A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY AND COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS HELD BY SELECTED GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY THOMAS HERBERT ZARLE 1970 THESIS





This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY AND COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS HELD BY SELECTED GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

presented by

THOMAS H. ZARLE

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

tegerald_ Fairine Major professor 6

Date _____ April 29, 1970

O-169









ABSTRACT

A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY AND COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS HELD BY SELECTED GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ву

Thomas Herbert Zarle

The present study was designed to analyze, define, and compare some of the characteristic underlying attitudes and beliefs held by selected groups in higher education. An additional purpose of this study was to determine whether the attitudes and beliefs held by these groups were related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

Specifically this study had three objectives:

- to ascertain the factor structure of a set of selected assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students,
- (2) to determine whether an analysis of variance procedure would detect any differences in a comparison of the above groups' scores on the identified factors,

(3) to determine whether the procedures of analysis of variance would detect any relationship between the identified factors and the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

The data for this study was collected in the fall of 1968 and winter of 1969 by means of a questionnaire designed to measure the subjects' attitudes and beliefs relative to a set of selected issues in higher education. It was hypothesized that the sample groups would not differ in their basic attitudes and beliefs and that these attitudes and beliefs would not be related to the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and region.

Factor analytic procedures were used to isolate and identify the basic attitudes and beliefs of the subjects, and a repeated measures analysis of variance design was used to test the hypotheses.

The following three factors were extracted and identified for use in this study: <u>Factor I, Institutional</u> <u>Involvement in the Educational Process</u>--a measure of an individual's beliefs about whether an institution of higher education should or should not be involved in a student's non-academic experiences; <u>Factor II, Benefits of</u> <u>the Institutional-Student Relationship</u>--an assessment of the strength and direction of an individual's beliefs about who should benefit from this relationship; <u>Factor</u> III, Institutional Stability--a measure of an individual's beliefs about the need for organizational stability in higher educational institutions.

The results of this study supported rejection of the hypotheses that the sample groups would hold the same beliefs and that the beliefs would not be related to the selected demographic variables. Generally, the five sample groups were different in their attitudes and beliefs as represented by the three factors used in this study. Specifically, the administrative groups tended to evidence a stronger belief that higher educational institutions should be involved in the attempt to influence the nonacademic dimensions of a student's educational experience and that the institutional-student relationship should have reciprocal value for both the institution and the student. Generally, the faculty were more similar to the administrative group in their beliefs than to the students. In most situations the deans of students were more similar to the institutional presidents than they were to any other group. The only exception to this pattern was that the deans and students shared the belief that too much emphasis has been placed upon the importance of institutional stability. The presidents and faculty both expressed the belief that institutional stability should be a primary consideration in the educational process.

In a practical sense this study has indicated that the various groups in higher education are not only different from each other on the dimensions of this study, but

Thomas Herbert Zarle

these same groups evidenced a significant amount of variance within themselves. In this respect, a significant relationship was found between some of the demographic variables and the various attitudes and beliefs expressed by the various sample groups. Clearly, educators would do well to question any generic reference to views purported to be held by students, faculty, presidents, or deans of students. Such normative references may not be an accurate reflection of the positions held by the various sub-groups on the referenced group.

A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY AND COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS HELD BY SELECTED GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ву

Thomas Herbert Zarle

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling Personnel Services and Educational Psychology G- 64230 10-9-70

DEDICATION

To Nancy, Gretchen, and Stig

Who have given so much of themselves . . .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

. . . A LIFE WITHOUT CONFRONTATION IS DIRECTION-LESS, PASSIVE AND IMPOTENT.

--Robert R. Carkhuff

I would like to acknowledge those individuals who have made it possible for me to experience the kinds of confrontations which have facilitated my growth as an educator, counselor, and person.

Throughout the completion of my formal educational program I have been fortunate to have encountered individuals like Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Dr. W. Harold Grant, Dr. Louis C. Stamatakos, and Dr. Arthur M. Vener. Particular acknowledgment is given to Dr. Laurine E. Fitzgerald, who has served as the chairman of my committee and the major advisor for this research. Dr. Fitzgerald displayed the patience and insight to confront me with myself at those strategic points in my development. Her faith in me caused me to grow.

To the Research and Publications Division of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, I give thanks for permission to use the information obtained in their prior research efforts.

iii

For assistance in working out the technical details of procedures and statistical analysis, I would like to acknowledge Mr. David Wright.

And foremost, I acknowledge, my wife, Nancy, daughter, Gretchen, and son, Stig, for their sacrifice, patience, and abundant love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	c i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i		Page
I.	THE PROBLEM		1
	Statement of the Problem		3
	Purpose of the Study		4
	Need for the Study		5
	Definition of Terms		6
	Hypotheses		8
	Limitations of the Study		8
	Overview of the Study	•	9
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE		10
	Introduction to the Problem		10
	Literature Related to the Assumptions and Beliefs of Various Groups in		
	Higher Education		14
	Summary	•	23
III.	DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	•	26
	Nature of the Sample		27
	Instrumentation		27
	Administration of the Questionnaire .		30
	Hypotheses: General and Specific		33
	Methods of Analysis		34
	Summary	•	36
IV.	ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	•	38
	Factor Analysis Results		39
	Identification of the Three Factors .	·	43
	Factor IDegree of Institutional Involvement in the Educational		
	Process		45
	Factor IIBenefits of the Insti-		
	tutional-Student Relationship		47
	Factor IIIInstitutional Stability.		49

ſ

B W	etw lith	een in	Gr Gro	oup	o Cor Comp	npa par	riso iso	ons ns	•	•	•	•	•	•	51 59
	Ну Ну Ну Ну Ну	pot pot pot pot	hes hes hes hes hes	is is is is	II III IV V. VI	• • •	• • •	• • •	60 68 76 83 92						
S	umm	ary	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	98
	Fa Be Wi	cto twe thi	r A en n G	na] Gro Fou	Lysis Dup (up Co	s. Comj ompa	par:	iso son	ns s.	• •	• •	• •	• •	• •	98 99 102
V. SUM	MAR	У,	CON	CLU	JSIO	NS,	ANI	ΙC	MPL	ICA	TIO	NS	•	•	108
S	umm	ary	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	108
	Th Me	e P tho	rob dol	len ogy	n. ?•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	108 109
F	ind	ing	s a	nd	Cond	clu	sio	ns	•	•	•	•	•	•	111
	Be Wi	twe thi	en n G	Gro	oup (1p Co	Comj ompa	par: ari:	iso son	ns s.	•	•	•	•	•	112 116
I	mpl	ica	tio	ns	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	120
BIBLIOGRAP	НҮ	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	124
APPENDICES															
Appendix															
Α.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	127
в.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	130
с.	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page	
1.	Comparison of Characteristics of Sample Groups with Characteristics of Total NASPA Membership as of November, 1968	28	
2.	Goodness of Fit Comparison of Sample Groups with NASPA Membership	32	
3.	Principle Component Factor MatrixRotated Factor Loadings of the Twenty-Seven Questionnaire Items on Each Factor	41	
4.	Inter-Group Factor Comparison for All Possible Pairs of Sample Groups Indicating Strength of Relationship (Correlation) Between Factors for Three Factor Solution.	44	
5.	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of Factor Scores for the Five Sample Groups on Factors I, II, and III	52	
6.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Sample Group Mean Scores on Each of the Three Factors	52	
7.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Sample Group Mean Differences on Factor I	53	
8.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Sample Group Mean Differences on Factor II	56	
9.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Sample Group Mean Differences on Factor III	58	
10.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Editors Grouped by		
	Institutional Type	61	

Table		Page
11.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor I for Student Editors Grouped by Type of Institution .	. 62
12.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Editors Grouped by Institutional Size.	. 63
13.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factors I and III for Student Editors Grouped by Size of Institution	6
14.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Editors Grouped by Geographical Region	. 67
15.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Student Presidents Grouped by Type of Institution.	. 69
16.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor I for Student Presidents Grouped by Type of Institution	. 7(
17.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Student Presidents Grouped by Size of Institution	• 7:
18.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factors I and III for Student Presidents Grouped by Size of Institution	. 7:
19.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Student Presidents Grouped by Geographical Region	. 74
20.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution	. 7
21.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor I for Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution.	. 78
22.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Faculty Grouped by Size of Institution	. 80

Table		Page
23.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Faculty Grouped by Geographical Region	81
24.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor III for Faculty Grouped by Geographical Region	82
25.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Deans Grouped by Type of Institution	84
26.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor III for Deans of Students Grouped by Type of Insti- tution	85
27.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Deans Grouped by Size of Institution.	86
28.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factors II and III for Deans of Students Grouped by Size of Institution.	87
29.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Deans Grouped by Geographical Region	89
30.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor III for Deans of Students Grouped by Geographical Region	90
31.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores on the Three Factors for Presidents Grouped by Institutional Type	93
32.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factor I for Presi- dents Grouped by Type of Institution	94
33.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factors I and II for Presidents Grouped by Size of Institution.	95
34.	Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis of Mean Differences on Factors I and III for Presidents Grouped by Geographical Region.	96

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Allen Barton [1] reports in his work on the organizational measurement of college environments that,

[Higher educational] organizations are made up of individual people, but they are more than mere collections of individuals. [These individuals]... are interacting; their interactions are governed by informal expectations and formal rules which are agreed upon to varying degrees; the members have attitudes and beliefs ... which may lead to the formation of a common culture or a set of conflicting subcultures.

Dutton, Appleton, and Smith [11] concluded in their investigation of controversial topics in higher education that a certain amount of attitudinal incompatibility is an inevitable consequent of the diversity of philosophical viewpoints, power structures, and value systems which are represented by those who participate directly in higher education. A similar observation has also been made by selected researchers in higher education [21] that a notable characteristic of modern higher education is the heterogeneity which seems to exist among and between the various constituent groups which comprise the many college and university settings in the United States.

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators¹ submits that the responsibilities of the professional administrator in higher education are becoming more complex, demanding, and challenging as a result of the,

increasing complexity and diversity that is a ramification of an increased student enrollment. . . In the midst of such rapid change, it is difficult to keep fundamental principles and values in focus and the administrator is confronted with the prodigious task of clarifying and redefining his role and objectives in the face of the increasing fragmentation of the academic community [9].

Because of a concern over what is apparently an increasing tendency toward conflict and confrontation among and between the various constituent groups in higher education and because of the paucity of systematic research which attempts to identify and compare possible variations in attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs among these groups, NASPA initiated a series of investigations which sought to provide a more empirical approach to an understanding of this problem. In 1966, NASPA's Division of Research and Publications conducted a preliminary investigation of the "convictions and values" held by student personnel administrators [23]. Early in 1969 NASPA conducted an expanded follow-up study to the 1966 investigation by focusing on the "assumptions and beliefs" of student personnel administrators and institutional presidents, faculty members, and

¹Throughout the remainder of this study, NASPA refers to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

students [10]. The purpose of this follow-up study was to provide additional objective data on the "convictions and value orientations" which might determine how these selected members of the academic community respond to some important issues in higher education.

The present study, reported herein, represents an attempt to supplement these antecedent NASPA investigations by providing a more systematic method for analyzing, defining, and comparing some of the characteristic underlying assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students.

Statement of the Problem

There seems to be some question whether the various subgroups which comprise higher education are ethnocentric in the assumptions and beliefs they hold regarding certain issues critical to the resolution of campus problems. The premise upon which this study is based is that these constituent groups' behavior and responses to campus issues are influenced by the assumptions and beliefs they hold regarding certain crucial issues. In view of the fact that the academic community is being pressed to respond to and resolve some of the crucial issues facing it today, it is essential that we gain a better understanding of these possible variations in group perceptions.

Therefore, this study will attempt to:

- isolate and identify some of the underlying characteristics of a set of selected assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students;
- (2) determine whether the above groups differ on these isolated characteristics of assumptions and beliefs;
- (3) determine whether the assumptions and beliefs held by the above groups are related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

More specifically, this study will attempt to determine in a systematic manner whether: (1) certain meaningful and descriptive characteristics of assumptions and beliefs can be isolated and identified; and (2) whether selected constituent groups in higher education differ or are similar on these underlying characteristics.

Purpose of the Study

Each student personnel administrator must assume the responsibility for critically examining his own assumptions and beliefs relative to his role in the educational process. In addition, the student personnel administrator must acquaint himself with the assumptions, beliefs, and expectations held by other constituent groups in higher education. The proposed study is designed to stimulate this process by assisting the student personnel administrator to better understand these phenomena by gathering data on some of the basic assumptions and beliefs held by selected members of the academic community regarding certain significant issues and concerns in higher education. In general, it will be the purpose of this study to provide additional insights into the convictions and value orientations that often determine how selected members of the academic community respond to important issues in the higher educational setting. More specifically, it will be the purpose of this study to determine if there are certain underlying characteristics relative to these assumptions and beliefs which can be isolated and described, and whether certain selected groups in the setting of higher education are similar in their positions regarding these assumptions and beliefs.

Need for the Study

This inquiry is based on the premise that administrators, faculty, and students make assumptions and hold beliefs that influence their behavior and responses to certain campus issues. The assumption is also made that if such a study facilitates a better understanding of these assumptions and beliefs, then institutions of higher education will be assisted in gaining a better understanding of the sources of conflict and differences in position among the various members of the academic community. Such

a critical investigation of these potential behavioral antecedents could provide assistance to institutions in dealing more effectively with conflict in their settings and enhance the efficacy of each group's contribution to the educational process. In addition, an increased awareness of perceptions held by other members of the academic community can provide assistance to the student personnel administrator in better understanding some of the role conflicts that often interfere with his ability to assist students in their personal, social, and academic development.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in accordance with the purpose of this investigation:

Assumptions and Beliefs.--Assumptions and beliefs in this study will refer to the manner in which the subjects responded to a set of selected and contemporary issues that could affect the role or behavior assumed by the individual subject.

<u>Underlying Characteristics</u>.--Underlying characteristics in this study will refer to those factors which result from a principle-component factor analytic examination of each sample group's responses to the set of twenty-seven questions on the study instrument.

<u>Sample Groups</u>.--The sample groups utilized in this study will consist of the following individuals from each of the 715 institutions that held institutional membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators at the time the data was collected (November, 1968): the institution's president, the chief student personnel administrator,² the elected faculty member holding the highest position in the faculty senate or comparable body, the editor of the student newspaper, and the president of the student body.

Demographic Variables. -- The demographic variables utilized in the analysis of this investigation's data refer to: type of institution (public, private, church related); size of institution (student enrollment); and geographical location (regional accrediting association).

Systematic Manner of Analysis.--The systematic manner for realizing the objectives of this study refers to the utilization of the statistical methods of: principle component factor analysis and analysis of variance-repeated measures design.

²For purposes of this study the title "Dean of Students" or "Dean" was considered to be synonymous with "Chief Student Personnel Administrator."

Hypotheses

A basic supposition of this thesis is that the method of analysis chosen for this study will yield an identifiable set of underlying assumptions and beliefs on which the selected groups of student personnel administrators, presidents, faculty members, and students can be compared. The general hypotheses examined in this study are that there are differences in these basic assumptions and beliefs among these groups and that the basic assumptions and beliefs which are held by these groups are related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location. The specific null hypotheses examined in this study are presented in testable form in Chapter III.

Limitations of the Study

The fact that this research is basically an exploratory investigation is, in one respect a strength of the study. However, the major strength of the study is that it attempts to provide a systematic statistical analysis of phenomena which have traditionally been the subject of speculative inference which has had relatively little empirical support.

The major weaknesses also derive from its exploratory nature. This study is limited by those variables which are inherent in any investigation which uses a questionnaire to collect the data. Some of these

limitations are: difficulty in securing complete cooperation of individuals sampled, intentional respondent bias, and the possibility that some respondents may not have been able to adequately or accurately reflect their intent at the time of their response. This study is confined to those institutions having membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators during the time of the data collection. It was assumed that NASPA member institutions provide an adequate sampling of all institutions of higher education in the United States. However, the generalization of the results of this study is limited to those types of institutions which held NASPA membership in November of 1968.

Overview of the Study

Chapter I has served as an introduction to the problem by outlining the purpose of this study, defining the need for such a study, specifying the limitations for the study, and stating the general hypotheses to be examined. Chapter II summarizes pertinent literature related to the nature of the study. Chapter III presents the design of the investigation, the methodology followed, and the specific hypotheses investigated. Chapter IV provides an analysis and interpretation of the data. Chapter V presents a summary of the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, relevant implications for higher education, and recommendations for further study.



CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There is an evident paucity of research which has been specifically designed to investigate the possible diversity of assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes which are held by the various constituent groups in higher education. Additionally, there has been an even greater negligence demonstrated by researchers in conducting investigations designed to compare these groups on such dimensions. The few studies reported in the literature which are relevant to the present investigation will be reviewed in this chapter.

Introduction to the Problem

Today college communities are being challenged to examine the roles and behavior which have traditionally been assumed by faculty, students, and administrative personnel. In general, both the process and the content of this questioning has led to a substantial awareness of Potential and realized conflict between these groups. Sunderland [28] submits that in spite of this challenge there has not been a measurable increase in either the

clarification or modification of such conflict. The apparent lack of success on the part of the college community to resolve this issue suggests that educators are experiencing difficulty in conceptualizing, understanding, and coping with the bases for such conflict.

A number of specific and broadly philosophical and conceptual questions are being asked of, and by, individuals within and outside of higher education. Klopf [20] specifically indicates that individuals in student personnel work must determine what the implications are for higher educational practices when the perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators concerning their roles on the campus are investigated and compared.

As a professional educator, the student personnel worker must be alert to institutional diversity. Shaffer [25] advises that educators must work to secure a unity of purpose among the many cultures and forces operating on the campus, and all elements of the college community should seek to relate their purpose to the total process of higher education. Therefore, the desired coherence among the various participants in higher education will be the result of increased attempts to foster the clarification, understanding, and acceptance of common goals and efforts. However, specialists among the faculty, staffs, and students are often accused of being primarily concerned with their own endeavors. Such diversity of effort contributes to the resulting fragmentation and lack of coherence in

the campus community. Shaffer concludes that the student personnel worker in higher education must be able to respond to the ramifications these influences have on the institution and the individual student. And, in this respect, it should be the responsibility of the professional student personnel educator to attempt to understand and facilitate cooperative relationships among all emements of the campus.

Recently the Council of student Personnel Administrators concluded that,

evidence from a variety of sources indicates that the campuses and relationships of a disturbingly large proportion of colleges and universities are characterized by: an atmosphere of tension, mistrust, and antagonism among students, faculty, and administrators; and, an inability to integrate all educational forces within the college community into a coherent, positively directed institutional effort.

This same document submits that,

it would appear that the basis or rationale for developing individual institutional programs to meet current problems, issues, and trends would require the involvement and interaction of all interested segments of the educational community; and the role of the president and the student personnel administrator should be to strive for coherence throughout the campus [5].

A recent position paper by NASPA which examined the concept of "student power" [24] concluded that a recognition of generational differences between collegiate and facultyadministrative groups is of prime importance. However, primary to a recognition of these generational differences is an expression of concern about the evident lack of communication between these groups. It is presumed that this absence of adequate communication and understanding only serves to accentuate inter-group conflict. Therefore, a major recommendation from this NASPA paper was that action steps must be pursued which will facilitate both "the clarification of critical educational issues and an understanding of each group's position on these issues."

Cross [7], however, has pessimistically hypothesized that campuses are replete with groups of differing opinions and, "it is not possible to speak with any precision about what is upsetting The Students or how The Faculty view various campus issues."

Margaret Berry [2] wrote that, in this regard, a "realistic estimate" of inter-institutional diversity is difficult to determine; and "general estimates" are, at best, only impressionistic and unreliable. Therefore, it was her conclusion that the only way to insure "even approximate accuracy" is to examine each campus in its own setting. When this model is used as a guide, she contends that the results will indicate that each campus supports a cultural image that is very often not consistent with the faculty and administrative image of the same setting. It was her impression that each institution displays a "way of life, a tradition, a set of values, and a pattern of customs" that provides the framework for the behavior and experiences of the various groups in that community. In addition, she concluded that the environmental variables displayed on each campus are basically a reflection of the

predominant values and pressures of the geographical area in which the institution is located. In concurrance with Berry, Kelly [18] reported that the "cultural-matrix" of a particular campus is the result of the complex interaction of the beliefs, customs, and mores of the students, faculty, and administrative personnel in that setting.

Literature Related to the Assumptions and Beliefs of Various Groups in Higher Education

The following studies are relevant, in a general way, to the present investigation and examine the hypothesis that the various constituent groups in higher education do differ in the types of attitudes and beliefs they hold regarding certain campus issues. Related studies are also reviewed which have investigated the possibility that attitudes and beliefs are related to the variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

In a study that attempted to assess the attitudes of presidents, academic deans, and students about student discipline, Sillers and Feder [26] concluded that the "environmental dynamics" of a particular institution have a common influence on the perceptions of the individuals in that setting. This conclusion was based upon data which suggested a high degree of intergroup attitudinal similarity and the presence of a significant amount of inter-institutional variation in perceptions. In a related study, Hubbell [16] examined the attitudes of students, parents, student personnel administrators, and faculty toward student misconduct and the resulting institutional response to student misconduct. The results of this study indicate that there is a significant variation in measured attitudes toward the nature and treatment of college student misconduct. Specifically, student personnel workers were seen to be more lenient than the other groups in both their estimation of how universities would and should respond to student misconduct. Additional findings were that the parent group held the most severe perceptions about misconduct; the faculty were more similar to the parents; and the students were more like the student personnel administrators in their attitudes.

Stern reported [27] additional evidence which supports the hypothesis that institutional diversity is a factor which can be isolated and examined by educational researchers. The data from Stern's study of college environments confirms that institutions can be categorized On variables such as type, size, and geographical location. In general, he concluded that these variables are related to the expectations, beliefs, and behavior of the students, faculty, and staff that comprise such institutions.

Dutton, Appleton, and Smith's [11] investigation of institutional policies on controversial topics demonstrated that generally the variables of type of control,



size of enrollment and region were not significantly related to any variation in policy formulation among the sampled institutions. However, even though the major hypotheses were not accepted or rejected in their entirety, a number of differences among institutions were evident when individual policies were examined. For example, regional variations suggested that North Central schools tend to be more concerned about regulatory issues; whereas the New England institutions tend to be more "liberal" regarding matters of student regulations. The authors of this study concluded that,

. . . essentially all of the respondents felt that the president, academic dean, and chief student personnel officer considered social conduct regulations to be an expression of the particular value system which the institution accepted, as well as a means of achieving order in the academic community. In other words, they took the position that inculcation of behavioral standards is a part of the learning process.

In examining the possible relationships between the institutional variables of type of control, size, and region with institutional approaches to the adjudication of student misconduct, Dutton, Smith and Zarle [12] concluded that regional location and type of institutional control were by far the most influential factors in determining institutional differences in adjudication procedures. However, size of enrollment was significantly related to certain adjudication procedures. The most common pattern observed was that public institutions show the greatest concern for the development of procedures that assure fair


treatment of the student. Additionally, protestant schools appeared to be less supportive in the development of procedures that would provide maximum protection for the student.

When the variable of region was examined, Western institutions demonstrated the strongest commitment to procedures designed to assure the respect of basic student rights in the adjudication of conduct problems. Southern institutions seemed to provide "reasonable" protection of students' rights in adjudication, but appeared to be less concerned about providing for confidentiality of records and were more inclined to act against a student when offcampus violations occur. New England schools provided for the protection of students against infringements from noninstitutional agencies but maintained adjudication procedures that are less protective of student rights.

Generally, large institutions evidenced more protection than small schools. Concern for the protection of the student was more evident among public institutions in the West and among institutions with more than 5,000 students. The conclusion was submitted that institutions which are public, located in the West and have an enrollment greater than 5,000 display conduct procedures that reflect efforts to assure fair treatment of the student.

The American Council on Education's three-year study on campus disruption [4] reported a number of findings that suggest there are identifiable characteristics



that differentiate institutions on the variable of "proneness to disruptions." The conclusion of this research suggested that when the variables of "control and types" were examined disruptive protest was more likely to occur at private uni-Versities, coeducational colleges, and public four-year colleges. Specifically, 70 per cent of the private universities compared to 40 per cent of the public universities experienced disruptive protests. Violent protest was three to four times more likely in the public or private nonsectarian four-year colleges than in church-related institutions. The data also indicated that major protest incidents are least likely to occur among the nation's two-year colleges.

This same study reported that when "size of institution" was examined the general conclusion was that size (total enrollment) is highly related to the probability of major campus protest incidents, but that the nature of the relationship is confounded with type of institutional control. Generally, major campus unrest is most prevalent in large schools. Specifically, large institutions (greater than 5,000 students) of either type were more prone to disruption than intermediate size institutions (1,000 to 5,000 students). Similarly, the intermediate size institutions were more likely to experience disruption than the Small institution (less than 1,000 students).

In summary, Astin and Boyer reported in their American Council on Education Study that institutions which



experienced more disruption and violent protest tended to be universities, coeducational colleges, and public colleges; while institutions that had fewer protests than would be expected tended to be four-year colleges, technical schools, liberal arts colleges, and private nonsectarian colleges. These researchers concluded [4] on the basis of these findings that "unrest is in part a response to a feeling that the welfare of the individual student is slighted" and that

protest prone institutions can be characterized as having environments which were incohesive. Moreover, students and faculty had little involvement in the classrooms; students were not on warm and friendly terms with the instructors . . . and these institutions had relatively permissive policies concerning student regulations.

A study conducted by NASPA is of specific relevance to the present investigation. The Research and Publications Division of NASPA conducted an exploratory investigation of the assumptions and beliefs of student personnel administrators [23]. This exploratory study provided the basic model from which the present investigation was developed.

The results of this investigation suggested that student personnel administrators concur that: (1) the guarantee of an appellate hearing is an essential procedural safeguard against the possible abuse of authority; (2) it is the primary responsibility of the student personnel administrator to consistently support the central functions of teaching and research; (3) it is important for the student personnel administrator to maintain both



his integrity and his loyality to the central administration even when the president, academic dean, or business manager have made decisions which are unpopular with students; (4) the assumption that the student functions as a unit and cannot be separated into "intellect" and "the rest of the person" is the major justification for the claim to an educational role for student personnel administrators; and (5) the freedom to make personal decisions and to shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship is an optimal condition for student maturation.

The results from this study also reported that the respondents in the study did not agree on: (1) whether or not social conduct regulations are anything more than devices for maintaining order; (2) whether or not the consensus attitudes of faculty and students should be a dominant consideration in the establishment or review of social conduct regulations; and (3) whether or not there are areas of college policy or decision-making to which students necessarily cannot make significant contributions.

In an investigation that compared the attitudes of parents, students, faculty members, and student personnel educators regarding the university's relationship with students, Crookston [6] reported that "highly significant statistical differences" existed between the groups on all attitudinal areas examined. In the area of educational philosophy, the results specifically indicated that there seems to be no central preference by parents, students,



and student leaders regarding an educational philosophy. However, faculty members tended to hold a "rationalist philosophy"; while student personnel educators were considered to be "neo-humanist in their orientation." In examining attitudes concerned with academic freedom, Crookston found that on a dimension of "liberalness" the student leaders were consistently the most liberal of the groups sampled and they were followed by the student personnel educators, faculty, students in general, and then the parents. A general conclusion offered by this study was that parental attitudes represent the most restrictive position. Parents are followed by the faculty whose attitudes seemed to resemble parents more than any other group. The student personnel educators and students-in-general appear to have very similar attitudes; while student leaders represent the most liberal attitudinal position among the groups on the areas of academic freedom, educational philosophy, social conduct, and student selfgovernment. Crookston concluded that the data suggests that because student personnel educators work closely with students, they seem to operate from a somewhat different "set of assumptions about higher education than their academic colleagues." Such an awareness led Crookston to conclude that "it is small wonder that student personnel Workers are experiencing difficulty communicating with their academic friends."

Another investigation which has relevant implications for the present study is NASPA's 1968 "Investigation of the Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community" [10]. The purpose of this study was to investigate how institutional presidents, student personnel deans, faculty members, student body presidents, and student newspaper editors responded to questions about certain campus issues. A questionnaire was developed with items "logically" grouped into the following three categories: the responsibilities and administrative behavior of student personnel deans; the student and the educational process; and decision making and university governance.

A chi-square analysis of each item on the questionnaire indicated that the five groups were different on all but one of the eleven items related to the "responsibilities and administrative behavior of student personnel deans." The results also indicated that the five groups differed on all of the items grouped to measure beliefs relevant to the involvement of members of the academic community in decision making and governance and that the five groups differed on all but four of the items which were designed to measure attitudes relevant to the "student and the educational process."

In a study related to this NASPA investigation, Birch [3] concluded that when chief student personnel administrators were examined on the variables of type,



size, and enrollment of institution, there is an apparent consensus in the assumptions and beliefs of these individuals. Birch reported that the few significant differences on individual questionnaire items which were found "do not warrent rejection of the null hypothesis" and that there are no differences in assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators according to: type, location, and size of institution. The greatest number of differences that did occur were found when the variables of regional location were examined; however, these differences existed in less than 19 per cent of the items examined.

Birch concluded that a need exists for additional research that would examine the degree of relationship between the beliefs of chief student personnel administrators and others in the university community on issues that affect the total university setting. He submitted that a general perception in higher education seems to be that the beliefs held by student personnel administrators are not consistent with those held by other members of the university community and that additional research needs to be completed to determine the compatibility of beliefs within the community.

Summary

Generally, the literature emphasizes the common thesis that there is a need to clarify and understand the perceptions, beliefs, and assumptions which are held by



the various groups in higher education. Specifically, however, there is no clear unanimity in the conclusions presented by the variety of research efforts which have attempted to investigate such variables.

A few studies conclude that the diversity between institutions is, in fact, greater than the variation between the different groups which comprise institutions of higher education. Such results support the hypothesis that institutions can be differentiated on variables such as type, size, and geographical region and that these variables are related to the expectations, beliefs, and behaviors of the students, faculty, and staff in such settings. In those few studies which did not find a significant relationship between certain demographic variables and group attitudes, there was enough evidence to cause the researchers to "suspect" the possibility of such a relationship.

Therefore, past research evidence seems to support the hypothesis that the variables of type, size, and location of institution may be related to the kinds of beliefs and assumptions which are held by the various groups in higher education.

The research literature generally supports the hypothesis that faculty, students, and staff vary in the kinds of assumptions and beliefs they hold about selected issues in higher education. In this respect, the variation in reported results seems to be dependent upon the types



of issues that were investigated. Generally, the literature suggests that student personnel workers and students express similar assumptions and beliefs on dimensions such as liberalness, leniency in regulations, and educational philosophy; while, faculty and other administrative personnel are more alike in their views about selected issues in higher education.

In conclusion, the results of previous investigations suggest that there is general support for the hypotheses under investigation in this study. However, because of the diversity of methodological approaches and the variety of attitudes and beliefs examined, no clear and pervasive conclusions are evident from the results of reported research.



CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze, define, and **compare** some of the characteristic underlying assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students. It was an additional purpose of this study to determine whether the assumptions and beliefs held by these groups were related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location. This investigation was conducted as a supplemental study to an antecedent research project [10] sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The present investigation's survey instrument and the samples of student editors, student presidents, faculty members, institutional presidents, and chief student personnel administrators were used simultaneously with the NASPA study.

This chapter presents a discussion of the nature of the samples, the research instrument, the administration of the instrument, the specific hypotheses



examined, and the methods of analysis utilized in this study.

Nature of the Sample

Those colleges and universities holding institutional membership in NASPA in November of 1968 were used in this investigation as the source for the data collection. At the time the study was initiated, 715 institutions of higher education held institutional membership in NASPA. A membership list provided by the Association's central office was divided by type of institution, location of institution, and size of institution by referring to the September 1968 edition of Accredited Institutions of Higher Education (American Council on Education). A comparison of the characteristics of the participating sample groups with the 715 NASPA member institutions is shown in Table 1. The sample groups used in this study consisted of the following individuals from each of the 715 institutions: the institution's president, the chief student personnel administrator, the faculty member holding the highest elected position on the faculty senate or comparable body, the editor of the student newspaper, and the president of the student body.

Instrumentation

The model for the questionnaire which was developed for use in this investigation was initially used by NASPA in a preliminary study of the assumptions and beliefs of



	NAS	PA members	lip as of N	ovember, 196	.8	10 201	
			Percentag	e of Group R	tesponding		
	Per Cent	Deans	Faculty	Presidents	Student Presidents	Student Editors	
Type							
Public	36.4	34.5	39.9	35.0	34.5	37.9	
Independent	20.0	20.3	21.2	20.6	27.2	24.6	
Catholic	14.1	15.3	14.2	13.8	16.2	14.4	
Protestant	19.3	18.1	16.7	17.6	12.9	13.6	
Other	10.2	10.9	7.6	12.3	9.2	8.4	
Size							
Less than 1,500	33.7	35.2	35.2	33.6	37.6	35.0	
1,500 to 5,000	31.4	29.5	29.5	31.9	29.7	28.0	
5,000 to 10,000	15.2	17.2	16.1	16.7	16.2	17.6	
More than 10,000	19.7	18.1	18.9	17.6	16.5	19.1	
Region							
New England/							
Middle Atlantic	29.6	27.3	27.1	25.8	28.7	27.2	
South	19.9	19.9	20.6	18.4	16.5	20.8	
North Central	40.0	41.3	40.6	44.2	39.3	37.3	
Western/ North Western	10.5	10.7	10.5	11.1	11.5	10.7	

TABLE 1.--Comparison of characteristics of sample groups with characteristics of total

Total N



chief student personnel administrators [10]. This original instrument was modified for the present study under the advisement of the Division of Research and Publications of NASPA. Dr. W. Harold Grant, a professor of higher education at Michigan State University at the time of the instrument revision, and Dr. Irvin J. Lehmann of the Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State University served as consultants in the revision process. The questionnaire was reviewed by the NASPA Division of Research and Publications on three separate occasions during the revision process.

The revised instrument was used in a pilot study with twenty chief student personnel administrators, faculty members, and students to determine the feasibility of the questionnaire for this investigation. The pilot study Participants were asked to offer comments and propose revisions, if necessary, for the questionnaire. After the suggested modifications were incorporated into the final design, the instrument was printed for use in this investigation as well as for use in the broader NASPA project.

The questions contained in the final instrument were developed from four specific areas which were assumed to be representative of selected issues in higher education at the time of the study (Appendix A). The areas which served as guidelines for the development of the instrument were:



<u>Area I: The Responsibilities and Administrative</u> <u>Behavior of the Chief Student Personnel Administrator</u>.--This area contained items which pertain to the responsibilities normally attributed to the chief student personnel administrator and to the manner in which his affairs are conducted and to the manner in which he provides direction and management of campus affairs.

Area II: The Student and the Educational Process.--This area contains items which pertain to certain theoretical and philosophical understandings about the student and the educational process. Growth, ability, maturity, the learning process, and the factors that influence these phenomena form the basis for these items.

Area III: Standards of Behavior and Social Conduct Regulations.--This area contains items that pertain to regulations and standards governing student behavior (including the implementation of these standards of regulations).

Area IV: Involvement in University Governance and Decision Making.--This area contains items which are directed at the involvement by various members of the academic community in decision-making and university governance.

Administration of the Questionnaire

Was

The questionnaire designed for use in this study administered in conjunction with a more pervasive NASPA



study [10]. In the design of the NASPA study, each institution's chief student personnel administrator was sent a personal letter under the signature of Dr. Thomas B. Dutton, the Director of the Division of Research and Publications. This letter (Appendix B) explained the nature of the study and requested the assistance of each chief student personnel administrator in facilitating the completion of the investigation. The administrator was asked to distribute packets containing the questionnaires to his president, the appropriate faculty member, the editor of his campus's student newspaper, and the president of his student body. Each individual participant was instructed to return his completed questionnaire directly to the NASPA investigators. A self-addressed return envelope was included for each respondent.

A follow-up letter was sent to each of the chief student personnel administrators approximately one and a half months after the initial mailing. This follow-up mailing requested each chief student personnel administrator to remind the other participants on his campus to ^{Complete} their questionnaires if not already completed. A total of 2,032 questionnaires were returned for use in the study. This represented a return of approximately 60 per cent.

A goodness of fit comparison was made by type, size, and region between each sample group which partici-Pated in the study and the total NASPA membership at the



time of the study to determine whether the sample was representative of the NASPA membership. The results of the chi-square analysis (Table 2) indicate that the only groups which did not appear to be representative of NASPA member institutions were the student presidents and stuclent editors by type of institutional control.

Groups	Chi Square Values		
	Туре	Size	Region
Deans	1.39	2.67	. 98
Faculty	6.07	1.19	.94
Presidents	2.54	1.52	4.45
Student Presidents	10.77*	4.56	1.97
Student Editors	10.77*	2.42	.86

 $\ensuremath{\mathbf{T}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{ABLE}}$ 2.--Goodness of fit comparison of sample groups with NASPA membership.

*p < .05

Therefore, it is questionable to conclude that the student presidents and editors were representative of the types of institutions which were members of NASPA at the time of the study. The remaining chi-square results support the conclusion that the sample groups were representative of NASPA membership at the time of the study.



Hypotheses: General and Specific

The general hypotheses examined in this investigation were that student editors, student presidents, faculty members, chief student personnel administrators, and institutional presidents differ in the assumptions and beliefs they hold about selected campus issues and that the assumptions and beliefs held by these groups are related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

The specific hypotheses examined in this study were:

- No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by the sample groups of institutional presidents, chief student personnel administrators, faculty members, student editors, and student presidents.
- II. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by student editors when the student editors are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.
- III. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by student presidents when the student presidents are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.
- IV. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by the faculty members when the faculty members are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.
- V. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators when the chief student personnel administrators are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.



VI. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by institutional presidents when the institutional presidents are grouped by the demographic variables of instutitional type, size, and geographical region.

Methods of Analysis

In the past, a number of attempts have been made to compare and describe the type of data represented in + his study. However, to date, most attempts have been 7 imited in the techniques and methods utilized for such an investigation. Generally, most studies have relied upon non-parametric item-by-item analyses as the technique for data analysis. This study will attempt to provide a reliable, more powerful, and parsimonious investigation by utilizing the methods of factor analysis and analysis of variance to identify and compare the possible underlying assumptions and beliefs measured by this investigation's questionnaire. Factor analysis was chosen for this study because: (1) it is a parsimonious analytic tool, and (2) it is a method that can be used to explore and to identify fundamental underlying variables or properties from n sets of measures [19]. Additionally, the results from the factor analytic method can provide the data for a more powerful method of making group comparisons. In this regard, factor scores are considered to be a more reliable dependent variable than single item scores; and an analysis of variance of factor scores will provide a more powerful



approach to group comparisons than a non-parametric itemby-item comparison. 1

Specifically the analysis consisted of the following three basic steps:

A principle-component factor analysis was conducted on the questionnaire responses for the total sample of 2,032 subjects in an attempt to isolate and identify those factors which represent underlying groupings of the measured assumptions and beliefs. The computation of the factor analyses was completed by using the Michigan State University Computer Institute for Social Science Research Program, Factor A: Principle Components and Orthogonal Rotations [29].

 Factor scores were computed for each of the
O 32 subjects by using the Michigan State University Com-Puter Institute for Social Science Research program,
Factor C: Oblique Rotations of Factor Matrices, Varimax
Rotation, and Factor Scores Computations [8].

3. The individual factor scores generated from the Factor C program were used as the data input to a series of repeated measures analysis of variance comparisons for the purpose of investigating the specific null hypotheses.

¹Statement by Dr. Andrew C. Porter, Office of Re-Unich Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State Versity, personal interview.


The specific analysis of variance procedures were completed by use of the repeated measures analysis of variance program, entitled <u>Profile</u>. This program was supplied by the Office of Research Consultation of the Michigan State University College of Education.

The Scheffe' method for post hoc multiple comparison was used to examine all mean comparisons in conjunction with the analysis of variance procedures [15].

Summary

The present study was conducted in conjunction with a more pervasive research project sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The samples for the present study consisted of student editors, student presidents, institutional presidents, faculty members, and chief student personnel administrators from NASPA member institutions.

The data was collected in the fall of 1968 and winter of 1969 by means of a questionnaire designed to measure the subjects' assumptions and beliefs relative to a set of selected issues in higher education. It was hy-Pothesized that the sample groups differ in their basic assumptions and beliefs and that these assumptions and beliefs are related to the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.



Factor analytic procedures were used to isolate and identify the basic assumptions and beliefs of the subjects, and a repeated measures analysis of variance design was used to test the general and specific hypotheses.



CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The present study was designed to analyze, define, and compare some of the characteristic underlying assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students. It was an additional purpose of this study to determine whether the assumptions and beliefs held by these groups were related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location. The statistical methods of factor analysis and analysis of variance were used for these purposes.

This chapter presents the data which resulted from the statistical attempts to isolate and identify the basic factors which might be extracted from the questionnaire data collected for this study. The results of the analysis of variance tests of the general and specific hypotheses are also presented in this chapter.

The present study was designed to examine the hypotheses of the study by applying the method of factor analysis to items of a questionnaire which was developed



to sample the beliefs and assumptions which various groups in higher education hold about certain selected issues in higher education.

Specifically the study had three objectives:

- to ascertain the factor structure of a set of selected assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students;
- (2) to determine whether an analysis of variance procedure would detect any differences in a comparison of the above groups' scores on the identified factors;
- (3) to determine whether the procedure of analysis of variance would detect any relationship between the identified factors and the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

Factor Analysis Results

Responses to the study questionnaire were correlated and the inter-item product-moment intercorrelation matrix was subjected to a principle-component factor analysis. The resulting factor loading matrix was rotated to simple structure by using the varimax rotation method in an attempt to account for variables in as few factors as possible. The maximum number of rotations was determined by an eigenvalue threshold of one (Appendix C).



On the basis of the eigenvalues for each of the factors and the relative amount of variance accounted for by each factor, it was concluded that three primary dimensions were contained in the data of the present study.

Factors were constructed by successively selecting items with the highest loadings on any one factor and then excluding those items from consideration in other factors. For each factor, an attempt was made to set the factor loading criterion at an optimum level so that enough items would be included to adequately sample the underlying characteristic assumptions and beliefs which seemed to have relevant and logical meaning for this study.

Individual item loadings equal to or greater than .30 were used in this study for purposes of identifying and logically describing the three factors presented in Table 3. Kerlinger [19] emphasizes that there is no generally accepted method for setting a criterion level for factor loadings. He suggests that loadings between .30 and .40 are acceptable and often used by factor analysts. The loadings which met the .30 criterion level are underlined in Table 3.

The selection of the three factors was based on a logical content analysis of each item which loaded at .30 or greater on a particular factor. This procedure facilitated the assignment of a rational and functional definition to each of the three factors identified. This same Procedure was applied to two, four, five, and six factor



Items	Factors			
Questionnaire	I	II	III	
1	0.0117	0.5179	-0.0188	
2	-0.4211	-0.0346	0.1334	
3	-0.1178	0.4088	-0.1859	
4	-0.1195	0.0394	0.426	
5	-0.3324	0.1950	0.3319	
6	-0.2119	-0.1179	-0.1001	
7	0.2028	0.3876	0.0069	
8	0.0454	0.0525	-0.4439	
9	-0.4156	0.0082	0.4665	
10	-0.0253	0.3050	0.2540	
11	0.0270	0.4726	0.1089	
12	0.0126	0.4534	-0.179	
13	-0.5125	-0.0546	0.332	
14	-0.5545	-0.0867	0.061	
15	-0.4210	0.0934	-0.0976	
16	-0.0352	0.1567	0.357	
17	0.0307	0.0404	-0.2194	
18	-0.4058	0.0865	-0.128	
19	-0.2598	0.1424	-0.4842	
20	-0.1166	0.2973	-0.3924	
21	-0.0982	0.2611	-0.2860	
22	0.0384	0.2964	-0.170	
23	0.5653	0.2433	-0.244	
24	-0.4374	0.1802	-0.005	
25	-0.1885	0.3160	0.1030	
26	-0.0812	-0.0225	0.5234	
27	-0.0485	0.0937	-0.593	

TABLE 3.--Principle component factor matrix--rotated factor loadings of the twenty-seven questionnaire items on each factor.



solutions. A "logical" comparison of these multiple factor solutions seemed to support the conclusion that the three factor solution provided the most parsimonious solution and would, therefore, meet the objectives of this study better than any other factor solution.

An additional attempt was made to verify the validity of the above logical approach to the selection of the three factor solution by employing a statistical method which compares factors between studies based upon different individuals. This approach reported by Kaiser, Hunka and Bianchini [17] yielded a measure of relationship between all factors under consideration. The actual comparison in this study was conducted by use of the Fortran Program for Relating Factors Between Studies Based Upon Different Individuals: F MATCH. This program was supplied by the Office of Research Consultation in the Michigan State University College of Education.

The actual factor comparisons were completed by Conducting a separate factor analysis for each sample group's questionnaire responses. The results of these Separate factor analyses served as the input data to the F Match procedures.

The purpose of this procedure was to determine which factor solution yielded the smallest number of factors that would best describe the underlying assumptions and beliefs for each group. In this method all possible Pairs of the five sample groups' factors were compared by



the F MATCH program for two, three, four, and five factor solutions. In each case a correlation coefficient was computed as a measure of the relationship between each factor for each of the sample groups. In essence, this method indicated whether any two factors in different groups were measuring the same basic and characteristic assumption and belief.

The three factor solution clearly yielded the strongest degree of relationship between the factors extracted for the five sample groups. As can be seen in Table 4 the correlation coefficients in most of the comparisons were between .70 and .98. The conclusion drawn from these results was that the same three factors could be found in each of the five sample groups. Subsequently, when the results of the statistical and "logical" methods for identifying the most parsimonious factor solution were examined it was concluded the three factor solution seemed to provide the most useful approach for the present study's Purposes.

Identification of the Three Factors

The method of factor analysis attempts to analyze a set of observations by determining whether the variations represented by the observations' intercorrelations can be accounted for adequately by a number of basic categories smaller than that with which the investigation began [13]. Therefore, data obtained from a large number of <u>a priori</u>



	Student	Stude	nt Pres	idents	Student Deans				
	Editors	I	II	III	Presi- dents	I	II	III	
	I II III	.6327 .7737 .0341	.2238 .2248 .9483	.7414 .5924 .3154	I II III	.6594 .6419 .3914	.5861 .1129 .8023	•4708 •7584 •4507	
Student	Student	Faculty			Student	Р	Presidents		
	Editors	I	II	III	Presi- dents	I	II	III	
-	I II III III	.3208 .2634 .9098	.0488 .9639 .2619	.9459 .0397 .3220	I II III	.6767 .1957 .7098	.3200 .9464 .0442	.6631 .2570 .7030	
Stu Edi	Student	Deans			Deans				
	Editors	I	II	III	Faculty ·	I	II	III	
		.0850 .9198 .3831	.9749 .0026 .2227	.2058 .3924 .8965	I II III	.1598 .9867 .0287	.2127 .0060 .9771	.9640 .1623 .2108	
Student Editors	tudent	Presidents			Presidents		ts		
	ditors	I	II	III	Faculty	I	II	III	
	I I I I I I I I	.9133 .1837 .3634	.3558 .0744 .9316	.1982 .9802 .0026	I II III	.1274 .3282 .9360	.9762 .2085 .0597	.1756 .9213 .3469	
Student		Faculty		Deens	Presidents		ts		
	dents	I	II	III	Deans	I	II	III	
		.3601 .9324 .0306	.7799 .2829 .5583	.5119 .2249 .8291	I II III	.2947 .9519 .0838	.2953 .1741 .9394	.9088 .2521 .3324	
		the second s		and the second se				the second s	

TABLE 4.--Inter-group factor comparison for all possible pairs of sample groups indicating strength of relationship (correlation) between factors for three factor solution.



measures may be explained in terms of a smaller number of reference variables. The results of factor analysis serve as indirect and descriptive evidence for underlying entities and the interpretation of such entities represents a descriptive and tentative categorizing of such hypothetical variables [22]. The resultant factors are statistically derived unities which must be interpreted by examining the content of those specific items which maintain "high" loadings on the individual factors. In the end, the fact must be recognized that the placing of "labels" and "names" on each factor is a descriptive process which is based on the logical analysis of the item content of each factor. The resulting labeling procedure and the attempt to apply pervasive interpretations of the factors are basically subjective processes. Such processes represent parsimonious attempts to identify constructs or hypothetical unities which presumably underlie individual performance [19].

Factor I--Degree of Institutional Involvement in the Educational Process

Factor I appears to reflect the beliefs an indi **vidual** holds about the degree of direct and obvious in **volvement** the institution should or should not have in the **educational** process. This factor seems to represent how an **individual** feels about the extent and degree of involve**ment** an institution should have directly or indirectly



through its agents in effecting change or influencing the direction of change in students. The items which have high loadings on this factor seem to examine whether an individual feels an institution should or should not be involved in the process of effecting an intended, immediate, or future change in the non-academic aspects of an individual student's experience in higher education.

Generally, this factor seems to involve beliefs about an institution's involvement in the following areas: should an institution of higher education have some basic and direct affect on the student's non-academic development; and should the institution be concerned with the "enforcement of moral standards," the "social maturity and value development of the individual student," the integration of attempts to influence the development of a student's values and social maturity with the academic program, the planned manipulation of the institutional environment with the intention of supporting student development; and should the institution attempt to influence students to adopt values which are held to be important by the institution?

Individuals who scored relatively high on this **factor** tended to believe that the institution should be **actively** and directly involved in an attempt to influence **the** non-academic development of the individual student. **Such** a score reflected a belief that the university or **college** should indirectly by its policies or directly



through its official agents attempt to effect change in the student's moral, value, and social beliefs.

Factor II--Benefits of the Institutional-Student Relationship

Whereas Factor's I and III are considered to be process oriented factors, Factor II is more content or substantive oriented with regard to the relationship which exists between the institution and the student and the affect of this relationship upon the student and the institution. In essence, Factor II assesses the strength of the individual's beliefs about whether the "climate" of the educational process should be devoted primarily to the "growth" of the individual student or to the facilitation of a mutually productive environment for both the institution and the student. A rational interpretation of the items which have high loadings on this factor seemed to be concerned with whether the relationship between the student and the institution exists solely for the benefit of the student and his individual needs or whether the institution should benefit in any appreciable manner from the relationship. Low scores on Factor II appeared to be related to the belief that policies, procedures, and relation- ${}^{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{i}_{\mathbf{p}s}$ should exist basically and primarily for the student's benefit. In a bi-polar sense, this factor assesses th_{e} individual's beliefs about whether the educational Process as evidenced in Factors I and III should be



responsive more to the needs of the student or the institution.

Some of the items which met the criterion level for loading on this factor seemed to reflect beliefs about whether the personal relationship between the institution and the student should take priority over the performance of administrative tasks, whether the institution's primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student, whether the dean of students should disassociate himself from unpopular decisions made by the president and others so that students might feel they have "friend in COurt," whether depersonalization in higher education is Felated to an increasing number of "lower echelon" staff members inserted between the student and top-level administrators, and whether the only justification for student interferes with student growth and development.

Individuals who scored relatively high¹ on this factor tended to believe that the student should not be the only benefactor from the institutional-student relationship. A high score on this factor suggests that the **Poli**cies, procedures, and institutional-student relationship

¹The subject's item responses were keyed so that a by the individual questionnaire items. Therefore, higher cores on this factor imply disagreement with the undering belief represented by this factor.



should be, at least, reciprocal in their effects on the institution and the student.

Factor III--Institutional Stability

Factor III appears to be a factor which assesses the beliefs an individual holds about the university or college as an organization. This factor reflects what Gross and Grambsch [14] identify as the "support or adaption goals" of the institution. In a general sense, Gross and Grambsch imply that such a dimension seems to be concerned with the "management goals" of an institution. Such a factor specifically examines areas of concern such as: who should be involved in the decision-making process, who should run the university, and who should establish the priorities regarding which goals should be given max imum attention.

The items which had high loadings on this factor were in a general sense items which are more procedural, Process and administrative in orientation than the more substantively oriented items which comprise Factor II. Factor III appears to be a factor which reflects an individual's beliefs about the importance of the administrative Process and the need for institutional stability.

Additional items which had high loadings on this factor reflected beliefs about whether the dean of student's responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions, whether the



dean of students should be responsible for upholding standards which are too sensitive by their nature to be stated in a specific code of conduct, whether there is a direct relationship between a dean of student's effectiveness and his over-concern with maintenance of control and order, whether the dean of students should devote much attention to the enforcement of regulations, whether the academic institution has such a specific purpose that the behavior of its participants must be restricted in special ways, whether exceptions to policy only reinforce unacceptable behavior, whether it is more advisable to underdelegate than to over-delegate responsibilities to students, whether students should not be involved in top-Level institutional policy decisions because they lack sufficient maturity, and whether the present climate of dissent has had a negative impact on higher education.

The individual who is assessed as having a high score on Factor III tends to believe in a relative manner that the administrative processes of an institution are not of primary importance and that the stability of the individual institution should not be a primary concern of the process of higher education. A high score could be interpreted rationally as meaning that there is too much concern with the establishment and implementation of procedures and policies, while not enough effort is directed toward the ramifications of such pehnomena on the educational process itself.



Between Group Comparisons

The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance (Table 5) and the one-way analysis of variance (Table 6) have indicated rejection of the null hypothesis that no differences would be found between the sample groups' assumptions and beliefs as reported in this investigation. The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance clearly indicated that there is a significant main effect. This suggests that the five sample groups did differ in the characteristic underlying assumptions and beliefs they held as represented by Factors I, II, and III reported in this study.

The significant main and interaction effects suggest that the group effects reported in Table 5 are not constant across groups and factors. In order to more clearly ascertain where the group differences existed a series of one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted on each of the three factors. Scheffe's multiple comparison test was used in conjunction with any significant one-way analysis of variance results in order to determine the exact group differences.

As can be seen from Table 6 the five sample groups are different on each of the three factors used in this study. Specific group comparisons for Factor I results are presented in Table 7. The results of the Scheffe com-Parisons for Factor I show that the college presidents tended to believe more strongly than the other groups that



Source	df	MS	F
Total	6095	.682	
Groups	4	27.259	70.44*
S-Groups	2027	.387	
Rep Meas	2	.602	.87
2 G	8	54.901	78.88*
S-G	4054	.696	

TABLE 5.--Repeated measures analysis of variance of factor scores for the five sample groups on Factors I, II, and III.

*p < .01

TABLE 6.--One-way analysis of variance of the sample group mean scores on each of the three factors.

	the second se	Calendary and the second second second	
Source	df	MS	F
Factor I			
Groups Error	4 6081	96.128 .593	162.105*
Factor II			
Groups Error	4 6081	7.619 .593	12.848*
Factor III			
Groups Error	4 6081	33.066 .593	55.761*

*p < .01



		Groups					
Groups	x	Deans	Faculty	Student Presidents	Student Editors		
Presidents	.457	.081	. 342	. <u>949</u>	1.080		
Deans	.376		.261	• <u>868</u>	• <u>999</u>		
Faculty	.115			• <u>607</u>	• <u>738</u>		
Student Presidents	-4.92				.131		
Student Editors	623						
	(Combined	Comparison	S			
		Groups					
Groups		Stu	dent Group	s Facu	Faculty		
Presidents + Faculty	+ Deans		2.634				
Faculty			• <u>773</u>				
Presidents + Deans				. <u>30</u>	02		

TABLE 7.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of sample group mean differences on Factor I.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.


the institution should be actively and directly involved in the non-academic development of the student. The dean of students group was not significantly different from the presidents, but both the presidents and the deans were significantly different from the other groups. The faculty were different from both groups of students, but the two student groups were not different from each other.

When the groups of presidents, deans, and faculty members were jointly compared against the combined groups of students the results indicate that the three "staff" groups scored significantly higher than the students on the factor representing institutional involvement in the educational process. Additional combined comparisons indicated that the faculty were different from the students and the combined groups of presidents and deans maintained a significantly higher score on Factor I than the faculty.

Clearly these results suggest that there are identifiable differences between the sample groups in how much they believe the institution should be involved in attempting to influence the non-academic dimensions of a student's higher educational experience. College presidents held the strongest agreement with such a belief. And, the deans of students were not different from this chief administrative group on this factor. The groups of faculty members, student body presidents, and student editors tended to disagree with the belief represented in Factor I.



Specific group comparison results for Factor II are presented in Table 8. The results of the Scheffe comparisons show that the college presidents tended to believe more strongly than the other groups that the relationship between the institution and the student should have reciprocal value for the university or college as well as the student and that there are often certain situations where the primary commitment should not be to the individual student. The dean of students group was not different from the presidents on this factor. However, the presidents' group was different from the other three sample groups. The deans and the faculty were not different, from the students.

The combined groups of students and faculty were significantly lower on Factor II than the combined groups of presidents and deans. This result suggests that the "non-administrative" sample groups tended to believe that the relationship between the institution and the student should exist more for the student's benefit than the institutions'. Additional combined group comparisons indicated that the student groups scored lower than the non-student groups, and the faculty group scored lower than the administrative groups.

Generally, these results suggest that there are discernable and significant differences between the sample groups in the manner in which they view the relationship between the institution and the student. The chief



		Groups							
Groups	x	Deans	Faculty	Student Presidents	Student Editors				
Presidents	.167	.084	.156	• <u>299</u>	• <u>338</u>				
Deans	.083		.072	• <u>215</u>	• <u>254</u>				
Faculty	.011			.143	• <u>182</u>				
Student Presidents	132				.039				
Student Editors	 171								
		Combined	Comparison	IS					
			Groups						
Groups	Groups -		residents	Students					
Student Edit + Student Presidents	ors	6	68						
Presidents + Deans + Faculty					714				
Faculty		.114 .732			732				

TABLE 8.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of sample group mean differences on Factor II.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

administrative group tended to display a greater disagreement with the belief that the student should be the sole or major benefactor from the relationship between the institution and the student. However, the deans of students were similar to the presidents in the strength and direction of their belief on this factor. The deans and the faculty were also similar in their beliefs as represented by Factor II, while the student groups tended to be similar to each other in their beliefs.

ł

Specific group comparisons for Factor III are presented in Table 9. The Scheffe multiple comparison results indicated that the two groups of students displayed more disagreement with the belief portrayed by Factor III than the other sample groups. Specifically, the students' high factor score on Factor III suggested that they did not agree with the belief that the stability and maintenance of the institution and its administrative processes should be a primary concern of the educational process. Basically, such a high score suggests that the students believed that too much emphasis has been placed on institutional procedures which seem to be established and implemented for the purpose of maintaining the stability of the institution itself.

The combined groups of students and dean of student groups were significantly different from the combined faculty and college president groups. Also, the college

Concerne a		Groups						
Groups	Х	Student Presidents	Deans	Faculty	Presidents			
Student Editors	. 291	.060	.176	• <u>503</u>	• 664			
Student Presidents	.231		.116	• <u>433</u>	• <u>604</u>			
Deans	.115			.337	. 488			
Faculty	-2.12	:			.161*			
Presidents	373							
		Combined Co	omparison	IS				
			Gr	oups	1. <u>.</u>			
Groups		Students		Deans				
Faculty + Presidents		1.5	14					
Students	• <u>155</u>							

TABLE 9.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of sample group mean differences on Factor III.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

*****p < .05

president's score was significantly lower than the faculty
group's score.

Generally, the results of these comparisons suggested that there are identifiable differences between the group beliefs as measured by Factor III regarding emphasis placed upon the need for appropriate institutional policies, procedures, and regulations which have been designed for the purpose of facilitating the maintenance of the institution and insuring its stability as an organization.

Specifically, these results suggest that the students and deans of students tended to share the belief that too much emphasis has been placed upon the importance of institutional stability. The faculty and college president groups appeared to believe that such procedures and processes are important, and that the maintenance of the individual institution is an important variable in the process of higher education.

Within Group Comparisons

The general hypothesis that the assumptions and beliefs held by the five sample groups would be related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region was tested by using a repeated measures analysis of variance to test for possible within group differences which might be related to these demographic variables. Specifically, each sample group was divided into sub-groups according to the selected

demographic variables. The analysis of variance procedures were applied to the resulting sub-group scores on the three factors. Additional one-way analysis of variance and Scheffe multiple comparison tests were applied in an effort to isolate specific within group differences on the three factors.

Hypothesis II

II. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by student editors when the student editors are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

Student editors grouped by institutional type.--

The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance for editor-type sub-groups (Table 10) did not yield a significant group effect, but the repeated measures effect was significant. Subsequently, the one-way analysis of variance results (Table 10) yielded a significant difference between the various institutional sub-groups for student editors on Factor I. The Scheffe multiple comparison results (Table 11) indicated that the only significant difference was that editors from Catholic institutions tended to score significantly higher than the editors from public institutions. While none of the student editor groups scored very high on this factor the results indi-Cated that only the Catholic and public groups were Significantly divergent in their beliefs represented by Factor I. This result implies that among the student

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures ANOVA	
Total	1028	.772	
Groups	4	.620	1.64
S-Groups	338	.377	
Rep Meas	2	70.217	92.51*
R G	8	1.367	1.80
RS-G	676	.759	
	0	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	4 1014	2.413 .631	3.824*
Factor II			
Groups Error	4 1014	.470 .631	.745
Factor III			
Groups Error	4 1014	.508 .631	.805

TABLE 10Ar	nalys	is of v	variance	of	mean	scores	on	the	three
factors	for	editor	s grouped	d by	inst	citution	nal	type	≥.

*p < .01

editors those individuals from public institutions seemed to evidence a stronger reaction against the active and direct involvement of the university in the non-academic development of the individual student.

		Groups						
Groups	x	Other	Other Protes- tant		Public			
Catholic	351	.056	.191	.274	• <u>445</u>			
Other	407		.135	.218	.389			
Protestant	542			.083	.254			
Independent	625				.171			
Public	796							

TABLE 11.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor I for student editors grouped by type of institution.

Note: Underlined mean differences significant at p < .05.

Student editors grouped by institutional size.--The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance (Table 12) did not yield a significant group effect, but there was a significant interaction effect. The one-way analysis of variance comparisons (Table 12) for student editor sub-groups based on size of institutions indicated that there were significant group differences on Factors I and III. The post hoc comparisons by the Scheffe method (Table 13) indicated that the only difference reported on Factor I was that editors from institutions with less than

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures ANOVA	1
Total	1037	.773	
Groups	3	.042	.11
S-Groups	342	.381	
Rep Meas	2	71.189	94.65**
R G	6	2.040	2.71*
RS-G	684	.752	
	0	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I	******		
Groups Error	3 1026	1.837 .629	2.920*
Factor II			
Groups Error	3 1026	1.136 .629	1.806
Factor III			
Groups Error	3 1026	2.224 .629	3.535*

TABLE 12.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for editors grouped by institutional size.

*p<.05 **p<.01

	Groups						
Groups	Factor I* X	Factor III* \overline{X}					
Less than 1,500	470	.135					
5,000 to 10,000	690	.333					
1,500 to 5,000	691	.303					
More than 10,000	797	.525					
	Combined Comparison	S					
2	Less Than 1,500						
Groups	Factor I	Factor III					
More than 1,500	• <u>987</u>	.756**					
Underlined	mean difference sign	$\frac{1}{1}$					

TABLE 13.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factors I and III for student editors grouped by size of institution.

Underlined mean difference significant at p < .01.
*No significant mean differences.</pre>

**p < .05

1,500 students had a significantly higher score than all other editor groups combined. The multiple comparison on Factor III shows that editors from schools with more than 10,000 students tended to disagree more with the belief represented in Factor III than the editors from the smaller sample schools. Additionally, the editors from the smallest sample schools (less than 1,500 students) tended to score significantly lower on Factor III than all other editors combined. That is, these editors agreed that institutional stability was a valuable dimension of the educational process.

These results indicated that none of the editorsize groups scored very high on Factor I. However, the data suggests that editors from schools with less than 1,500 students enrolled seemed to agree more with the belief represented by Factor I than all other editor-size groups combined. That is, the editors from the smallest enrollment schools seemed to feel more positive about institutional involvement in the non-academic aspects of the higher educational process.

The results for Factor III indicated that editors from the smallest schools seemed to agree more with the belief represented by Factor III than all other editor groups combined. That is, the editors from the smallest enrollment schools seemed to express the belief that the need for institutional stability should be met through a

recognition of the role of the administrative process in their setting.

Student editors grouped by geographical region.--The repeated measures and one-way analysis of variance results for the editor sub-groups based on geographical region (Table 14) indicated that there were no significant differences between the editor-region sub-groups on the three factors reported in this study.

Summary for statistical examination of Hypothesis

II (student editors).--In general the results of this investigation have indicated that Hypothesis II was re-Specifically, the results of this study indicated iected. that student editors from different types of institutions did differ in the manner in which they responded to the questionnaire items of Factor I. There was no evident relationship between the various student editor sub-groups based on institutional type and Factors II and III. The results have also indicated that student editors from the various sizes of institutions did differ in their beliefs as represented by Factors I and III. No difference was found for the groups on Factor II. In addition no significant differences were found on all three factors for the editor sub-groups based on geographical location of institution.

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures ANOVA	
Groups	3	.433	1.14
S-Groups	329	.379	
Rep Meas	2	66.017	87.90**
R G	6	1.687	2.25*
RS-G	658	.751	
	-*	One-Way ANOVA	
Factor I		,	
Groups Error	3 987	1.292 .627	2.061
Factor II			
Groups Error	3 987	•928 •627	1.481
Factor III			
Groups Error	3 987	1.376 .627	2.194

TABLE	14Ar	halys	sis o	f va	ariance	of	mean	scores	on	the	three
	factors	for	edit	ors	grouped	a pi	y geog	graphica	al 1	regio	on.

*p < .05 **p < .01

Hypothesis III

III. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by student presidents when the student presidents are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

Student presidents grouped by institutional type.--

The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance (Table 15) yielded significant main and interaction effects. This suggests that there were group differences and these differences were not constant across factors. Subsequently, the one-way analysis of variance results reported a significant group effect only on the Factor I results. The Scheffe test (Table 16) reported that the student presidents from Catholic schools tended to score higher than the student presidents from either the independent or public schools and that student presidents from Protestant schools tended to score higher than their colleagues from the independent and public schools. A combined multiple comparison found that the student presidents from the two religious supported schools tended to score higher on Factor I than their student counterparts at the secular institutions.

Student presidents grouped by institutional size.--The results of the analysis of variance tests for the subgroups based on size of institution (Table 17) indicated that there were significant group differences on Factors

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures	ANOVA
Groups	4	1.997	4.66*
S-Groups	385	.428	
Rep Meas	2	50.921	77.74*
R G	8	2.248	3.43*
RS-G	770	.655	
	O	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	4 1155	5.255 .579	9.076*
Factor II			
Groups Error	4 1155	.233 .579	.058
Factor III			
Groups Error	4 1155	1.068 .579	1.845

TABLE 15Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three
factors for student presidents grouped by type of
institution.

*p < .01

Cround	v	Groups						
Groups	× -	Protes- tant	Other	Inde- pendent	Public			
Catholic	169	.033	.111	• <u>443</u>	• <u>551</u>			
Protestant	202		.078	• <u>410</u>	• <u>518</u>			
Other	280			• <u>332</u>	• <u>440</u>			
Independent	612				• <u>108</u>			
Public	720							
	С	ombined Co	omparisons	5				
			(Groups				
Groups	Catholic + Protestant							
Public + Independent		2.065						

TABLE 16.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor I for student presidents grouped by type of institution.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

df	MS	F
Repea	ted Measures ANOV	A
3	.145	.32
386	.446	
2	50.921	77.27**
6	2.264	3.43**
772	.659	
0	ne-Way ANOVA	
3 1158	1.938 .588	3.295*
3 1158	.390 .588	.663
3 1158	2.381 .588	4.049**
	df Repea 3 386 2 6 772 0 1158 1158 1158	df MS Repeated Measures ANOVA 3 .145 386 .446 2 50.921 6 2.264 772 .659 One-Way ANOVA 3 1.938 1158 .588 3 2.381 1158 .588

TABLE	17Ana	ilysi	s of va	riance	of m	ean	score	es c	on the	three	
	factors	for	student	presid	dents	gro	uped	by	size	of	
institution.											

*p < .05 **p < .01

I and III. The multiple comparison results for Factor I (Table 18) found that the only significant difference was when the combined groups from the two smaller sized schools were compared against the student president groups from schools that had more than 5,000 students enrolled. The result was that the student presidents from the smaller schools tended to score higher on Factor I than the student presidents from the larger schools.

The multiple comparisons on Factor III indicated that the student presidents from the schools with more than 10,000 students scored significantly higher on Factor III than the student presidents from either the schools with less than 1,500 enrolled or schools that had between 1,500 and 5,000 students enrolled. Additionally, the student presidents from the combined groups from all schools with less than 10,000 students tended to score significantly lower than the student presidents from schools with more than 10,000 students enrolled.

Student presidents grouped by geographical region.--There were no significant F values detected for the various regional sub-group comparisons on the three factors (Table 19).

<u>Summary for statistical examination of Hypothesis</u> <u>III (student presidents)</u>.--In general, the results of this investigation have indicated that Hypothesis III was rejected. Specifically, the data has shown that student

	Groups							
Groups	Factor I*		Factor III					
	x	x	More than 10,000	5,000 10,000) 1,500) 5,000			
Less than 1,500	391	.174	• <u>356</u>	.061	.036			
1,500 to 5,000	432	.138	• <u>392</u>	.097				
5,000 to 10,000	672	.235	.195					
More than 10,000	661	.530						
	Combined	Compar	isons					
	Groups							
Groups	Fac More t	ctor I chan 5,	Fa 000 More	than l	II 0,000			
Less than 5,000	•	510						
Less than 10,000				1.04	13			

TABLE 18.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factors I and III for student presidents grouped by size of institution.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

*No significant mean differences.

Source	df	MS	F						
Repeated Measures ANOVA									
Groups	3	. 424	• 98						
S-Groups	370	.429							
Rep Meas.	2	45.119	66.94*						
R G	6	.702	1.04						
RS-G	740	.674							
	Or	ne-Way ANOVA							
Factor I									
Groups Error	3 1110	.695 .592	1.174						
Factor II									
Groups Error	3 1110	• 378 • 592	.638						
Factor III									
Groups Error	3 1110	1.007 .592	1.802						

TABLE	19	Ana	alysis	of	variance	of	mean	scor	es	on	the	three
fact	ors	for	studer	nt j	presidents	s gi	rouped	l by	geo	ogra	aphic	cal
region.												

*p < .01

presidents from different types of institutions differed in their beliefs as represented by Factor I. As can be seen by the low scores in Table 16 none of the presidenttype sub-groups seemed to display a high degree of agreement with the belief portrayed by Factor I. However, the student presidents from both types of the religious supported institutions tended to agree more with the ideas represented in Factor I than the student presidents from all other types of institutions combined. That is, the sub-groups represented by the Catholic and Protestant institutions seemed to react more favorably than the other sub-groups to institutional involvement in the non-academic aspects of a student's educational experience. No differences were found on Factors II and III between the various student president sub-groups based on institutional type.

The data also has indicated that student presidents from the institutions which varied on the dimension of size of student enrollment differed in the manner in which they responded to items for Factors I and III. These results reported that the student presidents from the smaller sized schools (less than 5,000 students) tended to score higher on Factor I than those student presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students enrolled. This result suggests that even though none of the student presidents tended to agree with the belief represented by Factor I those individuals from the smaller schools did feel significantly less strongly about the possibility

of institutional involvement in the non-academic development of the individual student. The significant results for the comparison on Factor III suggest that student presidents from schools with more than 10,000 students evidence a significantly stronger disagreement with the belief that administrative processes and the stability of the individual institution should be a primary concern of the process of higher education.

Hypothesis IV

IV. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by faculty members when the faculty members are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

Faculty sub-groups based on institutional type.--

The results of the analysis of variance procedures have indicated that the various faculty subgroups based on institutional type were different only on Factor I (Table 20). Specific comparisons indicated that faculty members from Protestant schools scored higher on Factor I than faculty members from either public schools or schools that were classified as "other."² (Table 21.) Also, faculty from Catholic schools were higher on Factor I than faculty from the "other" schools. The combined groups of faculty

²For purposes of this study the category entitled "other" represents the following institutional types: Teachers Colleges, Technical Institutions, and Two-Year Colleges.

Source	df	MS	F					
Repeated Measures ANOVA								
Groups	4	.579	1.40					
S-Groups	424	.411						
Rep Meas	2	11.938	15.41*					
R G	8	1.368	1.76					
RS-G	848	.775						
One-Way ANOVA								
Factor I								
Groups Error	4 1272	2.288 .654	3.498*					
Factor II								
Groups Error	4 1272	•278 •654	.425					
Factor III								
Groups Error	4 1272	.769 .654	1.176					

TABLE 20.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for faculty grouped by type of institution.

*p < .01

		Groups						
Groups	x	Catholic	Inde- pendent	Public	Other			
Protestant	.380	.168	.267	• <u>385</u>	• <u>439</u>			
Catholic	.212		.079	.217	.271			
Independent	.133			.138	.192			
Public	005				.054			
Other	059							
		Combined C	omparisons	5	<u></u>			
Cuevas		Groups						
Groups			Public +	Other				
Independent + Catholic + Protestant	+		• <u>6</u>	<u>76</u>				

TABLE 21. Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor I for faculty grouped by type of institution.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

members from independent, Catholic, and Protestant schools scored significantly higher on Factor I than their colleagues from public supported schools.

Faculty sub-groups based on institutional size.--The results presented in Table 22 indicate that there were no significant differences between any of the faculty subgroups based on size of student enrollment.

Faculty sub-groups based on geographical region.--Table 23 reports that there were significant sub-group differences on Factor III between the various faculty groups based on geographical region. The multiple comparison test (Table 24) indicated that the only significant difference was found when the combined faculty groups from the Western, North Central, and New England/Middle Atlantic sub-groups were compared to the faculty members from the South. In this particular comparison it was found that the Southern faculty group tended to score significantly lower on Factor III than all other groups combined.

Summary for statistical examination of

Hypothesis IV.--In general the results of this investigation do not support the retention of Hypothesis IV. Specifically the data has shown that faculty members from public supported schools tended to score significantly lower on Factor I than the faculty subjects from the independent, Catholic, and Protestant schools combined. This

Source	df	MS	F
	Repeat	ed Measures ANOVA	
Groups	3	.888	2.16
S-Groups	424	.410	
Rep Meas	2	11.938	15.30*
R G	6	1.159	1.48
RS-G	848	.780	
	0:	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	3 1272	•934 •656	1.423
Factor II			
Groups Error	3 1272	1.226 .656	1.868
Factor III			
Groups Error	3 1272	1.095 .656	1.669

TABLE 22.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for faculty grouped by size of institution.

*p < .01

Source	df	MS	F					
Repeated Measures ANOVA								
Groups	3	.942	2.30					
S-Groups	420	.408						
Rep Meas	2	12.811	16.48*					
R G	6	1.512	1.94					
RS-G	840	.777						
	O	ne-Way ANOVA						
Factor I	***********		<u>, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>					
Groups Error	3 1260	1.101 .654	1.683					
Factor II								
Groups Error	3 1260	•465 •654	.711					
Factor III								
Groups Error	3 1260	2.983 .654	4.561*					

TABLE 23.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for faculty grouped by geographical region.

*p < .01

		Groups					
Groups	x	North Central	New England/ Mid. Atlantic	Southern			
Western/ North Western	054	.112	.179	.408			
North Central	166		.067	.296			
New England/ Mid. Atlantic	233			.229			
Southern	462						
	Com	bined Compa	arisons				
			Groups				
Groups			Southern				
All Regions Except Southern			• <u>933</u>				

TABLE 24.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on factor III for faculty grouped by geographical region.

Underlined mean difference significant at p < .05.

result suggests that faculty members from public institutions believe that institutions of higher education should not be involved in the non-academic affairs of the individual student. The data also suggests that faculty members from the non-public types of institutions tended to believe that institutions should to varying degrees be involved in the non-academic affairs of the individual student.

The only significant difference in the facultyregion sub-group comparisons was found on Factor III. This result reports that the faculty subjects from the Southern schools tended to believe that the maintenance of institutional stability is a goal that should be pursued in the educational process. The fact should be noted from the data, however, that the faculty subjects were all low on this particular factor. That is, the data suggests that the faculty subjects as a whole tended to agree with the need for institutional stability in higher education.

Hypothesis V

V. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators when the chief student personnel administrators are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

<u>Chief student personnel administrators (deans)</u> <u>grouped by institutional type</u>.--The analysis of variance results for deans of students subgroups (Table 25) based



Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures ANOVA	
Groups	4	.512	1.57
S-Groups	448	.326	
Rep Meas	2	11.733	20.02**
R G	8	1.359	2.31
RS-G	896	.586	
	O	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	4 1344	.883 .499	1.769
Factor II			
Groups Error	4 1344	.775 .499	1.553
Factor III			
Groups Error	4 1344	1.457 .499	2.919*
. > α*)5 **p <	.01	

TABLE 25.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for deans grouped by type of institution.

.

on the institutional type variable indicated that the only significant difference was found on Factor III. The multiple comparison results (Table 26) reported that the deans from Catholic institutions tended to score higher on Factor III than deans from schools classified as "other."

Groups		Groups					
	X	Public	Protes- tant	Inde- pendent	Other		
Catholic	.276	.087	.242	.257	• <u>345</u>		
Public	.189		.155	.170	.120		
Protestant	.034			.015	.103		
Independent	.019				.088		
Other	069						

TABLE 26.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor III for deans of students grouped by type of institution.

Note: Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

Chief student personnel administrators (deans)

grouped by institutional size.--The analysis of variance tests for deans from various size institutions (Table 27) indicated that significant results were found between the sub-groups on Factors II and III. The specific comparisons on Factor II (Table 28) suggest that the deans from schools which have an enrollment greater than 10,000 students tended to score higher on Factor II than deans from schools with
Source	df	MS	F
	Repeat	ed Measures ANOVA	1
Groups	3	1.960	6.18**
S-Groups	453	.318	
Rep Meas	2	11.837	20.16**
R G	6	1.328	2.25
RS-G	906	.587	
	Oı	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Groups Error	3 1359	.996 .498	2.000
Factor II			
Groups Error	3 1359	1.887 .498	3.789*
Factor III			
Groups Error	3 1359	1.620 .498	3.253*

TABLE 27.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for deans grouped by size of institution.

	Groups			
Groups	Factor II \overline{X}	Factor III X		
More than 10,000	.237	.313		
5,000 to 10,000	.233	.023		
1,500 to 5,000	.028	.134		
Less than 1,500	024	.041		
	Combined Comparison	S		
	Groups			
Groups	Factor II	Factor III		
	Less than 5,000	More than 10,000		
More than 5,000	• 466			
Less than 10,000		. <u>641</u>		

TABLE 28.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factors II and III for deans of students grouped by size of institution.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

less than 1,500 students. Additionally, the deans from the two larger sized institutional categories tended to score significantly higher on Factor II than the deans from the smaller institutions.

The only significant comparison on Factor III (Table 28) was when the deans from schools with more than 10,000 students were compared with the combined sub-groups from the other size categories. The deans in the larger institutions scored significantly higher on Factor III than the remaining deans.

<u>Chief student personnel administrators (deans)</u> <u>grouped by geographical region</u>.--The analysis of variance tests (Table 29) yielded a significant F value only on Factor III for comparisons of the deans of students grouped on the basis of institutional location. The multiple comparison results (Table 30) indicated that the major difference was found when the responses of deans from the Western/ North Western and New England/Middle Atlantic schools were combined and compared against the North Central and Southern deans. The latter group scored significantly lower on Factor III than did the deans from both coastal regions.

Summary for statistical examination of Hypothesis V

(chief student personnel administrators).--In general the results of this investigation do not support Hypothesis V. Specifically, the only significant difference found in the sub-group comparisons based on institutional type was that

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures AN	OVA
Groups	3	.235	.71
S-Groups	449	.328	
Rep Meas	2	12.045	20.51*
R G	6	1.383	2.32
RS-G	898	.587	
	O	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	3 1347	.550 .481	1.143
Factor II			
Groups Error	3 1347	.477 .481	.992
Factor III			
Groups Error	3 1347	1.858 .481	3.863*

TABLE 29.--Analysis of variance of mean scores on the three factors for deans grouped by geographical region.

*p < .01

		Groups				
Groups	x	New England/ Mid. Atlantic	North Central	Southern		
Western/ North Western	.277	.076	.183	• <u>357</u>		
New England/ Mid. Atlantic	.201		.107	.281		
North Central	.094			.174		
Southern	080					
		Combined Comparis	sons			
Cround			Groups			
Groups		North Central + Southern				
Western/ North Western New England/ Mid. Atlantic	+		• <u>464</u>			

TABLE 30.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor III for deans of students grouped by geographical region.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .05.

chief student personnel administrators (deans of students) from Catholic institutions scored higher on Factor III than deans of students from "other" schools. Basically, this result implies that the deans of students from Catholic schools do not believe that the maintenance of institutional stability is a goal that should be pursued as a primary dimension of higher education.

The results from the comparisons based on institutional size have indicated that deans from schools with more than 5,000 students enrolled tended to score higher on Factor II than deans from schools with less than 5,000 students enrolled. This result implies that deans from the larger institutions tended to believe that the institution, as well as the student, should benefit from the student-institution relationship and that deans from the smaller institutions tended to believe that the student should be the primary benefactor of the institutionalstudent relationship.

The results from the sub-group comparisons based on institutional location have indicated that deans from the North Central and Southern regions scored significantly lower on Factor III than the deans from the Coastal regions. This implies that the deans from the North Central and Southern regions tended to believe that the administrative processes and the stability of an individual institution should be a primary concern in the process of higher

education. The deans from the Coastal regions tended to disagree with such a belief.

Hypothesis VI

VI. No differences will be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by institutional presidents when the institutional presidents are grouped by the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical region.

Institutional presidents grouped by institutional

type.--The analysis of variance tests (Table 31) indicate that a significant difference exists only on Factor I between the president sub-groups based on institutional type. Specifically, the presidents from Protestant schools tended to score higher on Factor I than the presidents from public schools. Additionally, the combined presidential groups from Protestant, Catholic, and independent institutions scored significantly higher on Factor I than did presidents from public schools (Table 32).

Institutional presidents grouped by institutional <u>size</u>.--The president groups from the two smaller sized categories scored significantly higher on Factor I than the presidents from the larger schools. In addition, the presidents from the two smaller sized school categories scored significantly lower on Factor II than the presidents from the two larger sized school groupings (Table 33).

Source	df	MS	F
	Repea	ted Measures .	ANOVA
Groups	4	. 294	•77
S-Groups	401	.378	
Rep Meas	2	10.841	104.92**
R G	8	2.522	3.73*
RS-G	802	.675	
	0	ne-Way ANOVA	
Factor I			
Groups Error	4 1203	2.581 .575	4.489**
Factor II			
Groups Error	4 1203	1.351 .575	2.349
Factor III			
Groups Error	4 1203	.417 .575	.725

TABLE	31Ar	nalys	is of	varia	ance	of	mean	scores	on	the	three
i	factors	for	presid	lents	grou	ped	by :	institu	cior	nal t	cype.

*p < .05 **p < .01

·

Crowna	V	Groups				
Groups	л	Other	Catholic	Inde- pendent	Public	
Protestant	.685	.108	.175	.204	• <u>425</u>	
Other	.577		.067	.096	• <u>317</u>	
Catholic	.510			.029	. 250	
Independent	.481				.221	
Public	.260					
		Combined	Comparisor	IS		
Groups			Group	os		
Groups			Publi	lc		
Non-public		1.471				

TABLE 32.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factor I for presidents grouped by type of institution.

Underlined mean differences significant at p < .05.

	Gı	coups
Groups	Less Th Factor I	nan 5,000 Factor II
More than 5,000	• <u>566</u>	• <u>488</u>

TABLE 33.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factors I and II for presidents grouped by size of institution.

Note: Underlined mean differences significant at p < .01.

Institutional presidents grouped by geographical

<u>region</u>.--In comparing the presidential groups based on geographical location the statistical tests indicated that the combined groups of presidents from the North Central, New England/Middle Atlantic, and Southern regions scored significantly higher on Factor I than the presidents from the Western regions (Table 34). Also, the presidents from the combined groups of the Western/North Western, New England/Middle Atlantic, and North Central regions scored significantly higher on Factor III than the presidents from the South.

<u>Summary for statistical examination of Hypothesis</u> <u>VI (institutional presidents)</u>.--In general the results of this investigation have indicated that Hypothesis VI was rejected. Specifically, the data has indicated that the presidents from the public institutions scored significantly lower on Factor I than the presidents from all other type sub-groups combined. This result implies that the

	Group	s
Groups	Factor I	Factor III
	Western/ North Western	Southern
North Central & New England/ Middle Atlantic & Southern	1.162*	
North Central & New England/ Middle Atlantic & Western/North Western		1.101*

TABLE 34.--Scheffe multiple comparison analysis of mean differences on Factors I and III for presidents grouped by geographical region.

*p < .01

presidents from the public schools did not agree with the ideas represented in Factor I. Basically, these presidents seemed to believe less strongly than the other presidents that the institution should be actively and directly involved in attempting to influence the nonacademic development of the individual student. The results also indicated that the presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students tended to express the belief that the institution should not be directly involved in effecting the non-academic development of the student, while presidents from schools with less than 5,000 students seemed to express agreement with the belief that institutions should be involved in this manner. The presidents from those schools with less than 5,000 students scored significantly lower on Factor II than presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students. This result implies that presidents from the smaller schools appeared to believe that policies, procedures, and relationships should exist basically and primarily for the student's benefit. The presidents from the larger institutions appear to have indicated that they feel these variables should have, at least, a reciprocal benefit for the student and the institution.

The results of the sub-group comparisons based on geographical region have indicated that the Western/North Western presidents scored significantly lower on Factor I than all the other presidential sub-groups combined. Those presidents from the Western regions seemed to react significantly less favorably than the other sub-groups to institutional involvement in the non-academic aspects of a student's educational experience. In addition, the presidents from the Southern region scored significantly lower on Factor III than the presidents from all the other regions combined. The presidents from the South seemed to feel more strongly than the other presidential subgroups that administrative processes and the stability of the institution should be a primary concern of the process of higher education.

Summary

Factor Analysis

The present chapter has presented the results of the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data in an attempt to measure and compare the assumption's and beliefs of various groups in higher education. The factor analytic procedures yielded three independent dimensions which were analyzed and identified as the most parsimonious explanation of the original questionnaire responses. The three factors which resulted from the principle components solution were:

Factor I--Institutional Involvement in the Educational Process.--Factor I examines the beliefs an individual holds about the degree of involvement a higher educational institution should or should not have in the non-academic aspects of an individual student's experience in a higher educational setting.

Factor II--Benefits of the Institutional-Student Relationship.--Factor II assesses the strength and direction of an individual's beliefs about whether the relationship between the student and the institution exists solely for the benefit of the student and his individual needs, or whether the institution should benefit in any manner from the relationship.

Factor III--Institutional Stability.--Factor III appears to be a factor which assesses the beliefs an individual holds about the university or college as an organization. In this sense Factor III reflects an individual's beliefs about the importance of the administrative process and the need for institutional stability.

Between Group Comparisons

The general hypothesis that no differences would be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by the sample groups was rejected. The statistical methods of repeated measures and one-way analyses of variance were used in conjunction with Scheffe's multiple comparison analysis in reporting the following results:

- The college presidents scored significantly higher on Factor I (institutional involvement) than either the faculty, student presidents, or student editor groups.
- 2. The dean of students were not statistically different from the presidents on Factor I, and the combined groups of presidents and deans scored significantly higher on Factor I than the combined groups of faculty and student groups.
- The faculty scored significantly higher on
 Factor I than both groups of students, but the

two student groups were not different from each other.

- The combined groups of presidents, deans, and faculty members scored significantly higher than the student groups on Factor I.
- The two combined administrative groups (presidents and deans) scored significantly higher than the faculty group on Factor I.

Higher scores on Factor I indicate relative agreement with the belief that the higher educational institution should be actively and directly involved in an attempt to influence the non-academic development of the individual student.

- 6. The college presidents scored significantly higher on Factor II (benefit of relationship) than either the faculty, student presidents, or student editor groups. The college president and dean of students groups were not different on this factor.
- The dean of students were not different from the faculty members on Factor II, but the deans did score significantly higher than the student groups.
- The faculty scored significantly higher on Factor II than the student presidents, and the two student groups were not different from each other on this factor.

- 9. The combined groups of presidents and deans of students were significantly higher on Factor II than the combined groups of students and faculty members.
- 10. The combined non-student groups scored significantly higher on Factor II than the combined student groups.
- 11. The faculty members scored significantly higher on Factor II than the student groups and significantly lower than the two administrative groups combined.

Higher scores on Factor II indicate relative agreement with the belief that emphasis should not be placed upon the student as the only benefactor from the institutionalstudent relationship. A high score suggests that the policies, procedures, and institutional-student relationship in higher education should be, at least, reciprocal in their effects on the institution and the student.

- 12. The individual groups of students scored significantly higher on Factor III (institutional stability) than either the faculty or president groups.
- 13. The combined groups of students and deans of students scored significantly higher on Factor III than the combined groups of faculty and presidents.

- 14. The combined groups of students scored significantly higher on Factor III than the deans of students.
- 15. The faculty were significantly higher on Factor III than the presidents.

Higher scores on Factor III indicate relative disagreement with the belief that the administrative processes and stability of an individual institution should be a primary concern in higher education. High scores can be interpreted as meaning that too much emphasis is placed upon the establishment and implementation of procedures and policies which seem to be directed toward the facilitation of the institution's stability rather than the educational process itself.

Within Group Comparisons

Hypothesis II.--The hypothesis that there would be no relationship between the student editor sub-groups based on the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and location and the identified factors was rejected.

> 1. The only significant difference between student editors grouped by type of institution was that editors from Catholic institutions scored significantly higher on Factor I (institutional involvement) than those from public institutions. There was no statistical relationship

between the various student editor sub-groups based on institutional type and Factors II and III (benefit of relationship and institutional stability).

- 2. Student editors from institutions with less than 1,500 students enrolled scored significantly higher on Factor I than the combined editor groups from schools with more than 1,500 students. The editors from schools with less than 1,500 students also scored significantly lower on Factor III than all combined editor groups with more than 1,500 students. There was no relationship between the student editor groups based on size of institution and Factor II.
- 3. There were no significant statistical relationships between the student editor groups based on geographical region and Factors I, II, or III.

Hypothesis III.--The hypothesis that there would be no relationship between the demographic variables for student presidents and the identified factors was rejected.

> Student presidents from the two religious supported schools (i.e., Catholic and Protestant) scored significantly higher on Factor I (institutional involvement) than student

presidents from secular institutions. There were no differences between the student president sub-groups based on institutional type on either Factors II or III (benefit of relationship and institutional stability).

- 2. Student presidents from schools with less than 5,000 students enrolled scored significantly higher on Factor I than student presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students enrolled and student presidents from schools with more than 10,000 students scored significantly higher on Factor III than student presidents from schools with less than 10,000 students. No differences were detected for the student president sub-groups on Factor II.
- There were no significant differences between the student president sub-groups based on geographical region.

Hypothesis IV.--The hypothesis that there would be no relationship between the demographic variables for faculty members and the identified factors was rejected.

> Combined groups of faculty from independent, Catholic, and Protestant schools scored significantly higher on Factor I (institutional involvement) than faculty from public institutions. No differences were detected on Factors II and

III (benefit of relationship and institutional
stability).

- There were no significant relationships between the faculty groups based on institutional size and Factors I, II, III.
- 3. The combined groups of faculty from the Western/North Western, North Central and New England/Middle Atlantic sub-groups scored significantly higher on Factor III than faculty from the South. No differences were found on Factors I and II.

<u>Hypothesis V</u>.--The hypothesis that there would be no relationship between the demographic variables for chief student personnel administrators (deans of students) and the identified factors was rejected.

- Deans of students from Catholic institutions scored significantly higher on Factor III (institutional stability) than deans from "other" institutions. No differences were found on Factors I and II (institutional involvement and benefit of relationship).
- 2. Deans of students from schools with more than 5,000 students enrolled scored significantly higher on Factor II than deans from schools with less than 5,000 students. Also, deans from schools with more than 10,000 students



scored significantly higher on Factor III than deans from the combined groups with less than 10,000 students. No differences were found on Factor I.

3. Deans of students from the combined Western/ North Western and New England/Middle Atlantic schools scored significantly higher on Factor III than the deans from the combined North Central and Southern groups. No differences were found on Factors I and II.

<u>Hypothesis VI</u>.--The hypothesis that there would be no relationship between the demographic variables for institutional presidents and the identified factors was rejected.

- 1. Presidents from the combined Protestant, Catholic, and independent groups scored significantly higher on Factor I (institutional involvement) than presidents from public schools. No differences were found on Factors II and III (benefit of relationship and institutional stability).
- 2. Presidents from schools with less than 5,000 students scored significantly higher on Factor I and significantly lower on Factor II than presidents from schools with more than



5,000 students. No differences were found on Factor III.

3. Presidents from the combined North Central, New England/Middle Atlantic and Southern groups scored significantly higher on Factor I than presidents from the Western regions. Also, presidents from the South scored significantly lower on Factor III than the combined president groups from the other regions. No differences were found on Factor II.



CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The Problem

The present investigation was designed and implemented as an attempt to provide a systematic method for analyzing, defining, and comparing some of the characteristic underlying assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students. It was an additional purpose of this study to determine whether the assumptions and beliefs held by these groups were related to the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

Specifically this study had three objectives:

- to ascertain the factor structure of a set of selected assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students.
- (2) to determine whether an analysis of variance procedure would detect any differences in a



comparison of the above groups' scores on the identified factors;

(3) to determine whether the procedures of analysis of variance would detect any relationship between the identified factors and the selected demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

Methodology

This investigation was conducted as a supplemental study to an antecedent research project sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The present investigation's survey instrument and samples were used simultaneously with the NASPA study. The subjects for this investigation were drawn from the 715 colleges and universities which held institutional membership in NASPA in November of 1968. Specifically the subjects consisted of the following individuals from the above institutions: the institution's president, the chief student personnel administrator, the faculty member holding the highest elected position on the faculty senate or comparable body, the editor of the student newspaper, and the president of the student body.

The questionnaire used in this investigation solicited the subjects' responses to a set of selected issues in higher education. The specific questions used in the final study questionnaire were developed from four specific areas



which were assumed to be representative of selected issues in higher education at the time the study was conducted. The areas which served as guidelines for the questionnaire were: (1) the responsibilities and administrative behavior of the chief student personnel administrator, (2) the student and the educational process, (3) standards of behavior and social conduct regulations, and (4) involvement in university governance and decision making.

The questionnaires were sent to the chief student personnel administrator at each of the 715 colleges and universities holding institutional membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators as of November, 1968. The administrator distributed the questionnaire materials to the various subjects on his campus. A total of 2,032 questionnaires were returned for use in the study. This represented a return of approximately 60 per cent.

It was hypothesized that no differences would be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by the sample groups and that no relationship would be found between these assumptions and beliefs and the demographic variables of institutional type, size, and geographical location.

This study attempted to test these hypotheses by utilizing the methods of factor analysis and analysis of variance to identify and compare the possible underlying assumptions and beliefs measured by this investigations'



questionnaire. Specifically, the method of analysis consisted of the following steps: (1) principle-component factor analysis was used to identify the underlying groupings of related measured assumptions and beliefs, (2) repeated measures and one-way analysis of variance procedures were used to test for differences between the sample groups on the extracted factors and for possible relationships between these factors and the variables of institutional type, size, and location.

Findings and Conclusions

The objective of this study to ascertain the factor structure of a set of selected assumptions and beliefs held by student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, and students was accomplished by factor analyzing the responses of the 2,032 subjects participating in this study. The following three factors were extracted and identified for use in this study:

Factor I--Degree of Institutional Involvement in the Educational Process: This factor reflects the beliefs an individual holds about the degree of active and direct involvement the institution should have in attempting to influence the non-academic development of the individual student. This factor reflects whether the respondent believes that the institution should or should not attempt to effect change in the student's values and beliefs.

Factor II--Benefits of the Institutional-Student Relationship: This factor represents an assessment of an



individual's beliefs about whether the relationship which exists between the institution and the student should be devoted primarily for the "growth and benefit" of the individual student or directed toward the facilitation of a mutually productive environment for both the institution and the student. This factor extracts the relationship between some of the questionnaire items which appear to be examining the belief that there is more to the educational process than complete devotion to the students' needs.

Factor III--Institutional Stability: This factor reflects the structure of the beliefs that an individual holds about the university or college as an organization. This factor is related to the belief that the administrative processes of an institution are or are not an important dimension and that the stability of the individual institution should or should not be a primary concern of the process of higher education.

Between Group Comparisons

The results of the present study support the rejection of the hypothesis that no differences would be found in the basic assumptions and beliefs held by the sample groups of chief student personnel administrators, institutional presidents, faculty members, student presidents, and student editors.

Factor I Comparisons.--It can be concluded from the results of this study that institutional presidents evidence



a stronger commitment than all the other sample groups except the deans of students to the belief that higher educational institutions should attempt to be actively and directly involved in affecting the non-academic development of the student. The presidents and the deans tended to agree on this issue. When the presidents, deans, and faculty were combined and compared to the combined student groups a significant degree of commitment to this belief was noted for the "staff" group.

Basically, the conclusion is that there are identifiable differences between the sample groups in how much they believe a higher educational institution should be involved in attempting to influence the non-academic dimensions of a student's educational experience. Specifically, the administrative groups (presidents and deans) tended to agree more strongly with such a belief than the other groups. However, the faculty also evidenced more agreement with such a belief than students. In this case the faculty were more closely aligned with the administrative groups than with the student groups.

Factor II Comparisons.--The results of this study have shown that the combined groups of presidents and deans of students evidence more disagreement than the other sample groups with the suggestion that the student should be the only benefactor from the institutional-student celationship. The deans and faculty seemed to hold


similar beliefs about this issue. However, when the presidents, deans, and faculty were combined and compared to the combined student groups it was evident that the "staff" groups did not agree with the students that the student should be the only concern in the institutional-student relationship.

Basically, the conclusion is that there are discernible and significant differences between the sample groups in the manner in which they view the relationship between the institution and the student. Specifically, the administrative groups (presidents and deans) tended to believe that emphasis should not be upon the student as the only and primary benefactor of the institutional-student relationship. In this case there was not a clear and specific difference between the beliefs held by the deans and the faculty. Clearly, however, the presidents and deans both evidenced a position on this belief that was significantly different from the students. In this case the faculty were more closely aligned with the administrative groups than with the student groups.

Factor III Comparisons.--It can be concluded from the results of this study that the combined groups of students and deans disagree with the belief that the stability and maintenance of the institution and its administrative processes should be the primary concern of the educational process. Specifically, the results indicate that the



students believe that too much emphasis has been placed on those institutional procedures which seem to be established and implemented for the purpose of maintaining the stability of the institution. The deans seemed to be expressing a similar belief. However, the deans did not present their position as clearly and strongly as the students. It should be noted that the deans were very similar in their belief patterns to the presidents on Factors I and II, but on Factor III they are clearly in disagreement with the presidents. Perhaps the deans are reacting to the issue of institutional stability and its supporting policies and procedures because these may be the very variables which obstruct and hinder the dean from fulfilling his role in his own setting in his own way.

Generally, the results of these comparisons have suggested that there are identifiable differences between the group beliefs as measured by Factor III regarding the emphasis which might be placed upon the need for appropriate institutional policies, procedures, and regulations which have been designed for the purpose of facilitating the maintenance of the institution and insuring its stability as an organization.

Specifically, the conclusion is presented that the students and deans of students share the belief that too much emphasis is placed upon the importance of institutional stability. The faculty and president groups believe that such procedures and processes are important,



and the maintenance of the individual institution is an important variable in the process of higher education.

Within Group Comparisons

Student editors .-- (1) Type of Institution. The comparison of student editors from different types of institutions has shown that none of the student editors evidenced very much agreement with the belief that institutions of higher education should be actively or directly involved in the non-academic affairs of the individual student. Among the student editors the subjects from Catholic institutions reported the highest degree of agreement with such a belief, while the editors from the public schools reported the lowest degree of agreement with such a belief. (2) Size of Institution. The comparison of student editors from different sized institutions has shown that none of the student editors agree with the belief that institutions of higher learning should be involved in the non-academic affairs of the individual student. However, it can be concluded that editors from the smallest schools (less than 1,500 enrolled) felt more positive than the other editors about institutional involvement in a student's nonacademic affairs. These same small school editors also reported the belief that there is a definite need for institutional stability.



Student presidents .-- (1) Type of Institution. The comparison of student presidents from different types of schools has indicated that none of the student presidents reported very much agreement with the belief that institutions of higher education should be involved in the nonacademic affairs of students. However, it can be concluded that student presidents from the religious affiliated schools evidenced more agreement with this belief than student presidents from secular institutions. (2) Size of Institution. None of the student presidents from groups based on institutional size expressed agreement with the belief that institutions of higher education should be involved in the non-academic affairs of students. However, it can be concluded that those student presidents from schools with less than 5,000 enrolled reported more agreement with such a belief than presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students. Also, student presidents from schools with more than 10,000 enrolled evidenced a strong disagreement with the belief that the administrative processes and stability of an institution should be a primary concern of higher education.

Faculty.--(1) Type of Institution. In this study the results support the conclusion that faculty members from non-public institutions agree with the belief that higher educational institutions should to varying degrees be involved in the non-academic affairs of the individual



student. Faculty members from public institutions do not support this view. (2) Geographical Region. The results of this study support the conclusion that faculty subjects from the Southern schools evidence the belief that maintenance of institutional stability is a goal that should be pursued in the process of higher education. However, the data from this investigation also supports the conclusion that faculty members, in general, do not evidence strong support for such a belief.

Dean of students .-- (1) Type of Institution. It can be concluded from the data of this study that deans from Catholic institution's support the belief that maintenance of institutional stability is a goal that should be pursued as an important dimension in higher education. (2) Size of Institution. The results support the conclusion that deans from larger institutions (more than 5,000 students) believe that the institution, as well as the student, should benefit from the relationship which exists between the student and the institution. However, deans from the smaller schools (less than 5,000) believe that the student should be the primary benefactor of the relationship. (3) Geographical Region. The data indicates that the deans from the North Central and Southern regions of the country tend to believe that the administrative processes and stability of the institution must be a primary concern of the process of higher education, while the



deans from the Coastal regions seem to believe that too much emphasis is placed upon the facilitation of institutional stability.

Institutional presidents. -- (1) Type of Institution. The data from this study supports the conclusion that presidents from public institution's do not agree with presidents from non-public institutions that colleges and universities should be actively and directly involved in attempting to influence the non-academic development of the individual student. (2) Size of Institution. The results of this study have shown that presidents from schools with more than 5,000 students believe that institutions of higher education should not be directly involved in effecting the non-academic development of the student, while presidents from schools with less than 5,000 students do believe that institutions should be involved in this manner. The presidents from the larger institutions (more than 5,000) do not agree with their colleagues from the smaller schools that policies, procedures, and relationships should exist basically and primarily for the student's benefit. The presidents from the larger institutions appear to believe that these variables should have a reciprocal benefit for the student and the institution. (3) Geographical Region. The results of this study indicate that presidents from the Western schools react less favorably than the other regional groups to institutional



involvement in a student's non-academic experiences. Also, presidents from the South believe more strongly than the other presidential groups that the administrative processes and stability of the institution should be a very important aspect of the higher education process.

Implications

The major thrust of this study was an attempt to examine the notable characteristic of heterogeneity which seems to exist among and between the various identifiable groups which comprise the higher educational scene today. In this respect, the results of this study have clearly supported the thesis that the constituent groups in higher education can be differentiated on the basis of their beliefs about certain selected issues in higher education. Such a conclusion does not, in fact, report anything which is extremely divergent from the many reports on this subject which have been based on traditional and speculative inference. However, the strengths of the conclusions which are reported in this study are derived from a systematic statistical analysis which yielded these same conclusions.

If student personnel workers and other administrative personnel in higher education are going to meet the complex, demanding, and challenging responsibilities which are an inevitable consequent of their roles they must seek to gain a better understanding of the diversity



of beliefs which exists among and between the various members of the academic community.

The application of factor analysis in this study has yielded support for the possibility of using such parsimonious statistical methods as factor analysis and related multi-variate techniques to isolate, identify, and examine some of the underlying characteristics which seem to differentiate among the various groups in higher education.

Clearly, the implication is that the results of a more systematic investigation of these potential behavioral antecedents could provide assistance to institutions of higher education in coping more effectively with conflict in their settings and possibly enhance the efficacy of the constituent groups' contributions to the educational process. In addition, an increased awareness of the perceptions and beliefs held by the other members of the academic community could provide assistance to administrators in understanding more about the bases of the role conflicts which often interfere with their ability to facilitate the personal, social, and academic development of the students, faculty, and administrative personnel in their settings. In the end, the individual administrator in higher education must determine what the implications are for the educational process in his own setting.



In this respect, this study does not go far enough for the individual institution and administrator. The best this study can do is to suggest general trends which are based upon the data supplied by the samples which participated in this particular investigation. This study can only suggest and imply a methodology which can be useful in examining a particular set of questions. The indivicual administrator/educator in higher education should/ must attempt to apply these techniques in his own setting.

This study should be replicated in additional settings with different groups in an attempt to substantiate and clarify the trends which have been suggested by the results reported herein. Also, the methodology used in this study should be applied to related but different types of issues and concerns in an attempt to gain a better understanding of how or whether the groups used in this study are different on dimensions other than those examined in this study.

In a practical sense, the results of this study have indicated that the various groups in higher education are not only different from each other on the dimensions of this study, but these same groups evidence a great deal of variance within themselves as they are examined on these dimensions. Certainly more and varied attempts to clarify and substantiate the evidence of this study should be made; but, in respect to the thesis supported by the data reported in this study educators might do well to



question any generic reference to views purported to be held by the students, the faculty, the presidents, and the deans of students. This study suggests that such normative references may not be an accurate reflection of the position held by a substantial proportion of the referenced group.

Although the present study has been able to yield fairly strong implications about between and within group differences on certain identified belief structures, attempts to refine the available means of investigating such issues should incorporate the variables of functionality and parsimony so that practicing administrators/ educators in higher educational settings can adapt the data and methodology to their own experiences.



BIBLIOGRAPHY



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barton, Allen. <u>Organizational Measurement and Its</u> <u>Bearing on the Study of College Environments</u>. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.
- Berry, Margaret. "Campus Culture: A Product of Its Own History." <u>The Journal of College Student</u> Personnel, 8:3-9, January, 1967.
- 3. Birch, Edward E. "An Investigation of Selected Assumption's and Beliefs of Chief Student Personnel Administrators." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Boyer, Alan and Alexander, Astin. <u>Campus Disruption</u> <u>During 1968-1969</u>. Office of Research, American <u>Council on Education</u>, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1969.
- 5 Council of Student Personnel Administrators in Higher Education. "Current and Developing Issues in Student Life." Report prepared by the Commission on Current and Developing Issues, Council of Student Personnel Administrators in Higher Education, Second Revision. (Mimeographed.)
- 6. Crookston, Burns. "A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships With Students." <u>The</u> Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 5:134-139, October, 1967.
- 7. Cross, K. Patricia. "The Campus Confrontations." <u>The Research Reporter</u>. The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Number I. Berkeley: University of California, 1969, pp. 1-4.
- DeTemple, David and A. V. Williams. "Factor C: Oblique Rotation's of Factor Matrices, Varimax (Normal) Rotation, and Factor Score Computations." Computer Institute for Social Science Research, Technical Report No. 35, Michigan State University, 1968. (Mimeographed.)



- Dutton, Thomas. "Research Needs and Priorities in Student Personnel Work." Division of Research and Publications, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1968. (Mimeographed.)
- 10. Dutton, Thomas, James Appleton, and Edward Birch. "An Investigation of Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community: A Preliminary Report." Division of Research and Publications, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1969. (Mimeographed.)
- 11. Dutton, Thomas, James Appleton, and Fred Smith. "Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Monograph No. 1, 62-62, January, 1968.
- 12. Dutton, Thomas, Fred Smith, and Thomas Zarle. "Institutional Approaches to the Adjudication of Student Misconduct." Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Monograph No. 2, 25-30, January, 1969.
- Fruchter, Benjamin. <u>Introduction to Factor Analysis</u>. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1954.
- 14. Gross, Edward and Paul Grambsch. <u>University Goals and Academic Power</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Hays, William L. <u>Statistics for Psychologists</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- 16. Hubbell, Robert. "Varying Perceptions of Alleged Misbehavior and Resultant Disciplinary Action." The Journal of College Student Personnel, 7:260-265, September, 1966.
- 17. Kaiser, Henry, Steve Hunka, and John Bianchini. "Relating Factors Between Studies Based Upon Different Individuals." Computing Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Kelly, Janet. <u>College Life and the Mores</u>. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.
- 19. Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.



- Klopf, Gordon (ed.). <u>College Student Personnel in</u> <u>the Years Ahead</u>. Washington: American College Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series, 1966.
- Michael, William and Ernest Boyer. "Campus Environment." <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, 35:264-276, October, 1965.
- 22. Mischel, Walter. Personality and Assessment. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- 23. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. "An Exploratory Investigation of Selected Assumptions and Beliefs of Student Personnel Administrators: A Preliminary Report." Division of Research and Publications, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- 24 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. "Statement on Student Power." A Report prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Power, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1968. (Mimeographed.)
- 25. Shaffer, Robert H. "Issues and Problems in the Organization, Administration and Development of College Student Personnel Programs in the Years Ahead." In <u>College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead</u>, Gordon Klopf (ed.). Washington: <u>American College Personnel Association</u>, Student Personnel Series, No. 7, 1966.
- 26. Sillers, Dan J. and Daniel D. Feder. "Attitudes of General and Student Personnel Administrators Toward Student Disciplinary Problems." <u>The Journal</u> of College Student Personnel, 5:130-140, March, 1964.
- 27. Stern, George G. <u>Studies of College Environments</u>. Syracuse: Psychological Research Center, 1966.
- 28. Sunderland, Stephen. "A Memo on Training for Responsible Role Development." Higher Education Division, National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, January, 1968. (Mimeographed.)
- 29. Williams, A. "Factor Analysis--Factor A: Principle Components and Orthogonal Rotations, 3600 Fortran." Computer Institute for Social Science Research, Technical Report No. 34, Michigan State University, 1967. (Mimeographed.)





APPENDICES





APPENDIX A





NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS Division of Research and Publications

AN INVESTIGATION OF ASSUMPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The purpose of this study is to gather data on basic assumptions and beliefs of selected members of the academic community regarding significant issues and concerns in higher education. The data collected should help institutions gain greater understanding of some of the sources of conflict and differences in position among members of the academic community, and how colleges and universities might respond more effectively to campus problems and strengthen their contributions to student development.

An important dimension of the study focuses on perceptions held by members of the academic community concerning the chief student personnel officer's role and functions, and his assumptions and educational orientation. It is hoped that information of this type will offer a point of reference for institutions as well as student personnel administrators in evaluating the activities and practices of student personnel administrators, how they respond to campus issues and how they might more effectively participate in the learning process.

So that respondents may feel free to be frank in their expressions, be assured that you will remain anonymous.

When you have completed the instrument, please return it to Dr. Thomas B. Dutton, Director, NASPA Division of Research and Publications, 202 Wilson Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan. A self-addressed envelope has been provided for this purpose.

In view of the importance of the data to institutions and to student personnel administrators, your cooperation in providing the information requested would be greatly appreciated.

1. Person completing the questionnaire:

	Student:	Campus position, if applicable
	Faculty:	Title, if applicable

2. Type of institution:

Public Liberal Arts College

- Public University
- Independent Liberal Arts College Independent University
- Catholic Institution
- Protestant Institution
- Teachers College
- Technical Institution
- 3. Total Enrollment:

 Less than 1,500	
 1,500 to 5,000	
 5,000 to 10,000	
 More than 10,000)

4. Regional Accrediting Association:

New England or Middle Atlantic North Central Southern

Western or Northwestern



DIRECTIONS :

Please exact to each statement from the following perspective: A - "New do you personally foct alows it estiments", and <math>B - "New do you fest that a dean of students would react to the same statement. Beyond first to all statements by placing an (3) in one hox under perspective A only. Please <u>do not</u> react from perspective B until you have responded to all of the statements from perspective.

Please note that the title "Deam of Students," for purposes of this study, is synonomous with "Chief Student Personnel Administrator."

	HOW DO YOU PERSONALLY FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT?
	A.
students ative tasks.	YES NO
ies of the	YES NO
l needs of	YES NO
istently	YES NO
which be- of	YES NO
n of stu- en if he	YES NO
nd in mself from demic dean.	YES NO
the	YES NO
ith the	YES NO
ble con-	YES NO
e ten- ng of	VES NO
ohibits	YES NO
ific icted	YES NO
lue	YES NO

- The dean of student's availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks.
- Bassically, counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the desam of students and serve the same ends.
- The dean of student's primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student.
- The dean of student's responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions.
- The dean of students is responsible for upholding certain standards which because of their sensitive nature cannot be stated in a specific code of regulations.
- Even at the risk of jeopardizing his rapport with students, the dean of students must be willing to engage in direct and open conflict with them if he disagrees with their position on an issue.
- In the interest of enabling students to feel that they have a "friend in COURT." It is important for the dean of students to disassociate himself from umpopular decisions made by the president, business manager, or academic dean.
- The dean of student's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order.
- In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.
- The essential purpose of conduct regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community.
- A significant aspect of depensionalization in higher education is the tendency of the dean of students to allow and to encourage the inserting of more "professional staff" between himself and students.
- The only justification for student conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development.
- Since an academic institution is a community established for a specific purpose the behavior of the members of that community must be restricted in Special ways.
- The institution should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student.


	Provide and the second second
	HOW DO YOU PERSONALLY FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT?
	۸.
udent's	YES NO
idents are ior.	YES NO
"defeating	YES NO
e certain as- or promote	YES NO
ent ability and er delegation f under delegation.	YES NO
ec to make per- ies of citizen-	YES NO
ion is provi-	YES NO
on for the ing relationship.	YES NO
values held to	YES NO
ing more than a the individual	YES NO
ulations.	YES NO
olicy deci-	YES NO
, the present ment in higher	YES NO

- Social maturity and value development are integral to the student's intellectual attainment.
- Exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents are likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.
- Attempts by the dean of students to protect the student from "defeating experiences" may actually hinder student growth.
- 18. The deam of students should consciously attempt to manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of individual students.
- 19. Within the context of obvious individual differences in student ability and maturity, it is more desirable to err in the direction of over delegation of responsibility to students rather than in the direction of under delegation.
- 20. S tudents attain maturity to the extent that they are left free to make personal decisions and to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the academic community.
- An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student.
- Except for considerations of safety, there is no justification for the dean of students to violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship.
- Attempts by deans of students to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors.
- 24. The essential ingredients of procedural due process are nothing more than a natural expression of the college's respect and concern for the individual student.
- 25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations.
- Students should not be involved in top level institutional policy decisions because they lack sufficient maturity.
- 27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education.



APPENDIX B



National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

(THE ASSOCIATION OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS FOUNDED IN 1919)

Prendent D. WORLETS (), (), (ROUGETS basin of Men Pundue University Latayette, busins, 47007 Prevident Decomete MARK W, SMITH Dean of Men Granulle, Ubis, 4003 Conference, et al. their mene Frankley, CLIFFORD Bean of Student Affaire Rutzer, University Brennews, M. Arbiter(SST UFE), Prevident -PICTER II, ARMACOST President Ottawa University Ottawa University Richard Barton Richard Barton Richard StageLKOW re President for Student Missing Buffalo, New York 14214 Buffalo, New York 14214 anter chivicato de Nero Xeel (1997) - (1997) Harresto Electrica Nerros Statistica Marco Marco Statistica Marco Marco Statistica Marco Mar Vice 10 PRESTON PARE Dear of Student Life Lehigh University lethlehem, Pennylvania 18013 ARDEN O, FRENCH Dean of Men Louisians State University Baton Nonge, Louisians 20003 CHESTER E. PETERS e President for Student Affairs Kansas State University Mankattan, Kansas 66502 374-Manhatim, Kanase 46/02 JOIN W. TRUITT ier President for Stationt Affair Forth The Content Affair Forth The Content Affair CHANNIC THE MENT Portland State College Portland, Griffen 92/27 STANLEY BENZ STANLEY BENZ Station College Stati Vice Rein Ju-Star College Processor Conferences and College Processor College Procesor College Processor College Processor College Processor Coll Atlanta, Groppia 1032 GLEN W. JOHNSON Dean of Students Angeborg College Minney College H & Recht, Minney Stor H & Recht, Minney Ere President (A. VENDER University of New Mexico University of New Mexico

November 18, 1968

TO: NASPA Members

FROM: Thomas B. Dutton, Director Division of Research and Publications

In January 1966, the Division of Research and Publications initiated a study of the convictions and values of student personnel administrators. Using this study as a foundation, the division has developed a new investigation dealing with the assumptions and beliefs of not only student personnel administrators but also other members of the academic community. The purpose of the study is to gain insight into the convictions and value orientations that determine how selected members of the academic community respond to important issues in higher education. The inquiry is based on the premise that regardless of academic training or background administrators, faculty and students, with varying degrees of awareness, make assumptions and hold beliefs that influence behavior and responses to campus problems. Knowledge of these assumptions and beliefs should assist institutions in graining a better understanding of some of the sources of conflict and differences in position among members of the academic community and how institutions might deal more effectively with campus difficulties.

Another important dimension of the study focuses on the perceptions that others in the institution have of the student personnel administrator. It seems clear that various factions on the campus perceive him in different ways and that it is important for him to be aware of those perceptions that might interfere

130

51st Anniversary Conference, Jung Hotel, New Orleans, La., April 13 - 16, 1969



November 18, 1968

NASPA Members

with his ability to assist students in their personal, intellectual, and social development. It is our hope that increased knowledge of such perceptions will provide insights that will be of value to institutions and deans of students in evaluating the activities and practices of student personnel administrators, how they respond to issues, and how they might more effectively contribute to the learning process.

In the packet of material that you have received, instruments have been provided for you, your president, a faculty member holding the highest or a high <u>elected</u> position in your faculty senate or comparable body, the editor of your student newspaper, and the president of your student body. I would like to request that the envelope containing the instrument be given directly to each of these persons, that you explain the purpose of the study to them, and that you ask them to return the instrument directly to me in the self-addressed envelope provided. The success of the study depends on a good return from them; accordingly, your direct contact and encouragement is most vital.

I would like to request that you record the names and addresses of the persons to whom you give the packets on the enclosed card. This will permit us to communicate directly with the persons listed if we do not hear from them. It is our hope that the data will be received in time to permit the preparation of a report for the NASPA meeting in New Orleans.

Your help would be greatly appreciated.

TBD/mm

Enclosures



TO: NASPA Members

FROM: Thomas B. Dutton, Director, Division of Research and Publications

If you have not returned the questionnaire used in the assumptions and beliefs research, please do so as soon as possible. Would you please also contact your president, student body president, student newspaper editor, and the faculty member who received the questionnaire to determine if their forms have been returned. To date the return has been good, but more forms must be secured to make the data most worthwhile.

Your cooperation would be greatly appreciated.

January 6, 1969

mm





APPENDIX C



EIGENVALUES USED TO DETERMINE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ROTATIONS IN VARIMAX ROTATION PROCEDURE WITH THRESHOLD VALUE SET AT 1.0

1	2.8353	5	1.1273	9	1.0100
2	1.9750	6	1.0886	10	0.9888
3	1.4034	7	1.0577	11	0.9407
13	0.9003	17	0.8298	21	0.7484
14	0.8919	18	0.8141	22	0.7418
15	0.8674	19	0.7888	23	0.6944
16	0.8578	20	0.7604	24	0.6862

25	0.6646
26	0.6349
27	0.5858

(Computer Message from Principle Component Factor Analysis Program)

"Since Eigenvalues 10 through 27 are less than the threshold value, the associated factors are not rotated"















