

**The College Student Expectations Survey (CSXQ)
Results of an Administration to Entering Freshmen at California State
University, Fresno Fall 2004**



By

Dr. William P. Stock
Student Affairs Research and Assessment Officer

January 10, 2005

**The College Student Expectations Survey (CSXQ)
Results of an Administration to Entering Freshmen at California State University,
Fresno Fall 2004**

Introduction:

Every institution of learning has expectations that its graduates will display growth in or development of desirable learning objectives as a result of time spent interacting with the curriculum, personnel, and stated mission of that institution. At some institutions those expectations are formally recorded and actively communicated to students, and at other institutions the expectations are more informal or subtle.

At California State University, Fresno (Fresno State) broad expectations are communicated to current and potential students through the university's mission statement, which states in part:

(the university)...”furnishes opportunities for students to expand their intellectual horizons, foster lifelong learning, prepare for further professional study, and gain an appreciation of cultures other than their own”

General Catalogue, 2004-05 (P. 14)

Supplementing the rather general statement above are mission statements of various divisions of the university that focus upon more specialized aspects of student growth and development. As of the 2004 fall semester, two administrations of the National Survey of Student Engagement in 2001 and 2002 (NSSE) suggest that student growth and development at Fresno State closely parallels that of comparable universities throughout the United States. Lacking, from these NSSE administrations, however, is a direct measure of the extent to which Fresno State's expectations for its degree recipients develops during attendance at this institution. Administration of the CSXQ, therefore, was designed to check the findings of previous and concurrent administrations of NSSE as well as to explicitly measure ten expectations Fresno State has for its degree recipients.

Instrumentation:

The CSXQ and companion instrument CSEQ share 87 items in common. In addition, each instrument provides for collection of student background information (demographics) and local questions arrayed on a five point Likert scale. According to promotional material from the vendor, both the CSXQ and CSEQ include questions about college activities and beliefs about the campus environment. Both instruments are conceptually similar to but not identical with the more recently-developed NSSE, and all three are under administrative supervision of Indiana University.

Descriptions of and numbers of items associated with sections of the CSXQ follow:

- Library and Information Technology (9)
- Experiences with Faculty (7)
- Course Learning (9)
- Writing (5)
- Campus Facilities (9)
- Clubs, Organizations, Service Projects (5)
- Student Acquaintances (7)
- Scientific and Quantitative Experiences (5)
- Conversation Topics (16)
- Conversation Outcomes (6)
- Reading, Writing, and College Opinion (5)
- Environmental Emphasis (7)
- Environmental Relationships (3)

The ten expectations for which Fresno State respondents were asked to indicate their current sense of importance and perception of personal competence are shown below. Importance was measured on a five point Likert scale with anchor points of “Very Unimportant” and “Very Important”. Competence was measured on a similar five point scale ranging from “not competent” to “exceptionally competent”.

- Become civically engaged
- Acquire computer competence
- Develop problem solving skills
- Become an effective communicator (written and oral)
- Become an ethical person
- Achieve competence in major/career
- Acquire knowledge of skills needed in a diverse society
- Embrace concept of lifelong learning
- Commit to a healthy life style
- Establish personal goals

Methodology:

As implied above, one objective of administering CSXQ and (spring 2005) CSEQ is to compare the findings of the National Survey of Student Engagement with these instruments. Because of importance differences in survey objectives, methodology, and scope, the comparison can only address a limited range of results. In order to maximize the utility of this comparison, it was decided to use – to the extent possible – NSSE methodology in the administration of CSXQ/CSEQ on the Fresno State campus. Ideally, a random sample of freshmen in the fall semester would be coupled with a random sample of seniors in the spring semester to see what differences emerge between the two groups on both the parent instrument and the ten local expectations.

As so often occurs in educational research, however, practical constraints limited the degree to which this methodology could be implemented as described. Freshman orientation (Dog Days) was unavailable as a venue for administering the CSXQ, so the instrument was administered as a census to all but one section of University 1 (Introduction to College). Class section of respondents was added to each student record in order to compare CSXQ results among subgroups of University 1 students (general student enrollees, athletes, migrant students, HCOP enrollees, and Summer Bridge students). In addition, Institutional Research developed a data extract from the Student Module of People Soft that facilitated comparison between all first time freshmen and the subset enrolled in University 1.

Seven students from the campus Educational Opportunity Program completed the CSXQ and provided valuable feedback on the wording for the local items. Since minor changes in the local items were made as a result of the pretest administration, these items were deleted from the database for the pretest group. Actual classroom administration of the CSXQ was done by a group of Smittcamp Honors College students (mostly freshmen) in partial fulfillment of their community service requirement. At the conclusion of the survey process, 25 of 26 class sections and 641 of the students registered in the course completed the questionnaire.

Results:

Frequency distributions, descriptive statistics, a codebook, and a CD-Rom containing a number of files were returned by Indiana University. Among the printed tables, national norms for 72 of the items were provided by Carnegie classification of participating colleges and universities. A second set of norm tables based upon Barron's Competitiveness Ranking was also included. All comparisons between Fresno State results and national norms in this report used the Carnegie Classification for MA granting institutions.

The first question addressed was whether the 641 valid surveys completed by enrollees in University 1 were representative of the 2,336 first time freshmen enrolling at Fresno State in Fall 2004. Data records for each of these 2,336 first time freshmen were provided by the Office of Institutional Research. In addition to standard demographic information, these records contained scholarship information for first semester at Fresno State, ACT and SAT scores, high school grade point average, and – if enrolled in University 1 – section number and final course grade.

Table 1 indicates for freshmen enrolled and not enrolled in University 1 mean high school grade point average, mean SAT and ACT test scores, term units completed in Fall 2004, and term grade point average for fall 2004. For four of the aforementioned variables, the freshmen not enrolling in University 1 have higher scores than the group enrolled in the course. However, the fall semester grade point average for the enrolling group was slightly higher than for the non-enrolling group (2.79 vs. 2.75). Differences in high school grade point average and admission test scores were statistically significant

(not shown), but the effect size (as measured by eta squared) was small (less than ten percent).

Table 2 examines the question as to whether important differences exist among University 1 students enrolled by class section. Different sections are targeted to specific cohorts of freshmen: general student body, athletes, CAMP (migrant students), HCOP (health-related majors), and Summer Bridge. With respect to number of units completed during the Fall 2004 semester, the Summer Bridge cohort completed noticeably more units than any of the other groups, but it should be noted that these students actually completed University 1 during summer 2004 with the credit posted to the fall semester. Differences among the five groups were statistically significant (not shown) for all variables except term grade point average, but again effect size was small.

Demographic characteristics for freshmen in University 1 completing the CSXQ are shown in Table 3. While 54.7 percent of survey respondents expected to receive A, A-, or B+ grade average at Fresno State, the campus records for University 1 enrollees indicate that only 10.9 percent actually achieved at this level. In addition, it is interesting to note that 81.3 percent of survey respondents expect to enroll for a more advanced degree. Finally, it is worthy of note that only 49.9 percent of respondents expect to derive half or more of their financial support while in college from their parents.

Table 4 looks at the relation between expected student participation in clubs, organizations, and service projects with anticipated grades in college. Five survey items relate to clubs, organizations, and service projects:

- Attend a meeting of a campus club, organization, or student government group.
- Work on a campus committee, student organization, or service project.
- Work on an off-campus committee, organization, or service project (civic, group, church group, community event, etc.).
- Meet with a faculty member or staff advisor to discuss the activities of a group or organization.
- Manage or provide leadership for an organization or service project, on or off the campus.

Inspection of Table 4 indicates that between 45 and 65 percent of respondents **never** plan to participate in a club, organization, or service project. Further, there appears to be a direct relationship between anticipated grades and participation with those students expecting higher grade point averages also expecting greater participation.

Table 5 examines anticipated student interaction with their peers. These seven items may be found on page 2 of the CSXQ instrument (attached). Respondents indicating that they anticipated interaction “often” or “very often” with different groups of students ranged from a low of 42.3 percent for peers with religious beliefs very different from their own to a high of 77.9 percent for peers whose race or ethnic background is different from their own. In general, the majority of respondents anticipated interacting with peers from differing backgrounds while at college.

Table 6 provided respondents an opportunity to indicate the degree to which they perceive Fresno State emphasizing different aspects of the college environment. Possible responses ranged from 1 (weak emphasis) to 7 (strong emphasis). Mean responses ranged from a low of 5.16 for “emphasis on developing aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities” to a high of 5.68 for “emphasis on developing information literacy skills (using computers, other information resources)”. Do these results suggest that students – at least freshmen – perceive Fresno State as a technologically – driven institution that does not place much emphasis upon the arts and humanities?

Table 7 reflects respondents’ choices from three campus groups between two competing constellations of behaviors and attitudes:

- **Peers** - friendly, supportive, and sense of belonging versus competitive, uninvolved, sense of alienation
- **Faculty** - approachable, helpful, understanding, encouraging versus remote, discouraging, unsympathetic
- **Administrative personnel and offices** - helpful, considerate, flexible versus rigid, impersonal, bound by regulations.

Again, a seven point scale was used with 1 being the least favorable response and 7 being the most favorable. Perceived mean expectation of positive behaviors and attitudes was highest for peers and lowest for administrative personnel and offices.

The nine items in Table 8 summarize CSXQ items dealing with course learning. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they expected to do certain activities in their courses. Possible responses were arrayed on a four point scale ranging from “never” (1) to “very often” (4). Mean scores ranged from a low of 2.71 for “contribute to class discussions” to a high of 3.33 for “take detailed class notes”.

Table 9 addresses the institutional expectations of graduates from Fresno State and reflects the work of the Student Success Task Force. These expectations are listed both in Table 9 and on page 2 of this report. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each of the ten expectations to them and then to estimate their personal competence for each of these same expectations. Perhaps of more importance than mean importance or competence scores for each of the ten expectations is the mean difference between the two. If the college experience is congruent with the relative magnitude of these mean differences, student needs – at least as perceived by the students themselves – are being addressed with a differential emphasis reflective of those same needs.

The gap between perceived student importance and competence was highest for “achieve competence in major/career” (0.71) and lowest for “become an ethical person” (0.16). Presumably, students are here to acquire competence in a domain of learning to enhance their career opportunities, so it is not too surprising that the largest gap between importance and competence is in this area. The low, mean gap for ethical behavior, however, is subject to different interpretations. Perhaps students realize that most of their

ethical mindset is in place by the time they reach college. Or, perhaps notions of cheating, plagiarism, and the like are already in place and unlikely to change as a result of the collegiate experience.

Apparently respondents see little need to close the gap between perceived importance and competence for “becoming an effective communicator – both written and oral”. The relatively small gap for this item of 0.20 suggests that our students feel comfortable in their ability to engage in both spoken and written discourse. This opinion clearly is not shared with faculty who routinely interact with freshmen. Also of concern is the low importance score and gap that respondents assigned to “becoming civically engaged”. On the other hand, respondents admitted relatively high gaps for “acquiring computer competence”, “developing problem solving skills”, “acquiring knowledge of skills needed in a diverse society”, and “commit to a healthy life style”.

Table 10 compares mean responses to aggregation of items (quality of effort scores) between Fresno State and National respondents at peer universities. Since the CSXQ (second edition) is relatively new, the list of peer institutions is relatively small:

- Arizona State University, West
- Eastern Washington University
- Fairleigh Dickinson University
- Immaculate College
- Niagara University
- Plymouth State University
- Rochester Institute of Technology
- Southwest Texas State University
- Troy State University – Main Campus
- University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
- University of Evansville
- University of North Carolina at Pembroke

Of the ten item aggregations, the mean score for the National norms exceeds that for Fresno State in all but one case. The specific items that are aggregated are clearly indicated on pages 1 through 3 in the instrument (attached). Only for the six Conversation Information items did the mean sum of item scores for Fresno State exceed that of the comparison institutions. For seven of the ten item aggregations, the difference in mean scores was comparatively small (less than 1.5). However, for three of the item aggregations the difference was quite substantial.

The item aggregation “Experiences with Faculty” consists of seven items, and the following four items had the most discrepant mean scores between Fresno State and National respondents:

How often do you expect to do the following?

- Discuss your academic program or course selection with a faculty member.
- Socialize with a faculty member outside the classroom.

- Ask your instructor for comments and criticisms about your academic performance.
- Work with a faculty member on a research project.

“Clubs, Organizations, and Service Projects” consists of five items, and two of those items account for most of the difference between Fresno State and National mean responses:

How often do you expect to do the following?

- Attend a meeting of a campus club, organization, or student government group.
- Work on a campus committee, student organization, or service project (publications, student government, special event, etc.)

The “Campus Facilities” item cluster consists of nine items ranging from use of a campus art gallery to playing a team sport. Only one item, however, had a large mean difference between Fresno State and National results:

How often do you expect to do the following?

- Use recreation facilities (pool, fitness equipment, courts, etc.)

It is quite likely that student perceptions with respect to use of recreation facilities will change once the campus recreation center opens.

Summary and Recommendations

Some of the more salient findings from this Fall 2004 administration of the College Student Expectations Survey include:

- Freshmen in University 1 classes have somewhat lower academic credentials from high school – as measured by high school grade point average and SAT/ACT scores – than do non-participants in University 1.
- Academic performance during their first semester at Fresno State – as measured by units completed and semester grade point average – are virtually the same for University 1 participants and non-participants.
- Both academic credentials from high school and academic performance during their first semester at Fresno State show significant variations among subgroups of University 1 participants.
- A significant gap exists between respondents’ expected grades in college and their actual performance during the first semester in college.
- Fourteen percent of respondents on average expect to work more than ten hours per week on campus while 44 percent anticipate working more than ten hours per week off campus.
- Students anticipating high grades also expect to participate actively in campus extracurricular life.
- A majority of respondents anticipate interacting with other students whose backgrounds and interests are different.

- Among seven aspects of the college environment at Fresno State, respondents perceive most emphasis placed upon information literacy skills (computers and related aspects) and least emphasis placed on development of aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities.
- Among nine activities related to course learning, respondents anticipated most frequent participation in taking detailed class notes and completing class notes. Least interaction was anticipated in contributing to class discussions.
- For ten desired outcomes of degree recipients at Fresno State, respondents perceived the greatest need in achieving competence in a major or career and the least need for assistance in becoming an ethical person.
- With respect to a comparison of ten item cluster means (scales?) on the CSXQ, University 1 respondents scored lower than entering students completing the instrument at peer universities on all but one scale (Conversation Information). This difference was particularly noticeable for Experiences with Faculty, use of Campus Facilities, and participation in Clubs, Organizations, and Service Projects.

Based upon the results of this administration of the College Student Expectations Survey, it is recommended:

- To the extent possible these findings be compared with this year's results from the freshman cohort of the National Survey of Student Engagement.
- That some thought be given to how the campus can be perceived more favorably in the area of emphasis placed on development of aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities.
- That the College Student Experiences Survey be administered to graduating seniors first enrolling here as freshmen to see how a senior profile reflects development occurring during time spent here.
- That the same local questions (ten desired outcomes for all degree recipients) be included with a future administration of the senior survey.

Table 1
California State University, Fresno
A Comparison of Freshmen Enrolled and Not Enrolled in University 1
Fall 2004

	Univ1					
	Enrolled		Not Enrolled		Total	
	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N
High School GPA	3.20	781	3.41	1,554	3.34	2,335
ACT Composite Score	17.9	283	20.5	394	19.4	677
SAT Combined Total	883	675	995	1,409	959	2,084
Term Units - Fall 2004	12.2	776	12.4	1,521	12.3	2,297
TERM GPA - Fall 2004	2.79	774	2.74	1,510	2.76	2,284

Table 2
California State University, Fresno
A Comparison of University 1 Cohorts
Fall 2004

	University 1 Cohort											
	Athletes		CAMP		HCOP		Summer Bridge		Body		Total	
	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N	Mean	Valid N
High School GPA	2.97	53	3.27	83	3.43	32	3.06	96	3.22	517	3.20	781
ACT Composite Score	18.0	9	16.9	37	17.0	6	15.6	48	18.8	183	17.9	283
SAT Combined Total	960	51	819	76	835	27	767	81	909	440	883	675
Term Units - Fall 2004	13.3	53	10.8	83	12.5	32	15.1	96	11.7	512	12.2	776
Term GPA - Fall 2004	2.85	53	3.01	83	2.80	32	2.68	95	2.77	511	2.79	774

Table 3
California State University, Fresno
Selected Background Characteristics of Students Completing the
College Student Expectations Questionnaire in 26 Sections of University 1
Fall 2004

		Count	Column N %
Where live during school year	dorm, other housing	183	28.9%
	fraternity, sorority	11	1.7%
	residence in walking	154	24.3%
	residence in driving	286	45.1%
	Total	634	100.0%
Expected grades at this college	C-, C-, or lower	9	1.4%
	B-, C+	67	10.6%
	B	211	33.3%
	A-, B+	298	47.1%
	A	48	7.6%
	Total	633	100.0%
Parents graduate from college	no	398	62.7%
	yes, both parents	93	14.6%
	yes, father only	51	8.0%
	yes, mother only	61	9.6%
	do not know	32	5.0%
	Total	635	100.0%
Enroll for a more advanced degree	yes	512	81.3%
	no	118	18.7%
	Total	630	100.0%
Number of term credit hours	6 or fewer	15	2.4%
	7-11	37	5.9%
	12-14	317	50.2%
	15-16	198	31.3%
	17 or more	65	10.3%
	Total	632	100.0%
Hours on out-of-class academic work	5 or less hrs weekly	54	8.6%
	6-10 hrs weekly	179	28.5%
	11-15 hrs weekly	140	22.3%
	16-20 hrs weekly	142	22.6%
	21-25 hrs weekly	58	9.3%
	26-30 hrs weekly	32	5.1%
	more than 30 hrs	22	3.5%
	Total	627	100.0%
Hours working on campus for pay	none; no job	293	76.1%
	1-10 hrs weekly	40	10.4%
	11-20 hrs weekly	44	11.4%
	21-30 hrs weekly	7	1.8%
	31-40 hrs weekly	1	0.3%
	more than 40 hrs	0	0.0%
	Total	385	100.0%
Hours working off campus for pay	none; no job	231	43.3%
	1-10 hrs weekly	69	12.9%
	11-20 hrs weekly	151	28.3%
	21-30 hrs weekly	61	11.4%
	31-40 hrs weekly	14	2.6%
	more than 40 hrs	8	1.5%
	Total	534	100.0%
Part of expenses provided by family	all or nearly all	200	31.6%
	more than half	116	18.3%
	less than half	106	16.7%
	none or very little	211	33.3%
	Total	633	100.0%
Racial or ethnic identification	American Indian	3	0.5%
	Asian, Pacific Islander	104	16.7%
	Black, African American	44	7.1%
	White, Caucasian	186	29.8%
	Mexican-American	199	31.9%
	Puerto Rican	1	0.2%
	Other Hispanic	19	3.0%
	Other	35	5.6%
	Multiracial	33	5.3%
	Total	624	100.0%

Table 4
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to Clubs, Organizations, and Service Projects
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

		Expected grades at this college										Total	
		A		A-, B+		B		B-, C+		C, C-, or lower			
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %		
Attend a meeting of campus org	never	16	33.3%	129	43.4%	102	48.3%	36	53.7%	5	55.6%	288	45.6%
	occasionally	16	33.3%	107	36.0%	71	33.6%	18	26.9%	3	33.3%	215	34.0%
	often	7	14.6%	39	13.1%	20	9.5%	10	14.9%	1	11.1%	77	12.2%
	very often	9	18.8%	22	7.4%	18	8.5%	3	4.5%	0	0.0%	52	8.2%
	Total	48	100.0%	297	100.0%	211	100.0%	67	100.0%	9	100.0%	632	100.0%
Work on campus committee-organization	never	25	52.1%	186	62.6%	144	68.6%	49	73.1%	7	77.8%	411	65.1%
	occasionally	11	22.9%	78	26.3%	48	22.9%	14	20.9%	2	22.2%	153	24.2%
	often	7	14.6%	23	7.7%	15	7.1%	4	6.0%	0	0.0%	49	7.8%
	very often	5	10.4%	10	3.4%	3	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	2.9%
	Total	48	100.0%	297	100.0%	210	100.0%	67	100.0%	9	100.0%	631	100.0%
Work on off-campus committee-org	never	18	37.5%	126	42.4%	109	51.7%	37	56.1%	7	77.8%	297	47.1%
	occasionally	14	29.2%	88	29.6%	70	33.2%	18	27.3%	2	22.2%	192	30.4%
	often	8	16.7%	46	15.5%	22	10.4%	10	15.2%	0	0.0%	86	13.6%
	very often	8	16.7%	37	12.5%	10	4.7%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	56	8.9%
	Total	48	100.0%	297	100.0%	211	100.0%	66	100.0%	9	100.0%	631	100.0%
Meet with faculty to discuss group	never	25	52.1%	176	59.1%	135	64.0%	50	74.6%	7	77.8%	393	62.1%
	occasionally	15	31.3%	88	29.5%	67	31.8%	12	17.9%	2	22.2%	184	29.1%
	often	3	6.3%	22	7.4%	6	2.8%	4	6.0%	0	0.0%	35	5.5%
	very often	5	10.4%	12	4.0%	3	1.4%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	21	3.3%
	Total	48	100.0%	298	100.0%	211	100.0%	67	100.0%	9	100.0%	633	100.0%
Manage an organization on or off campus	never	23	47.9%	162	54.5%	121	57.6%	46	68.7%	8	88.9%	360	57.1%
	occasionally	12	25.0%	82	27.6%	74	35.2%	15	22.4%	1	11.1%	184	29.2%
	often	3	6.3%	31	10.4%	14	6.7%	6	9.0%	0	0.0%	54	8.6%
	very often	10	20.8%	22	7.4%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33	5.2%
	Total	48	100.0%	297	100.0%	210	100.0%	67	100.0%	9	100.0%	631	100.0%

Table 5
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Relating to Student Interaction with Peers
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

		Count	Column N %
Make friends with students whose interests are different from yours.	never	15	2.3%
	occasionally	217	33.9%
	often	250	39.1%
	very often	158	24.7%
	Total	640	100.0%
Make friends with students whose family background (economic, social) is different from yours.	never	13	2.0%
	occasionally	165	25.8%
	often	265	41.5%
	very often	196	30.7%
	Total	639	100.0%
Make friends with students whose race or ethnic background is different from yours.	never	7	1.1%
	occasionally	134	21.0%
	often	249	39.0%
	very often	248	38.9%
	Total	638	100.0%
Have serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values are very different from yours.	never	62	9.7%
	occasionally	262	41.0%
	often	181	28.3%
	very often	134	21.0%
	Total	639	100.0%
Have serious discussions with students whose religious beliefs are very different from yours.	never	98	15.3%
	occasionally	271	42.3%
	often	155	24.2%
	very often	116	18.1%
	Total	640	100.0%
Have serious discussions with students whose political opinions are very different from yours.	never	126	19.9%
	occasionally	260	41.0%
	often	155	24.4%
	very often	93	14.7%
	Total	634	100.0%
Have serious discussions with students whose race or ethnic background is very different from yours.	never	79	12.5%
	occasionally	215	34.0%
	often	185	29.3%
	very often	153	24.2%
	Total	632	100.0%

Table 6
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to the College Environment
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

	Valid N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Emphasis on developing academic, scholarly, and intellectual qualities.	635	5.55	1.17
Emphasis on developing aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities.	634	5.16	1.17
Emphasis on developing critical, evaluative, and analytical qualities.	632	5.45	1.18
Emphasis on developing an understanding and appreciation of human diversity.	635	5.44	1.25
Emphasis on developing information literacy skills (using computers, other information resources)	635	5.68	1.21
Emphasis on developing vocational and occupational competence.	635	5.22	1.21
Emphasis on the personal relevance and practical value of your courses.	634	5.28	1.23

These seven items represent a semantic differential anchored by 1 = Weak Emphasis and 7 = Strong Emphasis. Recall that these responses represent entering freshman expectations early in the year.

Table 7
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to Relationships Among People
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

	Valid N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Relationships with other students or student groups	633	5.64	1.11
Relationships with faculty members	632	5.23	1.43
Relationships with administrative personnel and offices	633	4.86	1.20

These seven items represent a semantic differential anchored as follows:
Item 1: 1 = Competitive, Uninvolved, Sense of Alienation vs. 7 = Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging
Item 2: 1 = Remote, Discouraging, Unsympathetic vs. 7 = Approachable, Helpful, Understanding, Encouraging
Item 3: 1 = Rigid, Impersonal, Bound by Regulations vs 7 = Helpful, Considerate, Flexible
Recall that these responses represent entering freshman expectations very early in the year.

Table 8
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to Course Learning
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

	Valid N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Complete assigned readings	638	3.15	0.74
Take detailed class notes	635	3.33	0.72
Contribute to class discussions	627	2.71	0.83
Put together different facts and ideas	633	2.83	0.78
Apply class material to other areas	639	2.91	0.83
Summarize major points and information	637	2.84	0.83
Use information from other areas in class	639	2.88	0.83
Explain course material to others	637	2.77	0.81
Work on project integrating ideas	639	2.90	0.85

These Likert scale items are coded as follows: 1=Never 2=Occasionally 3=Often 4=Very Often

Table 9			
California State University, Fresno			
CSXQ Local Questions Related to Institutional Expectations for Graduates			
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004			
	Perceived Importance ¹	Perceived Competence ²	Difference
Become civically engaged	3.42	3.14	0.28
Acquire computer competence	3.93	3.56	0.37
Develop problem solving skills	3.97	3.59	0.38
Become an effective communicator (both written and oral)	4.11	3.91	0.20
Become an ethical person	3.80	3.64	0.16
Achieve competence in major/career	4.30	3.59	0.71
Acquire knowledge of skills need in a diverse society	3.95	3.58	0.37
Enhance concept of lifelong learning	3.93	3.63	0.30
Commit to a healthy life style	4.08	3.69	0.39
Establish personal goals	4.24	3.99	0.25

¹ Perceived importance items coded on 5 point scale ranging from 1 = Very unimportant to 5 = Very important.

² Perceived competence items coded on 5 point scale ranging from 1 = Not competent to 5 = Exceptionally competent.

Table 10
 California State University, Fresno
 A Comparison of Quality of Effort Mean Scores Between
 Fresno State and National Respondents on the CSXQ¹²

Scale	Fresno State	National
Library and Information Technology (9)	23.76	24.98
Experiences with Faculty (7)	14.68	17.18
Course Learning (9)	26.35	27.73
Writing (5)	12.62	13.37
Campus Facilities (9)	19.57	23.28
Clubs, Organizations, Service Projects (5)	8.29	10.35
Student Acquaintances (7)	19.14	20.23
Scientific and Quantitative Experiences (5)	11.66	12.67
Conversation Topics (10)	22.89	23.89
Conversation Information (6)	15.70	15.53

¹ Carnegie Master's Granting Institutions

² Numbers in Parenthesis Indicate Items in Scale