

FACULTY, STUDENT, AND STUDENT PERSONNEL
WORKER PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN THE
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF NORTH CAROLINA

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF PHD
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM PRESTON EMERSON

1971



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Faculty, Student, and Student Personnel Worker Perceptions of Selected Student Personnel Service in the Community Colleges of North Carolina

presented by

William Preston Emerson

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD degree in Education
Department of Administration and
Higher Education

Walter F. Johnson
Major professor

Date April 26, 1971

Q-203
+ 177
g 129
304

V
A 151
12 05

77RLLS
33 12 00

70 11 30

10316

2022

1000000000

000 A 087

APR 25 1990
134 U X

TIME

MAY 10 1990

ABSTRACT

FACULTY, STUDENT, AND STUDENT PERSONNEL WORKER PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF NORTH CAROLINA

By

William Preston Emerson

A study was made to investigate differences in perceptions on the dependent variables (1) perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, (2) personal versus vicarious experience used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and (3) familiarity of selected student personnel services held by faculty, students, and student personnel workers at ten North Carolina community colleges.

A sample of twenty faculty, fifty students, and three student personnel workers was drawn from each college for study.

A survey instrument, consisting of three parts, was developed by the researcher to gather data for the study. Faculty and student personnel worker data were gathered by mail. Student data were gathered through visits to each college.

The principal components solution of the item correlation matrices was employed to determine the factor composition of the instrument. The data for parts A, B and C were found to be univariate for each part. Therefore, total scores rather than factor scores were used in the analyses.

The analyses were made by faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles and by institutions. Statistical tests used to analyze the data were: the multivariate analysis of variance, univariate analysis of variance, and the Tukey and Scheffé post-hoc tests.

Significant differences were revealed between colleges on each of the variables. Faculty rated the effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than did students and student personnel workers. Student and student personnel worker ratings of effectiveness on this variable coincided.

Faculty and students rated their personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than did student personnel workers. Faculty and student ratings did not differ from one another.

Faculty and students rated their familiarity of selected student personnel services significantly lower than did student personnel workers. Faculty and student ratings did not differ from one another.

The development and implementation of comprehensive and continuous professional development programs were recommended.



FACULTY, STUDENT, AND STUDENT PERSONNEL WORKER PERCEPTIONS
OF SELECTED STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN THE
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF NORTH CAROLINA

By

William Preston Emerson

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1971

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses his gratitude to all persons who contributed in any way to the completion of this study. The inspiration, guidance, and counsel of Drs. Walter F. Johnson and W. Harold Grant in directing this research are gratefully acknowledged, as well as the constructive suggestions and encouragement of Drs. Louis C. Stamatakos, Max R. Raines, and Kevin D. Kelly, members of the writer's guidance committee.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Andrew C. Porter for his assistance in preparation of the experimental design and interpretation of the findings. Special acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Howard S. Teitelbaum for assisting with the computer programs.

Appreciation is due Dr. Ben E. Fountain, Jr., President, and members of the Board of Trustees of Lenoir Community College for granting the writer a leave of absence to pursue his graduate studies.

Finally, to his wife, Doris; his daughters, Karen and Deane; and his son, Michael, for their sacrifice, encouragement, and indispensable help, the writer is deeply indebted and affectionately grateful.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview of the Two-Year College	3
Background of the North Carolina Community College System	7
Purpose of the Study	9
The Importance of the Study	11
Limitations of the Study	12
Definition of Terms	12
Organization of the Study	14
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
The Need for Evaluation	15
Studies Relating to Evaluation of Student Personnel Services	19
Summary of Related Research	37
III. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY	39
The Population	39
The Sample	41
Instrumentation	42
Collection of the Data	47
Analysis of the Data	48
Statistical Procedures	50
Summary	51
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	52
The Findings	53
Summary	63
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
Summary	65
Findings	67

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

	Page
Conclusions	70
Implications	72
Recommendations for Further Research	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
APPENDICES	80
APPENDIX A. Related Correspondence and Study Instrument	80
APPENDIX B. Principal Axis Analysis	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	<u>Text</u>	Page
1.	Full-time faculty, students, and student personnel workers, by sex	40
2.	Functions basic to junior college student personnel programs	46
3.	Multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests of means for colleges	54
4.	Differences between college means for part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services	56
5.	Differences between college means for part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate selected student personnel services	57
6.	Differences between college means for part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services	59
7.	Multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests of means for faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles	60
8.	Differences between faculty, student, and student personnel worker role means for part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services	62
9.	Differences between faculty, student, and student personnel worker role means for part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the selected student personnel services	62

LIST OF TABLE (cont'd.)

Table	Page
10. Differences between faculty, student and student personnel worker role means for part C-- familiarity of selected student personnel services	63

Appendix

1. Factor loading matrix for factor 1 of part A-- perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, factor 1 of part B-- personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the selected student personnel services, and factor 1 of part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services . . .	96
---	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The "personnel movement" of the twentieth century came as an answer to some of the most pressing needs both in education and society as a whole. The movement's growth can be attributed for the most part to vast technological, economic, and social changes which commenced at the turn of the century and gradually transformed America into a modern industrial society. The complexities of modern society accelerated the needs of individuals for assistance in training for a great variety of future careers, and in identifying their abilities and aptitudes.

Prior to the twentieth century, the college student pursued a rigid program of study. He attended college to improve his intellect and to gain information and skills. There was little or no concern for personality development, socialization, and training in human relations.

The thrust of the "personnel movement" put emphasis upon the individual student and his all-round development rather than upon training the intellect alone. Williamson offered the following definition of student personnel work:

In current usage, the term "student personnel work" (services) refers both to a program of organized services for students and to a point of view about students. As an organized program, we may identify on every campus

certain services designed to help students solve a problem in logic, develop a study skill, enjoy associations, learn to read rapidly, or organize a charitable drive. In expressing their point of view about students, we hear workers speak of these students in terms of their many-sided developments: physical, moral, scholastic, and social. And we readily identify in the worker's attitude toward each student a respect for individuality and concern for development of the many facets of that individuality.¹

The Committee on College Personnel of the American Council on Education published pamphlets in 1939 and again in 1949 describing student personnel work at the college level. The following statements emphasize the underlying "spirit" of the "personnel point of view," based on three assumptions:

- (1) Individual differences are anticipated, and every student is recognized as unique.
- (2) Each individual is to be treated as a functioning whole.
- (3) The individual's current drives, interests, and needs are to be accepted as the most significant factor in developing a personnel program appropriate for any particular campus.²

Thus, student personnel work is more than a service performed by a special worker. It is any service performed by any adult on campus in the spirit of these assumptions.

For development of well-rounded individuals, colleges and universities require certain general education courses in addition to specialty subjects which make up their major fields of study. Most educators would agree that educational

¹E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 3.

²Kate H. Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 56.

experiences in college are not and should not be confined to the classroom, and informal learning activities constitute a large part of the college education which students are expected to acquire. The extent to which these services are successful depends on the degree to which a student is familiar with the services and his participation in the activities that are provided. As is the case with many of the services or activities provided, these may or may not be selected by the individual student. He can take them or leave them, or be selective in his participation. The influence of these activities and services, nevertheless, pervades the campus and students will be subjected either directly or indirectly to this atmosphere. To carry out the objectives of the community college and meet the many needs of the students, effective student personnel programs are a necessary part of the total structure of the institution.

An Overview of the Two-Year College

The two-year college has emerged as an established element of the American system of education over the past 60 years.³ Although the four-year college can trace its origins to Colonial days, the first two-year college was not established until 1901 in Joliet, Illinois. By 1969 there were some 800 two-year colleges, comprising more than one-third of the institutions of higher learning in the United States. Approximately 500 are public community colleges

³James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), p. 45.

that charge modest fees or none. The remainder are private, many of them charging substantial fees. Approximately 50 new colleges are being established each year, and by 1980 the American Association of Junior Colleges expects there will be more than 1,200 in operation.⁴

Growth in enrollment has been equally dramatic. In 1964 over 1 million students were reported to be attending junior colleges in America, a 14 percent increase over the preceding year.⁵ The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in its newly published report on the future of the two-year college, projected that the current national enrollment of 2 million would double by 1980 and triple by the year 2000.⁶

The public two-year college is the outgrowth of a philosophy of education which believes that:

The American way of life holds that human beings are supreme, hence of equal moral worth and are, therefore, entitled to equal opportunities to develop to their fullest capacities. The basic function of public education then should be to provide educational opportunity by teaching whatever needs to be learned to whomever needs to learn it, whenever he needs to learn it.⁷

According to Blocker et al., for this philosophy to be operational one must assume that there will be unanimity among the

⁴Alvin C. Enrich (ed.), Campus 1980 (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1969), p. 134.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open Door Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1970), p. 34.

⁷Clyde E. Blocker et al., The Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 32.

various individuals and groups in the community. Gleazer enumerated his concept of the ideal community college when he stated:

A good community college will be honestly, gladly, and clearly a community institution. It is in and of the community. The community is used as an extension of the classroom and laboratory. Drawing upon the history, traditions, personnel, problems, assets, and liabilities of the community it declares its role and finds this accepted and understood by faculty, administration, students, and the citizenry.⁸

Blocker et al. further pointed out the lack of unanimity among both professional and lay thinkers as to the validity of the foregoing assumptions.

Numerous statements have been made during the past 40 years concerning the purposes of the community college--statements which support the ideology of an ideal type of educational institution. One such statement of purposes, made by Crawford, makes apparent the comprehensive view of the educational mission of the community college:

It is appropriate for community colleges to provide, for all persons above the twelfth-grade levels, education consistent with the purposes of the individuals and the society of which they are a part, subject only to the restrictions in the state statutes. . . . The educational needs appropriate for community colleges to fulfill at this time include:

(1) The need for programs of liberal arts and science courses, usual to the first and second years of college, which will provide sound general and preprofessional education of such quality that credits may be transferred to a nationally or regionally accredited four-year college or university and applied towards degrees of the baccalaureate level or higher.

(2) The need for vocational and technical programs in the trades, industrial, agricultural, and semiprofessional fields. Such programs may be of long or short duration, depending on the amount of time needed by the student

⁸Ibid., p. 33.

to complete the requirements for entrance into the occupation.

(3) The need for programs of courses for adults and other community college students, for which credit may or may not be given, designed to provide general education and to improve self-government, healthful living, understanding [of] civic and public affairs, avocational growth, constructive use of leisure time, personal and family living satisfactions, cultural depth, and to facilitate occupational advancement.

(4) The need for individual services to students including guidance and counseling, assistance in career selection, removal of deficiencies in preparation for college programs, personality and health improvement.

(5) The need for programs and services for individuals and groups interested in cultural, civic, recreational, and other community betterment projects.⁹

This list of purposes concisely illustrates the uniqueness of the community college and is consistent with the ideal concept as stated by Gleazer.

The student personnel services program in the two-year college consists of a series of related services designed to support the instructional program and to make a contribution to the total development of the student.¹⁰ The two-year college, more than any other institution of higher education, seeks to project a student-centered image by claiming as its primary function a comprehensive attempt to meet the needs of diverse groups of students. According to Blocker et al., the argument that guidance (student personnel work) is more important in the two-year college than in other institutions of higher education has been substantiated by virtue of the widely varying backgrounds of students, the variety and

⁹Ibid., pp. 33-34.

¹⁰Max R. Raines, Junior College Student Personnel Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965), p. 15.

difficulty of decisions which students must make, and the need for nonacademic services that support and give purpose to the efforts of students.¹¹

The two-year college is the only post-high school educational institution that claims the student personnel function as one of its major purposes. According to Matson, the ultimate success or failure of the two-year college movement depends on the extent to which this purpose is implemented.¹²

Background of the North Carolina Community College System

Although the first public junior college in North Carolina was established at Asheville in 1927, it was not until the emergence of public interest in the establishment of community college services in 1950 that steps were initiated to make these educational services available to the people.¹³ In 1952, Dr. Allan S. Hurlburt conducted a study to determine the need for a system of tax-supported community colleges in North Carolina. His recommendations were not implemented until the passage of the "Community College Act" in

¹¹Enrich, p. 239.

¹²Jane E. Matson, "Student Personnel Services in Junior Colleges--A Special Challenge," NASPA, IV, No. 4 (April, 1967), 163.

¹³Kenyon B. Segner, III, "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1966), pp. 1-6.

1957, which placed the public two-year colleges under the direction of the State Board of Higher Education.¹⁴

The 1957 General Assembly also authorized funds to the State Board of Education to establish a system of industrial education centers.¹⁵ Between 1958 and 1962, the industrial education centers operated as part of the public school systems and were administered by local superintendents and boards of education. The program was supervised by the State Department of Public Instruction, according to regulations established by the State Board of Education.¹⁶ Thus, between 1957 and 1963, North Carolina had two parallel post-high school systems of less than four-year grade. These were the public junior colleges and industrial education centers.¹⁷

In 1961, Governor Terry Sanford questioned the feasibility of two post-high school systems operating under different administrative organizations. As a result, the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, appointed by Governor Sanford and chaired by Irvin E. Carlyle, submitted its report in 1962, recommending that the two types

¹⁴Allan S. Hurlburt, Community College Study (Raleigh, North Carolina: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1952), p. 5.

¹⁵Segner, p. 59.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁷Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School (Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Archives and History, 1962), p. 67.

of institutions be brought under the control of the State Board of Education.¹⁸

Based on the recommendations of the Carlyle Commission, the 1963 General Assembly enacted General Statute 115A, which provides the legal framework for the establishment, organization, and administration of the North Carolina Community College System. The State Board of Education was authorized to establish a state-level department to govern this system of institutions.¹⁹

During the period from 1963 to 1968, the State Board of Education approved the establishment of an additional 13 community colleges and 37 technical institutes.²⁰ A total of 54 institutions now comprise the North Carolina Community College System.

Purpose of the Study

Regardless of the philosophy and organizational structure of a student personnel services program, the researcher believes that a service or group of services cannot be effective unless faculty, students, and student personnel workers are aware of and utilize such services. Since evaluation is an essential part of any student personnel services program and is the basis for change in policies for a more effective direction of efforts, a perceptual study of the effectiveness

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 57-66.

¹⁹Progress Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina (Raleigh, North Carolina: Department of Community Colleges, 1969), p. 3.

²⁰Ibid., p. 4.

of selected student personnel services in the community colleges of North Carolina was deemed appropriate.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate differences in perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services that exist between faculty, students, and student personnel workers in the community colleges of North Carolina.

To provide for a better understanding of the findings on the effectiveness variable, data were collected for the same groups on the variables personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate selected student personnel services and on familiarity of selected student personnel services. The data on these variables were examined in the same manner as data collected on the effectiveness variable. Analyses were made between colleges and between roles.

The following major null hypotheses were defined to provide specific focus for the study and to establish empirically testable objectives:

Hypothesis I: There are no differences between colleges on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

Hypothesis II: There are no differences between roles on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The researcher was interested in testing the interaction effect to determine if the results could be

attributable, without qualification, to the treatment effects colleges and roles. Hypothesis III was provided to attain this objective. The interaction effect is the experimental effect created by the combination of treatments--columns and rows--over and above effects associated with treatments--columns and rows--considered separately.

Hypothesis III: There is no college by role interaction on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The Importance of the Study

The findings of this study should have considerable significance for all persons who are concerned with providing the best education for community college students. The findings may serve several purposes. Through an exploration of existing student, faculty, and student personnel workers' perceptions, administrators should acquire some insight into the effectiveness of student personnel services in the community colleges of North Carolina. A university or college's effectiveness is conditioned, in part, by the degree to which faculty members and student personnel workers share common views. This study should clarify some of these views and be helpful in providing the basis for student personnel programs consistent with both institutional and societal expectations. The study should contribute to the general knowledge of community college student personnel programs. Moreover, this study should point out areas of student personnel services where experimentation and research are needed.

Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. The population was limited to students, faculty, and student personnel workers in ten community colleges of North Carolina for the 1969-1970 academic year.
2. The collection of data was restricted to questionnaire responses of students, faculty, and student personnel workers.
3. The study was limited because of the possible biases and personal interests of the respondents and by the fact that perceptions are influenced by one's total environment and thus are undergoing constant change.
4. The study was limited by not knowing how those students, faculty, and student personnel workers selected for study and who did not complete the questionnaire would have responded to the statements.

Definition of Terms

The following is a glossary of terms used in this study.

Community college: refers to a comprehensive public two-year college which offers transfer and occupational curricula, and adult education programs designed to meet the needs of the community. For the purposes of this study, the

term community college is used interchangeably with two-year college and junior college.

Effectiveness of student personnel services: ascertained by asking students, faculty members, and student personnel workers their opinions of the services. The criterion for effectiveness is, therefore, the rating given to the service as it is perceived by the respondent.

Faculty: refers to a person whose principal task is to provide instruction in the academic community.

Perception: refers to the importance attributed to and the conscious opinion and knowledge which the respondent has, regarding the student personnel services; includes both personal experience and secondary information.

Role: refers to a pattern of behavior, structured around specific rights and duties associated with a particular status position within a group or social situation. A person's role is defined by the set of expectations for his behavior held by others and by the person himself. For purposes of this study, faculty, student, and student personnel worker were considered as roles.

Student: refers to a person who is registered for 12 or more term hours of credit courses.

Student personnel services: refers to the college program which assists students, individually and in groups, to take full advantage of the opportunities offered in the academic community. Emphasis is placed upon the personal development of the student so that he may achieve his own

goals and the goals of society as reflected by the particular institution he attends.

Student personnel worker: refers to a person whose principal task is to perform one or more student personnel functions which assist students, individually and in groups, to take full advantage of the opportunities offered in the academic community.

Organization of the Study

The first chapter of this study contains the introduction, the purposes of the study, the hypotheses, the importance of the study, the definition of terms, and the organization of the study. The second chapter provides a review of literature relative to the study. The third chapter contains the population, the sample procedure, the instrumentation, the data collection procedures, and the procedures for analyzing the data. In the fourth chapter the data are analyzed. The fifth chapter contains the summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The survey of related literature was confined to the following areas: (1) studies related to the need for evaluation of student personnel services and (2) studies related to the evaluation of student personnel services.

The Need for Evaluation

A review of the literature in the field of student personnel work revealed general agreement about the merit of research for the development of effective student personnel programs. Lloyd-Jones and Smith pointed out that:

Research and evaluation can assist those in charge of student personnel programs to discover what they have to work with; the type and capacities of students; the result of interacting forces; the type and nature of equipment, space, and other facilities available and needed; trends and emphasis in their personnel efforts and the results of their efforts. Research and evaluation may become the basis for change in policies, for a more effective direction of efforts. Research and evaluation may also become the basis for further needed research and evaluation.¹

Echoing Lloyd-Jones and Smith, Williamson expressed a need for the continuous evaluation of student personnel services:

¹Esther McD. Lloyd-Jones and Margaret R. Smith, A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938), pp. 278-279.

The administrator who supervises must be provided with up-to-date information on all phases of the programs which affect the workers. This calls for a continuous search for identification of what needs to be done to improve services to students.²

In expressing the need for research at the junior college level, Blocker et al. called for a critical appraisal of guidance services:

There is a need for a critical appraisal of the organization and administration of guidance services, the kinds of services which should be provided, the quality and quantity of these services, financial support, qualification of staff members, and responsibilities of the academic faculty for counseling and academic guidance. Such an analysis can provide the framework within which personnel services appropriate to the clients of the college in keeping with its purposes can be provided with expenditures of time, funds, and effort.³

Bogue also expressed the need for a comprehensive evaluation of guidance services.⁴

In a 1960 article written for the Junior College Journal, Klitzke emphasized the need for research at the junior college level and indicated important questions dealing with staff, students and parents, groups, individuals, and lay public that needed to be answered.⁵ He stated that student personnel workers need both increased research opportunities and improved research capabilities.

²E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 121.

³Clyde E. Blocker et al., The Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 239.

⁴Jesse Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), pp. 320-327.

⁵Leon L. Klitzke, "Needed Research in Junior College Student Personnel Services," Junior College Journal, XXX (April, 1960), 452-459.

In spite of the agreement about the merit of evaluation of personnel services, there is little evidence that the need is being met. In 1941 the American College Personnel Association Committee on Research and Publications found that, of 230 papers on various aspects of student personnel work presented at conventions between 1924 and 1940, not one was an evaluation of the total student personnel program.⁶

In 1961, Robinson and Brown reviewed research activities pertaining to students and student personnel programs that were being conducted by 13 agencies and centers for the study of higher education.⁷ They reported that 77 studies were either currently in progress or had been recently concluded. All of these studies were concerned with such matters as student characteristics, attendance, retention, and withdrawals, as well as with other aspects of student personnel programs. No studies were reported that looked at student personnel programs as a whole.

A bibliography of doctoral dissertation studies devoted to the junior and community college listed 45 under the heading "Student Personnel Services" during the period from

⁶Burns B. Crookston, "Student Personnel Work--College and University," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. C. W. Harris (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 1415-1427.

⁷Donald W. Robinson and Derck W. Brown, "A Report on Student and Student Personnel Research Activities," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (December, 1961), 358-360.

1918 to 1963.⁸ Only 10 of these studies looked at the total student personnel services program.

A more up-to-date bibliography of doctoral dissertation studies devoted to the junior and community college listed nine under the heading of "Student Personnel Services" during the period from 1964 to 1966.⁹ Only three of these studies were concerned with the total student personnel services program.

Several explanations have been offered for the paucity of research in this area. Blaesser asserted that the field of student personnel services does not readily lend itself to experimental techniques.¹⁰ Arbuckle indicated that the paucity of accumulated research data in student personnel services could be attributed to the frequent use of the survey method in evaluating the different personnel services.¹¹ Feder expressed a need for the development of new and better research methodology that would provide the foundation for the evaluation of existing practices and the development of new

⁸Franklin Parker and Anne Bailey, The Junior and Community College (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967).

⁹John E. Roueche, A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1964-1966 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967).

¹⁰Willard W. Blaesser, "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Programs in Colleges," Review of Educational Research, XXIV (1954), 113-120.

¹¹Dugald S. Arbuckle, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953), p. 12.

ones in terms of the requirements of a developing field of services.¹²

Studies Relating to Evaluation of Student
Personnel Services

This part of the literature review will summarize research studies that were concerned with the evaluation of student personnel services.

Under the auspices of the American Council on Education, Hopkins conducted one of the earliest surveys of student personnel services programs.¹³ He visited 14 eastern and mid-western universities, spending several days at each institution observing their work, interviewing authorities in the field, and examining available data. He used a list of 20 criteria to appraise five services: recruitment and admissions, health, counseling, placement, and discipline services at each institution. His rating scale for each service was from an "A," for work sufficiently significant to make it worthwhile for other institutions to learn about it, to a "C," for work that was ineffective or not attempted. This study revealed the need for emphasizing better communication and improving coordination of the various educational services in order to build up a strong, effective personnel program.

¹²Daniel D. Feder, "Personnel Work in Education as Related to Change," Personnel Services in Education, Part II, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 269.

¹³L. B. Hopkins, "Personnel Procedures in Education," The Educational Record, VII, Suppl. No. 3 (October, 1926), 46.

A point scale evaluation form was designed by Brumbaugh and Smith to evaluate the services of educational counseling, admissions and orientation, personal problems, records, personal organization, health and recreation, vocational counseling, diagnosis and remedial treatment, student placement, and extracurricular activities.¹⁴ The evaluation form was sent to 50 experts engaged in the field of student personnel work at various colleges and universities in the United States with instructions to distribute the thousand points allotted to the entire project among the 10 major divisions in proportion to the relative weight they should attach to each division. On the basis of the above procedure, the scale was revised and used by the experts in evaluating the personnel work in their own institutions. Brumbaugh and Smith pointed out that responses from college administrators and personnel workers indicated that the scale was useful in analyzing personnel problems.

In 1929, Gardner evaluated student personnel services in 57 institutions of the North Central Association.¹⁵ He visited these institutions and collected data from the administrative staff and students with the aim of discovering the relationship between provisions for student personnel services and academic excellence in these institutions. Three

¹⁴A. J. Brumbaugh and L. C. Smith, "A Point Scale for Evaluating Personnel Work in Institutions of Higher Learning," Religious Education, XXVII (1932), 230-235.

¹⁵Donfred H. Gardner, Student Personnel Services (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936).

criteria were used for evaluation:

1. The reports and opinions of recognized experts.
2. Judgment of four different members of the research staff.
3. The total score of each institution.

Gardner concluded that the score cards that had been developed for evaluating institutional programs of student personnel service did discriminate between institutions of different levels of excellence.

In 1951, Rackham constructed a Student Personnel Services Inventory for 15 student personnel activities, which included a rating scale with weighted indexes and a theoretical or "ideal" profile with which an institution could compare its own ratings.¹⁶ A tentative list of criteria was developed for 381 colleges. From this completed list of criteria, a 225-item rating scale was constructed covering 15 recognized areas of student personnel work. The rating scale was submitted to 10 national leaders in college personnel work who were asked to weight the relative importance of each item and its subparts in relation to the total personnel program. The combined ratings of the 10 judges were used to assign weighted values to each item and to each area. From his findings, Rackham reached the following conclusions about student personnel services programs:

¹⁶Eric N. Rackham, "The Need for Adequate Criteria When Evaluating College Student Personnel Programs," Educational and Psychology Measurements, II, No. 4 (Winter, 1951), 691-699.

1. The student personnel services programs should be an integral part of the total educational program of the institution which it serves.
2. A student personnel services program should be judged as a whole and not simply as the sum of its separate parts.
3. Since change is a universal law, any adequate program will possess a flexibility which permits it to adapt itself to varying problems and objectives.
4. Personnel programs may differ from each other noticeably.
5. The effectiveness of any student personnel services program must in the last analysis rest upon scientific evidence and concrete facts rather than upon untried assumptions and unsupported personal opinions.¹⁷

In 1958 the Committee on the Administration of Student Personnel Work, appointed by the American Council on Education, listed the following services as functions of student personnel work:

- Selection of students for admission
- Registration and records
- Counseling
- Health services
- Housing and food services
- Student activities
- Financial aid to students
- Placement
- Discipline
- Special clinics for remedial reading, study habits, speech, and hearing
- Special services, such as student orientation and veteran affairs
- Advisory service
- Foreign student programs
- Marriage counseling
- Religious activities and counseling.¹⁸

In 1965, Raines, under the auspices of the American Association of Junior Colleges, conducted a nationwide study

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 698-699.

¹⁸Thomas Blackwell, College and University Administration (New York: The Center for Applied Education, Inc., 1966), pp. 58-59.

to elevate junior college student personnel programs.¹⁹ In the study, 100 smaller colleges and 50 larger colleges were selected randomly and proportionately from 7 regions.

Seventy-four smaller and 49 larger junior colleges actually participated in the study. More than 500 staff members in the 123 participating colleges completed the Inventory of Selected College Functions (SCF) and Inventory of Staff Resources (ISR). In addition, all of the larger colleges and 21 of the small colleges were visited by student personnel experts. Twelve student personnel experts in junior college education were brought together to develop a basic frame of reference from which to make clinical judgments. By majority consensus the following 21 basic functions were selected for intensive analysis and constitute the basic student personnel program:

- Precollege information
- Student induction
- Group orientation
- Career information
- Personnel records
- Educational testing
- Applicant appraisal
- Student counseling
- Student advisement
- Applicant counseling
- Co-curricular activities
- Student self-government
- Student registration
- Academic regulation
- Social regulation
- Financial aids
- Graduate placement
- Program articulation

¹⁹Max R. Raines, Junior College Student Personnel Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965), pp. 13-22.

In-service education
Program evaluation
Administrative organization,²⁰

Raines regarded a total program as satisfactory if at least two-thirds of the 21 basic functions were being satisfactorily implemented. Nevertheless, he found that not a single institution was judged to have implemented all of the 21 basic functions at a satisfactory level. Programs ranged from 19 satisfactory implementations to 15 unsatisfactory. The median was 10 satisfactory, 6 unsatisfactory, and 5 in between. Only 25 percent of the larger colleges qualified as satisfactory. Informal analysis of data from smaller colleges suggested an even lower percentage were performing satisfactorily.

Raines also found that adequate guidance and counseling were provided in less than 50 percent of the colleges. Of the five functions directly pertaining to counseling and guidance of students, only one student advisement was satisfactory in more than 50 percent of the colleges. Moreover, Raines ascertained that almost none of the junior colleges were effectively providing career information and that coordinative, evaluative, and up-grading functions were the least effectively provided of all functions. These functions were not adequately provided in at least 9 out of 10 of the junior colleges.

Fitzgerald sought to determine faculty perceptions of student personnel services in a 1959 study at Michigan State

²⁰Ibid., p. 22.

University.²¹ Mailed questionnaires were used to provide the opportunity for selected faculty members to indicate a rating of importance for higher education for each of 40 statements of function of student personnel services. In addition, the respondents were asked to indicate their opinion of the quality of performance of the functions on the local campus. The "Student Personnel Services Questionnaire" was administered to a random sampling of faculty members with instructional responsibilities. Their responses were tabulated for the functional area, as well as by each specific statement of function.

Response data were presented according to grouped statements of function: admissions, registration, and records functions; counseling service functions; health service functions; student activities functions; financial aid and placement functions; disciplinary functions; special clinics; and special services functions.

Faculty responses to the questionnaire indicated that student personnel services were recognized as having importance for the achievement of the philosophy and purposes of higher education, but the degree of importance accorded these functions was, to some extent, dependent upon the nature of the service. Highest perceptions of importance tended to be placed on those functions relating most directly with the academic purposes of the institution. Of less importance

²¹Laurine E. Fitzgerald, "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959).

were those functions which facilitated student life activities while the individual was engaged in academic pursuits; and of least importance were the student personnel functions which dealt only indirectly with the student in an academic setting.

Chi-square analysis revealed significantly different responses given by faculty members who indicated that they worked closely with student organizations and faculty members who did not. Faculty with a close working relationship tended to view the student personnel functions as more important for higher education and better achieved on the local campus than the faculty members who did not work closely with student organizations.

Rankin,²² Ross,²³ and Tante²⁴ used Fitzgerald's questionnaire in their studies of college student personnel programs. Ross recommended greater involvement of the faculty in student personnel programs and improvement of communications among administrators, faculty, and student personnel workers.

²²Gary E. Rankin, "Graduating Seniors, Perceptions of the Student Personnel Services at Colorado State University" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, 1967).

²³Margaret A. Ross, "Administration, Faculty, and Student Personnel Workers' Evaluation of Student Personnel Functions" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, 1967).

²⁴James Tante, "How Faculty, Student Personnel Workers, and Students Perceive Student Personnel Services at the University of Denver" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1964).

Zimmerman used a revised form of Fitzgerald's instrument for his 1963 study of student perceptions of student personnel services at Michigan State University.²⁵ He ascertained that the students of the sample were least satisfied with the area of student conduct and most satisfied with placement service.

In 1959, Arbuckle and Kauffman sent inquiry forms to 288 traditional four-year liberal arts colleges.²⁶ Of the total number, 186 or 84 percent replied. Six areas were studied: orientation, housing, health services, financial aid programs, counseling (academic, vocational, and personal), and self-government activities. The findings of this study indicated that the modern liberal arts college was by no means unaware of the role of student personnel services in higher education. All colleges offered some form of most of these services. The colleges reported that although they gave most attention to housing and health, they were quite heavily committed to vocational services. Arbuckle and Kauffman concluded that (1) these colleges were not so anti-vocational as is sometimes assumed, and (2) counseling was the service that was least effectively provided and concerning which a need for improvement was most often expressed.

²⁵Elwyn E. Zimmerman, "Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Michigan State University" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963).

²⁶Dugald S. Arbuckle and Joseph F. Kauffman, "Student Personnel Services in Liberal Arts Colleges," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (December, 1959), 296-299.

In a sampling of 16 small liberal arts colleges in the North Central Association area made in 1959, Scott compared personnel services, principles, and practices.²⁷ He found that although the principles of student personnel work were comparable in small and large institutions, the method of implementing the principles varied widely. Scott suggested that small colleges think seriously about the methods that they use and about the ways in which the services are coordinated with each other and with other areas of the institutions. It should not be assumed that the system of services for students will automatically be well coordinated just because a college is small.

In 1961, Beckers attempted to evaluate the student personnel program on the undergraduate level at the Auburn University School of Education.²⁸ Five basic steps were taken to achieve this purpose:

1. The role of student personnel programs in teacher education was defined as a background from which appropriate criteria were derived for appraising student personnel policies and practices.
2. Major elements of the student personnel program in the School of Education were described and analyzed.

²⁷William L. Scott, "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Small Liberal Arts Colleges" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959).

²⁸Wilmer H. Beckers, "An Evaluation of the Student Personnel Program at the Auburn University School of Education" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1961).

3. Student and faculty reactions to the student personnel services were obtained.
4. The student personnel program was evaluated in terms of the criteria derived in the initial step.
5. Recommendations were made on the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study.

Data for the investigation were obtained from observations of the student personnel program, from interviews with student personnel staff members, from questionnaires completed by student and faculty members, and from pertinent faculty reports.

Beckers concluded the following from his evaluation of the program:

1. The faculty respondents, in theory, accepted in all or most respects a point of view consistent with democratic values for the institution as a whole. This point of view, however, had not carried over completely to the student personnel program.
2. There was a lack of agreement among the faculty respondents about what the overall purpose of the student personnel program was and what its relationship should be to the teacher preparation program.
3. There was general agreement among the majority of the faculty respondents with respect to the objectives of the individual student personnel service areas.

4. The student personnel program was well supported by administrative leadership, but was lacking in overall coordination.
5. The availability of student personnel services had been inadequately communicated both to the students as a group and to some faculty members from two departments.
6. The student personnel services generally were inadequate in meeting students' needs.
7. The faculty group that generally had a more favorable opinion of the student personnel program was better acquainted with the student personnel services than was the student group.

The student personnel program at Clark College was studied by Brantley in 1960.²⁹ He attempted to investigate intensively Clark's student personnel program; the objectives of its educational program; and the social environments, vocational interests, and problems of Clark College students, and from the findings to make recommendations for the development of the student personnel program.

Brantley assumed that in those instances in which the programs were understood, historically and contemporarily, and in which the environments, interests, and problems of the students were known, an adequate student personnel program could be planned; bases for future research and evaluation

²⁹Edward J. Brantley, "A Study of the Student Personnel Program at Clark College" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1960).

could be provided; and information useful to similar institutions could be made available.

Two of Brantley's recommendations were:

1. That a student personnel worker should understand before his employment any difference that exists between the philosophy of the college and his own educational philosophy.
2. That the administration of the college should clarify for the faculty and the staff the extent to which each personnel service is essential to the total program of the institution.

Badger made a study of the University of Southern Mississippi in 1967 to determine the typical appraisal of experts as to the ideal nature of the major functions of student personnel services, the ideal nature of the major areas of student life to which the services were pertinent, the relative value of each function to each area, and the relative importance of each area to each other area.³⁰ Badger identified three areas of student living that should be affected by student personnel services: social, personal, and educational. Fourteen functions of the services were identified as those that should be affecting the three areas of student living. These 14 functions were: preadmission counseling, admissions, orientation, records, health, housing, food, activities, counseling, discipline, financial

³⁰Herbert L. Badger, Jr., "Evaluating Student Personnel Services" (unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, 1967).

assistance, information and placement, instruction meets student needs, and evaluation. Badger proposed an outline for a program to evaluate the complete student personnel services program through a continued evaluation for each of the 14 functions. The results would be incorporated into one annual evaluation that would be directly comparable with similar evaluations conducted at other institutions.

In 1968, M. W. Johnson at Colorado State College made a comparison of the perceptions of student personnel services between the instructional staff and student personnel workers.³¹ Additional comparisons were made between tenured and nontenured staff, among school or division affiliations, and among the four faculty ranks.

The major purpose of Johnson's study was to gather perceptions from full-time instructional staff and student personnel workers that could be used in evaluating student personnel services on the Colorado State College campus. A secondary purpose was to discover if these same perceptions differed significantly when grouped on the basis of tenure and nontenure, school or division affiliation, and the four faculty ranks. The four perceptions selected were: importance of service, awareness of the existence of the service, effectiveness of the service, and location of the service. The eight areas of student personnel services were: admissions, registration, and records; counseling services;

³¹Michael W. Johnson, "Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, 1968).

health services; housing and food services; student activities; financial aid and placement; student conduct; and special services.

The four hypotheses Johnson sought to test were to determine any significant differences in the four perceptions of student personnel services (1) between student personnel workers, both professional and subprofessional, and full-time instructional staff; (2) between tenured and nontenured staff; (3) among the eight schools or divisions at Colorado State College; and (4) among instructional staff classified by faculty rank.

Johnson utilized the questionnaire method to gather information about the variables under study. The questionnaire consisted of 40 statements related to the functions and responsibilities of student personnel services on the Colorado State campus. For each of the 40 statements, 4 questions were asked regarding respondents' perceptions of importance, awareness, effectiveness, and location of the service.

The analysis of the data was completed by an IBM 1130 computer at the Colorado State computer center. Results were obtained in the form of chi-squares, percentages, and frequency distributions. Chi-square goodness of fit tests were applied to the original tests showing significant differences for the purpose of determining where and in what direction they were significant. The percentages and frequencies aided in determining the direction.

From the findings of the study, Johnson concluded:

1. There was less difference in the perceptions of the importance of student personnel services between instructional staff and personnel workers than was generally thought.
2. Staff members were largely aware of the existence of those student personnel services administered on their campus.
3. There was an unwillingness or inability on the part of staff members to judge the effectiveness of the personnel services offered.
4. Staff members showed a tendency to require more information as to the campus location of the various personnel services.

T. B. Johnson in 1968 sought to determine faculty, student personnel administrator, and student perceptions of selected student personnel services in his study of nine Illinois four-year colleges and seven junior colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.³² A mailed questionnaire provided respondents an opportunity to rate the effectiveness of 45 specific student personnel services on a five-point scale (1 = very effective to 5 = very ineffective). The survey instrument focused on nine student personnel services: admissions and orientation, counseling services, faculty advisement, activities program,

³²Thomas B. Johnson, "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Selected Illinois Four-Year Colleges and Junior Colleges" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1968).

housing, residential counseling program, fraternities and sororities, placement services, and financial aid and scholarships.

An analysis of the findings of Johnson's study revealed that admissions and orientation programs generally were regarded as effective by all groups surveyed. From 39 percent to 45 percent of all groups reported that specific remedial courses were not available.

The advisement function was accorded a rating of neither effective nor ineffective by both students and personnel administrators. Faculty judgments of advisement were more favorable and in sharp contrast to the rating by junior college students, which approached the ineffective category.

The availability of counseling on personal and social problems received ratings of slightly less than effective. Religious counseling was regarded as generally effective by all groups, but counseling for married and foreign students received lower ratings. Sixty percent of the four-year college students reported that counseling for married students was unavailable.

The availability of a student center to provide for student social and recreational needs received low ratings from junior college students and off-campus students. Student personnel deans evaluated this service much higher. Sixty-seven percent of the junior college students reported that fraternities were not available.

The vast majority of the junior college students commuted. The effectiveness of a residence counseling staff

received average ratings of 2.840 from resident students and 2.823 from all four-year college students. Personnel deans rated this service as effective (2.063).

The development of student government and social-cultural problems in the residence halls and Greek-letter organizations was judged neither effective nor ineffective.

Locating of off-campus housing was assigned lowest mean scores by Greek-letter societies (3.278), students living off-campus (3.200), and upperclassmen.

Placement services and financial aid received ratings of effective from all groups, while the junior college students provided a lower evaluation, and a substantial percentage indicated that they were uninformed about the service.

Student participation to determine institutional policies which directly affect them was accorded a middle rating by junior college students (3.096) and an effective rating by student personnel administrators (2.147).

In a 1968 study at Michigan State University, Peterson analyzed the perceptions held by student personnel administrators, faculty members, and students of student personnel programs in the senior colleges of the American Lutheran Church.³³ An instrument developed by Raines, the "Inventory of Selected College Functions," was used to gather data for the study. Peterson found differences in perceptions held by student personnel administrators, faculty members,

³³Glen Peterson, "A Study of Student Personnel Programs of the Eleven Senior Colleges of the American Lutheran Church" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1968).

and students with respect to scope and quality of some studied personnel service in each of the 11 colleges surveyed.

Summary of Related Research

The reviewed literature pertaining to student personnel services was confined to two areas: studies related to the need for evaluation of student personnel services and studies related to the evaluation of student personnel services.

There was general agreement about the merit of research for the development of effective student personnel services programs in the studies reviewed; and, at the same time, little evidence that the need was being effectively met. Although the research activities were numerous, they more often dealt with aspects of students and student personnel services programs than the student personnel services program as a whole.

Blaesser, Arbuckle, and Feder agreed that there was a great need for better research methodology in terms of the requirements of a developing field of services.

Difficulties related to the evaluation of student personnel services were similar in most of the reviewed literature. Basically, these were:

1. Differences in agreement as to what personnel services should be.
2. Differences in opinion of effectiveness among students, faculty, and administrators.

3. Difficulties in finding accurate evaluation methods.

It was evident from the review of literature that faculty and administration had become more cognizant of the importance of an adequate student personnel services program. It was obvious that there should be better communication and improved coordination of various educational services in order to build a stronger more effective student personnel services program.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a description of the population surveyed, the instrument used in collecting the data, and the procedures followed in collecting and analyzing the data.

The Population

The population for this study consisted of faculty, students, and student personnel workers at 10 community colleges affiliated with the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges during the 1969-70 academic year. The colleges, their locations, and the number and percentage of full-time faculty, students, and student personnel workers are presented in Table 1.

Data relative to enrollment by sex revealed that the faculty group consisted of 363 or 68.3 percent male; 169 or 31.7 percent female. The student group consisted of 6,583 or 64.2 percent male; 3,677 or 35.8 percent female. Furthermore, the student personnel worker group consisted of 27 or 64.3 percent male; 15 or 35.7 percent female.

Every community college in this study offered both transfer and occupational programs. Of 10,260 full-time students, 4,719 or 46 percent were enrolled in occupational programs; 5,541 or 54 percent were enrolled in transfer programs.

Table 1. Full-time faculty, students, and student personnel workers, by sex

College and location	Faculty				Students				Student personnel workers			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
College of the Albemarle,	24	6.3	11	6.5	456	6.0	281	7.6	1	3.7	2	13.3
Elizabeth City												
Davidson County Community	33	9.1	11	6.5	705	10.7	236	6.4	2	7.4	3	20.0
College, Lexington												
Gaston College,	61	16.8	18	10.7	1124	17.1	502	13.7	5	18.5	1	6.7
Dallas												
Isothermal Community	24	6.6	7	4.1	309	4.1	184	5.0	3	11.1	0	0.0
College, Spindale												
Lenoir Community College,	41	11.3	24	14.2	875	13.3	498	13.5	3	11.1	2	13.3
Kinston												
Rockingham Community	42	11.6	16	9.5	660	10.0	374	10.2	3	11.1	2	13.3
College, Wentworth												
Sandhills Community College,	42	11.6	24	14.2	701	10.6	370	10.1	1	3.7	2	13.3
Southern Pines												
Southeastern Community	29	7.1	19	11.2	537	8.2	569	15.5	3	11.1	1	6.7
College, Whiteville												
Surry Community College,	29	7.1	12	7.1	483	7.3	317	8.6	2	7.4	1	6.7
Dobson												
Wayne Community College,	39	10.7	27	15.1	733	11.1	346	9.4	4	14.8	1	6.7
Goldboro												
Total	363	99.2	169	99.1	6583	99.0	3677	99.6	27	99.9	15	99.9
Male and female, %	68.3		31.7		64.2		35.8		64.3		35.7	

The Sample

In planning this study, the researcher decided to select 20 faculty, 50 students, and 3 student personnel workers from each of the 10 colleges for analysis. The total sample was comprised of 200 faculty, 500 students, and 30 student personnel workers.

Downie and Heath's "Tables of Random Numbers" were used to draw a random sample of subjects from each college for study.¹ Subjects were drawn from alphabetized faculty, student, and student personnel worker directories after a different number was assigned to each name. The "Tables of Random Numbers" were entered at random and the subjects were drawn by reading up and down the tables in a consistent manner.

A pool of subjects approximately 30 percent larger than required for analysis was selected to obtain the number of subjects preselected for study. Of 800 students selected, 529 or 66 percent completed the instrument. Two hundred and seventy faculty members were sent instruments; 208 or 77 percent completed the instrument. Thirty-six student personnel workers were sent instruments; 34 or 95 percent completed the instrument. Four colleges employed only three student personnel workers; consequently, all subjects were drawn for the study. The remainder of the student personnel workers were selected by the random sampling process.

¹N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965).

When more instruments were returned than the researcher had preselected for study, a different number was assigned to each instrument and the random sampling process again was used to draw subjects for study. This procedure was to ensure that each subject in the population had an equal opportunity for inclusion in the study.

This study did not include the technical institutes or the private junior colleges of this state.

Instrumentation

The research instrument, entitled "Evaluation of Selected College Services" (Appendix A), was developed to elicit respondents' perceptions of selected student personnel services. The instrument contained 65 descriptive statements of functional operations.

The basic statements for the instrument were obtained from an unpublished instrument entitled "Inventory of Selected Colleges Services," developed by Dr. Max R. Raines, Professor of Higher Education and Administration at Michigan State University. The Raines instrument, which contained 38 descriptive statements encompassing several functions each, was designed for use as a survey instrument and also as a departure point for interviews with respondents. The researcher separated, according to function, several of the original statements contained in the Raines instrument into two or more statements to clarify the interpretation of responses to items. Five complementary statements of interest were added to the instrument.

An appraisal team, headed by Raines, used his instrument in an appraisal of the student personnel program at William Rainey Harper College in May, 1969.² Troesher modified the Raines instrument for her study of student personnel services at Rock Valley College in 1969.³ A modified form of the instrument was used by the Student Personnel Division of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges in a 1969 evaluation of student personnel work.⁴

For each statement contained in this researcher's instrument, the following questions were asked:

- A. Based on your experiences and the experiences of your friends (vicarious experiences), how effective is each listed service as offered at this college?
- B. How much of your evaluation of effectiveness is based on personal or vicarious experiences?
- C. How familiar are you with each listed service?

Questions A, B, and C are hereinafter referred to as parts A, B, and C.

²Unpublished report, "Appraisal of the Student Program at William Rainey Harper College" (May, 1969). The Appraisal Team included: Dr. Max Raines, Chairman, Michigan State University; Dr. James Nelson, Waubesa Community College; and Dr. Marie Prael, Michigan State University.

³Carol M. Troescher, "A Descriptive Study of the Perceptions Held by Students, Faculty, and Student Personnel Administrators of Student Personnel Services at Rock Valley College" (unpublished EdD dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1969).

⁴Edward Kuhl, A Second Look at Student Personnel Work in the Maryland Junior Colleges (Baltimore: Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

Respondents were provided an opportunity to rate the effectiveness of a service on the following six-point scale:

- 5 = very effective: a service was considered very effective if it was successful 85 percent of the time.
- 4 = moderately effective: a service was considered moderately effective if it was successful from 65 percent to 84 percent of the time.
- 3 = somewhat effective: a service was considered somewhat effective if it was successful from 45 percent to 64 percent of the time.
- 2 = moderately ineffective: a service was moderately ineffective if it was successful from 25 percent to 44 percent of the time.
- 1 = very ineffective: a service was considered very ineffective if it was successful below 25 percent of the time.
- 0 = service not offered: a service that was not offered at the college.

Respondents were asked to indicate how much of their evaluation of effectiveness was based on personal or vicarious experiences on the following five-point scale: 5 = all personal, 4 = mostly personal; 3 = about the same, 2 = mostly vicarious, and 1 = all vicarious.

Respondents were asked to rate their familiarity with each service on the following five-point scale:

- 5 = very familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing thorough knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 4 = moderately familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing extensive knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 3 = somewhat familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing some knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 2 = vaguely familiar--aware of the service but possessing limited knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 1 = not familiar--aware of the service but possessing no knowledge or understanding of its function.

Raines indicated that the statements in his instrument focused on 21 functions basic to any junior college's student personnel program. In his report to the Carnegie Corporation in November, 1965, Raines stated that there were many ways to organize these basic functions into structurally sound units. For purposes of the Carnegie Report, the 21 functions were organized into 5 administrative units.⁵ An additional unit on health was included by the investigator to evaluate health appraisal and health clinical functions (Table 2).

⁵Max R. Raines, Junior College Student Personnel Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965).

Table 2. Functions basic to junior college student personnel programs

Administrative unit	Function
Admissions, Registration, and Records	Precollege information, personnel records, applicant appraisal, student registration, educational testing, and academic regulation.
Placement and Financial Aids	Financial aid and graduate placement.
Student Activities	Student self-government, co-curricular activity, social regulatory, and student inductive.
Guidance and Counseling	Applicant consulting, student advisement, group orienting, student counseling, and career information.
Central Administration	Program articulation, in-service education, program evaluation, and administrative organization.
Health	Health appraisal and health clinical.

A draft of the instrument was prepared and administered in the presence of the investigator to 15 faculty, students, and student personnel workers at Onslow Technical Institute, Jacksonville, North Carolina, in November, 1969. Suggestions to improve clarity of wording and format led to a revision of the instrument. The final form of the instrument was developed after it was administered to a similar group at Lenoir Community College, Kinston, North Carolina, in December, 1969.

Collection of the Data

Permission to conduct the study was granted by Dr. I. E. Ready, Director, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. In a memorandum to community college presidents, dated December 8, 1969, Dr. Ready expressed confidence that the study would be helpful, and solicited their cooperation with the investigator (Appendix A).

The President of each college agreed for the researcher to collect data for the study. The Dean of Student Affairs at each college agreed to act as project director at his respective college. Prior commitments, however, prevented three student personnel deans from rendering direct assistance; consequently, Central Piedmont Community College, Western Piedmont Community College, and Wilkes Community College were not included in the study as was originally planned.

Early in January, 1970, each Dean of Student Affairs was asked to forward to the researcher a roster of faculty, students, and student personnel workers and to indicate a convenient date for the researcher to visit his campus to administer the instrument to the students. Three weeks prior to the visit to each campus, a research instrument with a cover letter and return envelope for each faculty member and student personnel worker in the sample was mailed to the respective deans of student affairs, with instructions to place the material in the appropriate campus mailboxes (Appendix A). A follow-up letter was sent to each faculty member and student personnel worker who had not responded within two weeks.

Two weeks prior to the researcher's visit to a college, students were sent a letter soliciting their assistance and informing them of arrangements for the researcher's visit. A student who did not complete the instrument while the researcher was on campus was informed by letter to secure an instrument from the Student Affairs Office. An instrument, a cover letter, and a return envelope were mailed to any student who had not secured an instrument from the Student Affairs Office within one week after the campus visit. Copies of this correspondence appear in Appendix A.

The Dean of Student Affairs at each college assisted with the follow-up procedures. Data collection for the study, which began on January 15, 1970, was completed on April 15, 1970.

Analysis of the Data

The respondents' scores on the instrument were coded and keypunched onto data cards so that the data could be processed and analyzed on the CDC 3600 computer at Michigan State University. Each instrument required three data cards of 71 columns each to include all of the data received. Each data card repeated the first six columns of identifying data and included college, role within college, and location of respondent within the sample.

The principal components solution of the item inter-correlation matrices was employed to determine the factor composition of the instrument. Faculty, student, and student personnel worker scores were combined to determine those

factors common to all groups. The eigenvalue threshold levels for part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate a service, and part C--familiarity with a service were set at 1.00, and analyses were conducted to determine those values higher than the specified level. For part A, factors 1 through 15 were positive and higher than the threshold level; factors 16 through 65 were either negative or lower than the specified level. For part B, factors 1 through 15 were positive or greater than the threshold level; factors 16 through 65 were either negative or lower than the specified level. For part C, factors 1 through 14 were positive and higher than the threshold level; factors 15 through 65 were either negative or lower than the specified level (Appendix B).

In principal component analysis, it is common practice to evaluate only the first few, say k , eigenvalues and vectors, especially if the number of observed variates is fairly large. The process may reasonably be stopped when the components already found account for a sufficiently high proportion of the total variance.⁶ Inspection of the eigenvalues revealed that the first eigenvalue for part A, 13.6; part B, 15.1; and part C, 16.4, accounted for a high proportion of the total variance.

⁶A. E. Maxwell and D. N. Lawley, Factor Analysis as a Statistical Method (London: Butterworth, 1963), pp. 50-51.

Inspection of the factor loading matrices for the first factors in parts A, B, and C revealed factor loadings of between .300 and .600, all positive, indicating for these data that all items contributed approximately equal to a single factor or that the data were univariate for each part. Therefore, total scores rather than factor scores were used for the analysis (Appendix B).

Statistical Procedures

The multivariate technique for analysis of variance was employed to test the hypotheses of interest. This technique was employed in order to test the dependent variables simultaneously. The alpha level selected for each experiment was $\alpha = .05$.

Univariate analysis of variance tests were used to investigate differences disclosed by the multivariate procedures. Since there was a lack of independence between the univariate tests, the computed probability values represented an underestimate of the true probability. To assure that the alpha level did not exceed the original value specified for each experiment, each univariate test was tested at α/K , when K equaled the number of univariate tests. Therefore, the test alpha level used for each univariate experiment was $.05/3 = .0167$.

Differences between colleges disclosed by the univariate analysis of variance tests were investigated with Tukey post-hoc procedures. Since the faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles contained unequal sample sizes,

Scheffé post-hoc procedures were used to determine differences between roles. Again, the error rate was partitioned to have an experiment-wise error rate of $\alpha = .05$. The test alpha level for each post-hoc test was set at $\alpha = .0167$.

Summary

The population for the study consisted of faculty, students, and student personnel workers at 10 North Carolina community colleges. Random sampling procedures were employed to select a sample of 20 faculty, 50 students, and 3 student personnel workers from each college for analysis.

A questionnaire instrument, entitled "Evaluation of Selected College Services," was developed by the researcher and used to gather data for the study. Student data were collected by campus visitation. Faculty and student personnel worker data were collected by mailed questionnaire. The data were keypunched onto data cards and the analysis was made on a CDC 3600 computer at Michigan State University.

The principal components solution of the item inter-correlation matrices procedures was used to factor analyze the instrument. The researcher found that the data for parts A, B, and C were univariate. Therefore, total scores, rather than factor scores, were used for analysis.

The hypotheses were tested using the multivariate technique for analysis of variance, employing the .05 level of significance. Univariate analysis of variance tests were used to investigate differences disclosed by the multivariate procedures. Post-hoc procedures were utilized to investigate differences disclosed by the univariate procedures.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This chapter is devoted to an analysis of the data in order to confirm or to reject the hypotheses which provided the focus for the study. The multivariate technique for analysis of variance was employed to test the hypotheses of interest. When a significant difference was disclosed by the multivariate technique, univariate analysis of variance tests were employed to investigate each variable--parts A, B, and C--contained within the hypothesis in order to determine which of the dependent variables contributed to the overall difference between the independent variables.

Post-hoc procedures were employed to investigate significant differences disclosed by the univariate tests in order to determine whether there were significant differences between specific levels of the independent variables. Differences between colleges disclosed by the univariate tests were investigated using Tukey post-hoc procedures. Since the faculty, student, and student personnel worker role groups contained unequal sample sizes, Scheffé post-hoc procedures were used to investigate differences between roles.

Computed probability values were obtained for the multivariate and univariate analysis of variance experiments.

The null hypotheses were rejected when the computed probability values were less than the specified alpha level.

The Findings

The hypotheses in this section are stated in the null form and presented in the order in which they appear in Chapter I. It should be kept in mind that each college cell mean was determined by weighting the scores according to the number in each role group, then dividing this figure by the total N. Each faculty, student, and student personnel worker role cell mean was determined by adding the role scores and dividing by the total N.

Hypothesis I states that there are no differences between colleges on the variables perceived effectiveness of student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

A summary of the multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests for hypothesis I appears in Table 3, which shows that the computed probability value of .0001 for the multivariate analysis of variance test for colleges was less than the alpha level of .05 specified for the experiment. Consequently, null hypothesis I was rejected.

Since a significant difference was disclosed by the multivariate analysis of variance experiment, the researcher proceeded with univariate analysis of variance tests on the variables part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student

Table 3. Multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests of means for colleges

College	College cell means ^a		
	Part A	Part B	Part C
I	195.17	197.84	195.93
II	202.73	209.41	202.82
III	210.26	208.93	202.80
IV	191.67	209.86	210.53
V	208.76	211.06	211.67
VI	212.47	212.75	218.30
VII	193.45	193.15	190.30
VIII	203.72	216.47	213.78
IX	221.71	211.35	214.75
X	178.28	206.03	208.10

Multivariate test

F-ratio = 4.27

df = 27 and 2039.16

P-value = .0001

Univariate tests

Source of variance	df	Between MS	Univariate F-value	P-value
Part A	9	11853	7.50	.0001
Part B	9	3645	3.00	.0017
Part C	9	5688	4.22	.0001

df for hypothesis = 9

df for error = 700

^aPart A = perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services; part B = personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services; part C = familiarity of selected student personnel services.

personnel services, part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services to determine more precisely which of

the dependent variables contributed to the overall difference between the independent variables.

The computed probability values of .0001 on the univariate test for colleges on part A, of .0017 on part B, and of .0001 on part C were less than the alpha level of .0167 specified for the test. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for all three parts.

The overall alpha level for the univariate analysis of variance experiment did not exceed the .05 level.

Since a significant difference was disclosed by the univariate analysis of variance experiment for parts A, B, and C, the researcher employed post-hoc comparisons between college means to compare specific levels of the college factor. The Tukey post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining differences between pairs of college means for part A. The critical value was found to be 11.19. Table 4 illustrates the difference between each set of means and denotes which are greater than the critical value. Analysis of the data for part A revealed 26 pair-wise differences. The tenth college in the study scored significantly lower than all other colleges, while college IX scored significantly higher than all colleges but college VI.

When the Tukey post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining differences between pairs of college means for part B, the critical value was found to be 9.83. Table 5 illustrates the difference

Table 4. Differences between college means for part A---perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services

College	Mean score	Differences between college means							
		II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX X
I	195.17	202.73	210.26	191.67	208.76	212.47	193.45	203.72	221.71 178.28
II	202.73	7.56	15.09*	3.50	13.59*	17.30*	1.72	8.55	26.54* 16.89*
III	210.26		7.53	11.06	6.03	9.74	9.28	.99	18.98* 24.45*
IV	191.67			18.59*	1.50	2.21	16.81*	6.54	11.45* 31.98*
V	208.76				17.09*	20.80*	1.78	12.05*	30.04* 13.39*
VI	212.47					3.71	15.31*	5.04	12.95* 30.48*
VII	193.45						19.02*	8.75	9.24 34.19*
VIII	203.72							10.27	28.26* 15.17*
IX	221.71								17.99* 25.44*
									43.43*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 5. Differences between college means for part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate selected student personnel services

College	Mean score	Differences between college means							
		II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
		209.41	208.93	209.86	211.06	212.75	193.15	216.47	211.35
I	197.84	11.57*	11.09*	12.02*	13.22*	14.91*	4.69	18.63*	13.51*
II	209.41		.48	.45	1.65	3.34	16.25*	7.06	1.94
III	208.93			.93	2.13	3.82	15.78*	7.54	2.42
IV	209.86				1.20	2.89	16.71*	6.61	1.49
V	211.06					1.69	17.91*	5.41	.29
VI	212.75						19.60*	3.72	1.40
VII	193.15							23.33*	18.20*
VIII	216.47								5.12
IX	211.35								10.44*
									5.32

*Significant at the .05 level.

between each set of means and denotes which are greater than the critical value. Analysis of the data revealed 16 pair-wise differences. In this case, colleges VII and I had scores significantly lower than every other college. They did not differ from one another, however.

The Tukey post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining differences between pairs of college means for part C. The critical value was found to be 10.35. Table 6 illustrates the difference between each set of means and denotes which are greater than the critical value. Analysis of the data revealed 20 pair-wise differences. In this case, college VII had a significantly lower score than all colleges except college I. College I had a significantly lower score than every college except colleges II, III, and VII.

Hypothesis II states that there are no differences between roles on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

A summary of the multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests for hypothesis II appears in Table 7.

The computed probability value of .0000 for the multivariate analysis of variance test for faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles was less than the alpha level of .05 specified for the experiment. Consequently, null hypothesis II was rejected.

Table 6. Differences between college means for part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services

College	Mean score	Differences between college means								
		II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
		202.82	202.80	210.53	211.67	218.30	190.30	213.78	214.75	208.10
I	195.93	5.89	6.87	14.60*	15.74*	22.37*	5.63	17.85*	18.82*	12.17*
II	202.82		.02	7.71	8.85	15.50*	12.52*	10.96*	12.03*	5.28
III	202.80			7.73	8.87	15.50*	12.50*	10.98*	11.95*	5.30
IV	210.53				1.14	7.77	20.23*	3.25	4.22	2.43
V	211.67					6.63	21.37*	2.11	3.08	3.57
VI	218.30						28.00*	4.52	3.55	10.20
VII	190.30							23.48*	24.45*	17.80*
VIII	213.78								.97	5.68
IX	214.75									6.65

*Significant at the .05 level.

Since a significant difference was disclosed by the multivariate analysis of variance experiment, the researcher proceeded with univariate analysis of variance tests on the variables part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, part B--personal versus vicarious experience used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services.

Table 7. Multivariate and univariate analysis of variance tests of means for faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles

Role	Cell means ^a		
	Part A	Part B	Part C
Faculty	187.32	202.38	207.72
Student	206.82	208.21	203.53
Student personnel worker	211.89	266.89	258.93

Multivariate test

F-ratio = 21.61
df = 6 and 1396
P-value = .0000

Univariate tests

<u>Source of variance</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Between MS</u>	<u>Univariate F-value</u>	<u>P-value</u>
Part A	2	28803	18.23	.0001
Part B	2	15682	12.00	.0001
Part C	2	43511	32.00	.0001

df for hypothesis = 2
df for error = 700

^aPart A = perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services; part B = personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services; part C = familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The computed probability value of .0001 on the univariate analysis of variance test for faculty, student, and student personnel worker roles on parts A, B, and C was less than the alpha level of .0167 specified for the test. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for all three parts.

The overall alpha level for the univariate analysis of variance experiment did not exceed the .05 level.

Since a significant difference was disclosed by the univariate analysis of variance experiment for parts A, B, and C, the researcher employed post-hoc comparisons between role means to compare specific levels of the role factor.

The Scheffé post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining between which pairs of role means a significant difference existed for part A. The critical value was found to be 24.14. Table 8 illustrates the difference between each pair of role means and denotes which is greater than the critical value. Analysis of the data revealed that the faculty mean score was significantly lower than student and student personnel worker mean scores. Student and student personnel worker mean scores did not differ from one another, however.

The Scheffé post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining between which pairs of role means a significant difference existed for part B. The critical value was found to be 20.20. Table 9 illustrates the differences between each pair of role means and denotes which is greater than the critical value. Analysis of the

Table 8. Differences between faculty, student, and student personnel worker role means for part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services

Role	Mean score	Differences between role means	
		Student	Student personnel worker
		206.82	211.89
Faculty	187.32	19.50	24.57*
Student	206.82		5.07

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 9. Differences between faculty, student, and student personnel worker role means for part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the selected student personnel services

Role	Mean score	Differences between role means	
		Student	Student personnel worker
		208.21	266.89
Faculty	202.38	5.83	64.51*
Student	208.21		58.68*

*Significant at the .05 level.

data revealed that faculty and students had mean scores significantly lower than the student personnel worker mean score. Their scores did not differ from each other, however.

The Scheffé post-hoc procedure was applied to calculate the critical value for determining between which pairs of role means a significant difference existed for part C. The critical value was found to be 22.28. Table 10 illustrates the differences between each pair of role means and denotes which is greater than the critical value. Analysis

of the data revealed that faculty and student mean scores were significantly lower than student personnel worker mean score. Their scores did not differ from one another, however.

Table 10. Differences between faculty, student, and student personnel worker role means for part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services

Role	Mean	Differences between role means	
		Student	Student personnel worker
		203.53	258.93
Faculty	207.72	4.19	51.21*
Student	203.53		55.40*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis III states that there is no college by role interaction on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The multivariate test for college by role interaction revealed an F-ratio of 1.27 with 54 and 2080.58 degrees of freedom. The computed probability level of .0894 was greater than the alpha level of .05 specified for the experiment. Consequently, null hypothesis III was not rejected.

Summary

Multivariate and univariate tests of means for colleges on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious

experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services revealed significant differences at the .05 level.

Multivariate and univariate tests of means of roles on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services revealed significant differences at the .05 level.

Multivariate and univariate tests for college by role interaction revealed no significant differences at the .05 level.



CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate differences in perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services that existed between selected groups associated with the North Carolina Community College System. Faculty, student, and student personnel workers' perceptions were examined regarding the effectiveness of selected student personnel services by their respective role and also by institution.

To provide for a better understanding of the findings on the effectiveness variable, similar investigations were made for the same groups on the variables personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services and on familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The following major null hypotheses were defined to provide specific focus for the study and to establish empirically testable objectives:

Hypothesis I: There are no differences between colleges on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

Hypothesis II: There are no differences between roles on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The researcher was interested in testing the interaction effect in order to determine if the results could be attributable, without qualification, to the treatment effects colleges and roles. Therefore, hypothesis III was provided to attain this objective. The interaction effect is the experimental effect created by the combination of treatments--columns and rows--over and above effects associated with treatments--columns and rows--considered separately.

Hypothesis III: There is no college by role interaction on the variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The population for this study was limited to faculty, students, and student personnel workers at 10 community colleges affiliated with the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. A sample of 20 faculty, 50 students, and 3 student personnel workers was randomly drawn from each college for study.

A survey instrument, consisting of three parts, was developed by the researcher to gather data for the study. Faculty and student personnel worker data were gathered by

mail. Student data were gathered through visits to each institution.

The principal components solution of the item inter-correlation matrices was employed to determine the factorial composition of the instrument. Analysis of the data revealed that the data for each part of the instrument were univariate. Therefore, total scores rather than factor scores were used for analysis.

The multivariate analysis of variance test was used to test the hypotheses of interest. When a significant difference was disclosed by the multivariate test, univariate analysis of variance tests were employed to investigate each variable contained within the hypothesis.

Post-hoc comparisons were employed to investigate differences disclosed by the univariate tests in order to determine whether there were significant differences between specific levels of the independent variables.

Findings

The findings that were derived from the analyses of the data are presented in the order in which they appear in Chapter IV.

Hypothesis I of this study states that there are no differences between colleges on the three variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance test for colleges revealed a significant difference between colleges.

Univariate analysis of variance tests on each of the three variables within the hypothesis revealed a significant difference between colleges on all three of the variables.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons for colleges on perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services revealed 26 pair-wise differences between colleges. The tenth college in the study scored significantly lower than all other colleges, while college IX scored significantly higher than all colleges but college VI. Tukey post-hoc comparisons for colleges on personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services revealed 16 pair-wise differences between colleges. In this case, colleges VII and I had scores significantly lower than every other college. They did not differ from one another, however. Tukey post-hoc comparisons for colleges on familiarity of selected student personnel services revealed 20 pair-wise differences between colleges. In this case, college VII had a significantly lower score than all colleges except college I. College I had a significantly lower score than every college except colleges II, III, and VII.

Hypothesis II of this study states that there are no differences between roles on the three variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the

effectiveness of selected personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance test for roles revealed a significant difference between roles.

Univariate analysis of variance tests on each of the three variables within the hypothesis revealed a significant difference between roles on all three of the variables.

Scheffé post-hoc comparisons for roles on perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services revealed that the faculty score was significantly lower than student and student personnel worker scores. Student and student personnel worker scores did not differ from one another, however. Scheffé post-hoc comparisons for roles on personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services revealed that faculty and students had scores significantly lower than the student personnel workers' score. Their scores did not differ from one another, however. Scheffé post-hoc comparisons for roles on familiarity of selected student personnel services revealed that faculty and students had scores significantly lower than the student personnel workers' score. Again their scores did not differ from one another.

Hypothesis III of this study states that there is no college by role interaction on the three variables perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the

effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

The multivariate analysis of variance test revealed no significant differences. Consequently, the null hypothesis of no difference was not rejected.

Conclusions

The instrument used to gather data for this study was not a standardized instrument. Therefore, the researcher recognized that caution must be exercised in making inferences from the findings. Nevertheless, several conclusions were drawn and are presented below.

1. The perceptions of faculty, students, and student personnel workers located in colleges within a system such as the North Carolina Community College System can be investigated empirically.

2. The perceptions of faculty, students, and student personnel workers in North Carolina community colleges differed significantly between colleges on perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

3. Faculty, students, and student personnel workers at college X rated the effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than all other colleges. College IX rated the effectiveness of the services significantly higher than all colleges but college VI.

4. Faculty, students, and student personnel workers at colleges VII and I rated their personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than every other college. They did not differ from one another, however.

5. Faculty, students, and student personnel workers at college VII rated their familiarity of selected student personnel services significantly lower than all colleges except college I. At college I they rated their familiarity of selected student personnel services lower than every other college except colleges II, III, and VII.

6. The perceptions of faculty, students, and student personnel workers in North Carolina community colleges differed significantly between roles on perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services, and familiarity of selected student personnel services.

7. Faculty rated the perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than students and student personnel workers. Students and student personnel workers' ratings of effectiveness did not differ from one another.

8. Faculty and students rated their personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the effectiveness of selected student personnel services significantly lower than student personnel workers. Faculty and student ratings did not differ from one another, however.

9. Faculty and students rated their familiarity of selected student personnel services significantly lower than did student personnel workers. Again faculty and student ratings did not differ from one another.

Implications

The findings and conclusions of this study led to the following implications.

If, as Matson stated, the ultimate success or failure of the two-year college movement is contingent upon the successful implementation of an adequate student personnel program, the program functions must be fully understood by all of the principal groups in the community colleges who are expected to utilize or to implement them. The familiarization of faculty and students with student personnel services functions should receive major attention. Until all significant groups in the community college understand various student personnel services functions, they cannot be expected to utilize or coordinate their efforts effectively in achieving the objectives of the program.

The North Carolina Community College System should give attention to the development and implementation of comprehensive and continuous professional development programs for its personnel. Such programs should be designed to assist faculty and student personnel workers to remain abreast of developments in student personnel services.

A comprehensive professional development program should provide induction training for established faculty and

student personnel workers. Various educational experiences should be made available to these persons, such as self-directed learning opportunities, workshops and institutes, graduate courses, and other educational media.

Procedures should be developed at each community college to evaluate and enhance the quality of services. Faculty, students, and student personnel workers, as well as top administrators, should work together in policy-making activities. Once developed, new student personnel services policies should be effectively communicated to all principal groups. It is especially important that students be made aware of what services are available and how to utilize them. Therefore, a comprehensive student orientation program should be implemented. There also should be greater involvement of faculty in student personnel services programs.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Efforts should be continued to improve the instruments used to measure the effectiveness of student personnel services. The major weaknesses of the researcher's instrument were that it did not differentiate among the 21 functions generally acknowledged as essential student personnel services and many of the respondents considered it to be too lengthy.

2. A replication of this study might be made on the campuses of technical institutes and two-year private colleges in North Carolina.

3. It would be interesting to compare faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services according to college division, tenure and nontenure status, and sex.

4. There is need for research to determine if faculty members who work closely with student organizations differ significantly from other faculty with regard to perceived effectiveness of personnel services.

5. It would be interesting to know how much importance faculty, students, and student personnel workers attach to student personnel services, and if there are differences in their perceptions of the importance of these services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel-Aal, Mohamed Abou El-Ela. "An Analysis of Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services in Teachers' Colleges in the United Arab Republic (Egypt)." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1965.
- Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.
- _____ and Kauffman, Joseph F. "Student Personnel Services in Liberal Arts Colleges," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (December, 1959), 296-299.
- Badger, Herbert L., Jr. "Evaluating Student Personnel Services." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, 1967.
- Beckers, Wilmer H. "An Evaluation of the Student Personnel Program at the Auburn University School of Education." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1961.
- Blackwell, Thomas. College and University Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Blaesser, Willard W. "The College Administrator Evaluates Student Personnel Work," Educational and Psychological Measurement, IX (1949), 412-428.
- _____. "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Program in Colleges," Review of Educational Research, XXIV (1954), 113-120.
- Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Bogue, Jesse. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.
- Brantly, Edward J. "A Study of the Student Personnel Program at Clark College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1960.

- Brumbaugh, A. J., and Smith, L. C. "A Point Scale for Evaluating Personnel Work in Institutions of Higher Learning," Religious Education, XXVII (1932), 230-255.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open Door Colleges: Policies for the Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1970.
- Collins, Charles C. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Crookston, Burns B., "Student Personnel Work--College and University," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by C. W. Harris. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
- Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Enrich, Alvin C. (ed.). Campus 1980. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1969.
- Feder, Daniel D. "Personnel Work in Education as Related to Change," Personnel Services in Education, Part II, edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Fitzgerald, Laurine E. "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959.
- Gardner, Donfred H. Student Personnel Services. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Good, C. V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, D. E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Croft, Inc., 1954.
- Hopkins, L. B. "Personnel Procedures in Education," The Educational Record, VII, Suppl. No. 3 (October, 1926), 1-46.
- Hurlburt, Allan S. Community College Study. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1952.
- Johnson, Michael W. "Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, 1968. 19
- Johnson, Thomas Bradford. "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Selected Illinois Four-Year Colleges and Junior Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1968.

- Klitzke, Leon L. "Needed Research in Junior College Student Personnel Services," Junior College Journal, XXX (April, 1960), 452-459.
- Kuhl, Edward. A Second Look at Student Personnel Work in the Maryland Junior Colleges. Baltimore: Student Personnel Division, Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther McDonald, and Smith, Margaret Ruth. A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.
- McDaniel, J. W. Essential Student Personnel Practices for Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1962.
- Matson, Jane E. "Student Personnel Services in Junior Colleges--A Special Challenge," NASPA IV, No. 4 (April, 1967), 161-164.
- Maxwell, A. E., and Lawley, D. N. Factor Analysis as a Statistical Method. London: Butterworth, 1963.
- Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Parker, Franklin, and Bailey, Anne. The Junior and Community College: A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1918-1963. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Peterson, Glen. "A Study of the Student Personnel Programs of the Eleven Senior Colleges of the American Lutheran Church." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1968.
- Progress Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina: First Five Years, 1963-1968. Raleigh, North Carolina: Department of Community Colleges, State Board of Education, 1969.
- Rackham, Eric N. "The Need for Adequate Criteria When Evaluating College Student Personnel Programs," Educational and Psychological Measurement, II, No. 4 (Winter, 1951), 691-699.
- Raines, Max R. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.

- Raines, Max R. "Student Personnel Development in Junior Colleges," NASPA, IV, No. 4 (April, 1967), 153-161.
- Rankin, Gary E. "Graduating Seniors, Perceptions of the Student Personnel Services at Colorado State College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, 1967.
- Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Archives and History, 1962.
- Rice, Joseph P., Jr. "A Comparative Study of the Guidance Program in the Private and Public Junior College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1959.
- Robinson, Donald W., and Brown Dirck W. "A Report on Student and Student Personnel Research Activities," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (December, 1961), 358-360.
- Robinson, Seldon C. "Student Evaluation of the Adequacy of Student Personnel Services in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in Texas." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, 1966.
- Ross, Margaret A. "Administration, Faculty, and Student Personnel Workers' Evaluation of Student Personnel Functions." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, 1967.
- Roueché, John E. A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1964-1966. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Scott, William L. "A Study of Student Personnel Services in Small Liberal Arts Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959.
- _____. "Student Personnel Services: Principles and Practices for Small Colleges," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (May, 1960), 737-739.
- Segner, Kenyon Bertel, III. "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1966.
- Spinks, Samuel L., Jr. "A Survey of Presently Existing Student Personnel Services in Selected Mississippi Public Junior Colleges, the Attitudes of Presidents Toward These Services, and the Allocation of Responsibilities for These Services." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, 1962.

- Starr, James M. "Guidance Practices in Selected Junior Colleges in the Northwest," Junior College Journal, XXXI (April, 1960), 442-446.
- Tamte, James. "How Faculty, Student Personnel Workers, and Students Perceive Student Personnel Services at the University of Denver." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1964.
- Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Troescher, Carol Mable. "A Descriptive Study of the Perceptions Held by Students, Faculty, and Student Personnel Administrators of Student Personnel Services at Rock Valley College." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1969.
- _____ and Crookston, Barns B. "Student Personnel Work-- College and University," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by C. W. Harris. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. Pp. 1415-1427.
- Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- Zimmerman, Elwyn E. "Student Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Michigan State University." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE AND STUDY INSTRUMENT

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

State Board of Education
Raleigh, North Carolina

December 8, 1969

TO: Presidents of Community Colleges

FROM: I. E. Ready

Mr. W. Preston Emerson, Dean of Student Affairs, Lenoir Community College, will be contacting you about some help he needs in connection with his dissertation project at Michigan State University. I believe the results of his study will be helpful, and I commend him to you for any cooperation you find you can give.

IER:hd

CC: Mr. W. Preston Emerson

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kinston, North Carolina

Dr. Nan Preas, Director
Student Personnel Services
College of the Albemarle
Elizabeth City, North Carolina

Dear Dr. Preas:

I am sending under separate cover enough questionnaires for the faculty and your staff. You will find the name of the recipient attached to the top of each questionnaire. I will be very grateful if you will place them in the appropriate campus mailboxes.

Dr. Preas, I know that you cannot commit the support of the faculty, but your support of the project will be extremely important.

Sincerely,

s/s W. Preston Emerson

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kinston, North Carolina

Dear Student:

I am currently in the process of conducting a dissertation research project at Michigan State University and need your assistance if it is to be a success. The dissertation involves a study of student, faculty, and student personnel services in the community colleges of North Carolina. The findings will be generalized to the system and no individual will be identified by name.

The results of this study will be derived from a questionnaire which is being given to a random sample of students, faculty, and student personnel workers in the community colleges of North Carolina.

Your name has been enclosed in the above-mentioned sample. I plan to be at the College of the Albemarle on Tuesday, January 20, from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. to administer the questionnaire. I have the permission and support of Dr. Petteway and Dean Preas in this venture. The questionnaire will be administered in the Conference Room.

I am hopeful that the completed research will have significance for student personnel workers, and that it will prove beneficial for the community colleges as a result of better understanding of attitudes and perceptions regarding these services.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

s/s W. Preston Emerson

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kinston, North Carolina

Dear Colleague:

I am currently in the process of conducting a dissertation research project at Michigan State University and need your assistance if it is to be a success. The dissertation involves a study of student, faculty, and student personnel worker perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services in the community colleges of North Carolina. The findings will be generalized to the system and no individual will be identified by name.

I am hopeful that the completed research will have significance for student personnel workers, and that it will prove beneficial for the community colleges as a result of better understanding of attitudes and perceptions regarding these services.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

s/s W. Preston Emerson

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kinston, North Carolina

Dear Student:

I am currently in the process of conducting a dissertation research project at Michigan State University and need your assistance if it is to be a success. The dissertation involves an analysis of student, faculty, and student personnel worker perceptions of the effectiveness of student personnel services in the community colleges of North Carolina. The findings will be generalized to the system and no individual will be identified by name.

The results of this study will be derived from a questionnaire which is being given to a random sample of students, faculty, and student personnel workers in the community colleges of North Carolina.

Your name has been enclosed in the above-mentioned sample. Will you assist me in this project by completing the enclosed questionnaire? Your responses will be considered confidential. The number assigned to the questionnaire is to be used only for the follow-up of nonrespondents.

A final report of this project will be filed for your reference at the Lenoir Community College Library.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

s/s

W. Preston Emerson

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kinston, North Carolina

Dear Student:

I was pleased to have the opportunity to visit your college this week to collect data for my dissertation project at Michigan State University. Many of your classmates participated in the project, but I cannot locate a survey form from you. I feel that you will want to participate in the study so I have taken the liberty of leaving a questionnaire for you at the Dean of Student Affairs office. It will only take about twenty minutes to complete it and the Dean will return it to me. I believe this project will do a lot to improve the Student Personnel Service programs in all of the community colleges. I am counting on you to help me out.

Sincerely,

s/s

W. Preston Emerson

EVALUATION OF SELECTED COLLEGE SERVICES

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX: ☐ Student ☐ Faculty ☐ Student personnel worker

Directions: This instrument contains 65 statements of services which are provided by various colleges as a part of their total programs. You are asked to consider each service in relationship to its use on your campus. It is important that you read the statements carefully before responding to the questions about the services.

Question A asks you to rate the effectiveness of each listed service, based on your experiences and the experiences of your friends (vicarious experiences).

Definition of scale for Question A:

- 5 = very effective--a service is very effective if it is successful 85% of the time.
- 4 = moderately effective--a service is moderately effective if it is successful from 65% to 84% of the time.
- 3 = somewhat effective--a service is somewhat effective if it is successful from 45% to 64% of the time.
- 2 = moderately ineffective--a service is moderately ineffective if it is successful from 25% to 44% of the time.
- 1 = very ineffective--a service is very ineffective if it is successful below 25% of the time.
- 0 = service not offered--a service that is not offered at the college.

Question B asks you to rate how much of your evaluation is based on personal or vicarious experiences.

- 5 = all personal; 4 = mostly personal; 3 = about the same; 2 = mostly vicarious; 1 = all vicarious

Question C asks you to rate your familiarity with each listed service.

Definition of scale for Question C:

- 5 = very familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing thorough knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 4 = moderately familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing extensive knowledge and understanding of its function.
- 3 = somewhat familiar--acquainted with the service and possessing some knowledge and understanding of its function.

ILLUSTRATION II:

B. Providing students with study skills information.

Question A							Question B							Question C																	
Very effective	5	4	3	2	1	0	Very ineffective	5	4	3	2	1	0	All personal	5	4	3	2	1	Very vicarious	5	4	3	2	1	Familiar	5	4	3	2	1
Moderately effective							Somewhat effective							Mostly personal						All the same						Familiar					
Somewhat effective							Ineffective							About						Mostly vicarious						Vaguely familiar					
Ineffective							Service not offered							Mostly personal						All						Familiar					
Very ineffective														Personal						Mostly vicarious						Not familiar					

Your response: Since, in this case, you feel that your college is providing this service, you decide to circle the 4 in question A, the 3 in question B, and the 5 in question C.

YOU ARE NOW READY TO BEGIN MARKING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTION A, QUESTION B, AND QUESTION C FOR EACH STATEMENT. CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS. IF YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE ANY ANSWER, ERASE THE INCORRECT RESPONSE AND THEN CIRCLE THE DESIRED RESPONSE.

	Question			Question		
	<u>A</u>			<u>B</u>		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
1. Providing prospective students with information about the College's programs and requirements.	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Informing prospective students about regulations and expenses at the College.	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Providing prospective students with information about activities at the College.	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Interpreting standardized test results to incoming students as a means of helping them select courses and curricula in which they are most likely to succeed.	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Developing normative testing data for the College.	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Appraising any previous educational record of the student to determine his probable success in various courses and curricula which might interest him.	5	4	3	2	1	0
7. Conducting registration for classes and payment of necessary fees.	5	4	3	2	1	0
8. Maintaining records of the academic progress of each student.	5	4	3	2	1	0
9. Processing class changes and withdrawals.	5	4	3	2	1	0
10. Maintaining records of the activities of each student at the College and the honors which the student may receive.	5	4	3	2	1	0
11. Maintaining records which indicate the social development of each student.	5	4	3	2	1	0

	Question A	Question B	Question C
12. Establishing and maintaining regulations pertaining to academic probation.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
13. Establishing and maintaining regulations pertaining to course prerequisites.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
14. Establishing and maintaining regulations pertaining to graduation requirements.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
15. Consulting with incoming students about their educational goals, their career plans, and their probable chances for achieving them.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
16. Assisting students with course selection.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
17. Providing a course during the first quarter (or semester) which helps students to learn about the College, about study skills, and about career opportunities.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
18. Providing counselors who are available to consult with students about their vocational plans and their personal and social concerns.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
19. Providing information about career opportunities that are related to the various courses and curricula of the College.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
20. Providing several orientation days at the beginning of school in order to help new students "get the feel of things."	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
21. Developing and enforcing "consistent" regulations for governing the social life of the student while on campus.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

	Question					Question					Question					
	A					B					C					
22. Providing opportunities for students to have their own student government association with elected representatives.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
23. Providing student leadership training programs.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
24. Providing a variety of clubs and activities which help students to develop their special interests.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
25. Providing opportunities for students to become actively involved in the solution of some of the major problems faced by our society.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
26. Arranging for student participation with civic leaders and events.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
27. Providing opportunities and facilities for students to participate in a variety of intramural sports.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
28. Determining the need for expanded intramural program needs for the campus.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
29. Providing opportunities and facilities for students to participate in various intercollegiate sports.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
30. Arranging opportunities for students who need financial assistance to work on part-time jobs.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
31. Providing students who need financial assistance with opportunities for loans.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

	Question A	Question B	Question C
32. Analyzing the progress of financial aid recipients.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
33. Providing students who need financial assistance with opportunities for grants-in-aid.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
34. Awarding scholarships to students who have outstanding academic records.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
35. Awarding scholarships to students who have outstanding activity records.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
36. Arranging opportunities for students to work on a part-time basis in jobs that are directly related to their career objectives.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
37. Assisting students who are graduating from career programs to meet prospective employers.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
38. Assisting students who are graduating from career programs to locate employment that is in keeping with their career plans.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
39. Providing tests which will help students in identifying any deficiencies in their reading skills and a special program to correct the deficiencies.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
40. Providing tests which will help students in identifying any deficiencies in their basic writing skills and a special program to correct the deficiencies.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

	Question <u>A</u>						Question <u>B</u>						Question <u>C</u>					
41. Providing tests which will help students in identifying any deficiencies in their mathematics skills and a special program to correct the deficiencies.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
42. Requiring students to have a physical examination before admission to the College as a means of protecting the health of the student.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
43. Acquainting students and staff with procedures for handling health emergencies and resources for treating physical and emotional health problems.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
44. Distributing to students and staff health and safety information.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
45. Instructing students in first-aid procedures.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
46. Providing a systematic and periodic health appraisal of students.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
47. Reviewing health appraisals to identify special health problems.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
48. Providing accident and health insurance programs.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
49. Providing medical personnel to handle health problems of illness and accidents which may occur on campus.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		
50. Assisting students who live off-campus and away from home to find suitable living accommodations.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1		

Question	Question		
	A	B	C
51. Maintaining contact with alumni as a means of continuing evaluation of the College programs.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
52. Providing College resources and staff to acquaint out-of-school youth with the educational opportunities available to them.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
53. Maintaining a liaison with high schools so that a student avoids unnecessary duplication of high school studies.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
54. Maintaining a liaison with senior colleges so that a student is suitably prepared if he plans to transfer to a senior college.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
55. Conducting surveys, such as this, as a means of strengthening the services to students and faculty.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
56. Providing opportunities for members of the staff to increase their professional skill and knowledge through participation in professional conferences and programs on the campus.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
57. Providing opportunities for members of the staff to increase their professional skill and knowledge through participation in professional conferences and programs away from the campus.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
58. Developing methods of coordinating and staffing student services for maximum benefit of the students and faculty.	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

	Question			Question			Question									
	A			B			C									
59. Providing food services for students and staff of the College.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
60. Providing bookstore services for students and staff of the College.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
61. Maintaining security of college buildings and grounds, including parking lots.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
62. Establishing and maintaining regulations pertaining to campus traffic and parking.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
63. Providing information about drugs and sex to student groups.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
64. Providing study and skills information to student groups.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
65. Providing for fire safety drills.	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL AXIS ANALYSIS

Appendix Table 1. Factor loading matrix for factor 1 of part A--perceived effectiveness of selected student personnel services, factor 1 of part B--personal versus vicarious experiences used to evaluate the selected student personnel services, and factor 1 of part C--familiarity of selected student personnel services

Question	Part A factor 1 ($\lambda=13.64$) ^a loading	Part B factor 1 ($\lambda=15.13$) loading	Part C factor 1 ($\lambda=16.36$) loading
1	0.38	0.34	0.41
2	0.33	0.37	0.38
3	0.38	0.34	0.43
4	0.41	0.38	0.40
5	0.44	0.48	0.50
6	0.45	0.42	0.45
7	0.33	0.25	0.26
8	0.34	0.39	0.43
9	0.33	0.35	0.44
10	0.46	0.47	0.50
11	0.52	0.38	0.56
12	0.45	0.44	0.51
13	0.44	0.42	0.45
14	0.40	0.42	0.47
15	0.53	0.46	0.49
16	0.47	0.34	0.36
17	0.38	0.37	0.46
18	0.42	0.46	0.45
19	0.59	0.50	0.55
20	0.34	0.36	0.44
21	0.51	0.49	0.57
22	0.33	0.51	0.52
23	0.48	0.54	0.58
24	0.46	0.52	0.54
25	0.56	0.52	0.54



Appendix Table 1 (cont'd.)

Question	Part A factor 1 ($\lambda=13.64$) ^a loading	Part B factor 1 ($\lambda=15.13$) loading	Part C factor 1 ($\lambda=16.36$) loading
26	0.54	0.60	0.60
27	0.41	0.50	0.47
28	0.48	0.57	0.54
29	0.38	0.53	0.55
30	0.43	0.51	0.51
31	0.47	0.52	0.56
32	0.52	0.57	0.55
33	0.47	0.58	0.53
34	0.48	0.60	0.58
35	0.45	0.61	0.56
36	0.56	0.57	0.53
37	0.51	0.55	0.55
38	0.55	0.52	0.50
39	0.46	0.51	0.52
40	0.37	0.51	0.49
41	0.46	0.47	0.50
42	0.39	0.40	0.36
43	0.52	0.54	0.57
44	0.51	0.55	0.58
45	0.43	0.52	0.45
46	0.41	0.54	0.50
47	0.44	0.55	0.50
48	0.36	0.53	0.52
49	0.41	0.55	0.51
50	0.43	0.52	0.47
51	0.47	0.54	0.55
52	0.58	0.58	0.58
53	0.54	0.52	0.54
54	0.53	0.46	0.51
55	0.54	0.50	0.52
56	0.50	0.44	0.53
57	0.43	0.43	0.52
58	0.58	0.55	0.62
59	0.37	0.30	0.27
60	0.39	0.27	0.36
61	0.47	0.38	0.44
62	0.45	0.34	0.43
63	0.49	0.52	0.50
64	0.56	0.56	0.55
65	0.30	0.41	0.37

^a λ = eigenvalue. The data for individual colleges are on file with this researcher at Lenoir Community College, Kinston, North Carolina.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293105256659