

**California State University, Fresno
College Student Expectations Survey (CSXQ)
Spring 2005**

In Fall 2004, the CSXQ (http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/pdf/csxq_whole.pdf) was administered as a census to all but one section of University 1 (Introduction to College). The 641 valid surveys completed by enrollees in University 1 were not perfectly representative of the 2,336 first time freshmen enrolling at Fresno State in Fall 2004. Freshmen not enrolling in University 1 had higher scores than the group enrolled in the course. 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). Demographic characteristics for freshmen in University 1 completing the CSXQ are shown in Table 1. The table shows that:

- 54.7 percent of survey respondents expected to receive A, A-, or B+ grade average. Campus records for University 1 enrollees indicate that only 10.9 percent actually achieved at this level in Fall 2004.
- 81.3 percent of survey respondents expect to enroll for a more advanced degree.
- While over 90% enrolled in 12 or more units, only 18% expected to spend more than 20 hours per week studying outside of class;
- 63 percent reported neither parent had graduated from college making them first generation college goers.
- Two thirds expected to work 10 hours per week or less at on/off campus jobs;
- 49.9 expect to derive half or more of their financial support while in college from their parents.

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

		Count	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 2 provides a glimpse into civic engagement as measured by expected student participation in clubs, organizations, and service projects. Interestingly almost 46% expect to never attend a campus organization meeting, 57% expect to never manage an organization on or off campus, and 65% never expect to work on a campus committee or organization. The data clearly show a direct relationship between anticipated grades and participation with those students expecting higher grade point averages also expecting greater participation.

Table 2
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to Clubs, Organizations, and Service Projects
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

		Expected grades at this college											
		A		A-, B+		B		B-, C+		C, C-, or lower		Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
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%

Student interaction with peers was further explored through seven other questions. Respondents indicated the frequency with which they anticipated making friends or having serious discussions with different groups of students. The percentage indicating “often” or “very often” is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
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%

Respondents were given an opportunity to indicate the degree to which they felt different aspects of the college environment would be emphasized during their freshmen year. Possible responses

ranged from 1 (weak emphasis) to 7 (strong emphasis). Mean responses are shown in Table 4 ranked from high to low. It would be interesting to know on what basis these expectations were formed. Developing information literacy and academic, scholarly, and intellectual qualities rate high which might be expected. Developing occupational and vocational competence is low as might be expected in the freshman year when general education work predominates. However, developing aesthetic, expressive and creative qualities is also low which would not necessarily be expected.

Table 4
California State University, Fresno
CSXQ Items Pertaining to the College Environment
University 1 Respondents - Fall 2004

	Valid N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Emphasis on developing information literacy skills (using computers, other information resources)	635	5.68	1.21
Emphasis on developing academic, scholarly, and intellectual qualities.	635	5.55	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 the personal relevance and practical value of your courses.	634	5.28	1.23
Emphasis on developing vocational and occupational competence.	635	5.22	1.21
Emphasis on developing aesthetic, expressive, and creative qualities.	634	5.16	1.17

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.

Students rated the extent to which relationships with others would be characterized by two different sets of characteristics. Relationships with students and student groups were rated from 1-competition, uninvolved, sense of alienation to 7-friendly, supportive, sense of belonging. Relationships with faculty members were rated from 1-remote, discouraging, unsympathetic to 7-approachable, helpful, understanding, encouraging. Relationships with administrative personnel and offices were rated from 1-rigid, impersonal, bound by regulations to 7-helpful, considerate, flexible. The mean ranking for students was 5.64, for faculty 4.86 and for staff 5.23. The relatively low mean number for faculty reinforces findings from NSSE.

The nine items in Table 5 summarize how often students 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). Taking notes and completing assigned readings are expected to occur much more frequently than contributing to classroom discussion or explaining material to others. As with Table 4, it would be interesting to understand how these were formed. Does it come from previous school experiences? Discussions with older siblings or others? Characterizations in the media? It will be very interesting to see what the senior responses to these questions are in the CSEQ.

Table 5
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 materials 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

During 2003-2004, the university identified a set of expectations of a California State University, Fresno graduate. Students 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. These are shown in Table 6. The gap between perceived student importance and competence might be interpreted as a measure of need for development in that area. It was highest for “achieve competence in major/career” (0.71) and lowest for “become an ethical person” (0.16). The low, mean gap for ethical behavior could mean that students realize most of their ethical mindset is in place by the time they reach college and the university experience is unlikely to have a large impact.

Respondents showed relatively high gaps for “achieving competence in the major”, “acquiring computer competence”, “developing problem solving skills”, “acquiring knowledge of skills needed in a diverse society”, and “commit to a healthy life style”. Apparently respondents see little need to close the relatively small gap between perceived importance and competence for “becoming an effective communicator – both written and oral”. Students apparently 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”.

Table 6
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
Achieve competence in major/career	4.30	3.59	0.71
Commit to a healthy life style	4.08	3.69	0.39
Develop problem solving skills	3.97	3.59	0.38
Acquire computer competence	3.93	3.56	0.37
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
Become civically engaged	3.42	3.14	0.28
Establish personal goals	4.24	3.99	0.25
Become an effective communicator (both written and oral)	4.11	3.91	0.20
Become an ethical person	3.80	3.64	0.16

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.

This summary by Dennis Neff, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, is based on a report by William Stock PhD which contains background on the survey and more detail. Analysis of the data will continue. The university is conducting the CSEQ Spring 2005 which will gather data from seniors about their experiences and which can then be compared with the expectations from this survey.