

AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED ASSUMPTIONS
AND BELIEFS OF CHIEF STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Edward E. Birch
1969

THESIS



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

An Investigation of Selected Assumptions
And Beliefs of Chief Student
Personnel Administrators

presented by

Edward E. Birch

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Admin. and Higher
Education

Walter F. Johnson
Major professor

Date November 12, 1969

~~JUN 10 1971~~ 29

~~7 2 75~~ 42

~~JUL 20 1971~~ 41

~~JUL 27~~

~~APR 8 1973~~ 092

~~APR 1 1973~~ 265

~~MAR 27~~ 26

~~MAR 27~~

~~JUL 1 75~~ 711

~~JUL 29 1975~~
000 H003

~~JUL 21 1975~~ 212

~~JUN 1 1976~~

~~JUN 2 1976~~ 212

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED ASSUMPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

By

Edward E. Birch

The Problem

It was recognized that there seems to be little understanding by chief student personnel administrators of the personal beliefs that prompt the decisions they make. Moreover, it was felt that there is some question as to the awareness of the degree of consistency with which personal beliefs which prompt response to issues critical to the profession and to the solution of campus problems, are held among chief student personnel administrators. Therefore, it was the purpose of this investigation to study the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators on selected contemporary issues in areas critical to their work. More specifically, the purposes of the study were to:

1. Identify the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making.
2. Determine differences in the assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making. Differences will be analyzed with respect to type, location, and size of institution.

Procedures

The investigation was conducted in conjunction with a broader research project sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The questionnaire and the sample of chief student personnel administrators used for the NASPA project were used simultaneously with the present investigation. Statements included in the questionnaire consisted of contemporary issues directly affecting the role of the student personnel administrator. The contemporary issues were developed according to three dimensions: responsibility and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process and university governance and decision making.

Questionnaires were sent to chief student personnel administrators of the 715 colleges and universities holding membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators as of November, 1968. Sixty-four per cent of the total number of NASPA institutions participated in the study.

Descriptive statistics (percentages) were employed in analyzing and describing the selected assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators. In addition, chi-square was used to test the null hypothesis that no differences existed according to the variable classifications of institutional type, size and location.

Major Findings of the Study

It was pointed out that the findings from the investigation should be interpreted as reactions by the participants at the time of the study and do not necessarily represent trends in the profession. Furthermore, the findings represent the majority view of chief student personnel administrators and their inner beliefs, but not their practices.

1. There is consensus of assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators according to type of institution, size of institution and regional location of institution.

2. The chief student personnel administrator's primary commitment is to students.

3. Chief student personnel administrators representing larger institutions tended to express less concern for personalization in student - CSPA and in student - institutional relationships. Although, it was recognized that this may be due, in part, to the fact that larger institutions, because of their size, require larger student personnel staffs.

4. Chief student personnel administrators are uncertain as to whether they should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.

5. The chief student personnel administrator perceives his effectiveness to be evaluated by his president on the basis of his reputation within the academic community, his administrative competence and the degree to which he is able to maintain control and order.

6. Chief student personnel administrators believe that the maintenance of reasonable control and order is the essential purpose of conduct regulation and that an academic community is a special community requiring that behavior be restricted in special ways.

7. Chief student personnel administrators feel that privacy for the individual student is essential to personalization in higher education.

8. Chief student personnel administrators feel that social maturity and value development are integral to the students' intellectual attainment and should be of concern to the institution.

9. Chief student personnel administrators feel that students, by their nature, desire liberalization of regulations. Moreover, they feel that campus dissent is good for higher education.

10. Chief student personnel administrators see their role in the development of policy in student affairs as that of determining policy in consultation with faculty and staff.

11. Chief student personnel administrators feel that primarily faculty and administrators should be involved in decisions regarding academic matters and the employment and retention of faculty and staff.

12. Chief student personnel administrators feel that faculty, administrators and students should be involved in decisions regarding parietal rules and the adjudication of student social and academic conduct problems.

13. In decisions relating to student activity matters, chief student personnel administrators feel that students should play the dominant role.

14. Chief student personnel administrators feel that in decisions pertaining to institutional budgetary matters, administrators should be primarily involved.

AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED
ASSUMPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF
CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

By

Edward E. Birch

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1969

66/72

9-23-70

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Walter F. Johnson, doctoral committee chairman, for his wise counsel, dedicated interest and continuing encouragement not only during the period of the study, but throughout the doctoral program as well. Appreciation is extended to doctoral committee members, Dr. Harold Grant, Dr. Max Raines, and Dr. Rollin Simonds for their guidance and cooperation. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Irvin J. Lehman for his helpful guidance, his time, and his interest throughout the investigation.

The contribution of the Research and Publications Division of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators is noteworthy and very much appreciated. Without the interest and support of the division, the study would not have been possible.

The writer is particularly indebted to Dr. Thomas B. Dutton, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at Oakland University. Dr. Dutton's patience, understanding and constant encouragement throughout the years of doctoral study shall long be acknowledged and appreciated.

A special expression of appreciation is reserved for the writer's wife, Suzanne, and daughters, Yvette and Michele, for their sacrifice, patience, understanding and support throughout the years of the doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of the Purpose	3
Need for the Study	4
Definition of Terms	6
Chief Student Personnel Administrator	6
Assumptions and Beliefs	6
Role	6
Hypothesis	7
Limitations of the Study	7
Organization of the Study.	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
The Role of the Student Personnel Administrator	9
Research Literature Related to the Role of the Chief Student Personnel Administrator	12
Literature Related to the Assumptions and Beliefs of Chief Student Personnel Administrators	16
Summary	18
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	20
Introduction	20
Selection of the Sample	20
Development of the Questionnaire	21
Administration of the Questionnaire	24
Characteristics of the Sample	25
Hypotheses	27
Method of Analysis	28
Summary	28

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	30
Responsibilities and Administrative Behavior	30
The Student and the Educational Process	42
University Governance and Decision Making	52
Academic Matters	57
Parietal Rules	59
Student Activity Matters	62
Employment and Retention of Faculty and Staff	62
Institutional Budgetary Matters	63
Adjudication of Student Misconduct	64
Summary	65
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	70
Summary	70
Findings and Conclusions	72
Responsibility and Administrative Behavior	73
The Student and the Educational Process	77
University Governance and Decision Making	79
Implications for Further Research	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85
APPENDICES	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of characteristics of participating institutions with characteristics of the total NASPA membership	22
2. Type, size and regional location of institutions participating in the study	26
3. Responses of all chief student personnel administrators pertaining to the responsibilities and administrative behavior of the chief student personnel administrator. .	33
4. Significant differences in responses of chief student personnel administrators according to type, size and regional location of institution	39
5. Chief student personnel administrators' perception of the criteria used by his president to evaluate his effectiveness	41
6. Responses of all chief student personnel administrators pertaining to the student and the educational process	43
7. Significant differences in responses of CSPA's according to type, size and regional location of institution	46
8. Response by chief student personnel administrators regarding the maturity of students for participation in decision making and governance	53
9. Chief student personnel administrators' primary reason for involving students in policy decisions . . .	54
10. Preferred role of chief student personnel administrators in policy development in student affairs	56
11. Chief student personnel administrators' suggested involvement of members of the academic community in decisions pertaining to six areas	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Participants in the pilot study	89
B	Questionnaire	91
C	Cover letter sent to chief student personnel administrators	94
D	Follow up card sent to chief student personnel administrators	97
E	Response of chief student personnel administrators according to type, size and location of institution	99

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The task of the chief student personnel administrator in institutions of higher education is continually changing and becoming progressively more difficult and demanding. The transitional status of his role can be attributed in large part to broader changes in higher education including marked growth in student enrollment, depersonalization in administrative-student relationships brought on in part by this growth, expansion of and change in educational experiences as well as by increased freedom for students. In addition to prompting change, these factors have cast new light and from some quarters brought increased criticism on the role of the chief student personnel administrator.

The traditional position taken by student personnel administrators in dealing with issues affecting the academic community is seemingly in flux. With traditional cleavages in student, administrative, faculty relationships intensifying as a result of significant changes in higher education, individual groups within the academic community seek greater voice and involvement in issues affecting the community. Student groups, in their efforts to gain a greater voice in institutional affairs, manifest this thrust for increased involvement. As a result, the work, role, and the expectations of the student personnel administrator are being challenged to a greater degree. Moreover, the traditional decision making authority of the student personnel administrator, indeed the basis for his response to issues crucial to the institution, is being questioned.

It is suggested that in responding to new challenges and increased demands, the chief student personnel administrator must better understand the values, convictions and assumptions that determine his behavior and ultimately his response to crucial issues (Dutton, 1968). Moreover, Kirk (1965, p.6) suggests that this can only be achieved "by looking inward to find out that which is internally consistent." Regardless of how better understanding of the factors that determine behavior is achieved, it is apparent that there is need for a commitment by the chief student personnel administrator to gain the insight necessary for responding in an intelligent manner to new issues, demands and problems existing on campuses today.

In noting the paucity of research conducted in this area and of its importance to the profession, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators initiated an investigation aimed at better understanding how chief student personnel administrators feel about issues critical to the profession. The investigation not only centers on the identification of assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators on issues critical to the profession, but also on how these beliefs mesh with the beliefs of the total academic community on the same issues. The NASPA¹ research project is entitled, "An Investigation of Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community." The writer serves on the research team for the NASPA project and was involved in its design and implementation.

The investigation currently under discussion is designed to be conducted in conjunction with this broad NASPA research project and to be concerned specifically with the assumptions and beliefs of

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

chief student personnel administrators in three areas that are particularly critical to their work. The investigation is based on the premise that regardless of academic training or background, chief student personnel administrators, with varying degrees of awareness, possess beliefs and make assumptions that influence behavior and responses to campus problems. The survey instrument and the sample of chief student personnel administrators used for the NASPA project will be used simultaneously with the present investigation.

Statement of the Problem

There seems to be some question as to whether chief student personnel administrators understand the personal beliefs that prompt the decisions they make. Moreover, there seems to be uncertainty as to the awareness of the degree of consistency with which personal beliefs, which prompt response to issues critical to the profession and to the resolution of campus problems, are held among chief student personnel administrators. In view of the concern frequently expressed by those inside and outside the academic community for the chief student personnel administrator to respond to crucial issues with clarity and consistency, there is need for better understanding of personal assumptions and beliefs and of the degree to which these assumptions and beliefs are consistent with those of others within the profession. With such understanding, the efficacy of the chief student personnel administrator as an educator and as an administrator should be enhanced.

Statement of Purpose

It is the purpose of this study to identify the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators on selected contemporary issues in three specific areas which are particularly critical to



1

1

s
p
a
I
t
a
a
Pe

their work.

Specifically, an attempt will be made to:

1. Identify the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making.
2. Determine differences in the assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making. Differences will be analyzed with respect to type, location, and size of institution.

Need for the Study

The need for the study of the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators is based on the notion that chief student personnel administrators know very little about their personal assumptions and beliefs and consequently, little about the basis for their decisions. In addition, there seems to be little understanding by professionals in the field of the degree to which personal beliefs are consistent among all chief student personnel administrators. This study is designed to aid chief student personnel administrators in the identification of their personal assumptions and beliefs as they pertain to issues crucial to

t
:
t
h
e
t
a
t
t
f
P
T
l
a
i
w
f
s
m
th
is
st
Pro

the profession. The results derived from a study of this type have the following implications.

First, through better understanding of the assumptions and the beliefs that guide behavior, student personnel administrators can be better prepared to respond to the effect of societal changes on higher education. Understanding of personal beliefs as they integrate with the beliefs of the profession and with the expectations of others inside and outside of the academic community provides a sounder base for response to new demands.

Second, through knowledge of the assumptions and beliefs (according to the three dimensions studied) of members of the profession, a professional reference point can be established by which chief student personnel administrators can gauge their personal assumptions and beliefs. Through a review of beliefs of student personnel administrators in similar positions and according to similar issues, the administrator can analyze, define and interpret his own response to issues within his own institution. It is important for a member of a profession to understand where he and his beliefs fit within the profession.

Third, a study of this nature can provide assistance in the professional preparation of student personnel administrators. Those responsible for the graduate and in-service training of student personnel administrators can gain a better understanding and a clearer definition of the contemporary stance of the chief student personnel administrator on issues crucial to the profession. This can result in a better understanding of the profession.

Finally, by responding to issues critical to the student personnel profession on an individual basis, members of the profession are forced

to think through their personal rationale for their professional behavior. Many times, professionals are swept up in response to the day to day demands of their work and are reluctant to spend time better understanding their personal beliefs in areas crucial to the success of their work. As a result of more complete understanding of their personal beliefs, student personnel administrators are in a better position to help others to develop more appropriate bases for their response to campus issues.

Definition of Terms

Terms used in this study are defined as follows:

CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR: The administrator who bears the immediate responsibility for the coordination and direction of the student personnel program in a college or university. For purposes of this study, the term is considered to be synonymous with "dean of students" or with "vice-president for student affairs."

ASSUMPTIONS AND BELIEFS: Anything taken for granted or believed or accepted as true by the chief student personnel administrator regardless of whether the basis is reason or prejudice. In this study, chief student personnel administrator's assumptions and beliefs will be determined for the following areas: responsibilities and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process, and decision making and university governance. For purposes of this study, reference to "assumptions and beliefs" will pertain only to assumptions and beliefs as determined for the above mentioned three areas.

ROLE: The expectations, perceptions, behaviors and responsibilities of the chief student personnel administrator.



|

|

t
a
t
a
a
m
h
k
in
ve
ti
qu

Hypothesis

It is the general hypothesis of this study that there are differences in assumptions and beliefs (according to the three dimensions studied) among chief student personnel administrators. The sample is broken down and analyzed according to: type of institution, location of institution, and size of institution.

Limitations of the Study

There are two aspects to this study. The first includes an investigation of the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators. The second aspect includes investigation of the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators on the basis of geographical region and institutional size and type. It is assumed that the responses to the items on the questionnaire will accurately reflect the true personal assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators participating in the study.

The study is confined to those institutions having membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. It is assumed that NASPA member institutions provide an adequate sampling of all chief student personnel administrators. Chief student personnel administrators participating in the study are assumed to be interested in honestly identifying their personal assumptions and beliefs, to be knowledgeable in the field of student personnel and interested in the improvement of themselves and their profession.

A mailed questionnaire was used to collect the data for this investigation. This method is perceived as a limitation due to assumptions always present with the use of such a procedure. When using the questionnaire means of data collection, it must be assumed that the

original intent of each statement was understood by the respondent, that each respondent answered honestly and that the responses reflect the intent of the respondent. In addition, one of the difficulties in a study such as this is to properly account for factors of social direction that elicit responses according to social desirability and not necessarily according to personal beliefs. This must be noted as a limitation as there can be no guarantee that chief student personnel administrators participating in the study were not influenced by factors other than their personal beliefs.

Organization 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 of the study and stating the general hypothesis for the study. Chapter II summarizes pertinent literature related to the nature of the study. Chapter III discusses the design of the study and the methodology followed in the conduct of the study. Chapter IV provides an analysis and interpretation of the data. Chapter V includes a summary of the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and appropriate recommendations for further study.

a

a

a

i

n

t

b

pi

o

ec

tl

ar

sp

r

a

po

bl

se

gr

vc

an

re

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There is a paucity of research designed to investigate assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators. Moreover, there are few studies which deal with the role of the chief student personnel administrator. Studies that are specifically relevant to the present investigation shall be reviewed in this chapter. In addition, studies not directly related but which have bearing on the current investigation will be included. A summary of the contribution of studies having both direct and somewhat peripheral bearing on the investigation will provide a common frame of reference for better understanding the nature of the present investigation.

The Role of the Student Personnel Administrator

The role of the student personnel administrator in American higher education has been determined largely by changing societal demands on the institution and by the expression of new and diverse student needs and interests. Historically, it was not until the 19th century that specialized personnel (usually faculty) were deemed necessary in classroom, dormitory and dining hall surveillance. This need was expanded around the turn of the century with the creation of the first full-time position in student personnel administration (DeFarrari, 1959, p. 76). Blaesser (1945) notes that the increased demand for student personnel services was created following the 19th century by essentially four groups: (1) humanitarians who tried to promote mental hygiene and vocation counseling, (2) administrators such as Gilman of Johns Hopkins and Harper of Chicago who emphasized programs of faculty advising and residential housing, (3) applied psychologists who began to identify

and measure individual differences and, (4) students who demanded an extra-curriculum.

However, the development of an actual office headed by a chief student personnel administrator to coordinate and direct student personnel services did not occur until post-World War II (Long, 1944). The functions and consequently the role of the chief student personnel administrator in higher education has continued to change since the post-World War II origins of the position. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1955) first noted the distinctiveness of the chief student personnel administrator by differentiating their role from that of the academic dean. The 1965 edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles describes the student personnel administrator in the following manner:

Directs and coordinates student personnel programs of college or university: participates in formulation of student personnel policies and advises staff members such as president of the educational institution; registrar; and director of admissions on problems relating to policy, program, and administration. Directs and assists in planning social, recreational, and co-curricular programs. Provides individual or group counseling or advising services relative to personnel problems, educational and vocational objectives, social and recreational activities, and financial assistance. Responsible for supervision of student discipline regarding adherence to university rules and in instances concerning responsibility to public for student actions. Sponsors and supervises student organizations. Prepares budget and directs appropriations of student services unit. Represents university in community in matters pertaining to student personnel programs and activities. May teach. May direct admissions, foreign student services, health services, student union and testing services. May be in charge of women's activities and be designated Dean of Women; or of men's activities and be designated Dean of Men. In large colleges and universities may delegate duties to staff members (p. 189).

While the position description for the chief student personnel administrator seems to have been narrowed over the years to a fairly concise group of expectations, it is not clear that chief student personnel administrators in fact function in a manner consistent with these expectations. The perceptions by others within the academic community of student personnel administrators' functions and beliefs leads to a questioning of the clarity of communication between chief student personnel administrators and others within the academic community; all of which points to a need for role clarification. Dutton (1968) notes in a NASPA position paper titled Research Needs and Priorities in Student Personnel Work that: "The dean is confronted with the prodigious task of clarifying and redefining his role and objectives in the face of increasing diffusion of institutional goals and programs, growing depersonalization and fragmentation of the academic community" (p.1). Dutton also indicates that the perceptions others have of the chief student personnel administrator's role is not always consistent with the functions that are normally attributed to this position. Greenleaf (1968) in assessing the role of the chief student personnel administrator from the view of others within the academic community notes that, "Students see student personnel administrators as members of the establishment, pretended baby sitters and obstacles to student power, faculty members regard administrators as alien to the educational process and view the dean's role as a 'bank for red tape' " (p. 231). Kirk (1965) feels that while student personnel administrators need to clarify their role, this should be accomplished by examining personal values and beliefs.

Research Literature Related to the Role of the Chief Student Personnel Administrator

Although the present investigation is not specifically concerned with definition of the role of the student personnel administrator, research literature pertaining to role relates to the nature of the study. This investigation is designed, in part, to help the chief student personnel administrator clarify his role on the basis of his response to selected issues which serve to reveal his personal assumptions and beliefs.

A survey of literature reveals few studies which empirically define the role of the chief student personnel administrator. Reynolds (1961), Rogers (1963), and Upcraft (1967), in independent investigations, surveyed the role of the chief student personnel administrator in various size institutions. All of these studies contribute to a more complete understanding of the chief student personnel administrator's functions and his role. Reynolds (1961), surveyed all liberal arts colleges below 2,000 students in enrollment in an effort to determine current practices of chief student personnel officers and to ascertain the degree of relationship of student personnel administrators to various student personnel functions. The following conclusions were stated:

1. Each of the 19 student personnel functions studied is performed by some of the respondents. Functions most often performed are personal counseling, discipline and student personnel records.
2. The student recruiting function is the only one not supervised by some of the respondents. The respondents generally consider most appropriate their relationship to the functions to the degree that they perform or supervise the functions.

3. Policy relationship to student personnel functions as well as final administrative authority for functions follow closely the pattern of performance and supervision.
4. Personal and institutional characteristics studied seem to be somewhat related to the degree of performance, supervision and policy relationships of the respondents to the student and personnel functions. More study of individual functions needs to be done in this area. The amount of graduate student personnel work and the amount of time devoted to student personnel work by the respondents seem to be related to the degree to which they consider their relationships to function appropriately.
5. The expectation that the role of the chief student personnel officer in the size group studied would be different from that of such officers in larger institutions seems to have been justified.
6. In the size and type of group of institutions studied, there has been a steady growth in the establishment of offices headed by chief student personnel officers since World War II. There has been some tendency for the establishment of these offices to be associated with size.
7. Most of the respondents are male and married. They have a median of twenty semester hours of graduate student personnel work. The median of the reported amount of time devoted to student personnel work is seventy-five per cent. Most of the chief student personnel officers report to the president of the institution.
8. It would seem important to be concerned with experience and training for such officers in the student personnel area where they personally perform or supervise to a high degree (p. v).

Rogers (1963), also in a study concerned with role, investigated effective and ineffective behavior of the chief student personnel administrator in institutions of 2,000 to 10,000 students. A critical incident technique was used to identify specific behaviors which were critical to the work of the dean of students. The investigation revealed the following results:

1. Student Personnel Deans in smaller institutions do more counseling with students than their counterparts in larger institutions.
2. Student Personnel Deans in smaller institutions are comparatively ineffective in developing cooperative relationships.
3. Student Personnel Deans in larger institutions are more ineffective in conducting investigations of reports of student misconduct than their counterparts in smaller institutions.
4. Student Personnel Deans do not consistently take the initiative to provide leadership and information, particularly to students and student groups.
5. Student Personnel Deans do not consistently take the initiative in communicating the reasons for their decisions to all parties concerned.
6. Student Personnel Deans are consistently successful when working with individual students in disciplinary situations.
7. A majority of the Student Personnel Deans' contacts are with individual male students and he is generally successful with these individuals.
8. The wider the range of activities the Student Personnel Dean uses to resolve a problem, the more likely he is to be considered effective by his professional peers.
9. Public relations is the category in which the Student Personnel Dean is involved with a wide variety of people, particularly the press. Therefore, every contact he makes has implications for his effectiveness in public relations (p. ii).

Upcraft (1967), in a study similar to the investigation conducted by Reynolds, proposed to describe and analyze the role expectations of chief student personnel administrators in institutions of higher education with more than 10,000 students. A questionnaire was administered to ninety-three chief student personnel administrators. The results were analyzed according to type and size of institution, degree held, type of training, recency of training, previous experience,

and the person to whom the administrator reports. The study concluded that there is a consensus of expectations concerning the role of the chief student personnel administrator in the large university.

A study conducted by Zook (1968), compared the chief student personnel administrator in four-year colleges and in two-year colleges. The study disagreed with Reynold's findings that size of institution is an important factor in the functions of the chief student personnel administrator. The study also concluded that chief student personnel administrators spent comparatively little time with students and that they saw their function as one of coordinating, planning and administering the student personnel program.

Bailey (1968), in an historical analysis of the role of the dean of men, investigated the changing role of the dean in American higher education. It was the intent of the investigator to survey the personal feelings and attitudes of the dean about his position. The study concluded that background factors do affect the attitude of the dean toward student personnel and the educational process and that the role of the student personnel administrator has changed over the years. Despite the fact that Bailey's investigation was concerned with the dean of men, the findings have implications for the chief student personnel administrator as well.

In summary, studies investigating role seem to point to the fact that the role of the chief student personnel administrator has changed and is continuing to change. Moreover, chief student personnel administrators are involved in typical administrative tasks at the expense of close interaction with students. There seems to be disagreement about the importance of the size of the institution to the functions

of the chief student personnel administrator. There is general consensus as to the role expectations of chief student personnel administrators although research tends to reveal that these attitudes, beliefs, and values are not being communicated effectively to others within the university community.

Literature Related to the Assumptions and Beliefs of
Chief Student Personnel Administrators

A study conducted by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators is of specific relevance to the present investigation. The Research and Publications Division of NASPA conducted an exploratory investigation of assumptions and beliefs of student personnel administrators (1966). This exploratory study provided the model from which the present investigation was developed. Impetus for the exploratory investigation was based upon the notion that basic assumptions influence the professional behavior of the student personnel administrator and that, therefore, the professional's role as an educator would be enhanced by examination of these assumptions and their implications. Purposes of the investigation were four-fold: (1) to identify assumptions and beliefs of members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, (2) to determine how widely these are held, (3) to stimulate NASPA members to re-examine their assumptions and to discuss with their colleagues the issues that are raised, and (4) to identify topics for more extensive and systematic empirical investigation.

The data was gathered on the basis of a twenty-seven item questionnaire with each item providing six forced-choice responses. The respondent, however, was asked to specify the nature of his reservations whenever

the alternative responses of "Agree with Reservation" or "Disagree with Reservation" was selected. The investigation included all persons on the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators' mailing list (691) and there was a return of 76%. The statements on the questionnaire were developed so as to be grouped for analysis purposes under the headings "Perceptions of the Dean and His Responsibilities," "Standards of Behavior and Social Conduct Regulations," "The Student and the Institution," and "The Administrative Style of the Dean." As the investigation was exploratory in nature, the analysis consisted of a reporting of frequency distributions and percentage figures.

The investigation concluded that there is greatest agreement among NASPA members on statements which indicate 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 support consistently the central functions of the college or university which are teaching and research, (3) it is important for the student personnel administrator to maintain both his integrity and his loyalty 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 exercise the rights and shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship is an optimal condition for student maturation.

Several questions and concerns are raised about this investigation.

These questions and concerns have particular relevance to the present investigation. Some concern must be raised as to the validity of the items contained in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed by a small number of deans serving as the research and publications division of NASPA, many of whom only supported the inclusion of items which were consistent with their own particular biases. Moreover, in order to stimulate discussion, the statements were deliberately worded in a provocative fashion. It was noted by more than one dean when the results of this survey were first presented that many of the items were "loaded," "ambiguous," and "situational" (Proceedings, 1966, p. 77). The questionnaire was limited and complete coverage of certain critical issues to the profession were not included. Moreover, the analysis of the data was not completed which meant that more careful scrutiny of the results would not be possible.

Summary

There is a continuing pattern of change in the role of the chief student personnel administrator. In addition to change in role, many suspect that the role of the chief student personnel administrator has become clouded and clarification is needed. The few studies which attempted to investigate the role of the chief student personnel administrator lack sufficient consensus to enable any degree of conclusiveness. Moreover, most of the role investigations were designed to be applicable only to particular size institutions, thus making generalization of the results limited.

Only one investigation was specifically relevant to the present investigation. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators conducted an exploratory study of the assumptions and beliefs

of student personnel administrators. This study serves as a basic model for the present investigation. Moreover, the analysis of the study was instrumental in the design of the present investigation.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The central purpose of this study is to investigate the assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators on selected contemporary issues. The investigation was conducted in conjunction with a broader research project (Dutton, Appleton & Birch, 1969) sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The NASPA study entitled, "An Investigation of Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community," was designed 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 survey instrument and the sample of chief student personnel administrators used for the NASPA project were used simultaneously with the present investigation. The investigator serves on the research team for the NASPA project and was involved in its design and implementation.

The chapter consists of a discussion of the selection of the sample, the development of the questionnaire, the method of administering the questionnaire, the characteristics of the sample, the statistical hypotheses, and a review of the method of analysis.

Selection of the Sample

The membership of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators was used in this investigation as representative of chief student personnel administrators. It was determined that member institutions of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators would be suitable

for this study because:

1. Membership in the Association includes institutions of varying size, purpose and geographical location;
2. Chief student personnel administrators by virtue of employment in member institutions are presumed to have professional interest in better understanding the role of the student personnel administrator in higher education today;
3. The Association has continually manifested concern for a better understanding of the student personnel administrator and the basis for his behavior at various institutions of higher education.

As of November, 1968, 715 institutions of higher education held membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. A membership list was obtained from the Association's central office. The list 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). These characteristics of NASPA membership institutions are shown in Table 1.

Development of the Questionnaire

The model for the questionnaire developed for use in this investigation was first used in a preliminary study of assumptions and beliefs conducted by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in 1966 (NASPA, 1966). The original instrument underwent major revision following an analysis of data obtained from the preliminary investigation. The Research and Publications Division of NASPA, including five chief student personnel administrators, an associate level student personnel administrator, a student personnel research director, and a student personnel educator, analyzed and modified the questionnaire. The questionnaire was reviewed

on three separate occasions. In addition, following the initial major revision, the questionnaire was reviewed by two Michigan State University professors. One professor is involved in the training of student personnel administrators at the graduate level while the second professor is involved in institutional research and evaluation services.

A pilot study was conducted using twenty chief student personnel administrators to determine the feasibility of the questionnaire. The pilot study participants were asked to offer comments and propose revision, if necessary, of the questionnaire. The suggested modifications

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
WITH CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TOTAL NASPA MEMBERSHIP

	TOTAL NASPA MEMBERSHIP		PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	
	Number (N=715)	Per Cent	Number (N=458)	Per Cent
Type				
Public	260	36.4	162	35.0
Independent	143	20.0	93	20.0
Catholic	101	14.1	70	15.0
Protestant	138	19.3	83	18.0
Other	73	10.2	50	12.0
Size				
Less than 1,500	240	33.7	161	35.0
1,500 to 5,000	225	31.4	135	30.0
5,000 to 10,000	109	15.2	79	17.0
10,000 and more	141	19.7	83	18.0
Location				
New England	212	29.6	125	28.0
Southern	142	19.9	188	20.0
North Central	286	40.0	91	41.0
Western	75	10.5	50	11.0

were incorporated into the final design. Following final extensive review, the instrument was printed for use in this investigation as well as for use in the broader NASPA project.

The statements selected for the questionnaire consisted of contemporary issues affecting the role of the chief student personnel administrator. These items were designed to be consistent with purposes of the study and were grouped according to the following three areas or categories:

Category I: Responsibilities and Administrative Behavior

Category I contains twelve 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 direction and management are provided.

Category II: The Student and the Educational Process

Category II contains fifteen items each of which pertain to certain theoretical and philosophical understandings about the student and the educational process. Growth, ability, maturity, and the learning process and the factors that influence these phenomena form the basis for these items.

Category III: University Governance and Decision Making

Category III contains sixteen items each of which is directed at the involvement by various members of the academic community in decision-making and university governance. The items are directed at decision-making relative to areas specifically within the scope of responsibilities normally reserved for the chief student personnel administrator, as well as decision-making that directly affects the total university community.

Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire designed for use in this study was administered in conjunction with the broad research project carried on by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Each university chief student personnel administrator, as NASPA institutional representative, was sent a personal letter over the signature of Dr. Thomas B. Dutton, Dean of Students, Oakland University and Director of the NASPA Division of Research and Publications. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix C. In addition, for purposes of the broad NASPA project, the chief student personnel administrator was asked to distribute packets containing the appropriate questionnaire to his president, a faculty member, editor of his campus's student newspaper, and the president of his student body. Each participant was instructed to return the completed questionnaire directly to the investigator. A self-addressed return envelope was included for each respondent.

Materials were sent to the chief student personnel administrator of the 715 NASPA member institutions. There were 353 responses from the first mailing. A follow-up mailing was sent approximately one and a half months later and yielded an additional 108 usable questionnaires. A total of 458 questionnaires were returned. This return represented approximately sixty-four per cent of the total number of NASPA institutions as of November, 1968. Two incomplete questionnaires were returned and were not usable.

A comparison by type, size and region was made between the chief student personnel administrators that participated in the study and the total membership of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in order to ascertain whether the results of the study could be

applied to the total NASPA membership. The differences as presented in Table 1 would suggest that no marked differences exist.

Characteristics of the Sample

The breakdown of the total sample of student personnel administrators by institutional type, size and regional location is included in Table 2. In order to enable a clearer picture of the nature of those participating in the study, a brief analysis shall follow.

Public universities made up the largest single group of participants. Representative of Protestant, Catholic and independent liberal arts colleges followed in order of size. Teacher colleges, technical institutions and junior or community colleges which make up the "other" grouping, accounted for a total of 12% of the sample. Public liberal arts colleges accounted for only 9% of the participants.

Chief student personnel administrators from institutions of less than 1,500 students made up approximately one-third (35%) of the sample according to size of institution while those representing the largest institutions with enrollments of more than 10,000 accounted for 18% of the total. Middle size institutions with enrollments of from 1,500 to 5,000, and 5,000 to 10,000 accounted for 30% and 17% respectively of the total.

From Table 2, one can see that 41% of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the investigation represented institutions included in the North Central region. Regional composition was determined by the various regional accrediting associations as listed in the Directory of Accredited Institutions of Higher Education (American Council on Education, 1969). Those representing institutions

2

1

-

E

2

7

(

(

(

2

3

S

-

P

P

P

2

P

-

M

S

V

-

TABLE 2

TYPE, SIZE AND REGIONAL LOCATION OF
INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Type	Number	Per Cent (N=455)
Public		
Liberal Arts College	43	9
University	116	26
Independent		
Liberal Arts College	69	15
University	24	5
Church Related College or Univ. (Catholic)	70	15
Church Related College or Univ. (Protestant)	83	18
Others		
Teachers College	20	5
Technical Institution	18	4
Junior College	12	3

Size	Number	Per Cent (N=458)
Enrollment less than 1,500	161	35
Enrollment 1,500 to 5,000	135	30
Enrollment 5,000 to 10,000	79	17
Enrollment 10,000 or more	83	18

Location	Number	Per Cent (N=454)
New England and Mid-Atlantic	125	28
North Central	188	41
Southern	91	20
Western and Northwestern	50	11

In

sa

20

be

co

ge

as

Mc

In

pr

by

L

ac

At

in the New England--Middle Atlantic regions accounted for 28% of the sample. Southern and Western--Northwestern institutions accounted for 20% and 11% respectively.¹

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to investigate the assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators on selected contemporary issues particularly critical to their work. It was the general hypothesis as stated in Chapter I that differences exist in assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators. More specifically, these differences exist according to: type of institution, location of institution and size of institution. For purposes of analysis these were stated as null hypotheses and tested by use of chi square test of significance:

1. No differences in selected assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in public institutions, private non-denominational institutions, Catholic institutions, Protestant institutions and "other" institutions.
2. No differences in selected assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in institutions with less than 1,500 students, in institutions with from 1,500 to 5,000 students, in institutions with from 5,000 to 10,000 students, and in institutions with

¹With respect to regional location, the following conventions will be adhered to throughout: New England will refer to New England--Middle Atlantic states, West will include Western and Northwestern states.

10,000 or more students.

3. No differences in selected assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in institutions located within the New England--Middle Atlantic accrediting association region, within the North Central accrediting association region, within the Southern accrediting association region and within the Western--Northwestern accrediting association region.

Method of Analysis

Chi square (X^2) was used to test the null hypothesis that no differences existed among chief student personnel administrators according to the variable classifications of institutional size, type and location. The .05 level of significance was established a priori to test the hypotheses of the study.

In addition, descriptive statistics (percentages) were employed in analyzing and describing the selected assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators. For analysis purposes, items were grouped according to the three areas of assumptions and beliefs studied: responsibilities and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process, and university governance and decision making.

Summary

The present study was conducted in conjunction with a broad research project sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The central purpose of this study was to

investigate selected assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators.

The population of the present study consisted of chief student personnel administrators in institutions of higher education. The sample was selected on the basis of membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators as of November 1, 1968.

A questionnaire was developed to serve the purposes of both the present investigation and a broad research project conducted by NASPA. The instrument used for the investigation was the result of major revision and modification of a questionnaire developed for use in an earlier similar investigation. The NASPA Division of Research and Publications, student personnel educators and research consultants assisted in the design of the instrument. In addition, a pilot study was conducted. The items selected for inclusion in the questionnaire could be grouped under three categories: (1) responsibilities and administrative behavior, (2) the student and the educational process, and (3) university governance and decision making.

The data were collected in the fall and winter of 1968 and 1969. Sixty-four per cent of the 715 NASPA members returned the questionnaire. It was hypothesized that differences exist in assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators according to type of institution, location of institution and size of institution. Chi square was used to test the null hypotheses. Descriptive statistics (percentages) were employed in analyzing and describing the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The analysis of the results of the investigation is presented according to the three areas of assumptions and beliefs included in the study: responsibilities and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process, and university governance and decision making. Response by the total sample of chief student personnel administrators to each of the statements included within the selected areas are analyzed. Tables are included which summarize the statistical information for the sample. Sub-sample responses by the variable classifications of institutional type, size and regional location are included in table form for only those statements containing statistically significant differences in the manner of response. Statistical information for all statements by the sub-samples of type, size and location are included in Appendix E.

Responsibilities and Administrative Behavior

Eleven statements (numbers 1-9, 11 and 22) were specifically designed to test assumptions and beliefs regarding the responsibilities and administrative behavior of the chief student personnel administrator. The category is defined in Chapter III. A twelfth item, although not specifically meeting the guidelines for this category, is pertinent to the administrative functioning of the chief student personnel administrator. Item number 32 asks the chief student personnel administrator to indicate from his personal perspective the criteria used to evaluate his effectiveness by the president of his

ins

th:

ea

bel

st

in

of

Ta

an

qu

it

in

sc

pr

st

di

to

we

in

institution.

Tables 3 and 4 contain summaries of the important findings for this section. Table 3 contains the response by the total sample to each statement pertaining to the responsibilities and administrative behavior of the chief student personnel administrator. In addition, statistically significant differences as determined by use of χ^2 are indicated (asterisk) in this table for the three separate analyses of the sub-samples of type, size and location of institution. In Table 4, the separate sub-sample analyses by institutional type, size and location found to be statistically significant are presented.

The following instructions appeared in the introduction to the questionnaire and applied to the eleven statements in the "responsibilities and administrative behavior" section and to the fifteen statements in the "student and the educational process" section.

Instructions: Please respond to each statement by placing an (X) in the appropriate box denoting whether you agree or disagree with the statement. You should respond from the perspective of how you personally feel about the statement.

Please note that the title "dean of students," for purposes of this study, is synonymous with "chief student personnel administrator."

Statement 1: From Table 3, it can be seen that chief student personnel administrators agree that their relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.

No significant differences existed among the participating institutions according to type and location. However, significant differences as determined by use of chi square were found according to institutional size. As is evident in Table 4, the degree of agreement tends to depend upon the size of the institution. The larger the institution the less agreement there seems to be that the chief student

pe
pr
ad
ag
re
ri
to
th
mo
di
su
re
st
te
ta
th
tu
ot
is
in
un
as

personnel administrator's relationship with students should take priority over administrative tasks. A limited consensus (61.4%) of administrators representing institutions with enrollments over 10,000 agreed with the item. At the other extreme, 79.2% of administrators representing small institutions agreed with the item. Smaller institutions tend to support the importance of close relationships with students to a higher degree. This, of course, could be due to the fact that by the very size of the institution, CSPA's at smaller institutions deal more directly with students while CSPA's at larger institutions tend to direct staff that relate directly with students.

Statement 2: As reported in Table 3, the sample conclusively supported the notion that counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.

There were no significant differences reported according to institutional type, size and location. However, there were interesting tendencies in the responses according to type of institution. Protestant institution representatives were much more supportive of the item than were Catholic institution representatives. In fact, Catholic institution CSPA's were less supportive of the item than CSPA's representing other type institutions.

Statement 3: Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (82.2%) that the dean of student's primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student.

The sub-samples of institutional type, size and location provided uniformity of support for a primary commitment to the needs of students as no significant differences in their response existed.

TABLE 3

RESPONSES OF ALL CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS PERTAINING TO THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR OF THE CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR.

Item	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent
1. The dean of students availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks.	73.8	26.2 *
2. Basically, counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean of students and serve the same ends.	77.8	22.2
3. The dean of students primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student.	82.2	17.8
4. The dean of students responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions.	24.9	75.1
5. 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.	59.3	40.7
6. 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.	90.8	9.2
7. 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 unpopular decisions made by the president, business manager, or academic dean.	6.0	94.0
8. The dean of student's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order.	76.4	23.6

Table 3 (cont'd.)

Item	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent
9. In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.	40.9	59.1 *
11. A significant aspect of depersonalization 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.	60.4	39.6 *
22. Except for consideration of safety, there is no justification for the dean of students to violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	90.1	9.9

*Significant differences exist at the .05 level of significance according to type, size or location of institution.

Statement 4: CSPA's¹ participating in the study clearly supported the importance of their personal convictions as opposed to responsibilities to their superior. The administrators disagreed that their responsibilities to the president should take precedence over their personal convictions. There were not significant differences in the way that chief student personnel administrators representing institutions of varying type, size and location felt about their responsibility to the president and the importance of personal convictions. It is interesting, however, that larger institutions seemed to be much more supportive of deans of students responsibilities to their president. They seemed to be less convinced that personal convictions should take precedence over responsibilities to their president. Moreover,

¹Throughout the remainder of the study, CSPA refers to Chief Student Personnel Administrator.

Southern and North Central institutions tended to be more concerned about their responsibilities to their president. Catholic institutions, however, were strongest in feeling that personal convictions should take precedence over responsibilities to presidents.

Statement 5: Divergence of opinion is evident in regard to whether deans should uphold certain sensitive standards that cannot be specified in a code of regulations. CSPA's participating in the study seemed uncertain whether they should be responsible for upholding standards not specified in a code of regulations. Although there seemed to be divergence among all chief student personnel administrators, there were no significant differences according to institutional response by type, size and location. However, larger institutions were much closer to splitting in their response than were small institutions who were more in agreement with the statement.

Statement 6: It is reported in Table 3 that a significant consensus of the CSPA's (90.8%) felt that they must be willing to engage in conflict with students when they disagree with them--even at the risk of jeopardizing their rapport. The unanimity and strength of this response among all chief student personnel administrators is evidenced by the statistical test for differences as no significant differences were evident within the sub-groups.

Statement 7: Ninety-four per cent of the respondents rejected the notion that the dean should disassociate himself from unpopular decisions made by other administrators. CSPA's, therefore, rejected any thought that no matter the issue, it is most important to create the impression among students that they always have a "friend in court." Chief student

personnel administrators clearly indicated strong disagreement with the statement. Again, there were no significant differences in response among the sub-groups of institutional type, size and location.

Statement 8: Table 3 reveals that 76.4% of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the study felt that the dean's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with control and order. Again, no significant differences existed according to type, size and location of institution. However, it is interesting to note that Western and Catholic institution representatives more strongly supported the statement while independent and Southern institutions were much less supportive.

Statement 9: Chief student personnel administrators were much less certain whether they should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards. Only 59.1% felt that they should not be concerned with enforcement of moral standards, thus indicating that uncertainty exists among the respondents on this item.

Accordingly, the sub-samples of institutions as defined by regional location also manifested a high degree of divergence. Significant differences in the manner of response to the item were found. As is indicated in Table 4, those institutions located in the Southern region had the greatest proportion agreeing that the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards. It is interesting to note that while Southern institutions tended to agree with the item, New England and Western institutions reported consensus in disagreement. North Central institutions, although also in disagreement with the item, were not as strong in disagreement and were more inclined toward

a split.

Although significant differences according to size and type were not found, interesting tendencies could be noted. Protestant institutions tended to support the feeling expressed by Southern institutions that deans of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards. The larger institutions, however, tended to be more supportive of the notion that deans of students should not be concerned with the enforcement of the moral standards.

Statement 11: As reported in Table 3, divergence again exists in response to the question of whether the insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization in higher education. Sixty per cent of the CSPA's agreed that the insertion of staff contributes to depersonalization.

Significant differences in response to the statement existed among all three of the sub-groups. It is noteworthy, as reported in Table 4, that chief student personnel administrators representing public institutions tended to feel that the insertion of staff between their office and students did not necessarily lead to depersonalization. The response to public institution CSPA's was in marked disagreement with that by CSPA's from independent, Catholic, Protestant and "other" institutions; all of whom felt that the insertion of additional staff does contribute to depersonalization. Institutions of religious affiliation were strongest in agreement in support of the statement.

Significant differences also existed according to size and location of institution. Again, as in Statement 1, less support for agreement existed as the enrollment of institutions participating in the study increased. The largest of institutions tended to feel that insertion

of additional staff would not necessarily contribute to depersonalization while the smallest of institutions reported agreement that insertion of staff would contribute to depersonalization.

Differences were recorded in the manner in which Southern and New England institutions responded to Statement 11. Southern institutions were split while New England institutions provided significant agreement that insertion of staff could result in depersonalization. Western institutions, although tending to agree with the statement, also manifested a high degree of uncertainty.

Statement 22: It is reported in Table 3 that substantial agreement (90.1%) exists among chief student personnel administrators in that the dean of students should not violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship. The degree of unanimity among the total sample is also evidenced among the sub-samples as no significant differences according to type, size and regional location of institution were recorded.

Statement 32: Table 5 includes data obtained from the responses of chief student personnel administrators to the question: "What criteria do you feel your president uses to evaluate your effectiveness?" The responses to the open ended question were grouped under the ten headings included in Table 5.

Student personnel administrators seemed to feel that the chief criterion used by presidents is the manner in which they, as deans of students, relate to others within the academic community. In essence, they believed that presidents determine dean's effectiveness on the basis of their reputation within the academic community. Chief student personnel administrators also highly supported "administrative competence and effectiveness" as an important criterion used by presidents. It is

SIG
ADM

Sta

1.

9.

11

TABLE 4

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF CHIEF STUDENT PERSONEL ADMINISTRATORS ACCORDING TO TYPE, SIZE AND REGIONAL LOCATION OF INSTITUTION.

Statement	Agree Percent	Disagree Percent	χ^2
1. The dean of student's availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks.			
Total Response	73.8	26.2	
Size			10.255*
Enrollment less than 1,500	79.2	20.8	
Enrollment 1,500 to 5,000	77.0	23.0	
Enrollment 5,000 to 10,000	70.1	29.9	
Enrollment 10,000 or more	61.4	38.6	
9. In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.			
Total Response	41.1	58.9	
Region			13.952*
New England or Mid-Atlantic	33.9	66.1	
North Central	40.0	59.1	
Southern	57.3	42.7	
Western or Northwestern	31.9	68.1	
11. A significant aspect of depersonalization 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.			
Total Response	60.4	39.6	
Type			13.165*
Public	49.4	50.6	
Independent	65.9	34.1	
Catholic	67.6	32.4	
Protestant	68.7	31.3	
Other	62.0	38.0	

Table 4 (cont'd.)

	Agree Percent	Disagree Percent	χ^2
Size			
Enrollment less than 1,500	67.5	32.5	16.471*
Enrollment 1,500 to 5,000	66.7	33.3	
Enrollment 5,000 to 10,000	51.9	48.1	
Enrollment 10,000 or more	44.6	55.4	
Region			7.941*
New England or Mid-Atlantic	67.2	32.8	
North Central	62.9	37.1	
Southern	50.0	50.0	
Western or Northwestern	53.1	46.9	

*Chi square value significant at or beyond the .05 level of significance.

interesting to note, as recorded in Table 5, that the three most selected criterion center on aspects that have less direct relationship to students and their development. Although "contribution to student development and assessment of student needs," "creative and innovative leadership," and "maintenance of campus morale" received relatively strong support, they clearly were not seen by a substantial percentage of CSPA's as significant criteria used in evaluation of their effectiveness.

Also interesting, is that strong support was recorded for, "maintenance of control and order" as a criterion used in evaluation. The felt importance of "keeping the lid on the campus" as a criterion consistent with the wishes of the president is indicated by the strong support for this response. Little support was given by CSPA's for "personal values and character" as an important criterion of effectiveness (in their estimation of how presidents evaluated them).

CI
US

Pe
ev

Ra

Ac

M.

Ci

C

S

M.

P

U

O

ti

ev

ca

da

no

TABLE 5

CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR'S PERCEPTION OF THE CRITERIA USED BY HIS PRESIDENT TO EVALUATE HIS EFFECTIVENESS.

Perception of criteria used to evaluate CSPA's performance	(N=632) *	
	Frequency	Per Cent
Relations with members of the academic community	142	22.5
Administrative competence and effectiveness	125	19.8
Maintenance of control and order	80	12.7
Contribution to student development and assessment of student needs	60	9.5
Creative and innovative leadership	59	9.3
Support of campus policies and objectives	48	7.6
Maintenance of campus morale	45	7.1
Personal values and character	5	.8
Unknown	59	9.3
Others	9	1.4

*N inflated by combination response. The first two responses from an individual were tabulated if more than one was recorded.

It is noteworthy that nearly 10% of chief student personnel administrators did not know or have any idea of criteria used by presidents in evaluating their effectiveness. The responses falling into the "unknown" category ranged from: "I wish I knew," and "Lord only knows" to "I'll be damned if I can figure it out...but it's probably whether he likes me or not (that's rather tenuous!)"

The Student and the Educational Process

Fifteen statements (numbers 10, 12-21, 23, 24, 25 and 27) included in the questionnaire were concerned specifically with the student and the educational process. The category is defined in Chapter III. Tables 6 and 7 contain summaries of the important findings. The arrangement of tables and general procedure established in the previous section shall be used for this section.

Statement 10: Table 6 records the fact that 76.4% of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the study agreed that the purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order. No significant differences existed according to type, size and location of institution. However, it can be noted that independent, Southern and the smallest of institutions (less than 1500) more highly supported the statement than did other sub-samples. Western institutions were the least most supportive of the statement.

Statement 12: Chief student personnel administrators tended to disagree with the statement (72.6%) that the only justification for conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.

Among the sub-samples, significant differences were present according to type of institution. Table 7 records the data describing the significant differences. The direction of response for each type of institution was consistent with the direction of the total sample. However, the degree of response by type of institution is noteworthy. The two religious affiliated type institutions were polarized in the degree to which they disagreed with the statement. Protestant institution CSPA's were more

TABLE 6

RESPONSES OF ALL CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS PERTAINING TO THE STUDENT AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS.

Item	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent
10. The essential purpose of conduct regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community.	76.7	23.3
12. The only justification for student conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development.	27.4	72.6*
13. 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.	75.9	24.1*
14. The institution should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student.	98.7	1.3
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to the student's intellectual attainment.	90.1	9.9
16. Exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents are likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.	21.8	78.2
17. Attempts by the dean of students to protect the student from "defeating experiences" may actually hinder student growth.	88.5	11.5
18. The dean of students should consciously attempt to manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of individual students.	84.6	15.4
19. Within the context of obvious individual differences in student ability and maturity,		

Table 6 (cont'd.)

Item	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent
it is more desirable to err in the direction of over delegation of responsibility to students rather than in the direction of under delegation.	88.9	11.1
20. Students 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.	89.5	10.5
21. An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student.	89.0	11.0*
23. Attempts by deans of students to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors.	28.7	71.3
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.	85.0	15.0
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations.	75.1	24.9*
27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education.	87.7	12.3*

* = Significant differences exist at the .05 level of significance according to type, size or location of institution.

strongly in disagreement with the statement that the only justification for conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth. On the other hand, CSPAs representing Catholic

institutions tended to be much less willing to disagree with the statement. In fact, Catholic institution CSPA's were closer to supporting agreement with the statement than were representatives from any other type of institution. If one might conceive of a continuum of agree - disagree, it would appear that independent, Protestant and "other" institutions are nearer the disagree position while public and Catholic institutions are clustered nearer the agree position.

Statement 13: Chief student personnel administrators tended to support the notion that within the academic community there is need for special consideration in the restriction of behavior. They agreed (75.9%) that since an academic institution is a community established for a specific purpose the behavior of the members of that community should be restricted in special ways.

Significant differences, as recorded in Table 7, existed according to the type of institution participating in the study. Protestant (84.3%), Catholic (79.4%), and independent institution CSPA's were clearly in strongest agreement that the behavior of community members must be restricted in special ways. Public institutions were much less in agreement (67.5%) with the statement.

Although significant differences were not recorded according to size and location, the smallest of institutions (less than 1500) and Southern institutions were clearly most supportive of the statement.

Statement 14: Significant consensus (98.7%) of chief student personnel administrators agreed that institutions of higher education should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student. No significant differences existed according

to the sub-groups of institutional type, size and location.

Statement 15: Chief student personnel administrators also strongly agreed that social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual development. Ninety per cent of the sample agreed with the statement. Again, there were no significant differences among the participants according to type, size and location of institution. Although, it can be noted that Catholic and Protestant institutions were most supportive of the statement.

Statement 16: Chief student personnel administrators disagreed with the notion that exception to policy would constitute reinforcement of unacceptable behavior. Seventy-eight per cent of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the study felt that exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents would not constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior. No significant differences existed according to type, size and location of institution. However, New England, and independent institutions were most strongly supportive in agreeing that exceptions to policy would not constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.

TABLE 7

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF CSPAS ACCORDING TO TYPE, SIZE AND REGIONAL LOCATION OF INSTITUTION.

Statement	Agree Percent	Disagree Percent	χ^2
12. The only justification for student conduct is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development.			
Total Response	27.4	72.6	

Table 7 (cont'd.)

Statement	Agree Percent	Disagree Percent	χ^2
Type			12.726*
Public	31.3	68.8	
Independent	24.4	75.6	
Catholic	39.7	60.3	
Protestant	20.5	79.5	
Other	14.6	85.4	
13. 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.			
Total Response	75.9	24.1	
Type			10.678*
Public	67.5	32.5	
Independent	79.8	20.2	
Catholic	79.4	20.6	
Protestant	84.3	15.7	
Other	77.6	22.4	
21. An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student.			
Total Response	89.0	11.0	
Region			9.133*
New England or Mid-Atlantic	92.8	7.2	
North Central	84.3	15.7	
Southern	94.4	5.6	
Western or Northwestern	85.7	14.3	
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations.			
Total Response	75.1	24.9	
Region			13.022*
New England or Mid-Atlantic	84.4	15.6	
North Central	67.2	32.8	

Table 7 (cont'd.)

Statement	Agree Percent	Disagree Percent	X ²
Southern	79.8	20.2	
Western or Northwestern	72.9	27.1	
27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education.			
Total Response	87.7	12.3	
Region			11.552*
New England or Mid-Atlantic	95.2	4.8	
North Central	85.4	14.6	
Southern	80.5	19.5	
Western or Northwestern	89.4	10.6	

* Chi square value significant at or beyond the .05 level of significance.

Statement 17: Chief student personnel administrators clearly agree (88.5%) that any attempt on their part to protect students from defeats may hinder student growth. Accordingly, there were no significant differences recorded by type, size and location of institution. Western institutions did, however, tend to be more supportive of the statement than were the other sub-samples.

Statement 18: While not wishing to protect students from defeats as it may hinder growth, chief student personnel administrators generally agreed (84.6%) that they should manipulate environment in ways which would promote student development. No significant differences existed according to the sub-samples. It can be seen, though,

that CSPA's representing institutions between 5,000 to 10,000 students were much less supportive of agreement with the statement.

Statement 19: On the matter of delegation of responsibility to students, administrators felt that within the context of individual differences in student ability and maturity, it is more desirable to err in the direction of over-delegation rather than in the direction of under-delegation. No significant differences, however, were found in the responses to this item according to type of institution, size of institution and regional location of institution.

Statement 20: As is indicated in Table 6, chief student personnel administrators clearly agree that maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility. No significant differences were recorded according to the nature of response by the sub-samples; type of institution, size of institution and location of institution. However, it is clear that CSPA's representing institutions with enrollments between 5,000 and 10,000 students were much less supportive of agreement with the statement.

Statement 21: The provision for privacy was considered by chief student personnel administrators to be an important ingredient for personalization in higher education. Eighty-nine per cent of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the study agreed with the statement.

Significant differences were not found among the responses according to type and size of institution. Differences did exist according to regional location.

Southern and New England institutions provided much stronger degrees of support for the privacy of students. CSPA's representing Western and North Central institutions were not as supportive in their agreement. All of the institutions by regional location tended to agree with the statement.

Statement 23: CSPA's tended to disagree with the statement that attempts to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors. Seventy-one per cent disagreed with the statement. Again, there were no significant differences according to the sub-groups. However, it is interesting to note that the smallest of institutions (less than 1500) were much less sure that attempts by deans to adopt values to be important by the institution were not questionable behaviors while Southern institutions were much more sure.

Statement 24: Consensus of chief student personnel administrators was recorded in agreement with the statement that procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual. Eighty-five per cent of the administrators were in agreement in their support of the statement. No significant differences existed according to type, size and location of institution. Independent institutions did, however, evidence much less support for the statement than did other type institutions. Catholic institutions reported much more support.

Statement 25: Three-quarters of the sample of chief student personnel administrators indicated support for the notion that students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations. No significant

differences existed according to the sub-samples of type and size of institution.

As noted in Table 7, significant differences did exist according to regional location. New England region institutions were more supportive (84.4%) of the notion that students desire liberalization of regulations than were institutions representing other regions. Southern institutions also agreed strongly with the item. North Central institutions provided limited agreement with the statement. CSPA's representing Western institutions more closely paralleled the limited degree of support by North Central participants. It is interesting to note that although no significant differences by type of institution occurred, Catholic and Protestant institutions were at opposite extremes in their response to the statement. Although all institutions agreed with the statement, Catholic institutions were much more in agreement with the notion that students desire liberalization of regulations than were all other "type" institutions. Protestant institutions were much less in agreement with the statement than were all other "type" institutions.

Statement 27: Interestingly, strong agreement (87.7%) was evidenced for the positive aspects of student dissent. Chief student personnel administrators tended to agree that although there have been negative results, the present climate of dissent represents a positive development in higher education.

There were no significant differences when the data were analyzed according to type and size of institution. However, in again noting Table 7, differences existed according to regional location of the

institutional representatives participating in the study. Institutions representing the New England region were again most strongly in agreement with the statement. New England region unanimity in support of student dissent is consistent with the strength of their support for the notion that students desire liberalization of regulations. Western and North Central institutions were also highly supportive of the statement. Southern institutions were less agreeable in their support than were the other regions. It is interesting that CSPA's in institutions located in the eastern and the western most regions of the United States were most supportive of the statement and that those located in the middle states between the two frontiers were least supportive.

Although significant differences did not exist according to type of institution, Catholic institutions were the strongest of all the sub-samples in their agreement that the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education.

University Governance and Decision Making

Sixteen statements (numbers 26, 28, 29, 30a-30k, 31a and 31b) which pertain to the degree of involvement by members of the academic community in decision making and governance were included in the questionnaire. Statement 26 sought an Agree--Disagree response while statements 28 and 29 asked the respondent to select one of four possible choices. Statements 30 and 31 included thirteen separate items, each of which required a single response. Tables 8 - 11 contain summaries of the important findings.

With the exception of item 26 which was analyzed by chi square, there were insufficient size cells in the response to all other statements. Hence, chi square analysis of differences by institutional type, size and regional location was not possible.

Statement 26: A significant consensus (88.9%) of the chief student personnel administrators participating in the study disagreed with the statement that students lack the maturity to participate in top level decisions. There were significant differences in the response of CSPA's according to type, size and location of institution. Large institutions (5,000 to 10,000 and 10,000 and above) and Protestant institutions did tend to be strongest in disagreement with the statement. "Other" institutions, however, were much more in agreement with the statement than were the other "type" institutions.

TABLE 8

RESPONSE BY CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING THE MATURITY OF STUDENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING AND GOVERNANCE.

Statement	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent
26. Students should not be involved in top level institutional policy decisions because they lack sufficient maturity.	11.1	88.9

Statement 28: The following instructions appeared in the introduction to the statement. "Rank in order of importance (1 = most important) the following reasons for involving students in policy

decisions."

Table 9 records the information that student personnel administrators tend to feel that the primary reason for involving students in policy decisions is because they contribute to the probability of insightful decisions. A comparatively large percentage of chief student personnel administrators also felt that involvement in decision making serves the purpose of educating students for leadership and citizenship. Much less support (12.5%) was given to the notion that participation in decision making would satisfy students' natural need for involvement and identification. It is interesting to note that only three or .7% of the total sample supported the lessening of the probability of student - administrative confrontation as the chief reason for involving students in decision making.

TABLE 9

CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS' PRIMARY REASON FOR INVOLVING STUDENTS IN POLICY DECISIONS. *

	N	Per Cent (N=455)
Item 28. A. Contribute to the probability of insightful decisions.	250	54.9
B. Educate students for leadership and citizenship.	145	31.9
C. Satisfy the student's need for involvement and identification.	57	12.5
D. Lessen the probability of student - administrative confrontation.	3	.7

* First choices only

The response of CSPA's according to the sub-samples of type, size and regional location of institution reveals that Protestant and Western institutions tend to be much more supportive of the notion that students contribute to the probability of insightful decisions than was the total sample. Southern institutions tended to be much less supportive of this notion and more highly supportive of the rationale that the involvement of students would serve to educate them for leadership and citizenship. Although, in all cases, the direction of the response by sub-samples was consistent with the direction of the total sample.

Statement 29: The following instructions appeared in the introduction to the statement: "What role should the dean of students perform in the development of policy in the area of student affairs?"

Chief student personnel administrators were in almost total agreement that they should be a vital part with at least a vote in any policy development in student affairs. Fifty-four per cent felt that the CSPA should determine policy in consultation with students and faculty and 38.5% felt that the CSPA should participate as a voting member in a campus governance body. It is interesting to note, as shown in Table 10, that the least degree of support was generated for unilateral decision making by the CSPA without requirement to consult with others. At the other extreme, little interest was shown in the CSPA providing advice but not voting.

The sub-sample response by type, size and regional location tended to be consistent with the response by the total sample except in a few isolated instances. Independent institution CSPA's preferred, in the development of policy, to be a voting member of a campus governance body. Western institutions also tended to see the dean of students as

an equal voting member of a policy-making group. However, "other" and Southern institutions were strongest of all the sub-samples in their support for CSPA's to "determine policy in consultation with students and faculty." Moreover, "other" institutions were least supportive of dean's of students "providing advice, but not voting" on student affairs policy issues.

TABLE 10

PREFERRED ROLE OF CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS IN POLICY DEVELOPMENT IN STUDENT AFFAIRS.

	N	Per Cent (N=454)
Item 29. A. Provide advice but not vote.	31	6.8
B. Participate as a voting member of a campus governance body.	175	38.5
C. Determine policy in consultation with students and faculty.	246	54.2
D. Determine policy without any requirement to consult with students and faculty.	2	.5

STATEMENTS 30 AND 31: Chief student personnel administrators participating in the study were asked to indicate what groups or combination of groups should be involved in decisions affecting six areas, all of which tend to represent particularly important concerns to members of the academic community. The six areas were: academic matters, parietal rules, student activity matters, employment and retention of faculty and staff, institutional budgetary matters and the adjudication of social

misconduct and academic dishonesty. The following instructions appeared in the introduction to statements 30 and 31:

Instructions: Indicate by checking the appropriate box, the degree to which you feel various members of the campus community should be involved in selected areas of decision making.

Response Code: 1. Primarily student; 2. Primarily administrative; 3. Primarily faculty; 4. Joint faculty-administrative with no student; 5. Primarily faculty-administrative with some student; 6. Joint faculty-student-administrative.

Academic Matters

As evident in Table 11, CSPA's strongly supported "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement in academic matters specifically related to curriculum design. Strong support was given (23.3%) to "joint faculty-student-administrative" involvement and "only faculty" involvement in grading practices and academic standing matters. It is interesting to note that increasingly less support was manifested for "joint community" involvement and "student" involvement in decisions affecting grading practices and in decisions affecting academic standing. Conversely, support for "primarily faculty" involvement increased from 20.0% on the item "curriculum design" to 32.5% on the item; "grading practices" and to 33.2% on the item; "academic standing."

Chief student personnel administrators' response according to type of institution, closely resembles the total sample response. All five types of institutions participating in the investigation strongly supported the notion that "faculty and administrators with lesser number of students" should be involved in decisions pertaining to curriculum. Catholic and Protestant institutions were particularly strong in their agreement with this notion. Independent institutions were not nearly

as strong in their support as they tended to lean toward involving "only faculty" in these decisions. In matters pertaining to grading practices and academic standing, independent institutions moved to strong support for "only faculty" involvement. Public institutions and "other" institutions continued to strongly support "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement in both of these areas. Catholic and Protestant institutions continued their strong support for "faculty-administrative and some student" involvement in matters pertaining to grading practices. They both, however, moved to strong support for "only faculty" involvement in academic standing matters. It is clear that whereas institutions were certain that there should be at least some student involvement in curriculum matters, there was less certainty that students should be involved in grading practices and academic standing matters.

Response by chief student personnel administrators according to size of institution again revealed support for "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement in matters pertaining to curriculum. Institutions with enrollments of 5,000 or less supported "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement in matters pertaining to grading practices and curriculum design. However, these same institutions strongly supported "only faculty involvement" in matters pertaining to academic standing. Interestingly, institutions of from 5,000 to 10,000 students supported "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement for all three of the areas. The largest of institutions (10,000 and above), however, strongly supported "only faculty" involvement in matters pertaining to grading practices and to academic standing.

Response according to regional location of institution indicated that all regions agreed that "faculty-administrative, and some students" should be involved in curriculum decisions. In decisions pertaining to grading practices, New England, North Central and Southern institutions felt that "faculty-administrative and some students" should be involved. Western institutions, however, strongly preferred "only faculty" involvement. Interestingly, New England institutions continued to depart from the total sample response by again supporting "some student" participation in academic standing issues as they did for grading practices and curriculum design. North Central and Southern institutions agreed that "only faculty" should be involved in matters pertaining to this area. It is clear that North Central and Southern institutions were more inclined toward only faculty participation in academic matters, especially pertaining to academic standing issues. New England and Western institutions, however, were more inclined toward "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement in all academic matters.

Parietal Rules

With respect to decision making in the areas of women's hours, visitation regulations and use of alcoholic beverages, chief student personnel administrators were most supportive of joint involvement by the various members of the academic community. However, strong support was also indicated for "primarily student" involvement in decisions pertaining to women's hours and visitation privileges but not for decisions pertaining to use of alcoholic beverages. In a reversal of feelings expressed regarding the groups that should be

involved in decisions affecting academic matters, very little support was given for "only faculty" involvement in decisions affecting parietal rules. Accordingly, in this area of decision making, higher degree of support was generated for "primarily student" involvement or at least "joint community" involvement.

Analysis of the sub-sample response by type, size and regional location of institution revealed a high degree of consistency with the response by the total sample. Public, independent, Catholic, Protestant, and "other" type institutions all strongly supported "joint involvement of faculty-administrators and students" in parietal rule issues. There was also strong sentiment, especially pertaining to issues concerning women's hours, for "primarily student" involvement. Public institutions, although preferring "joint involvement," were also particularly supportive of the notion that "only students" be involved in these issues.

Accordingly, sub-sample response by size and location of institution indicated preference for "joint faculty-administrative and student involvement" generally on issues relating to parietal rules. However, it is noted that institutions with from 5,000 to 10,000 students and located in Western regions tended to more highly support "only student" involvement. This is particularly true of Western institutions which tended to strongly feel that "only students" should be involved in decisions pertaining to women's hours and to visitation regulations in residence halls. It is interesting to note that Western institutions, which tended to give strong support to "only student" involvement in issues pertaining to women's hours and visitation regulations in residence halls, were equally as strong in supporting "joint administrative-faculty-student" involvement in issues

TABLE 11

CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS. (ITEMS 30 AND 31)

AREAS	Primarily Student	Primarily Administrative	Primarily Faculty	Joint faculty-administrative with <u>no</u> student	Primarily faculty-administrative with <u>some</u> student	Joint faculty-student-administrative
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Academic Matters						
Curriculum Design	0	.7	20.0	2.2	53.8	23.3
Grading Practices	.2	.2	32.5	5.7	38.7	22.6
Academic Standing	0	5.8	33.2	14.3	32.3	14.3
Parietal Rules						
Women's hours	31.7	6.1	.2	.2	8.4	53.4
Visitation regulations in residence halls	25.6	8.1	0	.4	9.2	56.6
Use of alcoholic beverages	4.7	17.7	.2	1.6	17.3	58.5
Student Activity Matters						
Allocation of student activity fees	64.8	1.5	0	.2	3.5	29.9
Student government and activities	77.1	0	.2	0	2.0	20.7
Student publications	61.1	.2	.2	0	2.0	36.5
Employment and Retention of Faculty and Staff	0	20.0	1.8	34.1	38.7	5.5
Institutional Budgetary Matters	0	42.9	0	19.8	31.4	5.9
Adjudication of:						
Student Social conduct problems	25.5	1.1	.2	.9	5.5	66.7
Student academic dishonesty	11.7	.7	9.3	3.8	13.1	61.6

pertaining to use of alcoholic beverages.

Student Activity Matters

As could be expected, chief student personnel administrators tended to stress "primarily student" involvement in all divisions pertaining to student activity matters. This was particularly true with respect to involvement in decisions affecting student government and activities. CSPA's felt that students should be at least equally involved and preferably exclusively involved in all decisions pertaining to the allocation of student activities fees, to student government and activities and to student publications. It is noteworthy, that in the area of student publications as contrasted with the other two areas, stronger support was given to "joint faculty-administrative-student" involvement and less support for "only student" involvement.

With respect to comparisons by type, size, and regional location of institution; public, North Central, Southern and the larger institutions (5,000 to 10,000 and above) tended to provide less support for "only student" involvement and more support for "joint faculty-administrative-student" involvement than did the total sample. This was particularly true on issues pertaining to allocation of student activity fees and to student publications matters. Again, sub-sample responses were generally consistent with the total sample response.

Employment and Retention of Faculty and Staff

Chief student personnel administrators were less supportive of the involvement of students in employment and retention of faculty and staff decisions. Administrators almost equally supported "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement and "faculty-administrative with no

student" involvement in this area. No support was given for "primarily student" involvement and minimal support for equal involvement by the three groups.

Accordingly, sub-samples of type, size and regional location all tended to prefer "faculty-administrative with some student" and "faculty-administrative with no student" involvement. It is interesting to note that Southern institutions tended to split between "faculty-administrative with some student" and "only administrative" involvement. Southern institutions were the strongest supporter of "only administrative" involvement while Western institutions were the strongest supporter of "faculty-administrative and some student" involvement.

Institutional Budgetary Matters

The tendency to exclude students from involvement was also evident in CSPA's response to participation in institutional budgetary matters. No support was given for "primary student" and little support for "joint academic community" involvement. However, strong support was reported for "primary administrative" and for "primary administrative-faculty with some student" involvement.

Comparisons by type, size and regional location of institution revealed that the response by the sub-samples tended to be consistent with the response by the total sample. Independent, Catholic, Protestant and "other" type institutions all strongly preferred "only administrative" involvement in institutional budgetary matters. Public institutions, however, tended to prefer "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement. Interestingly, Catholic and Protestant institutions tended to prefer

less student involvement than other types. Larger institutions (5,000 to 10,000 and 10,000 and above) and Western institutions tended to prefer "faculty-administrative with some student" involvement. However, smaller institutions (less than 5,000) and New England, North Central and Southern institutions tended to view institutional budgetary matters as purely a function of administrative personnel.

It is apparent that chief student personnel administrators, in the areas of employment and retention of staff and institutional budgets, feel that decision making is primarily an administrative-faculty task and that if students are to be involved, it is to be only on a limited basis.

Adjudication of Student Misconduct

In the area of student misconduct, chief student personnel administrators seemed to feel that "joint faculty-administrative-student" decisions should prevail for both student social conduct and academic dishonesty problems. It is interesting to note that there was some support for "only student" involvement in decisions affecting this area. Less support, however, was evidenced for "only student" involvement in student academic dishonesty cases than in social misconduct problems.

Analysis by type, size and regional location of institution reveals that "joint faculty-administrative-student" involvement is preferred in the adjudication of student social conduct and academic dishonesty problems. Protestant and independent institutions while preferring joint involvement, tended to manifest greater support for "only student" involvement than did other type institutions. Moreover, Southern institutions while also preferring joint involvement, gave greater support for "only student" involvement than did institutions representing other regional locations.

Response by sub-samples very closely parallel response by the total sample as although all supported "joint" involvement they more strongly supported "only student" involvement in adjudication of social conduct matters than in academic dishonesty matters.

Summary

The summary of Chapter IV includes only the major findings. Significant differences in response among the sub-samples of type, size and regional location of institution are reported. Chi square analysis of differences among the sub-samples was conducted for items 1 - 27. Significant differences among sub-samples could not be determined for items 28 - 32 due to inadequate cell size.

Responsibilities and Administrative Behavior

1. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (73.8%) that their relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to size of institution. CSPA's representing institutions with less than 1,500 students were much more supportive of the statement than were those representing institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more.
2. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (77.8%) that counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities.
3. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (82.2%) that their primary commitment is to the individual needs of the student.
4. Chief student personnel administrators disagreed (75.1%) that their responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.
5. Divergence existed among chief student personnel administrators as 59.3% agreed that they must assume responsibility for upholding sensitive standards that cannot be specified in a code of regulations.

6. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (90.8%) that they must be willing to engage in open conflict with students when they disagree, even though it means jeopardizing rapport with students.
7. Chief student personnel administrators strongly disagreed (94.0%) that they should disassociate themselves from unpopular decisions made by other administrators so as to enable students to feel that they have a "friend in court."
8. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (76.4%) that their effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order.
9. Divergence existed among chief student personnel administrators as 59.1% disagreed that they should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to regional location. Southern institutions tended to agree (57.3%) while institutions representing other regions disagreed.
10. Chief student personnel administrators tended to agree (60.4%) that the insertion of additional staff between their office and students contributes to depersonalization in higher education.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to type of institution, size of institution and location of institution. Public institutions and those institutions with enrollments of 10,000 and over tended to disagree with the item. CSPA's representing Southern institutions were evenly split. Those from New England institutions were most supportive in agreement.
11. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (90.1%) that there is no justification except for considerations of safety for violating the confidentiality of a counseling relationship.
12. Chief student personnel administrators perceived that the president's criteria in evaluating their effectiveness included their relationship with members of the academic community, their administrative competence and the degree to which they maintained control and order on the campus.

The Student and the Educational Process

1. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (76.7%) that the purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.
2. Chief student personnel administrators disagreed (72.6%) that the only justification for conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to type of institution. CSPA's representing Catholic institutions were more in agreement than others. Protestant and independent institution CSPA's indicated strongest disagreement.
3. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (75.9%) that the behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to type of institution. Public institutions were much less supportive of the item than were other institutions.
4. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (98.7%) that social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.
5. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (90.1%) that social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.
6. Chief student personnel administrators disagreed (78.2%) that exceptions to policy in handling student incidents constitutes reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.
7. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (88.5%) that their attempts to protect students from "defeating experiences" may hinder student growth.
8. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (84.6%) that they should manipulate aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support individual student development.
9. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (88.9%) that the over delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than under delegation.

10. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (89.5%) that maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.
11. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (89.0%) that provision for privacy for the individual student is essential to personalization in higher education.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to location of institution. CSPA's representing Southern institutions were stronger in agreement with the item than other institutional representatives.
12. Chief student personnel administrators disagreed (71.3%) that their attempts to influence students to adopt institutional values are questionable behaviors.
13. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (85%) that procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.
14. Chief student personnel administrators agreed (75.1%) that students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to location of institution. CSPA's from New England institutions were more supportive of the item.
15. Chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed (87.7%) that although there have been some negative results, present climate of dissent has been a positive development in higher education.
 - a. Significant differences existed according to location of institution as New England institutions were significantly more supportive of the statement.

University Governance and Decision Making

1. Chief student personnel administrators strongly disagreed (88.9%) that students lack maturity to participate in top level institutional policy decisions.
2. Chief student personnel administrators felt that the chief reason for involving students in policy decisions is that they contribute to the probability of insightful decisions.

3. The preferred role of chief student personnel administrators in policy development in student affairs is that of determining policy in consultation with students and faculty.
4. Chief student personnel administrators felt that in decisions regarding academic matters and employment and retention of staff that primarily faculty and administrators be involved.
5. Chief student personnel administrators felt that in decisions regarding parietal rules (women's hours, visitation privileges, use of alcoholic beverages) and the adjudication of student social and academic conduct problems that faculty, administrators and students be equally involved.
6. Chief student personnel administrators felt that in decisions regarding student activity matters primarily students be involved.
7. Chief student personnel administrators felt that in decisions regarding institutional budget matters primarily administrators be involved.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Problem

It was recognized that there is little understanding by chief student personnel administrators of the personal beliefs that prompt the decisions they make. Moreover, it was felt that there is little awareness of the degree of consistency with which personal beliefs which prompt response to issues critical to the profession and to the solution of campus problems are held among chief student personnel administrators. Therefore, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators on selected contemporary issues particularly critical to their work and according to three specific dimensions.

Specific purposes of the study were to:

1. Identify the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making.
2. Determine differences in the assumptions and beliefs held by chief student personnel administrators about critical issues relating to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, to the student and the educational process and to university governance and decision making. Differences were analyzed with respect to type, size and location of institution.

Methodology

The investigation was conducted in conjunction with a broader research project sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. The questionnaire and the sample of chief student personnel administrators used for the NASPA project were used simultaneously with the present investigation.

A questionnaire originally used in an earlier NASPA study was revised and used for purposes of this investigation. Statements included in the questionnaire consisted of contemporary issues directly affecting the role of the chief student personnel administrator. The contemporary issues were developed according to three dimensions: responsibility and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process and university governance and decision making. The NASPA Division of Research and Publications, student personnel educators and research consultants assisted in the design of the questionnaire. In addition, a pilot study was conducted.

Questionnaires were sent to chief student personnel administrators of the 715 colleges and universities holding membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators as of November, 1968. Sixty-four per cent of the total number of NASPA institutions participated in the study.

Hypotheses

It was the general hypothesis of the study that differences exist in assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators. It was hypothesized that these differences exist according to: type of institution, location of institution and size of institution. Chi square was used to test the following null hypotheses:

1. No difference in assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in public institutions, private non-denominational institutions, Catholic institutions, Protestant institutions and "other" institutions.
2. No difference in assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in institutions with less than 1,500 students, in institutions with from 1,500 to 5,000 students, in institutions with from 5,000 to 10,000 students and in institutions with 10,000 or more students.

3. No differences in assumptions and beliefs exist among chief student personnel administrators in institutions located within the New England--Middle Atlantic Accrediting Association region, within the North Central Accrediting Association region, within the Southern Accrediting Association region, and within the Western or Northwestern Accrediting Association region.

Descriptive statistics (percentages) were employed in analyzing and describing assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators according to the three dimensions of: responsibilities and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process, and university governance and decision making.

Findings and Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to investigate the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators. It was the general hypothesis that differences exist in the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators according to type of institution, size of institution, and regional location of institution. Null hypotheses were established for the three sub-groups.

It can be concluded from analysis of the data that the general hypothesis is rejected and that there is consensus of assumptions and beliefs among chief student personnel administrators on the areas examined according to type of institution, size of institution and regional location of institution. The few significant differences that did exist were not sufficient to warrant rejection of the null hypotheses. The greatest number of differences did occur according to regional location of institution. However, these differences existed in less than 19% of the items examined.

In addition to analysis by advanced statistical means, the data was examined through the use of descriptive statistics (percentages). The individual responses were grouped and analyzed according to the major categories of: responsibilities and administrative behavior, the student and the educational process and university governance and decision making.

The more significant findings are presented according to the above noted categories. Important findings derived from analysis of the specific sub-samples are also presented and discussed. Discussion follows the listing of major findings for each category.

It is important to note that the findings represent reactions by the participants at the time of the study and do not necessarily represent trends in the profession. Moreover, the findings represent the inner beliefs of the CSPA and not his practices. In addition, the findings represent only the majority view of those participating.

Responsibility and Administrative Behavior

1. The chief student personnel administrator's primary commitment is to students.
2. Chief student personnel administrators representing larger institutions tended to express less concern for personalization in student - CSPA and in student - institutional relationships.
3. Personal convictions are important to the chief student personnel administrator and should be followed even though they may be unpopular, may alienate students and may be contrary to the wishes of the president.
4. Counseling and discipline are felt to be interrelated responsibilities of the chief student personnel administrator and serve the same ends.

5. Except for considerations of safety, CSPA's feel that there is no justification for the violation of the confidentiality of a counseling relationship.

6. Chief student personnel administrators feel that over concern with the maintenance of control and order tends to reduce the effectiveness of the chief student personnel administrator.

7. Chief student personnel administrators are uncertain as to whether they should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.

8. Chief student personnel administrators are not certain whether the insertion of "professional staff" between themselves and students is a significant aspect of depersonalization in higher education.

9. Chief student personnel administrators are uncertain as to whether they should uphold standards not stated in a code of regulations.

10. The chief student personnel administrator perceives his effectiveness to be evaluated by his president on the basis of his reputation within the academic community, his administrative competence and the degree to which he is able to maintain control and order.

With respect to their responsibilities and administrative behavior, chief student personnel administrators expressed a strong commitment to students. Administrative tasks were deemed to be of lesser importance. This finding does not support the results of a study conducted by Zook in 1968. Zook (1968) concluded that chief student personnel administrators spend comparatively little time with students and saw as their chief function the coordinating, planning and administering of the student personnel program.

Not surprising was the fact that larger institutions tended to be less supportive than were other institutions of a primary commitment to students. The tendency for larger institution CSPA's to be perhaps

more impersonal and less committed to close relationships with students supports Rogers' (1963) earlier investigation. Rogers found that student personnel deans in smaller institutions have closer relationships and do more counseling with students than their counterparts in larger institutions.

In terms of personal style, chief student personnel administrators felt that even though their rapport with students was important, they must be willing to engage in direct and open conflict with students if they disagreed with their position. Moreover, CSPAs seemed to feel that they should not disassociate themselves from unpopular decisions made by others within the academic community, even if by doing so it would mean that students would have a "friend in court." The importance of the CSPAs' personal convictions in guiding behavior is clearly indicated by their feeling that personal convictions should take precedence over responsibilities to their president.

Although chief student personnel administrators supported the notion that conduct regulation was necessary and that counseling and discipline were interrelated functions, they were sensitive to the human side of control and order. They supported the need to protect the individual through due process, the need to make exceptions to policy when in the best interest of the student, and the importance of dissent in the academic community.

Chief student personnel administrators were uncertain about their role with reference to the enforcement of moral standards and the upholding of unspecified sensitive standards. It is interesting to note that Southern institution chief student personnel administrators

tended to evidence greater concern for the enforcement of moral standards than did CSPA's representing institutions from other regions. Although greater concern was evidenced, there was still a sizeable number of Southern institution CSPA's that did not support concern from moral standards.

It is significant to note that contrary to general belief, chief student personnel administrators representing Southern institutions were not significantly different in their responses to statements contained in the questionnaire from those representing institutions in other regional locations. Although Southern institutions tended to exhibit greater concern for the enforcement of moral standards, there was not noticeable evidence which would support conservative, liberal or other tendencies which might be construed as particular to the Southern CSPA.

It is interesting to note that while chief student personnel administrators perceive their effectiveness to be evaluated by their president on the basis of their relations with members of the academic community, their administrative competence and the degree to which they are able to maintain control and order, they do not personally include these criterion as the most important aspects of their work. In contrast, CSPA's believe that: (1) irrespective of relationships with members of the community, personal convictions should dictate their behavior, (2) their primary commitment is to the student and his needs and not to the performance of administrative tasks, and (3) their over concern with

maintenance of control and order would result in a reduction of their effectiveness. It is clear that CSPA's tend to place personal emphasis on different aspects of their work than those which they perceive are being used by their president to evaluate effectiveness.

Furthermore, it is interesting that while chief student personnel administrators talk about the importance of such factors as creative and innovative leadership and contribution to student development and assessment of student needs, they nevertheless feel that relatively little importance is attached to these factors by their presidents.

The fact that a relatively high number of chief student personnel administrators expressed complete unawareness of how their presidents evaluate their effectiveness supports the notion that many CSPA's really do not know what is expected of them.

The Student and the Educational Process

11. Chief student personnel administrators feel that procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.

12. Chief student personnel administrators believe that the maintenance of reasonable control and order is the essential purpose of conduct regulation and that an academic community is a special community requiring that behavior be restricted in special ways.

13. Chief student personnel administrators feel that privacy for the individual student is essential to personalization in higher education.

14. The institutional environment may be manipulated in ways which promote the development of individual students.

15. Students should not be protected from "defeating experiences."
16. Chief student personnel administrators feel that social maturity and value development are integral to the students' intellectual attainment and should be of concern to the institution.
17. Student maturity is felt by chief student personnel administrators to be attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.
18. Chief student personnel administrators feel that students, by their nature, desire liberalization of regulations.
19. Chief student personnel administrators feel that current campus dissent is good for higher education.

It is clear that chief student personnel administrators agree in their beliefs on several aspects of their work with students. In the area of control, it was felt that "reasonable" control and order administered in special ways because of the nature of the community is desired. Moreover, CSPAs felt that student desire for freedom was a manifestation of their nature. Although chief student personnel administrators are increasingly on the "firing line," they still highly support the notion that campus dissent is good for higher education.

A comparison of the beliefs of chief student personnel administrators in 1969 regarding control and regulations with their beliefs as noted in the 1966 NASPA assumptions and beliefs study reveals that although they are giving less attention to conduct and regulation now, they are clearer as to their beliefs. In 1966, CSPAs expressed uncertainty about the purpose of regulations. In 1969, CSPAs clearly supported the notion that the purpose of regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order within the academic community.

Chief student personnel administrators stressed the need for personalized student experiences in higher education. Privacy for the individual student and flexibility in working with the individual student were felt to be essential ingredients of personalization. CSPA's strongly supported flexibility in the administering of policy while dealing with specific student incidents. This marks a major change from the 1966 study when CSPA's were split in their response. Based on a comparison of the results of the two studies, it is apparent that chief student personnel administrators have become more aware of the impersonalization that has resulted from the significant growth in enrollment at institutions of higher education.

The notion of manipulation was well received by chief student personnel administrators especially as it applies to student development. However, as was the case in the 1966 study, chief student personnel administrators felt that manipulation should not include the protection of the student from "defeating experiences." In essence, CSPA's feel in 1969 as they felt in 1966 that the student should have the freedom to fail as this can be a positive contribution to student growth.

University Governance and Decision Making

19. Chief student personnel administrators feel that students possess the necessary maturity for the delegation of many responsibilities, including participation in top level decision making.

20. Chief student personnel administrators feel that the inclusion of students in decision making educates students for leadership and

citizenship and results in more insightful decisions.

21. Chief student personnel administrators see their role in the development of policy in student affairs as that of determining policy in consultation with faculty and staff.

22. Chief student personnel administrators feel that primarily faculty and administrators should be involved in decisions regarding academic matters and the employment and retention of faculty and staff.

23. Chief student personnel administrators feel that faculty, administrators and students should be involved in decisions regarding parietal rules and the adjudication of student social and academic conduct problems.

24. In decisions relating to student activity matters, chief student personnel administrators feel that students should play the dominant role.

25. Chief student personnel administrators feel that in decisions pertaining to institutional budgetary matters, administrators should be primarily involved.

The results of the study indicate that the chief student personnel administrator is in the vanguard of support for community decision making including student involvement. Chief student personnel administrators, however, while expressing strong sentiment for greater student voice in institutional affairs, were less inclined to support full student involvement in those areas which have traditionally been delegated to specific groups within the institution and where information is generally not public. Specifically, this would include academic matters, institutional financial affairs, and faculty selection and retention.

Chief student personnel administrators stress primary student involvement in decisions relating to those areas normally included in what could generally be defined as the "student life area." This would include student activities and rules and regulations that govern students' social and residence hall activity. It is also clear, from the results of the study, that CSPA's see their role in decision making as part of a joint decision making process with others sharing in final decisions with either consultative or full voting privileges. The CSPA does not prefer unilateral decision making responsibilities nor does he prefer to serve in an "advice providing--but not voting" capacity.

Chief student personnel administrators with respect to academic matters tend to be consistent with the traditional response by the academic community. The academic program has been one of the hardest areas within the academic community for faculty and administrators to accept as a legitimate area for student involvement. Although indicating need for token student involvement, particularly with respect to curriculum design, chief student personnel administrators tend to be consistent with the traditional stance taken by the academic community by supporting faculty and administrative control.

A recent survey of deans' of students feelings about student involvement in institutional decision making and governance supports the findings of this study (College Management, 1969). The survey concludes that deans support greater student voice in institutional affairs generally; however, they express doubt on full student involvement in academic matters and selection and retention of faculty and staff.

While taking into consideration the full impact of the results of the present investigation, it seems clear that CSPA's support greater freedom for students and advocate greater concern for student needs including a more significant role in institutional decision making. At the same time, they advocate for themselves a role in decision making in student affairs that is in many respects at least equal with others.

There seems to be several questions that emerge as a result of findings pertaining to university governance and decision making. If the assumption can be made that CSPA's are honest in their intent to implement community involvement in decision making, particularly as it applies to the area of student affairs, then are they also being honest with themselves in fully understanding that one of the consequences of involvement of the community may be decisions that are totally contrary to their beliefs and philosophies? Again, with the possibility of full community involvement, can chief student personnel administrators accept a non-policy making or non-leadership role in decision making in student affairs? Are they willing to place themselves in positions of implementing and defending decisions that may be totally inconsistent with their most revered beliefs? Indeed, are CSPA's willing to permit and support decisions that may be contrary to what they believe to be in the best interests of student development?

It is not the purpose of this investigation to raise questions about the professed assumptions and beliefs of the chief student personnel administrators participating in this study. However, the few questions presented in the preceding paragraph point to the need for full understanding of the implications that assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators present for their role.

Implications for Further Research

The study suggests areas for further research. First, it seems that in view of the general findings of the present investigation subsequent research should delimit the scope of assumptions and beliefs under consideration to correspond with one specific area of responsibility or concern of the chief student personnel administrator. This would allow for more in depth analysis of the area and, therefore, a fuller understanding of the beliefs that guide decision making and behavior of the chief student personnel administrator.

Second, the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators should be matched with their training, age, and experience. It would seem that this could be particularly useful in the development of student personnel training programs, and in better understanding differences and similarities in the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel administrators.

Third, the relationship of the chief student personnel administrator with his staff should be investigated more thoroughly. In addition to CSPA's learning more about their own assumptions and beliefs, it would seem important for them to know more about how their staffs respond on critical issues and the assumptions and beliefs that they possess which serve to dictate their behavior. The degree to which the beliefs of chief student personnel administrators and their staffs mesh plays a major role in the development of viable staff--CSPA relationships.

Fourth, the degree of relationship between the beliefs of chief student personnel administrators and of others in the university community

on issues affecting the total university community should be investigated. Much has been said about the fact that the CSPA's beliefs are not consistent with those of other members of the university community--that the CSPA is apart from the mainstream of academic community activity. The degree of compatibility of beliefs within the community would determine whether the CSPA is indeed in the mainstream of thinking in higher education.

Fifth, the role of the chief student personnel administrator as counselor of students should be investigated more thoroughly. The results of the study indicate that chief student personnel administrators are unsure of the degree of responsibility they should assume for counseling of students.

Sixth, the role of the chief student personnel administrator in the enforcement of moral standards should be investigated. Considerable divergence existed in the present study as to whether the CSPA should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.

Seventh, the degree of consistency between the beliefs of the chief student personnel administrator and the manner in which he actually responds should be studied. The results of the present study raise the question whether conclusions of studies such as this portray a true picture of the CSPA in action or merely of the CSPA in thought? Moreover, do the results of the work of chief student personnel administrators on their campuses support the beliefs that they profess? It would seem that investigation of these questions would be useful to the profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acheson, Eunice. The Personal and Professional Characteristics of Deans of Women. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1932.
- American Council on Education. Accredited Institutions of Higher Education. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, February, 1969.
- Ayers, Archie, Trip, Philip, & Russel, John. Student Services Administration in Higher Education. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Bailey, Walter R. "The Changing Role of the Dean of Men in American Higher Education: an Analysis of Influencing Factors." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1968.
- Blaesser, Willard. Student Personnel Work in the Postwar College. Washington: American Council on Education. Series VI, 6, 1945.
- Blaesser, Willard. The Future of Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.
- College Management. "Governing a College: How Much Should Students Have to say?" College Management, May, 1969, 30 - 39.
- Corsell, Paul T. "Student Personnel Workers on the Spot." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Fall, 1962, 232 - 237.
- Cottingham, Harold. "Roles, Functions and Training Levels for College Student Personnel Workers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1955, 534 - 538.
- DeFarrari, Roy. College Organization and Administration. Washington: The Catholic University Press, 1959.
- Dutton, Thomas, Appleton, James, & Birch, Edward. "An Investigation of Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community: a Preliminary Report." Unpublished report of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1969.
- Dutton, Thomas. "Research Needs and Priorities in Student Personnel Work." Unpublished position paper of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators - Division of Research and Publications, 1968.

- Dykes, Archie. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Fitzgerald, Laurine. "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Functions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.
- Greenleaf, Betty. "How others See Us." Journal of College Student Personnel, July, 1968, 225 - 231.
- Hawks, Herbert. Through a Dean's Open Door; A Guide for Students, Parents and Counselors.
- Institute for Student Personnel Administrators. "Approaches to the Study of Administrators in Student Personnel Work." Institute for Student Personnel Administrators. Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1960.
- Johnson, Walter. "Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968.
- Kennane, Mary. "Evolving Role of Deans of Students." Catholic Educational Review, Sept., 1963, 403 - 407.
- Kirk, Barbara. "Identity Crises." Unpublished address to American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, April, 1965.
- Klopf, Gordon. (Ed.) College Student Personnel in the Years Ahead. Washington: American College Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series No.7, 1966.
- Leonard, Eugenie A. Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959.
- Long, Lawrence. "Evolution of the Dean of Students." Journal of Higher Education, October, 1944, 383 - 384.
- Mayhew, Lewis. Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1968.
- Mueller, Kate. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Proceedings--Forty-Eighth Anniversary Conference. Seattle: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1966.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Division of Research and Publications. "An Exploratory Investigation of Selected Assumptions and Beliefs of Student Personnel Administrators: A Preliminary Report." Unpublished report, The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1966.

- Perry, Richard. "Administrative Behavior and the Vice President for Student Affairs." The NASPA Journal, October, 1966, 75 - 79.
- Reynolds, William. "The Role of the Chief Student Personnel Officer in the Small Liberal Arts College." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961.
- Rogers, Allan. "An Investigation of the Critical Aspects of the Function of the Student Personnel Dean as seen by his Professional Peers Using the Critical Incident Technique." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Sellers, Daniel, & Feder, Daniel. "Attitudes of General and Student Personnel Administrators Toward Student Problems." Journal of College Student Personnel, March, 1964.
- Shaffer, Robert. "Issues and Problems in the Organization, Administration and Development of College Student Personnel Programs in the Years Ahead." College Student Personnel in the Years Ahead. No. 7, 1966, 1 - 9.
- Shaffer, Robert, & Martinson, William. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.
- United States Department of Labor. Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Third Edition. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- United States Department of Labor. Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Second Edition. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955.
- Upcraft, M. Lee. "Role Expectations for Chief Student Personnel Administrators in Large Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- ✓ Willey, Harold. "The Role of the Dean of Men in Institutions of Higher Learning." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1959.
- Williamson, E.G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw - Hill Co., 1961.
- Williamson, E.G., & Cowan, John. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: The Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1966.
- ✓ Zook, Fredric. "A Comparative Study of the Chief Student Personnel Administrators in Public two and Four year Colleges of the Midwest." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1968.

APPENDIX A

Participants in the Pilot Study

O.D. Roberts
Dean of Men
Purdue University

Mark W. Smith
Dean of Men
Denison University

Earl W. Clifford
Dean of Student Affairs
Rutgers University

Peter H. Armacost
President
Ottawa University

Richard Siggelkow
Vice President for Student Affairs
State University of N.Y. - Buffalo

Carl W. Knox
Dean of Students
Florida Atlantic University

Richard E. Hulet
Vice President for Student Services
Illinois State University

Gilbert G. MacDonald
Vice President for Student Affairs
Northeastern University

Preston Parr
Dean of Student Life
Lehigh University

Arden O. French
Dean of Men
Louisiana State University

Chester Peters
Vice President for Student Affairs
Kansas State University

John W. Truitt
Vice President for Student Affairs
Indiana State University

Channing Briggs
Dean of Students
Portland State College

Stanley Benz
Dean of Students
San Jose State College

Merrill C. Beyerl
Vice President for Student Affairs
Ball State University

John L. Blackburn
Dean for Student Development
University of Alabama

William A. Yardley
Dean of Students
University of Houston

T. Roger Nudd
Dean of Students
California State College

Glen W. Johnson
Dean of Students
Augsburg College

Harold Lavender
Vice President for Student Affairs
University of New Mexico

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS
Division of Research and Publications

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

FORM A

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.

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. Title of person completing this questionnaire _____.

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 respond to each statement by placing an (X) in the appropriate box denoting whether you agree or disagree with the statement. You should respond from the perspective of how you personally feel about the statement.

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

INDICATE
HOW YOU
PERSONALLY
FEEL ABOUT
THE
STATEMENT.

1. The dean of student's availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks. YES NO
2. Basically, counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean of students and serve the same ends. YES NO
3. The dean of student's primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student. YES NO
4. The dean of student's responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions. YES NO
5. 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. YES NO
6. 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. YES NO
7. 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 unpopular decisions made by the president, business manager, or academic dean. YES NO
8. The dean of student's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order. YES NO
9. In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards. YES NO
10. The essential purpose of conduct regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community. YES NO
11. A significant aspect of depersonalization 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. YES NO
12. The only justification for student conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development. YES NO
13. 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. YES NO
14. The institution should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student. YES NO

INDICATE
HOW YOU
PERSONALLY
FEEL ABOUT
THE
STATEMENT.

15. Social maturity and value development are integral to the student's intellectual attainment. YES NO
16. Exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents are likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior. YES NO
17. Attempts by the dean of students to protect the student from "defeating experiences" may actually hinder student growth. YES NO
18. The dean of students should consciously attempt to manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of individual students. YES NO
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. YES NO
20. Students 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. YES NO
21. An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student. YES NO
22. Except for considerations of safety, there is no justification for the dean of students to violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship. YES NO
23. Attempts by deans of students to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors. YES NO
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. YES NO
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations. YES NO
26. Students should not be involved in top level institutional policy decisions because they lack sufficient maturity. YES NO
27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education. YES NO

28. Rank in order of importance (1=most important) the following reasons for involving students in policy decisions:

- a. Contribute to the probability of insightful decisions.
- b. Educate students for leadership and citizenship.
- c. Satisfy the student's need for involvement and identification.
- d. Lessen the possibility of student-administrative confrontation.

29. What role should the dean of students perform in the development of policy in the area of student affairs?
(Check one.)

- a. Provide advice but not vote.
- b. Participate as a voting member of a campus governance body.
- c. Determine policy in consultation with students and faculty.
- d. Determine policy without any requirement to consult with students and faculty.

30 - 31

DIRECTIONS:

Indicate by checking the appropriate box, the degree to which you feel various members of the campus community should be involved in selected areas of decision making.

Use the following code:

- 1. Primarily student
- 2. Primarily administrative
- 3. Primarily faculty
- 4. Joint faculty-administrative with no student
- 5. Primarily faculty-administrative with some student
- 6. Joint faculty-student-administrative

30. Involvement in decisions affecting:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Curriculum design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Visitation regulations for residence halls.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Women's hours.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Academic grading practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Use of alcoholic beverages.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Employment and retention of faculty and administrative staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The institution's budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Student government and activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Student publications and procedures related therein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Academic standing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Allocation and expenditure of student activity fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

31. Adjudication of:

a. Student social conduct problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Student academic dishonesty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

32. What criteria do you feel that your president uses to evaluate your effectiveness.

APPENDIX C

**Cover Letter Sent to
Chief Student Personnel Administrators**

Pres
U. D. K
Chair
Public
Catherine
KAY W
Deputy
EAGLE W
Federal
Entire
C. E. H
The
Oswald
RICHARD
Sally
R. E. S
L. I. B
Wayne
James
CART
Dean
J. K. K
D. W.
M. J. A
James
Normal
E. J. W

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEES
Dean
Section

ARTHUR
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

DEWEY
Dean
Section

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
(THE ASSOCIATION OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS FOUNDED IN 1919)

95

November 18, 1968

President
O. D. ROBERTS
Dean of Men
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
President Designate
MARK W. SMITH
Dean of Men
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023
Conference Co-Chairmen
EARLE W. CLIFFORD
Dean of Student Affairs
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
PETER H. ARMACOST
President
Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas 66067
Editor
RICHARD SIGGELKOW
Vice President for Student Affairs
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York 14214
Controller
J. DON MARSH
University Relations
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Immediate Past President
CARL W. KNOX
Dean of Students
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432
Placement Officer
RICHARD E. HULET
Vice President for Student Services
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761
Regional Vice Presidents
I
GILBERT G. MACDONALD
Vice President for Student Affairs
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts
II
PRESTON PARR
Dean of Student Life
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015
III
ARDEN O. FRENCH
Dean of Men
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
IV
CHESTER E. PETERS
Vice President for Student Affairs
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66502
V
JOHN W. TRUITT
Vice President for Student Affairs
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
VI
CHANNING BRIGGS
Dean of Students
Portland State College
Portland, Oregon 97207
VII
STANLEY BENZ
Dean of Students
San Jose State College
San Jose, California 95114
DIRECTORS
Professional Relations and Legislation
MERRILL C. BEYERL
Vice President for Student Affairs
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306
Professional Development and Standards
JOHN L. BLACKBURN
Dean for Student Development
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486
Research and Publications
THOMAS B. DUTTON
Conference Chairman Designate
Dean of Students
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan 48063
Association Personnel and Services
WILLIAM A. YARDLEY
Dean of Students
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004
Members-at-Large
T. ROGER NUDD
Executive Committee Secretary
Dean of Students
California State College at Fullerton
Fullerton, California 92631
JAMES DULL
Acting Dean of Students
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332
GLEN W. JOHNSON
Dean of Students
Angsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404
HAROLD W. LAVENDER
Vice President for Student Affairs

TO: NASPA Members

FROM: *Thomas B. Dutton*
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 gaining 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 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

NASPA Members

-2-

November 18, 1968

the highest or a high elected 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

APPENDIX D

**Follow Up Card Sent to
Chief Student Personnel Administrators**

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 E

**Response of Chief Student Personnel Administrators
According to Type, Size and Location of Institution**

Statement 1. The dean of student's availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	73.8	26.2	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			5.542
Public	67.9	32.1	
Independent	78.1	21.5	
Catholic	72.7	27.3	
Protestant	79.5	20.5	
Other	76.0	24.0	
Size			10.255*
Less than 1,500	79.2	20.8	
1,500 to 5,000	77.0	23.0	
5,000 to 10,000	70.1	29.9	
10,000 and above	61.4	38.6	
Region			0.681
New England	75.2	24.8	
North Central	72.6	27.4	
Southern	75.8	24.2	
Western	70.8	29.2	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 2: Basically, counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean of students and serve the same ends.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	77.8	22.2	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			7.785
Public	77.2	22.8	
Independent	80.6	19.4	
Catholic	66.2	33.8	
Protestant	84.1	15.9	
Other	79.6	20.4	
Size			.258
Less than 1,500	76.7	23.3	
1,500 to 5,000	78.5	21.5	
5,000 to 10,000	79.2	20.8	
10,000 and above	77.1	22.9	
Region			1.955
New England	74.2	25.8	
North Central	80.9	19.1	
Southern	77.5	22.5	
Western	77.6	22.4	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 3. The dean of students' primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	82.2	17.8	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	79.9	20.1	3.179
Independent	82.6	17.4	
Catholic	79.1	20.9	
Protestant	84.1	15.9	
Other	89.8	10.2	
Size			
Less than 1,500	84.2	15.8	1.811
1,500 to 5,000	78.8	21.2	
5,000 to 10,000	84.6	15.4	
10,000 and above	81.5	18.5	
Region			
New England	86.1	13.9	6.416
North Central	83.8	16.2	
Southern	78.9	21.1	
Western	70.8	29.2	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 4. The dean of student's responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	24.9	75.1	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			4.096
Public	28.0	72.0	
Independent	23.1	76.9	
Catholic	16.2	83.8	
Protestant	26.5	73.5	
Other	28.0	72.0	
Size			6.693
Less than 1,500	21.7	78.3	
1,500 to 5,000	20.5	79.5	
5,000 to 10,000	33.8	66.2	
10,000 and above	30.1	69.9	
Region			5.070
New England	21.0	79.0	
North Central	26.2	73.8	
Southern	32.6	67.4	
Western	18.4	81.6	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 5. 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	58.3	40.7	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			5.566
Public	52.8	47.2	
Independent	60.0	40.0	
Catholic	65.7	34.3	
Protestant	61.0	39.0	
Other	68.1	31.9	
Size			6.194
Less than 1,500	65.6	34.4	
1,500 to 5,000	59.5	40.5	
5,000 to 10,000	56.6	43.4	
10,000 and above	49.4	50.6	
Region			0.303
New England	60.3	39.7	
North Central	60.0	40.0	
Southern	58.4	41.6	
Western	56.3	43.8	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 6. 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	90.8	9.2	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			2.641
Public	90.1	9.9	
Independent	92.4	7.6	
Catholic	87.0	13.0	
Protestant	94.0	6.0	
Other	89.8	10.2	
Size			1.368
Less than 1,500	92.5	7.5	
1,500 to 5,000	89.6	10.4	
5,000 to 10,000	88.6	11.5	
10,000 and above	91.6	8.4	
Region			0.827
New England	90.2	9.8	
North Central	91.0	9.0	
Southern	92.3	7.7	
Western	87.8	12.2	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 7. 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 unpopular decisions made by the president, business manager, or academic dean.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	6.0	94.0	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			.622
Public	6.2	93.8	
Independent	5.6	94.4	
Catholic	7.4	92.6	
Protestant	6.0	94.0	
Other	4.0	96.0	
Size			1.469
Less than 1,500	7.9	92.4	
1,500 to 5,000	4.5	95.5	
5,000 to 10,000	6.4	93.6	
10,000 and above	4.8	95.2	
Region			1.273
New England	4.1	95.9	
North Central	5.9	94.1	
Southern	6.7	93.3	
Western	8.2	91.8	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 8. The dean of student's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	76.4	23.6	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			8.122
Public	76.5	23.5	
Independent	70.7	29.3	
Catholic	88.2	11.8	
Protestant	76.8	23.2	
Other	70.0	30.0	
Size			.666
Less than 1,500	75.9	24.1	
1,500 to 5,000	74.8	25.2	
5,000 to 10,000	76.9	23.1	
10,000 and above	79.5	20.5	
Region			5.466
New England	74.0	26.0	
North Central	79.3	20.7	
Southern	68.9	31.1	
Western	83.7	16.3	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 9. In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	40.9	59.1	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			7.238
Public	36.0	64.0	
Independent	37.1	62.9	
Catholic	41.2	58.8	
Protestant	53.0	47.0	
Other	42.9	57.1	
Size			5.811
Less than 1,500	43.0	57.0	
1,500 to 5,000	46.3	53.7	
5,000 to 10,000	38.2	61.8	
10,000 and above	30.5	69.5	
Region			13.952*
New England	33.9	66.1	
North Central	40.9	59.1	
Southern	57.3	42.7	
Western	31.9	68.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 10. The essential purpose of conduct regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	76.7	23.3	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	72.5	27.5	3.611
Independent	81.5	18.5	
Catholic	79.7	20.3	
Protestant	74.7	25.3	
Other	80.0	20.0	
Size			
Less than 1,500	81.9	18.1	3.800
1,500 to 5,000	73.3	36.7	
5,000 to 10,000	74.4	25.6	
10,000 and above	74.1	25.9	
Region			
New England	77.6	22.4	1.593
North Central	76.9	23.1	
Southern	80.2	19.8	
Western	70.8	29.2	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 11. A significant aspect of depersonalization 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	60.4	39.6	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	49.4	50.6	13.165*
Independent	65.9	34.1	
Catholic	67.6	32.4	
Protestant	68.7	31.3	
Other	62.0	38.0	
Size			
Less than 1,500	67.5	32.5	16.471 *
1,500 to 5,000	66.7	33.3	
5,000 to 10,000	51.9	48.1	
10,000 and above	44.6	55.4	
Region			
New England	67.2	32.8	7.941*
North Central	62.9	37.1	
Southern	50.0	50.0	
Western	53.1	46.9	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 12. The only justification for student conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	27.4	72.6	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			12.726*
Public	31.3	68.8	
Independent	24.4	75.6	
Catholic	39.7	60.3	
Protestant	20.5	79.5	
Other	14.6	85.4	
Size			1.192
Less than 1,500	28.5	71.5	
1,500 to 5,000	28.8	71.2	
5,000 to 10,000	22.4	77.6	
10,000 and above	27.7	72.3	
Region			0.191
New England	28.7	71.3	
North Central	27.4	72.6	
Southern	26.1	73.9	
Western	26.5	73.5	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 13. 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	75.9	24.1	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	67.5	32.5	10.678*
Independent	79.8	20.2	
Catholic	79.4	20.6	
Protestant	84.3	15.7	
Other	77.6	22.4	
Size			
Less than 1,500	82.8	17.2	7.714
1,500 to 5,000	73.9	26.1	
5,000 to 10,000	67.1	32.9	
10,000 and above	74.4	25.6	
Region			
New England	74.0	26.0	2.280
North Central	77.2	22.8	
Southern	79.8	20.2	
Western	69.4	30.6	

* = Significant

For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.

For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 14. The institution should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	98.7	1.3	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			4.422
Public	98.8	1.2	
Independent	96.7	3.3	
Catholic	98.5	1.5	
Protestant	100.0	0.0	
Other	100.0	0.0	
Size			3.497
Less than 1,500	99.4	0.6	
1,500 to 5,000	97.8	2.2	
5,000 to 10,000	97.4	2.6	
10,000 and above	100.0	0.0	
Region			0.393
New England	98.4	1.6	
North Central	98.9	1.1	
Southern	98.9	1.1	
Western	98.0	2.0	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 15. Social maturity and value development are integral to the student's intellectual attainment.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	90.1	9.9	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			5.788
Public	88.8	11.2	
Independent	87.0	13.0	
Catholic	94.1	5.9	
Protestant	95.1	4.9	
Other	86.0	14.0	
Size			3.447
Less than 1,500	90.6	9.4	
1,500 to 5,000	91.8	8.2	
5,000 to 10,000	84.4	15.6	
10,000 and above	91.6	8.4	
Region			3.143
New England	86.3	13.7	
North Central	91.4	8.6	
Southern	89.9	10.1	
Western	93.9	6.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 16. Exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents are likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	21.8	78.2	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			1.975
Public	21.9	78.1	
Independent	17.8	82.2	
Catholic	20.9	79.1	
Protestant	26.5	73.5	
Other	22.4	77.6	
Size			0.441
Less than 1,500	23.4	76.6	
1,500 to 5,000	21.6	78.4	
5,000 to 10,000	20.0	80.0	
10,000 and above	20.7	79.3	
Region			1.148
New England	18.7	81.3	
North Central	22.2	77.8	
Southern	24.4	75.6	
Western	23.4	76.6	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 17. Attempts by the dean of students to protect the student from "defeating experiences" may actually hinder student growth.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	88.5	11.5	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			2.402
Public	90.6	9.4	
Independent	89.0	11.0	
Catholic	84.1	15.1	
Protestant	86.7	13.3	
Other	89.8	10.2	
Size			3.247
Less than 1,500	85.5	14.5	
1,500 to 5,000	88.1	11.9	
5,000 to 10,000	90.9	9.1	
10,000 and above	92.7	7.3	
Region			4.365
New England	91.1	8.9	
North Central	85.0	15.0	
Southern	88.8	11.2	
Western	93.9	6.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 18. The dean of students should consciously attempt to manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of the individual student.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	84.6	15.4	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			2.475
Public	85.5	14.5	
Independent	81.3	18.7	
Catholic	86.4	13.6	
Protestant	87.8	12.2	
Other	80.0	20.0	
Size			5.369
Less than 1,500	85.4	14.6	
1,500 to 5,000	86.6	13.4	
5,000 to 10,000	76.0	24.0	
10,000 and above	87.8	12.2	
Region			2.826
New England	87.8	12.2	
North Central	81.3	18.7	
Southern	86.7	13.3	
Western	85.7	14.4	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 19. Within the context of 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	88.9	11.1	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			3.748
Public	90.1	9.9	
Independent	85.6	14.4	
Catholic	92.6	7.4	
Protestant	90.4	9.6	
Other	83.7	16.3	
Size			2.350
Less than 1,500	87.4	12.6	
1,500 to 5,000	91.7	8.3	
5,000 to 10,000	85.7	14.3	
10,000 and above	90.4	9.6	
Region			2.778
New England	85.5	14.5	
North Central	89.2	10.8	
Southern	89.9	10.1	
Western	93.9	6.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 20. Students 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	89.5	10.5	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	91.2	8.8	3.802
Independent	86.4	13.6	
Catholic	92.8	7.2	
Protestant	90.0	10.0	
Other	84.0	16.0	
Size			
Less than 1,500	87.9	12.1	7.308
1,500 to 5,000	92.4	7.6	
5,000 to 10,000	82.4	17.6	
10,000 and above	94.0	6.0	
Region			
New England	89.5	10.5	1.701
North Central	91.2	8.8	
Southern	86.2	13.8	
Western	87.8	12.2	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 21. An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	89.0	11.0	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			5.226
Public	90.1	9.9	
Independent	84.8	15.2	
Catholic	94.1	5.9	
Protestant	85.4	14.6	
Other	92.0	8.0	
Size			2.792
Less than 1,500	88.6	11.4	
1,500 to 5,000	91.9	8.1	
5,000 to 10,000	84.4	15.6	
10,000 and above	89.2	10.8	
Region			9.133*
New England	92.8	7.2	
North Central	84.3	15.7	
Southern	94.4	5.6	
Western	85.7	14.3	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 22. Except for considerations of safety, there is no justification for the dean of students to violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	90.1	9.9	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	91.9	8.1	6.146
Independent	87.0	13.0	
Catholic	95.6	4.4	
Protestant	85.5	14.6	
Other	92.0	8.0	
Size			
Less than 1,500	89.4	10.6	0.333
1,500 to 5,000	90.4	9.6	
5,000 to 10,000	90.8	9.2	
10,000 and above	91.6	8.4	
Region			
New England	92.8	7.2	1.416
North Central	88.8	11.2	
Southern	90.0	10.0	
Western	89.6	10.4	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 23. Attempts by deans of students to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	28.7	71.3	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	27.4	72.6	1.324
Independent	30.8	69.2	
Catholic	32.8	67.2	
Protestant	28.0	72.0	
Other	24.5	75.5	
Size			
Less than 1,500	35.7	64.3	6.487
1,500 to 5,000	22.6	77.4	
5,000 to 10,000	26.0	74.0	
10,000 and above	29.8	72.2	
Region			
New England	27.6	72.4	1.579
North Central	30.4	69.6	
Southern	23.9	76.1	
Western	31.9	68.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 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.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	85.0	15.0	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			7.318
Public	85.1	14.9	
Independent	76.9	23.1	
Catholic	91.3	8.7	
Protestant	86.6	13.4	
Other	88.0	12.0	
Size			2.440
Less than 1,500	83.6	16.4	
1,500 to 5,000	88.0	12.0	
5,000 to 10,000	80.8	19.2	
10,000 and above	86.7	13.3	
Region			3.709
New England	84.6	15.4	
North Central	82.9	17.1	
Southern	91.1	8.9	
Western	81.6	18.4	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	75.1	24.9	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			5.191
Public	76.6	23.4	
Independent	75.8	24.2	
Catholic	80.9	19.1	
Protestant	65.9	34.1	
Other	76.0	24.0	
Size			3.186
Less than 1,500	72.2	27.8	
1,500 to 5,000	80.6	19.4	
5,000 to 10,000	73.1	26.9	
10,000 and above	73.4	26.6	
Region			13.022*
New England	84.4	15.6	
North Central	67.2	32.8	
Southern	79.8	20.2	
Western	72.9	27.1	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 26. Students should not be involved in top level decision making because they lack sufficient maturity.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	11.1	88.9	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			6.306
Public	9.4	90.6	
Independent	11.1	88.9	
Catholic	13.2	86.8	
Protestant	7.2	92.8	
Other	20.4	79.6	
Size			3.417
Less than 1,500	13.3	86.7	
1,500 to 5,000	12.7	87.3	
5,000 to 10,000	9.3	90.7	
10,000 and above	6.1	93.9	
Region			0.577
New England	12.1	87.9	
North Central	11.4	88.6	
Southern	10.2	89.8	
Western	8.3	91.7	

* = Significant
 For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.
 For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education.

	Agree Per Cent	Disagree Per Cent	χ^2
Per cent of all Responses	87.7	12.3	
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE			
Type			
Public	85.4	14.6	6.949
Independent	87.5	12.5	
Catholic	97.1	2.9	
Protestant	85.4	14.6	
Other	86.0	14.0	
Size			
Less than 1,500	86.8	13.2	3.060
1,500 to 5,000	90.1	9.9	
5,000 to 10,000	82.7	17.3	
10,000 and above	90.2	9.8	
Region			
New England	95.2	4.8	11.552*
North Central	85.4	14.6	
Southern	80.5	19.5	
Western	89.4	10.6	

* = Significant

For type of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom is 9.488.

For size and region of institution, the value of χ^2 at the .05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom is 7.815.

Statement 28. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS' PRIMARY REASON FOR INVOLVING STUDENTS IN POLICY DECISIONS.

	Contribute to probability of insightful decisions.	Educate students for leadership and citizenship.	Satisfy students need for involvement and identification.	Lessen the probability of student - administrative confrontation.
Per Cent of all Responses	54.9	31.9	12.5	.7
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE				
Type				
Public	55.8	29.1	13.3	1.8
Independent	48.9	37.8	13.3	0
Catholic	50.0	38.2	11.8	0
Protestant	64.6	24.4	11.0	0
Other	54.0	34.0	12.0	0
Size				
Less than 1,500	58.8	29.3	11.9	0
1,500 to 5,000	47.4	37.0	13.3	2.2
5,000 to 10,000	57.2	35.1	7.8	0
10,000 and above	57.9	25.3	16.9	0
Region				
New England	52.9	36.6	9.8	.8
North Central	59.1	30.1	10.2	.5
Southern	44.7	35.1	19.2	1.1
Western	64.6	22.9	12.5	0

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 29. WHAT ROLE SHOULD THE DEAN OF STUDENTS PERFORM IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY IN THE AREA OF STUDENT AFFAIRS?

	Provide advice but not vote.	Participate as voting member of governance body.	Determine policy in consultation with faculty and students.	Determine policy without requirement to consult with others.
Per Cent of all Responses	6.8	38.5	54.2	.5
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE				
Type				
Public	7.5	37.3	54.7	.6
Independent	8.6	47.3	43.0	1.1
Catholic	7.4	30.9	61.8	0
Protestant	6.1	43.9	50.0	0
Other	2.0	26.5	71.4	0
Size				
Less than 1,500	5.7	39.2	55.1	0
1,500 to 5,000	7.4	39.3	51.9	1.5
5,500 to 10,000	6.5	36.4	57.1	0
10,000 and above	8.4	37.3	54.2	0
Region				
New England	7.4	40.2	50.8	1.6
North Central	7.5	38.5	54.0	0
Southern	3.3	31.9	64.8	0
Western	10.2	44.9	44.9	0

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30A. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

ACADEMIC Matters: Curriculum Design

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	0.0	0.7	20.3	2.2	53.8	23.3
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	0.0	1.2	25.3	1.9	44.4	27.2
Independent	0.0	1.1	28.3	1.1	48.9	20.7
Catholic	0.0	0.0	38.8	2.9	61.8	26.5
Protestant	0.0	0.0	12.0	2.4	69.9	15.7
Other	0.0	0.0	16.0	4.0	56.0	24.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	0.0	0.6	16.8	2.5	59.0	21.1
1,500 to 5,000	0.0	0.7	17.9	1.5	59.0	20.9
5,000 to 10,000	0.0	0.0	20.8	5.2	45.5	28.6
10,000 and above	0.0	1.1	28.9	0.0	43.4	26.5
Region						
New England	0.0	0.0	13.6	2.4	54.4	29.6
North Central	0.0	0.5	21.5	1.6	52.7	23.7
Southern	0.0	2.1	23.1	4.4	54.9	15.4
Western	0.0	0.0	26.5	0.0	55.1	18.4

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30B. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

PARIETAL RULES: Visitation Regulations in Residence Halls

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	25.6	8.1	0.0	0.4	9.2	56.6
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	36.7	5.1	0.0	1.3	8.9	48.1
Independent	22.2	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	64.4
Catholic	22.1	10.3	0.0	0.0	7.4	60.3
Protestant	14.6	11.0	0.0	0.0	15.9	58.5
Other	19.1	12.8	0.0	0.0	6.4	61.7
Size						
Less than 1,500	16.4	10.7	0.0	0.0	6.3	66.7
1,500 to 5,000	23.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	13.1	55.4
5,000 to 10,000	38.7	8.0	0.0	1.3	10.7	41.3
10,000 and above	34.6	3.7	0.0	1.2	7.4	53.1
Region						
New England	26.4	5.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	64.5
North Central	19.6	10.3	0.0	0.5	12.5	57.1
Southern	21.8	9.2	0.0	0.0	12.6	56.3
Western	51.0	6.1	0.0	2.0	2.0	38.8

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30C. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

PARIETAL RULES: Women's Hours

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
--	---------	---------	---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Per Cent of all Responses	31.7	6.1	0.2	0.2	8.4	53.4
---------------------------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE

Type	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Public	42.8	3.8	0.6	0.6	6.9	45.3
Independent	28.9	5.6	0.0	0.0	7.8	57.8
Catholic	25.8	9.1	0.0	0.0	10.6	54.5
Protestant	22.2	8.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	58.0
Other	23.9	6.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	63.0

Size	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Less than 1,500	23.6	8.3	0.0	0.0	7.6	60.5
1,500 to 5,000	27.1	6.2	0.0	0.0	10.1	56.6
5,000 to 10,000	44.0	5.3	1.3	0.0	8.0	41.3
10,000 and above	43.2	2.5	0.0	1.2	7.4	45.7

Region	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
New England	36.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	6.8	55.1
North Central	22.8	7.6	0.0	0.0	10.9	58.7
Southern	27.6	8.0	1.1	0.0	9.2	54.0
Western	57.1	6.1	0.0	2.0	2.0	32.7

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30D CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

ACADEMIC MATTERS: Grading Practices

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	0.2	0.2	32.5	5.7	38.7	22.6
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	0.0	0.0	35.2	3.7	39.5	21.6
Independent	1.1	0.0	41.3	4.3	31.5	21.7
Catholic	0.0	0.0	19.1	13.2	33.8	33.8
Protestant	0.0	1.2	38.6	0.0	44.6	15.7
Other	0.0	0.0	16.0	14.0	46.0	24.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	0.6	0.6	29.8	6.8	36.0	26.1
1,500 to 5,000	0.0	0.0	33.6	4.5	41.0	20.9
5,000 to 10,000	0.0	0.0	28.6	7.8	42.9	20.8
10,000 and above	0.0	0.0	39.8	3.6	36.1	20.5
Region						
New England	0.0	0.0	27.0	8.0	37.6	27.2
North Central	1.1	0.0	36.0	5.4	38.2	20.4
Southern	0.0	1.1	31.9	3.3	46.2	16.5
Western	0.0	0.0	36.7	6.1	30.6	26.5

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30E. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
 COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

PARIETAL RULES: Use of Alcoholic Beverages.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	4.7	17.7	0.2	1.6	17.3	58.5
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	5.0	10.7	0.6	2.5	13.8	67.3
Independent	7.6	17.4	0.0	2.2	17.4	55.4
Catholic	5.9	13.2	0.0	0.0	13.2	67.6
Protestant	1.2	26.5	0.0	1.2	22.9	48.2
Other	2.0	32.7	0.0	0.0	24.5	40.8
Size						
Less than 1,500	2.5	26.3	0.0	1.9	20.0	49.4
1,500 to 5,000	5.3	18.2	0.8	0.8	13.6	61.4
5,000 to 10,000	6.5	9.1	0.0	2.6	20.8	61.0
10,000 and above	6.1	8.5	0.0	1.2	14.6	69.5
Region						
New England	6.5	16.3	0.0	1.6	13.8	61.8
North Central	1.6	18.9	0.0	2.2	18.4	58.9
Southern	3.3	15.6	1.1	0.0	24.4	55.6
Western	10.2	22.4	0.0	2.0	10.2	55.1

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30F. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

EMPLOYMENT AND RETENTION OF FACULTY AND STAFF.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	0.0	20.0	1.8	34.1	38.7	5.5
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	0.0	16.0	1.9	30.9	42.0	9.3
Independent	0.0	19.6	2.2	40.2	37.0	1.1
Catholic	0.0	19.1	1.5	36.8	35.3	7.4
Protestant	0.0	28.9	2.4	26.5	37.3	4.8
Other	0.0	20.0	0.0	42.0	38.0	0.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	0.0	26.1	2.5	33.5	31.7	6.2
1,500 to 5,000	0.0	19.4	0.7	37.3	40.3	2.2
5,000 to 10,000	0.0	15.6	1.3	35.1	41.6	6.5
10,000 and above	0.0	13.3	2.4	28.4	47.0	8.4
Region						
New England	0.0	13.4	1.6	40.0	40.0	4.8
North Central	0.0	20.4	2.7	34.4	37.1	5.4
Southern	0.0	34.0	1.1	28.6	34.1	2.2
Western	0.0	10.2	0.0	24.5	51.0	14.3

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30G. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

INSTITUTIONAL BUDGETARY MATTERS.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	0.0	42.9	0.0	19.8	31.4	5.9
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	0.0	31.5	0.0	19.1	40.7	8.6
Independent	0.0	47.8	0.0	18.5	31.5	2.2
Catholic	0.0	47.1	0.0	23.5	23.5	5.9
Protestant	0.0	54.5	0.0	16.9	22.9	6.0
Other	0.0	46.0	0.0	24.0	26.0	4.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	0.0	50.9	0.0	19.9	23.0	6.2
1,500 to 5,000	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.6	30.6	3.0
5,000 to 10,000	0.0	31.2	0.0	18.2	40.3	10.4
10,000 and above	0.0	26.5	0.0	26.5	41.0	6.0
Region						
New England	0.0	41.6	0.0	17.6	33.6	7.2
North Central	0.0	45.2	0.0	21.5	28.5	4.8
Southern	0.0	45.1	0.0	22.0	29.8	3.3
Western	0.0	30.6	0.0	16.0	42.9	10.2

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30H. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

STUDENT ACTIVITY MATTERS: Student Government and Activities.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	77.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	2.0	20.7
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	77.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.9	20.0
Independent	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	23.9
Catholic	82.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	16.4
Protestant	75.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	19.3
Other	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	77.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.9	20.0
1,500 to 5,000	78.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	19.5
5,000 to 10,000	76.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	21.1
10,000 and above	75.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	23.5
Region						
New England	81.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.7
North Central	77.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	19.4
Southern	68.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.4	27.3
Western	79.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.4

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 301. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

STUDENT ACTIVITY MATTERS: Student Publications.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	61.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	2.0	36.5
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	57.1	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.2	41.0
Independent	69.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	28.3
Catholic	61.8	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	35.3
Protestant	59.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	37.3
Other	60.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	37.5
Size						
Less than 1,500	65.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.9	31.7
1,500 to 5,000	64.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	31.6
5,000 to 10,000	59.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	39.5
10,000 and above	47.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	51.2
Region						
New England	76.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	22.6
North Central	50.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.7	46.2
Southern	58.4	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.4	37.1
Western	63.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.7

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30J. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

ACADEMIC MATTERS: Academic Standing.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	0.0	5.8	33.2	14.3	32.3	14.3
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	0.0	4.4	33.1	6.9	38.8	16.9
Independent	0.0	3.3	37.0	25.0	22.0	12.0
Catholic	0.0	7.7	35.4	10.8	29.2	16.9
Protestant	0.0	8.6	33.3	16.0	30.9	11.1
Other	0.0	8.3	22.9	20.8	35.4	12.5
Size						
Less than 1,500	0.0	8.2	30.4	19.0	27.8	14.6
1,500 to 5,000	0.0	5.4	33.8	14.6	33.8	12.3
5,000 to 10,000	0.0	5.2	22.1	15.6	42.9	14.3
10,000 and above	0.0	2.5	48.1	3.7	28.4	17.3
Region						
New England	0.0	6.6	28.7	18.0	31.1	15.6
North Central	0.0	5.5	35.2	13.7	31.9	13.7
Southern	0.0	6.6	35.2	12.1	33.0	13.2
Western	0.0	4.3	31.9	10.6	38.3	14.9

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 30K. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

STUDENT ACTIVITY MATTERS: Allocation of Student Activity Fees.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	64.8	1.5:	0.0	0.2	3.5	29.9
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	50.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	5.7	42.8
Independent	78.3	2.2	0.0	1.1	1.1	17.4
Catholic	67.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	4.4	25.0
Protestant	71.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	25.3
Other	70.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	72.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.1	22.4
1,500 to 5,000	72.4	1.5	0.0	0.7	3.0	22.4
5,000 to 10,000	57.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.2	35.1
10,000 and above	43.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	52.5
Region						
New England	83.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	13.7
North Central	56.5	2.2	0.0	0.5	4.8	36.0
Southern	52.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	40.0
Western	69.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.6

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 31A. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

Adjudication of: Student Social Conduct Problems.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	25.5	1.1	0.2	0.9	5.5	66.7
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	31.3	0.6	0.6	1.3	6.9	59.4
Independent	25.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	3.3	69.6
Catholic	22.4	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.0	73.1
Protestant	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	66.3
Other	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.1	14.3	77.6
Size						
Less than 1,500	26.9	1.9	0.0	0.6	5.0	65.6
1,500 to 5,000	23.3	0.8	0.0	0.8	6.0	69.2
5,000 to 10,000	22.4	0.0	1.3	1.3	7.9	67.1
10,000 and above	29.3	1.2	0.0	1.1	3.7	64.6
Region						
New England	21.8	0.8	0.0	0.8	4.0	72.6
North Central	21.5	1.6	0.0	1.1	6.5	69.4
Southern	34.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	9.1	53.4
Western	32.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.3

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

Statement 31B. CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS SUGGESTED INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY IN DECISIONS PERTAINING TO SIX AREAS.

ADJUDICATION OF: Student Academic Dishonesty Problems.

	Student	Faculty	Admin- istrative	Fac.-Adm. No Stud.	Fac.-Adm. Some Stud.	Fac.- Adm.- Stud.
Per Cent of all Responses	25.5	1.1	0.2	0.9	5.5	66.7
SUB - SAMPLE RESPONSE						
Type						
Public	9.9	0.6	12.5	2.5	13.0	61.5
Independent	18.7	1.1	7.7	5.5	8.8	58.2
Catholic	4.5	1.5	9.0	6.0	20.9	58.2
Protestant	19.3	0.0	6.0	2.4	9.6	62.7
Other	2.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	16.0	70.0
Size						
Less than 1,500	16.3	0.0	7.5	6.9	14.4	55.0
1,500 to 5,000	12.7	1.5	9.0	0.7	11.2	64.9
5,000 to 10,000	3.9	1.3	9.2	6.6	14.5	64.5
10,000 and above	8.5	0.0	13.4	0.0	12.2	65.9
Region						
New England	12.9	1.6	3.0	5.6	8.9	67.7
North Central	6.5	0.0	13.4	4.3	15.6	60.2
Southern	24.7	0.0	9.0	2.2	19.1	44.9
Western	6.1	2.0	8.2	0.0	4.1	79.6

Significant differences among the sub-samples could not be determined due to inadequate cell size on certain items.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102409699