 16, 1955.

Segel, David and Maris M. Proffitt. Some Factors in the Adjustment of College Students, United States Office of Education Bulletin 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937.

Stalnaker, Elizabeth M. "A Four Year Study of the Freshman Class at the West Virginia University," Journal of Educational Research, 51:100-118, October, 1942.

Walters, Richard. "Report on Enrollment Trends in Higher Education," School and Society, 73:138-140, March 3, 1951.

C. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

Monroe, Walter S. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950, p. 1296.

D. OTHER SOURCES

Central Washington College of Education, Office of the Registrar, Roster Sheets, 1950-1951.

Central Washington College of Education, Personnel Office, "What is Happening to Our Student Drop Outs?" (An Evaluation of Autumn Quarter Opening Activity, 1951).

APPENDIX

Central Washington College of Education
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Former Student of Central:

Central Washington College is presently engaged in a program of student evaluation of the College. Your name has been chosen from a list of former members of the student body and you have been sent this questionnaire in the hope that you will volunteer your assistance in this project. Your name will not be mentioned in any way and your response will remain strictly confidential.

The aid we ask is simply that you sit down for a few minutes and think back over your life and experiences while you were attending Central. The attached questionnaire form is to aid you (and us) in getting at just how you felt about the set-up here as it affected you. Your frank and honest opinion is especially desired. If you were dissatisfied about something, we would like to know what it was. If you considered the College superior in other aspects, we want to know that, too.

The instructions and information to help you in completing the forms should be fairly simple. If you feel that something has been left out and you want it included, the bottom of each sheet contains a space especially for that purpose. Don't hesitate to use it. This is your opportunity to look at the school and your impressions of it objectively, put them down, and pass them on to us. Your answers and ratings on the following pages will be compiled and from them recommendations will be made for future planning and improvements in those areas in which the study may show a need for improvement.

So wherever you are now, and whatever your present occupation, please take a few minutes off, complete the questionnaire on the following pages, and send it back in the enclosed prepaid envelope. We will deeply appreciate your cooperation.

Research Project for Student Evaluation of
Central Washington College

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male _____ female _____
2. Present age _____ age on leaving Central _____
3. Present occupation or present school _____
4. Left Central during what year:

freshman	0-45 credit hours	_____
sophomore	45-90 credit hours	_____
junior	90-135 credit hours	_____
senior	135-192 credit hours	_____
graduate	192- credit hours	_____
5. Date entered C.W.C.E. _____ Date left C.W.C.E. _____
6. Major interest fields _____
 Minor interest fields _____
7. Cumulative grade point average earned at Central _____
8. In the space below, please designate, as well as you are able, your own reason or reasons for leaving Central Washington College of Education.

PHYSICAL FACTORS

In the following section an attempt is being made to determine the possible effect which living conditions during your residence at Central had on your decision to leave or transfer. Please consider these questions as pertaining to the place of longest residence and to where you took most of your meals.

1. I lived on campus at: (check one) --- or --- I lived off campus at: (check one)

<input type="checkbox"/> Munson Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Kamola Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents' home
<input type="checkbox"/> Munro Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Kennedy Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Private home
<input type="checkbox"/> Montgomery Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Sue Lombard Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Y.M.C.A.
<input type="checkbox"/> Alford Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Elwood Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carmody Hall	<input type="checkbox"/> Vetville	_____

On the basis of your considered opinion, please grade the following physical conditions pertaining to your place of residence, as follows:

A-excellent, B-good, C-fair, D-poor. Circle your answer.

(Example: A B C D)

2. A B C D Sufficient light for study provided.
3. A B C D My living quarters free from abnormal noise or unnecessary disturbance.
4. A B C D Furniture and equipment in my room adequate for my needs.
5. A B C D Rooms maintained comfortable and healthful temperature.
6. A B C D Rooms provided reasonable degree of privacy.
7. A B C D Rooms clean and easy to keep clean.
8. A B C D Sanitary facilities clean, uncrowded, and well maintained.
9. A B C D Reasonable policy in allowing students to decorate or make room homelike.
10. A B C D Adequate, inexpensive facilities for clothes washing, ironing, and drying.
11. A B C D Repairs to facilities which affected me, promptly and efficiently done.
12. A B C D Fulfillment of duties by supervisor, housemother, or other authority with respect to overall living conditions.

The following statement may or may not apply to you. If it does, answer specifically in as few words as possible. If it doesn't apply, leave it blank.

13. I moved out of a college dormitory at some time previous to leaving school because _____
-

14. I ate on campus at: (check one) --- or --- I ate off campus at:

<input type="checkbox"/> Sue Lombard Cafeteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents' home	<input type="checkbox"/> Restaurant
<input type="checkbox"/> Munson Cafeteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Private home	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Walnut Street Cafeteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Boarding house	

Using the same grading procedure as in statements 2-12, please evaluate the following statements (15-25) concerning eating arrangements and conditions at your residence.

15. A B C D Quality and nutritive value of the food served.
 16. A B C D Food charges (cost) from standpoint of value received.
 17. A B C D Quantity of food served.
 18. A B C D Food portions of reasonably equal quantity to all students.
 19. A B C D Variety of the menu.
 20. A B C D Service efficient and speedy.
 21. A B C D Dining hall personnel courteous and helpful.
 22. A B C D Unnecessary dining hall noise held at a minimum.
 23. A B C D Crowded conditions or long waiting lines held at a minimum.
 24. A B C D Dining hall atmosphere conducive to pleasant and healthful mealtimes.
 25. A B C D Sanitary measures practiced in food cooking, handling, and serving.
26. Keeping your above answers in mind, do you feel that living or eating conditions during your residence at Central influenced in any way your decision not to return?
- yes no undecided

You are invited to add your own comment below, or on the back of this sheet, concerning any of the above statements or any area connected with living conditions which you feel deserves further mention.

SOCIAL FACTORS

This section provides you, as an ex-student of C.W.C.E., an opportunity to pass judgment on the institution with regard to the social aspects of your life here.

Please grade the following numbered statements according to your experience with and opinion about, the social atmosphere, social activities, and the opportunities for social growth provided students at Central.

A-excellent, B-good, C-fair, D-poor. Circle your answer.

Example: (A C D)

Overall social atmosphere on the campus

2. A B C D Absence of snobbishness or cliqueishness shown at C.W.C.E.
3. A B C D Attitudes among, and relationships between students and faculty.
4. A B C D Degree of welcome extended to students in campus social activities.
5. A B C D Attractiveness of social activities to draw students to school functions.
6. A B C D Attractiveness of week-end activities to prevent excessive trips home.
7. A B C D Desire to learn and practice good manners among the students.
8. A B C D Adequate facilities for all campus social activities.
9. A B C D An attractive social center for the use of all students.

Campus clubs, organizations, and social functions

10. A B C D Campus clubs active socially; not a name and group of inactive members.
11. A B C D Opportunities provided for all interested students for participation.
12. A B C D All members of clubs and organizations actively worked for their club.
13. A B C D Definite statements of purposes of each organization available to all.
14. A B C D Club activities result of student planning.
15. A B C D Faculty and administration officials acting solely in advisory capacity.
16. A B C D "Mixers" were really mixers.
17. A B C D Students given freedom to manage their own social functions.

18. A B C D Cost of attending reasonably within the means of the students.
19. A B C D Degree of variety and imagination used; all functions not the "same old stuff."
20. A B C D Sufficient publicity given functions so that everyone "got the news."

Dormitory and living groups

21. A B C D Attitude among and between dormitories -- "social harmony."
22. A B C D Members considered dormitory a social experiment in democratic living.
23. A B C D Conduct among members showed respect for the rights of others.
24. A B C D Social unity of house group was unhampered by cliques or closed factions.
25. A B C D All house members took part in and shared responsibility for house activities.
26. A B C D House members formulated and followed intelligent principles for group living and conduct.
27. A B C D House councils or governing bodies active in dealing with house problems.
28. A B C D Minimum faculty interference in house council decisions and activities.
29. A B C D Healthy competitive spirit between dorms or living groups shown by intramural teams, and so forth.
30. Keeping your above answers in mind, do you feel that social conditions as they affected you during your residence at Central influenced in any way your decision not to return?
 ___ yes ___ no ___ undecided

You are invited to add your own comment below, or on the back of this sheet, concerning any of the above statements or any area connected with social conditions which you feel deserves further mention.

FINANCIAL FACTORS

In this section you are asked to give your opinion of Central from the standpoint of your pocketbook. It is desired that every student feel that his money was well spent. Please grade the following statements concerning expenses with this always in mind: did I feel that the returns were equivalent to the investment?

A-excellent, B-good, C-fair, D-poor. Circle your answer.
(Example: A B C D)

	<u>Per Quarter</u>		<u>Year</u>
1. A B C D Health fee	\$3.00		\$9.00
2. A B C D Library fee	3.00		9.00
3. A B C D Miscellaneous fee	5.00	YOUR	15.00
4. A B C D Student Government Association fee	13.50	BASIC	40.50
5. A B C D Hyakem fee	5.00	FEEES	5.00
6. A B C D General Course fee	2.50		7.50
7. A B C D Board (food service), autumn	96.00		
winter, and spring, each	88.00		272.00
8. A B C D Room and Linen fee, autumn	42.00		
winter, and spring, each	38.50		<u>119.00</u>
			<u>\$477.00</u>
9. A B C D Textbooks (bought in College Bookstore).			
10. A B C D Classroom supplies (arts, crafts, science, and so forth, bought in College Bookstore).			
11. A B C D Campus functions (dances, movies, concerts, games, etc.)			
12. A B C D Community functions (movies, clubs, etc.), in the town of Ellensburg.			
13. A B C D Community services (cafes, cleaning establishments, shops, and stores) in Ellensburg.			
14. A satisfactory attempt was made to inform all students as to how their fees were used. (Check one) ___ yes ___ no ___ undecided			
15. My education at Central was curtailed because of insufficient funds. (Check one) ___ yes ___ no ___ in part			
16. Had suitable employment, on or off campus, been available, I would have been able to remain in college. (Check one) (Answer this question only if the answer to question 15 was "yes"). ___ yes ___ no ___ not sure			
17. During my residence at Central the major portion of my money came from: (Check one)			
___ Parents or relatives			
___ Myself			
___ G.I. Bill			
___ Others (specify) _____			

18. I had a part, or full-time job during my residence at Central.
(Check one) yes no
19. Keeping your above answers in mind, do you feel that the College
could have reasonably altered its financial policy in any way so
as to prevent the necessity for your leaving school? (Check one)
 yes no undecided

You are invited to add your own comments below concerning any of
the above statements or any area connected with financial conditions
which you feel deserves further mention.