

~~M~~ 1972 103
MAY 17 1972 157
~~24~~ 1972

~~15~~
G. K. 153

55 K153

16 K253

K006
3 MAY 19 87

18 K114

578 8-205

345
103

1
ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF ATTRITION AMONG SELECTED
FORMER STUDENT PERSONNEL WORKERS

By
Walter B. Shaw

The Problem

The general problem of this study was to better understand some of the dynamics of student personnel attrition. Specifically, the problem of central concern was the determination of whether various sub-groups within the student affairs profession left the profession for different reasons. The sub-groups were: (1) by category of former position, (2) by sex, (3) by enrollment of the institution of former student personnel employment, (4) by the presence or absence of significant academic student personnel or closely related training in their backgrounds.

A secondary, but important objective of the study was to better understand the reasons why former student personnel workers left the profession.

The Method

A research instrument was developed to collect data from former student personnel workers by inquiring into their perceptions of their prior position and the reasons they had for leaving that position for another profession. The sample was identified through the cooperation of 737 (87.2%) of the voting delegates to NASPA, who supplied the names and addresses of people who had been in their departments within the past three years, but were no longer in the student personnel profession. The other requirements for inclusion into the sample were that they:

1. formerly held one of the generic positions of dean of students, dean of men, dean of women, director of housing, or were immediate assistant(s) to one of those positions.
2. had shown a commitment to the profession.
3. had reasons for attrition that excluded death, retirement or temporary leave.

Usable instruments were returned from 360 former student personnel workers. This number represented approximately 80% of the sample. *Total Sample approx. 450*

The null hypotheses were tested by an analysis of variance of eight factors derived through a factor analysis of the data. Frequency distributions were also constructed for each question of the instrument for the total group and for each category of former position.

Findings of the Study

Significant differences in reasons for leaving the student personnel profession were found by category of former position and by the presence or absence of significant academic student personnel training. No significant results were found for sub-groups by sex or enrollment of the institution of prior employment. Concerning the nature of the former position, differential perceptions were discovered only by category of position.

Important findings from the frequency distributions were that "internal politics," lack of appreciation by superiors, level of bureaucracy, level of decision making, resistance of the institution to innovation or change, and perceived resistance of much of the institution to the goals of the student personnel department were the most frequent reasons given for leaving the profession.

Major Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

1. The research instrument proved to be adequate to discriminate between categories of at least two sub-groups.
2. Attrition from student personnel work is frequent and possibly increasing; 652 former student personnel workers were reported from 737 institutions.
3. People from different positions tended to leave the profession for different reasons.

4. People with significant academic training in student personnel work tended to leave the profession for reasons different from those with no student personnel academic training.
5. Reasons dealing with openness and interpersonal relations were the most frequently cited causes of attrition.
6. Additional research is needed in the area of student personnel attrition and mobility. A longitudinal study of student personnel graduates, an examination of the relationship of training and mobility and attrition, and a study to determine whether or not attrition is increasing are all especially needed.

A STUDY OF ATTRITION AMONG SELECTED
FORMER STUDENT PERSONNEL WORKERS

By

Walter B. Shaw

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education
Department of Administration and Higher Education

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to the members of his Guidance Committee, Dr. Iwao Ishino, Dr. Vandel Johnson, Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, and Dr. Louis Stamatakos. He is especially grateful to Dr. Nonnamaker for his review of the rough drafts of the study and to his constant calming influence. He also wishes to thank Dr. W. Harold Grant for his assistance in the design of this study.

To his loving wife, Nancy Joe, whose patience and constant support, in spite of pregnancy, helped to make this study possible, he expresses his deepest gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF DIAGRAMS	vi
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM: ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE. .	1
Introduction.	1
Statement of the Problem.	4
Importance of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	7
Outline of the Study	10
Summary	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	13
Introduction.	13
Factors Internal to the College Student	
Personnel Profession	14
Factors Frequent Within the Profession .	19
Factors Within Individual Student	
Personnel Departments	23
Independent Factors	25
Summary	28
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	31
Introduction.	31
The Population of Interest	31
Identification of the Sample	32
Surveying the Sample	34
The Instrument	38
The Pre-test.	41
Administration of the Instrument	43
Format of the Analysis of the Results .	43
Testable Hypotheses	44
Statistical Analysis	45
Summary	51

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	53
Analysis Format.	53
Brief Review of the Nature of the Sample	53
Brief Review of the Instrument.	54
Brief Review of the Statistics Used and Their Rationale	55
Results of the Factor Analysis.	55
Presentation of the Data.	58
Part I (environment)	59
Part II (reasons for leaving)	67
Summary	87
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	89
Summary	89
Conclusions	98
Recommendations.	101
Implications for Further Research.	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	106
APPENDICES	112
APPENDIX A--Attrition Study Instrument	113
APPENDIX B--Letters to NASPA Voting Delegates and to Research Sample.	123
APPENDIX C--Frequency Distributions Not Included in Text of Document	128
VITA	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. NASPA voting delegates cooperating with study.	35
2. Frequency of attrition	35
3. Per cent of former student personnel worker sample returning completed instrument.	37
4. Items contained in Factors of Part I.	56
5. Items contained in Factors of Part II	57
6. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor I, Part I.	60
7. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor II, Part I	63
8. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor III, Part I	66
9. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor IV, Part I	68
10. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor I, Part II	70
11. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor II, Part II	75
12. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor III, Part II.	77
13. Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor IV, Part II	79
14. Stated major reasons for leaving student personnel work	80
15. F-ratios for differences in "reasons for leaving student personnel work" and perceptions of the former environment.	82

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagrams	Page
1. Model of Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance	50

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE

Introduction

Thomas B. Dutton, writing in NASPA: The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, said that research needed to be done to determine ". . . what factors influence attrition or continuation in (student personnel work)" (9:341). The question Dr. Dutton posed is a vital one in this important and growing profession.

The rate of growth of American higher education is creating a demand for additionally trained, experienced and/or otherwise qualified practitioners in the student personnel profession; at the same time it appears that relatively large numbers of needed people are leaving at this important period in the evolution of the profession. One seldom attends a professional conference without hearing of various deans who are no longer serving in the area of student affairs. Little had been done to directly determine just why there is such attrition, although the literature reflected that a significant amount of thought had been given to the problem.

Louis C. Stamatakos, recognizing the dearth of information in the area, submitted a resolution to the American College Personnel Association annual business meeting in 1966 proposing that examination be made of the "conditions of employment" (42) of college student personnel workers. The motion was tabled and referred to Commission I: Organization, Administration and Development of Student Personnel Services. That was four years ago and still nothing has been done. Efforts need to be made to better understand the complete environment in which student personnel workers operate, and special attention must be given to those areas that may influence the professional to abandon the entire field. The loss of many of these valuably experienced people can place a difficult strain on institutions and the profession at an important time in history.

Colleges and universities are undergoing major changes today in reaction to the problems which have surfaced partially as a result of increased size and the often related phenomenon of student unrest. Students are demanding less regulation of their lives while in college, and at the same time are crying for a greater interest in them as human beings. The college student personnel worker of today finds himself directly in the middle of this change.

In the past, colleges felt that often student personnel positions could be adequately filled with a warm but firm person. Special training or experience in counseling and

student personnel work was considered appropriate but not necessarily essential. This attitude was workable in the day in which the dean was only the person whom the institution had assigned the tasks of enforcing the rules and paternalistically caring for the personal needs of students. Today, in most institutions of higher education, additional duties have accrued and many of the traditional roles have decreased in importance, or have been eliminated. The benevolent authoritarian as dean is no longer an appropriate choice for this sensitive position. The friendly philosophy professor seldom can effectively fill the dean's position; the present need is for professionally trained and experienced student personnel workers. Dutton's and Stamatakos' concerns implied that many of these well qualified people are leaving student personnel work, and time is no longer on the side of a non-professional or inexperienced person who could be named as a replacement.

However, there is a partial alternative to that of finding a replacement; and that is to avoid the creation of an attrition caused vacancy. In order to keep from having an opening we must first discover just why people choose to leave. Only after better understanding the dynamics of the mobility can the problem be effectively attacked. This research study was hopefully an early step in the complex process of understanding college student personnel attrition.

In summary, increasing demands such as a changing role, student activism and alienation, increased institutional size and others, are being confronted by contemporary student personnel workers. At the same time evidence from various sources indicated that attrition from the profession was increasing, possibly because of some of these pressures. A more precise understanding of the effects of these demands and just what the current and former student personnel workers think and feel about them was necessary. Only through systematic study of the problem will institutions be able to intelligently adapt to avoid some of the pitfalls, and to blunt the effect of others. This study was an attempt to provide some of this needed information.

Statement of the Problem

The general problem of this study was to determine if former student personnel sub-groups meeting certain criteria, which will be stated later, left the student affairs profession for different reasons. The study's objective was accomplished in two stages. First, former student personnel workers were asked to evaluate the environment of their former positions on various criteria identified by writers in the literature as areas of potential difficulty. Second, they were asked whether these same elements of their former positions influenced their decision to leave the profession.

Assumptions

It was necessary to assume the following situations in order to allow for the accurate testing of the hypotheses, which will be stated later. The assumptions were:

1. Former student personnel workers left the profession for conscious and identifiable reasons.
2. The research instrument, to be discussed later, elicited those reasons for leaving in response to the appropriate questions contained in that instrument.
3. Former student personnel workers left the profession for; (a) reasons intrinsic within the profession; (b) reasons frequent within the profession, but not central to its purposes, goals and objectives; (c) reasons specific to individual institutions; or (d) reasons other than those within the profession.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses in this study may be stated as follows:

1. Student personnel workers in different positions left the profession for different reasons.
2. Male former student personnel workers left the profession for reasons different from female workers.
3. Student personnel workers from larger institutions left the profession for reasons different from those workers of smaller institutions.
4. Student personnel workers with significant academic training in student personnel work or counseling left the profession for reasons different from those with no significant academic training in student personnel work or counseling.

Importance of the Study

The general problem of the study was indicated in the preceding introduction. The presence of a student personnel

division in most of the colleges and universities in the United States today presupposes that they are expected to fulfill some function that contributes to the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the institution. The term "student personnel" indicates that the center of concern for the student personnel worker is the student. Likewise, American higher education traditionally has been concerned with more than just the classroom education of the student. Even a cursory review of the history of American higher education will readily indicate that the classroom has been seen only as a part (albeit, an important part) of the college experience. This concern for the student as a total person is probably the area of greatest difference between American higher education and European colleges and universities which have so strongly influenced it. The extra-classroom concerns, or co-curriculum as it is frequently referred to today, have ranged from the concept of the teaching of personal discipline and religious orientation, as in colonial education described by Rudolph (36), to that of student development as elaborated on by Grant (12).

The near absence of voices crying that we should be concerned with the intellect only as it relates to the classroom indicates increasing recognition of the importance of the co-curriculum. The present dominant feeling is one of increasing realization of the ecosystem¹ in which the

¹Ecosystem--A system formed by the interaction of a community of organisms with their environment.

student operates, and how it effects his development and growth in all areas, including his intellect.

In order to achieve the objectives of the profession, the student personnel worker of today must be a scholar of the student ecosystem so that he will be able to change the student's environment, enabling the environment to interfere less with and contribute more to the goals and objectives of the institution. This formidable task requires a specialist whose expertise is gained only through thorough training and experience. Whenever one of these specialists left a college, it was a loss to that institution; but when he left the entire profession, it was even more serious.

Of course not all of the people who leave college student personnel work are experts in student affairs and the college environment; however, many do have much expertise in specific student personnel areas. Whenever a number of them leave the profession, their departure can hinder the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the institution. For this reason the dynamics of the mobility need to be better understood. This study is important in that it was designed to increase our knowledge in the area of student personnel attrition.

Definition of Terms

Student Personnel Worker.--For the purpose of this study a student personnel worker was considered to be a person who is employed in an institution of higher education

as either dean of students, dean of men, dean of women, director of the student personnel housing program, or immediate assistants to any of these positions.

Dean of Students.--This is a generic term for the person who performs the duties traditionally assigned to the dean of students. He is the chief student personnel administrator in the institution. In a few cases, primarily the larger universities, both the nominal dean of students and the vice-president for student affairs would fall into this category.

Dean of Men.--This title is a generic term for the person who performs the duties traditionally assigned to the dean of men. Another frequent term for this position is assistant or associate dean of students--men.

Dean of Women.--This generic term was used to identify the person who performs the duties traditionally assigned to the position entitled dean of women. Assistant or associate dean of students--women, is also a frequent title for this position.

Director of Housing.--This term identified the person who is responsible for the student personnel aspects of the housing program. Other frequent titles for this category include, assistant or associate dean of students--housing, or dean of housing programs.

Immediate Assistants to the above positions.--An immediate assistant was considered to be a student personnel

worker one level below, and directly reporting to, one of the four previously defined positions. Some common titles found in the generic positions included assistant dean of men, assistant dean of women, assistant director of housing, and assistant dean of students.

Significant Graduate Work in College Student Personnel.--

This term was defined as at least a minor in a graduate program (either at master or doctoral level) in college student personnel work, or in a closely related area.

Commitment to the Student Personnel Profession.--

Commitment was defined, for the purpose of this study, as having completed significant graduate work in college student personnel or in a closely related area and/or having two or more years experience in a full-time student personnel position.

Attrition.--Attrition is leaving a college student personnel position for reasons other than death, retirement, or temporary leave.

Former Student Personnel Worker.--For the purpose of this study, a former student personnel worker was a person who had met the criteria for "student personnel worker" sometime during the past three years, who had not died or retired, and who was not now holding an active student personnel position.

Outline of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of the literature. Particular emphasis is placed on areas of perceived dissatisfaction in college student personnel work as expressed by the authors reported in the survey. The review is grouped into (1) a discussion of elements central to the goals of the profession; (2) a discussion of elements frequent within the profession but not intrinsic in its basic objectives; (3) a discussion of elements within specific individual institutions; and (4) a discussion of factors independent of, or a combination of, the first three areas.

Methodology and the rationale for the procedures used in conducting the study will be discussed in Chapter III. The third chapter explains the statistical analysis used in the study along with the basic assumptions that might affect the design and results. Chapter III also includes a description of the instrument used in the investigation and a discussion of the evolution and appropriateness of the format of the data. Also included will be a presentation of the data and the analysis that was used.

Chapter IV is devoted to a discussion of the data.

Chapter V concludes the presentation with a summary of the study and the conclusions that can be drawn from the results. Implications for the student personnel profession are discussed and recommended additional research is delineated.

Summary

Elements within college student personnel work which could cause increasing attrition were indicated by people such as Thomas Dutton, Louis Stamatakos and others. Given the rapid growth rate in American higher education, coupled with growing student unrest and student demands for a more personalized education, increased attrition is a potentially serious problem.

The review of the literature in Chapter II indicated that little in the way of systematic examination of college student personnel attrition had been done. This lack of data dictated the need for additional investigation in the area.

The general purpose of this study was to better understand some of the dynamics of the mobility of student personnel attrition. The general purpose was accomplished in two ways. First, was the discovery of whether certain sub-groups within the student personnel profession left for different reasons. The sub-groups studied included the generic positions of dean of students, dean of men, dean of women, director of housing, and immediate assistants to each of these positions. Other sub-groups included were those as indicated by differences in sex, enrollment of the institution of the former position, and degrees of academic student personnel training of the former student personnel worker. Second, was a better understanding of just why these same former student personnel workers left the profession.

The goals of this study were accomplished through a questionnaire and the resulting statistical analysis, as discussed in Chapter III, which is further examined in the discussion in Chapter IV. Chapter V summarizes the study, states conclusions that may be drawn from the results, and discusses implications that this study has for additional research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a review of the literature pertinent to a study of attrition of college student personnel administrators.

A great deal of speculation and research has been reported in the literature concerning aspects of the student personnel profession which may influence the perceived satisfaction or dissatisfaction of people employed in those positions. However, nothing in the literature of the profession was found which systematically investigated actual reasons for attrition. Because of the lack of direct investigation into the reasons of student personnel attrition, this review must be limited to areas which could lead to unhappiness and dissatisfaction in college student personnel work.

For the purpose of clear presentation, the discussion of the related literature will be divided into four parts. The first section will deal with factors that are generally felt to be intrinsic within the profession of college student personnel work. The second section will be addressed to factors which are caused by the individual colleges or

universities rather than those that arise from the student personnel profession. Thirdly, factors frequent within individual student personnel divisions, but generally felt to be somewhat independent of the goals and objectives of the profession as a whole, will be discussed. Finally, the fourth part will deal with a discussion of factors independent of, or a combination of, the first three. Chapter II will be concluded by a brief summary.

Factors Internal to the College Student Personnel Profession

Throughout the brief history of the college student personnel profession, student personnel divisions have had the responsibility for the quasi-legal aspects of student behavior. Austin (3) reported that the quasi-legal responsibilities hinder the dean in fulfilling his proper role, i.e. as a liaison between the students and the administration. The dean must play two contradictory roles, according to Austin, and he also often has to act as both the prosecutor and judge in student disciplinary affairs. These two functions, along with an investigatory role, can often cause difficulties in meeting other goals and objectives in student personnel work.

Dutton, Appleton and Birch, in a study of NASPA chief student personnel administrators and other key college or university officers, indicated that Austin's thinking is

supported by some empirical findings. The three researchers reported that:

It appears that (chief personnel administrators) feel that discipline interferes with counseling and renders the dean less effective as a source of help to the student (10: 6).

Mueller (28) discussed three other inconsistencies within the student personnel profession which could contribute to the dissatisfaction a student personnel dean might feel. First, she recognized a real conflict between the goals and objectives of the profession and many of the realities of contemporary American higher education. Elements contributing to the conflict could include inter-departmental jealousies and territoriality and the assignment by the institution of tasks that actually interfere with the accomplishment of student personnel goals, an example of which was previously discussed by Austin.

Nonnamaker (29) also referred to some instances where moderate faculty resistance was experienced when student personnel departments assumed a responsibility for academic advisement.

Increasing involvement in academic advising is indicative of other changes that are occurring in student personnel work today. Mueller (28) also expressed her concern for a dilemma in authority caused by the role transition from the rapidly fading in loco parentis control, to the realities of today's world. She further stated that the current situation in college student personnel work had caused added

uncertainty and frustration in some deans. She saw a second dilemma in the goal of encouraging social development in the midst of the current educational bureaucracy. The apparent causes are conflicts between different elements within the college community. These cross-purposes, ambiguities and inconsistencies could strain the talents and patience of any dean.

Traditionally college administrators, including student personnel workers, had been expected to show strong loyalty to the institution. They had been expected to refrain from criticism of the institution publicly, and sometimes privately. Klotsche and Butler (20) reported that student personnel workers needed to define an area of "professional freedom" for themselves similar to the "academic freedom" of their faculty colleagues. This was felt necessary because the lack of a clearly defined form of professional freedom, in addition to other uncertain elements within the profession, could lead to eventual dissatisfaction. A form of "professional freedom" could lead to a clearer sense of professional identity.

Shaffer believed that student personnel workers need to have an independent professional identity, and listed four characteristic elements that he felt should be present. The four elements were that they:

1. perceive themselves as a part of the institutional environment.

2. continue their professional growth.
3. emphasize the student's responsibilities in securing his education.
4. strive to preserve the mental health of the institution and its students (38: 179).

At least two research studies have been addressed to the identification of elements in student personnel work which practitioners must adapt to in order to effectively function in a college student affairs position.

Foy (11), in his survey of 1,300 student personnel affiliates of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) found unhappiness related to the number of years of experience in the profession. The two most frequent causes of dissatisfaction were both age related; they were "student activism" and "administration." Student personnel workers with the fewer years of experience tended to be more dissatisfied with administration than student activism. For those workers with more time on the job, the findings were reversed. Foy also asked the practicing student personnel administrators for the reasons of their predecessor's leaving. His findings are below:

Reason for Predecessor's Leaving Former Position	Percentage
Not known	3.9%
Promotion	14.7
Other position preferred	20.5
Unsuccessful	6.8
Released	5.5
Illness	2.3
Retirement	5.8
Death	1.1
New position	34.0

Position to which Predecessor Moved	Percentage
No answer	0.3%
Don't know	3.9
Promotion in SPW	7.3
Lateral move in SPW	10.4
Demotion in SPW	2.0
Promotion in an education field	7.6
College teaching	10.8
Public schools	2.3
Graduate school	6.7
Business or industry	3.0
Government	1.9
On leave	0.6
Illness	2.0
Retirement	5.8
Death	1.1
New position	28.0
Marriage	1.7
Religious service	3.9 (11: 73)

Another research study, done by Upcraft in 1966 (45), involved the chief student personnel administrators in universities with an enrollment of more than 10,000 students. Upcraft found that the "ideal" college student personnel worker, in the eyes of a sample of nearly 90 chief administrators, was seen as; a male, between ages 30 and 59, needing no specific previous experience in educational administration, student personnel administration, and/or experience in college teaching; he should hold a doctorate. Participation in community affairs was not seen as important, but involvement in university matters was valuable. He should have a close relationship with the faculty and be concerned with research and evaluation in his department.

Those college student personnel workers surveyed felt that public relations was an important part of the position.

The chief student personnel officer should allow students a great deal of freedom and involve them in university governance. He should, of course, know student leaders on a personal basis. Participation in the activities of his profession and in the decision making process of the institution were also viewed favorably, as was some autonomy from the president. Upcraft also reported that the size of the institution apparently affected the chief student personnel administrator's perception of his role.

Factors Frequent Within the Profession

Several writers referred to certain areas that are common across the college student personnel profession, not central to the profession, but which could influence some to leave the profession.

The growth of the college from one of a handful of staff with interrelating duties to the highly specialized multiversity frequently removed the student personnel dean from the academic function of the university. Sheldon (39) reported her perception that student personnel workers were becoming more and more dissatisfied with the growing estrangement of the dean from the academic affairs in the institution. Sheldon also felt that there was a decided scarcity of women in policy making positions in today's colleges and universities. She added that this scarcity contributed to the unhappiness of many women in college student personnel work.

Nygreen (30) appeared to closely agree with Sheldon. He wrote that many student personnel workers considered themselves to be in only marginal academic positions. He credited this factor with influencing many of the ablest practitioners to leave the student personnel field for teaching or administration. Nygreen observed that when many or most of the elder statesmen of a profession leave the field, as he sees them doing in college student personnel work, their departure belittles the field as a profession.

Like Nygreen, Koile (21) thought that too often today student personnel services tend to remain on the fringe of the educational program of the institution. Many people enter the college student personnel profession because they want to be broadly involved in the education of the young. Finding oneself on the outside of the actual educational process, while holding these hopes and expectations, could be very disheartening and conceivably lead to attrition.

Professional commitment to a field is possibly an important factor in longevity in that field. Many institutions have traditionally not sought professional student personnel workers to fill the appropriate positions. Cameron (5), in a research study, found that 25% of the student personnel deans in the profession at the time of his study (1965), entered the field only because they were assigned to it from some other position within the university. Is it unreasonable to expect that a person in that position

would have less of a commitment to the field than a person who has tied his professional life to college student personnel work?

When such a situation as Cameron referred to occurs, the need for intensive and thorough in-service training would appear to be great; however, some slight research would indicate that the need remains unfilled. Raines (34), in a study of 200 junior colleges, found a great many student personnel programs staffed with people without professional training. In addition, he found that these junior colleges completely lacked, or had ineffective in-service training programs. The fact of little or no professional training, coupled with insufficient or no in-service training, could leave the student personnel worker in a position in which he might easily feel a lack of confidence in his own ability to act even in routine, and certainly in crisis, situations.

Many people in student personnel work have frequently been heard to say that a dean's job was a thankless job. Kenniston discussed this possible source of frustration when he wrote:

Even if the dean goes to bat for the students, he nevertheless continues to be associated with the power structure in the mind of the dissenter (18: 184).

Some deans may have difficulty accepting this attitude as not being meant as a personal statement directed at them.

Ayres, Tripp, and Russel (4), in a 1965 report of a study of 723 institutions, related some findings that are consistent with those of Raines. These researchers found that the length of tenure of the chief student personnel administrators was related to institutional type and size. The large universities' chief student personnel officers tended to be more stable in their positions, while junior colleges experienced greater mobility. A similar situation was found when deans of men and deans of women were studied. As Nygreen and Koile expected, Ayres, Tripp, and Russel found student personnel deans to be only slightly involved in the academic functions of the institutions. They also found that deans performed a very wide range of tasks not directly related to their position. The broad variety of non-professional duties may possibly indicate that student personnel divisions are being frequently used as a "catch-all" area. The possibility arises that this apparent "catch-all" nature of their function could lead to the attrition of some student personnel administrators who do not wish to be the "jack of all trades, but master of none."

Incongruities between the educational and developmental objectives of student personnel programs and institutional support through money and facilities can lead many student personnel workers to feel that the institution does not indeed see them as educators. An example is apparent

in many college housing programs. Most colleges that operate housing programs have a paragraph in their catalogues that refer to the educational role of a college residence hall, but in practice often little interest is given in the educational area. Riker writes:

. . . few (institutions) see housing as an important factor in the education of students so that the business function is the end . . .

The performance record of college housing is marred by shallow concepts of its role as an educational facility, (and) hollow lip-service to its uses as a part of the institutional program . . . (35: 1).

A student personnel worker with educational objectives who is involved in a housing program such as that could easily feel frustrated.

Dutton, Appleton and Birch (10) reported that their research uncovered some of the same things Riker discussed. They found that many, if not most, presidents felt that maintenance of control and order was a major responsibility of the dean of students. Apparently the educational and developmental goals were secondary.

Factors Within Individual Student Personnel Departments

There are some elements which are quite common within individual student personnel departments and which are independent of the goals and objectives of the student personnel profession. Many of these elements could lead to dissatisfaction and attrition. Sometimes contrary to

student opinion, student personnel deans do have human feelings. Also, human beings have a variety of values, orientations, attitudes, ideologies, and ideas. Any combination of traits and beliefs, when greatly incongruent from those of students, could create some critical problems at times. Hodgkinson (16) wrote that many of the student personnel deans' problems were of their own making. He felt that protective ideologies could cause some deans to become too concerned with trivialities such as student dress, and ignore the more important problems. The orientation that Hodgkinson referred to could very easily create dissatisfaction and unhappiness, especially relative to today's students. Quite possibly this factor could influence the attrition rate.

A second element frequent in various college student personnel departments was discussed by Greenleaf (14). She reported that often in college one finds a rather poor definition of just what role a student personnel dean should play. The student personnel area exists; but no one really has a clear understanding of just why it is there. Greenleaf recognized that this confusion could easily cause frustration and dissatisfaction in deans and might lead to disharmony and confusion in the administrative system.

Many student personnel workers, no less than other professionally committed people, are ambitious. They like to feel that their ability is recognized and good work

rewarded; these rewards can be expressed in a variety of ways. A worker may gain personal satisfaction merely by being appreciated for what he is and does. Money is also an important factor, but possibly the most visible and personally valuable reward is a vocational promotion. Many people like to feel that competency is the best criterion for promotion. But is this the way it really works?

Sherburne (40) surveyed member institutions of the Western Athletic Conference (Big Ten) on patterns of student personnel worker career mobility. One finding was that women administrators were more frequently passed over for promotion than were men, even though the women deans often had credentials and training superior to the men who were promoted over them. Sherburne also found that mobility and professional preparation did not seem to be very closely related. High morale would probably be quite difficult to maintain in such an environment.

Independent Factors

Many characteristics of the milieu of college student personnel work do not fit neatly into any of the three previous categories. Some are a combination of the three previous divisions, other are unique; therefore, this section will concern itself with these difficult to categorize aspects.

Ingraham, in a major research study, published in 1968, reported that he found four common undesirable characteristics of the dean of students position. These four were:

1. The ambivalence between counseling and discipline (Ingraham considers counseling and discipline to be cross-purposes)
2. The dean of students' jobs are often twenty-four hour a day jobs
3. Faculty generally lack an appreciation for the variety of skills needed to perform in the position
4. Various odd jobs are often thrust upon the administrator which do not relate to his training, position, or interest (such as parking) (17: 224-225).

Consistent with his findings, Ingraham also found that deans of students appeared to be more dissatisfied with their status in the university community than were any of the other top university administrators. Could this dissatisfaction encourage them to leave the field of college student personnel work?

Another common complaint of deans reported by Ingraham was that deans of students, who generally felt that theirs was primarily an educational function, did not feel that they were considered to be educators by many of the faculty. Ingraham, in further investigation into faculty attitudes, reported the perception appeared accurate. His findings are generally consistent with those of Austin, Shaffer Nygreen, and Ayres, Tripp and Russel, which have been previously discussed.

Dutton, Appleton and Birch (10) also uncovered a dilemma produced by possibly inaccurate perceptions. They found that students tended to see the dean in a way very different from the way he saw himself, and also that there was great student unawareness about how the dean felt concerning crucial issues.

A review of many of the standard and respected sources in the literature of college student personnel work, including those by Lloyd-Jones (25), Lloyd-Jones and Smith (26), Mueller (27), Williamson and Foley (47), Leonard (22), Williamson (46), Wrenn (49), Arbuckle (2), Shaffer (37), and Siegal (41), revealed little relating to personality characteristics and/or other potential sources of dissatisfaction with student personnel work that could possibly lead to attrition.

As Foy and others have indicated, student personnel workers sometimes left the field of student affairs for reasons completely independent of the demands, pressures or characteristics of the profession. Foy's study disclosed that some left to fulfill a military obligation; others left because of ill-health, which of course could have been aggravated by the demands of the job; and apparently the geographical location was a factor leading to attrition in some additional cases.

Another possible reason could lie in a theory proposed by Dr. Laurence Peter. His theory has been commonly referred

to as the "Peter Principle." Its primary concept stated that, "In a hierarchy, every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence" (32: 7). There he will stay until his departure, which may be initiated by a variety of reasons. He may leave because his superiors ask him to go; he may die; he may retire; or the frustrations and dissatisfaction with doing an inadequate job might become too great for him to function comfortably, so he quits. The latter case might be an important factor in college student personnel attrition.

Summary

An in-depth review of contemporary literature in college student personnel work and related areas indicated that little has been written about the reasons why college student personnel workers have left the profession. However, there was a large body of information indicating that a great deal of thought, investigation and speculation had been done about the characteristics of the student personnel field that might cause unhappiness, frustration and dissatisfaction. The information could be divided into four categories of investigation and thought. One category consisted of factors that can be considered to be internal to the college student personnel profession. Among them are the dean's quasi-legal responsibilities, conflicts between the goals of student personnel work and realities in American higher education, and inter-departmental

jealousies and territoriality. Others included a lack of professional freedom, student activism and administration.

A second category consisted of factors frequent within the profession which are not generally felt to be central to the goals of the profession. These included a frequent lack of professional or in-service training, removal of the dean from academic affairs, lack of appreciation of the dean's role by many students and faculty, and the frequent assignment to the dean of duties with little relationship to his position.

The third category consisted of factors that were frequent within individual student personnel departments, but independent from college student personnel professional goals, such as over-concern with trivialities, poor definition within the department of the role of the student personnel worker at the institution, and a lack of rewards, especially promotion.

The fourth category consisted of aspects independent of, or a combination of the first three. An important example of this last category is the general feeling that the student personnel dean does not play an educational role in the institution. Another element might be the operation of the Peter Principle.

This review has indicated that there are many gaps in our understanding of why people leave college student personnel work, but it does point the way to potential

areas of fruitful inquiry. A goal of this study was to uncover answers to some of the questions that this review has raised.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter will present the methods used to determine the factors which influenced the attrition of selected former college student personnel workers. Included in Chapter III will be a complete discussion of the sample, how it was derived, how information was gathered, and the testable hypotheses. The instrument, design and methods of statistical analysis will also be considered.

The Population of Interest

The sampled population included all the former college student personnel workers who had worked in any of the 845 National Association of Student Personnel Administrator member institutions and had held a position in one of the following eight categories:

1. Dean of Students
2. Immediate assistant(s) to the Dean of Students
3. Dean of Men
4. Immediate assistant(s) to the Dean of Men
5. Dean of Women
6. Immediate assistant(s) to the Dean of Women

7. Director of Housing
8. Immediate assistant(s) to the Director of Housing

In addition to the exclusion of the student personnel positions other than the above eight, the population was further delimited by requiring that the following additional criteria be met:

1. The population of interest only included people leaving the profession between August, 1966 and October, 1969.
2. Reasons for the attrition must have excluded death, retirement or temporary leave.
3. The former student personnel worker had to have shown a commitment to the profession, as defined in Chapter I of this report.

Identification of the Sample

Former student personnel workers who met the criteria for inclusion had to be identified. Since, prior to this survey, no list or record of former student personnel workers appropriate to this study had ever been compiled, the population to be used first had to be established. After consultation, in person and by mail, with several authorities in research in student personnel work, including Drs. Robert Callis, Robert Shaffer, Thomas Dutton, and Harold Grant, a method of identification was derived.

Method of Identification of the Sample

All institutional voting delegates to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)

were requested by mail to supply the names, current forwarding addresses, if available, and former positions of all people meeting the previously stated criteria who had worked in their departments. The voting delegates were requested to respond on an enclosed business reply card. A space marked "NONE" was provided for institutions having no one who met the criteria. Based on findings in other comparable research studies a 50% response rate was arbitrarily determined to be the minimum acceptable return. Copies of the mailed materials may be found in Appendix B.

Effectiveness of the Method of Identification

All 845 voting delegates were requested to supply the desired information. About three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter to non-respondents again requested their cooperation. After an additional three weeks, replies had been received from a total of 737 of the voting delegates. This number represented 87.2% of the total, which is well above the previously set minimum acceptable level.

Scope of the Problem

A brief analysis of the replies from the NASPA voting delegates provided an indication of the scope of the attrition problem in college student personnel work. Of the 737 responding institutions, 359, or 48.7% reported at least one person fitting the criteria, and a grand total

of 652 former student personnel workers were noted. Tables 1 and 2 represent the scope of the problem.

Surveying the Sample

All former student personnel workers on the compiled list were sent:

1. a copy of the instrument
2. an explanatory cover letter
3. a business reply mail envelope to be used in the return of the completed instrument

The cover letter briefly explained the study and, in order to verify the NASPA voting delegates' accuracy, the most important criteria were stated again. If the criteria were not appropriate to each individual, the respondent was asked to return the uncompleted questionnaire with a brief note explaining why it was inappropriate, or if he felt that he met the requirements, he was asked to complete the instrument. After receiving the responses, they were immediately examined to determine if indeed all of the criteria were met. If any exceptions to the stated requirements were uncovered, that respondent was eliminated from the study. Several respondents were omitted because they did not meet the requirements for "commitment to the profession" (two years in one of the full-time college student personnel positions indicated and/or at least a minor in college student personnel work or closely related area in a graduate degree program). A few were eliminated

TABLE 1.--NASPA voting delegates cooperating with study.
(in per cents)

	Number	per cent of total
Number of NASPA voting delegates	845	N/A
Number of NASPA voting delegates responding	737	87.2
Number of NASPA voting delegates reporting attrition in positions of interest	359	48.7 (of respondents)
Number of NASPA voting delegates reporting no attrition in positions of interest	378	51.3 (of respondents)

TABLE 2.--Frequency of attrition.

Number of student personnel workers reported to have left the profession	652	
Frequency of attrition per reporting institution		.9 individuals left profession per institution
Frequency of attrition per institution reporting some attrition in positions of interest		1.8 individuals left profession per institution reporting some attrition

for other reasons. Table 3 indicates the frequency of response of the former college student personnel workers. A response rate of 40% was arbitrarily set as necessary for the study. In this study the percentage of response used was actually an interpolated estimate derived by the following formulae:

$$P = R + \frac{R}{Q} (N)$$

$$\text{Estimated Per cent} = \frac{R}{P}$$

where,

R=number of usable responses¹
 P=number in sampled population meeting
 criteria
 Q=total number of respondents (including
 unusable responses)
 N=total number of non-respondents²

Using the formulae, the estimate can be made that 80.0% of the total population of the sample which met the criteria completed the questionnaire. This percentage far exceeded the previously set standard of 40% response. Therefore, the assumption is made that the responding group is representative of the population of interest.

¹When the total population was of interest, this number referred to the total population. When one of the positions was of interest, it referred to that number.

²Ibid.

TABLE 3.--Per cent of former student personnel worker sample returning completed instrument.

Position	Number sampled	Per cent of total	Number responding	Per cent of total responding	Per cent of position responding	Estimated per cent of position ** responding
Dean of Students	167	35.5	130	36.1	77.8	79.2
Assistant Dean of Students	71	15.1	58	16.1	81.7	82.9
Dean of Men	53	11.3	43	11.9	81.1	82.7
Assistant Dean of Men	24	5.1	17	4.7	70.8	73.9
Dean of Women	52	11.0	38	10.6	73.1	74.5
Assistant Dean of Women	17	3.6	15	4.2	88.2	88.2
Director of Housing	38	8.1	31	8.6	81.6	83.8
Assistant Director of Housing	29	6.1	24	6.7	82.8	82.8
Position not reported	20	4.2	4	1.1	N/A	N/A
Total sample receiving instrument	471*	100	360	100	78.6	80.0

* Not all reported former student personnel workers received the instrument because of insufficient addresses.

** Derived by the formulae: where, R=number of usable responses, P=number in sampled population meeting criteria, Q=total number of respondents (including unusable responses), and N=total number of non-respondents

$$P = R + \frac{R}{Q} (N), \text{ estimated } = \frac{R}{P} \text{ per cent}$$

The Instrument

As indicated in Chapter II, no research was found comparable enough to the goals of this study to allow the use of another questionnaire. For this and other reasons, a new instrument had to be designed. This section will describe the evolution of the instrument. A copy of the research questionnaire may be found in Appendix A.

Reasons for the Use of the Questionnaire as the Method of Inquiry

Other methods of inquiry were considered and rejected, among them were: personal interviews, various personality inventories, and open-ended questions.

Logistical and financial reasons negated the personal interview option. A representative sample of the eight positions of interest would have required a prohibitively large number of individuals in each group, randomly sampled. Geography, money, and time made this option impossible.

The use of various personality inventories such as the Omnibus Personality Inventory, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and others was felt to be undesirable for two major reasons. Firstly, the instruments available were not especially appropriate to the purposes of this study; and secondly, the response rate in similar studies using standardized instruments often had not indicated the degree of cooperation desired.

Open-ended questions, as the sole method of eliciting information, was rejected because the areas of inquiry would lack in breadth. This lack would be caused by the necessarily limited number of questions that could be used within reasonable time limits. Another negative factor was the extreme difficulty of subjectively quantifying data for appropriate statistical analysis. Because open-ended questions do not suggest responses, and therefore are not as limited as more objective questions which have a variety of suggested responses, some open-ended questions were incorporated into the final instrument.

Therefore, the objective questionnaire was selected as the best instrument for use in this study. It was chosen because:

1. it permits inquiry into a wide variety of areas in the least amount of time.
2. it elicits subjective responses in an objective form and therefore is easily quantifiable.
3. it readily permits meaningful statistical analysis.
4. it is readily adaptable to the specific purposes of this area of study.

Format of the Instrument

The final instrument consisted of two major parts. The first part was made up of twenty-four items. This part was designed to inquire about the former student personnel worker's evaluation of the environment of his former position. Twenty-three of the questions had four

responses arranged in a modified continuum, which is discussed later in this section. The twenty-fourth question had two possible alternatives.

The design of Part I was modified from a model by Likert (23), (24) which was used to evaluate the interpersonal environment in a corporate organization. His model asked the respondent to evaluate the organization in the stated areas at any place on a continuum with four descriptive points. The attrition study instrument differed from Likert's model in that the survey respondent must describe the environment of his former position at one of the four descriptive points. However it was similar to Likert's model in that the descriptive points are arranged in linear order.

The second part of the instrument consisted of twenty-seven questions asking whether or not many of the same elements found in Part I were factors in the former student personnel worker's decision to leave his previous position. The respondent was asked whether the various elements were "not a factor," "a contributing factor," or "a major consideration" in his decision to leave the position.

The questions in Part II were paired with the questions in Part I, where each question in Part I asked the respondent to evaluate the environment, the paired question in Part II inquired whether that aspect was a factor in

his decision to leave. Some exceptions included two questions that had no appropriate application to Part I.

The Pre-test

Given the nature of the study and the sample population, a classical pre-test was not felt by the researcher to be appropriate in the student personnel worker attrition study. However, this does not mean that the need to establish the appropriateness and validity of the instrument was considered unimportant. A variety of alternatives to the classical pre-test were available and those used are discussed below.

NASPA Research and Publications Division

The research and publications division of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators expressed interest in the attrition study and seriously considered it for funded research under their auspices. According to a letter from Dr. James Appleton, director of the Research Division, a policy had been recently instituted providing for research funding only under the direction of a member of that division; therefore, it was not possible to fund this study. Appleton later indicated that the division had seriously considered making an exception to the policy in this case. The division did evaluate the design of the study and a preliminary instrument during their 1969-70

winter meeting. After consideration the committee made no major recommendations for revision of the instrument or the design.

Bias Examination of the Instrument

Each question was examined by the rules delineated by Payne (31). Any question indicating undue bias was modified; however, in some cases, words with special connotations remained because either there was no adequate substitute, or the word or phrase itself was an integral part of the theme or concept of the writer(s) who suggested the question. Therefore, an attempt was made to keep bias and wording which might indicate a preferred direction of response to a minimum.

Validity

Content validity (8), (1), which is often cited in studies of this type can also be claimed in this case. Experts in college student personnel work were consulted in the design of the instrument through personal conversations or via the literature of the profession. In addition, experts in research design from the College of Education's Office of Research Consultation at Michigan State University also examined the questionnaire.

Modified Pre-test

Several student personnel workers and graduate students were asked to evaluate critically a preliminary

form of the instrument. Their impressions were informally discussed and they were interviewed to determine the effectiveness of the questions in their inquiry into the intended areas.

Administration of the Instrument

The instrument was mailed to the sample of former college student personnel workers during the first quarter of 1970. The contents of the initial mailing have been previously discussed. The second mailing consisted of a second cover letter requesting cooperation, another copy of the instrument, and the pre-paid envelope. In the event that some potential respondents doubted the confidentiality of their responses, the second mailing included the option to return an unsigned questionnaire while signing a Business Reply Mail postcard stating that they had completed, but not signed the instrument. The postcard was to be returned in a separate mailing, to assure anonymity. Copies of all mailed items are in Appendix B.

Format of the Analysis of the Results

The analysis indicated by the nature of the questionnaire was descriptive in nature and in a form that permitted statistical analysis. The statistical analysis is discussed in depth in a following section of Chapter III, but briefly, the analysis determined differential responses by position, sex, enrollment of the institution of former employment,

and academic training. Common factors and intercorrelation were determined as well as the construction of frequency distributions by position and for the total group.

Testable Hypotheses

The analysis of this study tested the following null hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis I: No difference in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by category of former position as measured by the student personnel attrition study instrument.

or symbolically,

$$H_{01}: P_1 = P_2 = P_3 = P_4 = P_5 = P_6 = P_7 = P_8$$

where, P_1 = Dean of Students; P_2 = Assistant Dean of Students; P_3 = Dean of Men; P_4 = Assistant Dean of Men; P_5 = Dean of Women; P_6 = Assistant Dean of Women; P_7 = Director of Housing; and P_8 = Assistant Director of Housing.

Null Hypothesis II: No difference in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by sex in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument.

or symbolically,

$$H_{02}: S_1 = S_2$$

where, S_1 = males

S_2 = females

Null Hypothesis III: No difference in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by enrollment of the institution of the former student personnel position on the student personnel attrition study instrument.

or symbolically,

$$H_{o3}: E_1 = E_2$$

where, E_1 = Enrollment of the institution of the former student personnel position less than 7500 students.

E_2 = Enrollment of the institution of the former student personnel position 7500 students or greater.

Null Hypothesis IV: No difference in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by the absence or presence of significant academic student personnel training in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument.

or symbolically,

$$H_{o4}: T_o = T_1$$

where, T_o = no significant academic student personnel training

T_1 = significant academic student personnel training.

Statistical Analysis

The purpose of the statistical analysis for this study was twofold; firstly, the statistical analysis described the attitudes that the former student personnel workers had toward the environments of their prior student personnel positions. Also, the first part of the analysis examined the former student personnel workers' perceptions of their reasons for leaving the profession. Attention was given to both the individual positions and the group as a whole.

The second phase of the statistical analysis determined whether reported differences in attitudes toward the

1

environment and perceptions of reasons for leaving the profession existed in the following areas:

1. by position
2. by sex
3. by enrollment of the institution of the former student personnel position
4. by the presence or absence of significant academic student personnel training

The statistical analysis was performed on the CDC 3600 computer in the Michigan State University Computer Center, using programs developed by members of the Computer Institute for Social Science Research (C.I.S.S.R.) staff, and by David Wright in the College of Education's Office of Research Consultation. The data were transferred by hand from the instrument to optical scanning forms, and then transferred mechanically from the optical scanning forms to data punch cards. The data punch cards served as the method of information input into the CDC 3600.

Frequency Distribution

The initial phase of the statistical analysis was the construction of a frequency distribution for the entire sample that returned usable questionnaires. The sample was then categorized by former position and a frequency distribution was made for each group.

A frequency distribution was the simplest way of systematically presenting the data. It permits the reader

to see how the groups responded to each item. Frequency distributions in Chapter IV are reported in percentages.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation

Stage two of the statistical analysis consisted of the construction of correlation matrices, using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The purpose of the correlation matrices was to examine relatedness between items. However, as Underwood, Benton, Duncan, Taylor, and Cotton tell us:

A correlational study rarely indicates which variable influences which, or even whether either variable is influencing the other one directly. And in any case, a correlation coefficient, as a statistical procedure, can never tell us anything about causality at all (44: 140).

In brief, for the purpose of the student personnel attrition study, the correlation coefficient only tells us whether two items are related, and how closely related they are. According to Downie and Heath (8), the one assumption that must be made concerning correlation is that of linearity. A visual inspection of the data for this study indicated that the assumption was valid in this case.

Each item in Part I was correlated with every other item in Part I, to make one matrix. Each item in Part II was correlated with every other item in Part II to complete the second matrix. Correlations, per se, are not important to the analysis, but rather were necessary in the generation of factor scores, which will be discussed in the following section.

Factor Analysis

The third phase of the statistical analysis was a factor analysis. The purpose of a factor analysis in this study was to go a step beyond just correlation. Neither correlation methods nor factor analysis added anything to the original data; but both were useful tools in trying to understand the data.

The first objective of factor analysis was simplification. Wolfle stated that if correlations are separated into various factors, the correlations can be reduced into a smaller number of factor loadings, and, "Since many of these loadings will be so close to zero that they can be disregarded, still greater simplification is achieved"

(48: 1).

The second objective of factor analysis was to find a set of responses which will be fewer in number and more basic in nature than any one of the individual items could be.

As in other statistical techniques, for a measurement to be valid, certain assumptions must be applicable. Wolfle summarized the assumptions of several sources, and the most important of the assumptions are further summarized below:

1. Responses to an instrument are not undifferentiated, but rather consist of a number of factors or traits, each of which is elicited by a variety of different problems.

2. Tests may differ factorially in one or both of two ways . . . in their complexity and in their factor loadings.
3. It is assumed that the abilities involved in performing any task combine by simple addition (48: 2).

In this study the factor analysis had two purposes. Primarily, the factors that arose in the factor analysis were used in developing factor scores which in turn were used as input into the final phase of the statistical analysis, which was the analysis of variance. Secondly, they were used to further illuminate the information first brought to light by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. It not only indicated what items were related to other items, but it also separated out those items that were closely related to one another, but only slightly or not at all related to any of the other factors. An example of a use of this knowledge would be that a composite score of responses in a given direction to items within one factor could be a better predictor of attrition than would be any individual item. Because of the assumption of additivity, more subtle, but widespread attitudes of dissatisfaction became more apparent, through an examination of the factors.

Analysis of Variance

The analysis of variance determined whether the various positions examined differentially responded to the research instrument. Diagram 1 indicates the model used

Position	Individuals	Factors Part I				Factors Part II			
		F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	F ₄	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	F ₄
dean of students	1	S ₁	S ₁						
	2	S ₂	S ₂						
	.	.	.						
	130	S ₁₃₀	S ₁₃₀						
asst. dean of students	1	S ₁							
	2	S ₂							
	.	.							
	58	S ₅₈							
dean of men	1								
	2								
	.								
	43								
asst. dean of men	1								
	2								
	.								
	17								
dean of women	1								
	2								
	.								
	38								
asst. dean of women	1								
	2								
	.								
	15								
director of housing	1								
	2								
	.								
	34								
asst. director of housing	1								
	2								
	.								
	24								

DIAGRAM 1.--Model of repeated measures analysis of variance.

Legend: F₁ equals Factor I; F₂ equals Factor II; etc.
 S₁ equals subject 1 in that position; S₂ equals
 subject 2 in that position; etc.

to investigate differences by position. Inquiry into sex, enrollment and presence or absence of academic student personnel training was done using similar models.

The method of analysis of variance used was the repeated measures design, discussed by Greenhouse and Geisser. This method is used for analyzing quantitative, non-categorical profile data, such as instruments of this type. Use of the repeated measures design necessitated the following assumptions:

1. variables must have a multi-normal distribution
2. the variance-covariance matrix is arbitrary
(13: 95)

Greenhouse and Geisser reported that it was their opinion that the method is appropriate to much research in the social sciences, where there are multiple observations on individuals who have been sampled from one or more populations.

Summary

The testable hypotheses, the population of interest, identification of the population of interest, construction of the questionnaire, the pre-test, and the statistical analysis have been discussed. The population of interest consisted of former student personnel workers from eight categories of positions. It was stated that the former student personnel workers were identified through the cooperation of 87.2% of the voting delegates to NASPA. An

interpolated index of the rate of response to the questionnaire by the appropriate former student personnel workers who received the instrument was 80.0%.

The most important statistical analyses used were the frequency distribution, factor analysis, and analysis of variance. Any differences between groups were determined by the analysis of variance.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

An analysis of the data collected in the study is presented in this chapter.

Analysis Format

For the purposes of clear presentation and the testing of the hypotheses in the study, the data were examined from six perspectives. They were:

1. Construction of a frequency distribution of responses to the student personnel attrition study instrument for the total sample.
2. Construction of a frequency distribution of the responses to the student personnel attrition study instrument for each of the positions studied.
3. Analyses of variance to determine if differences existed in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument by category of former position.
4. Analyses of variance to determine if differences existed in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument between male and female respondents.
5. Analyses of variance to determine if differences existed in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument by the enrollment of the institution of the prior student personnel position.
6. Analyses of variance to determine if differences existed in response to the student personnel

attrition study instrument by the absence or presence of significant academic student personnel or closely related training.

Brief Review of the Nature of the Sample

As indicated in the preceding chapters, only the following student personnel positions were studied:

1. dean of students
2. assistant dean of students
3. dean of men
4. assistant dean of men
5. dean of women
6. assistant dean of women
7. director of housing
8. assistant director of housing

In addition to formerly holding one of the above eight categories of positions, other requirements had to be met for inclusion into the sample; they were a demonstrated commitment to the student personnel profession and attrition from the field between August, 1966 and October, 1969.

Brief Review of the Instrument

The research instrument was constructed after a review of the literature to identify those elements in the profession which could potentially influence attrition. From the review of the literature a question pool was developed and then slowly reduced as a result of consultation with experts in student personnel, research design, and statistics. The

final instrument contained two major sections. Part I inquired about the sample's perception of the environment of their prior position and Part II asked respondents to judge whether many of these same areas contributed to their decision to leave student personnel work.

Brief Review of the Statistics Used and Their Rationale

The frequency distributions were meant to present a clear picture of the nature of the research instrument data as a total group and by former position.

The analyses of variance were used to discover differences in response of the various sub-groups previously discussed.

A factor analysis was done to produce groupings of questions for input into the analyses of variance. The procedure also made the use of the analysis of variance more appropriate for the data. A more complete discussion of the results of the factor analysis follows.

Results of the Factor Analysis

As previously mentioned, the instrument was divided into major components ("environment" and "reasons for leaving") and a factor analysis was done on each separate part. In each analysis, four factors were developed accounting for 33% and 40% of the total variance for each respective part. The factors that were developed and the items included are found in Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 4.--Items contained in factors of Part I.

PART I	
Item	Factor Loading

Factor I

1. Presence of "professional freedom" .588
2. Opportunity for promotion .386
3. Level of bureaucracy .741
4. Appreciation by superiors .724
5. Institutional resistance to stud. pers. dept. goals .617
6. Institutional openness to change .595
7. Confidence shown by superiors .723

Factor II

1. Adequacy of training for position .440
2. Prestige in students' eyes .515
3. New position more in line with training .404
4. Perceived conflict between counseling and discipline .340

Factor III

1. Level of responsibility held .399
2. Involvement in discipline .450
3. Faculty status .433

Factor IV

1. Amount of departmental change .536
2. Amount of student activism .576

TABLE 5.--Items contained in factors of Part II.

PART II	
Item	Factor Loading

Factor I

1. Departmental rate of change	.681
2. Amount of "professional freedom"	.660
3. Bureaucracy	.781
4. Had too little responsibility	.529
5. Lack of appreciation by superiors	.749
6. Institutional resistance to SPW goals	.717
7. Attitude toward departmental goals	.491
8. Institutional resistance to change	.672
9. Level of decision making	.686
10. Confidence expressed by superiors	.610
11. Clarity of objectives	.539
12. Level of internal politics	.755

Factor II

1. Faculty status	.832
2. Prestige in eyes of institution	.446
3. Salary	.408
4. Position's educational function	.394

Factor III

1. Adequacy of training for position	.565
2. Level of involvement in discipline	.626
3. Level of training more appropriate for new position	.517
4. Conflict between couns. and discip.	.575

Factor IV

1. Demands of children	.785
2. Demands of marriage	.760

For the purpose of easier communication, the factors were assigned names which were felt to best represent the commonalities within each of the factors. They were:

Part I (environment)

Factor I -- Openness

Factor II -- Prestige and training

Factor III -- Definition of position

Factor IV -- Orientation of change

Part II (reasons for leaving)

Factor I -- Openness

Factor II -- Prestige

Factor III -- Training and discipline

Factor IV -- Personal

As can be seen in an examination of both Tables 4 and 5, and the assigned factor names, there appeared to be a fairly high correlation between factors in each part.

Of the 24 items in Part I, 16 fell into one of the four factors, and 22 of the 27 items in Part II had factor leadings large enough for inclusion. Most authorities considered these ratios to be quite high for a study of this type.

Presentation of the Data

This section is divided into two major units. First will be a discussion of the contents of the frequency distributions, and second will be a presentation of the

testable hypotheses, which were tested by the analyses of variance.

Part I (environment)

Part I, Factor I--Openness of the Former Environment

Table 6 contains a summary of the responses by position and for the total group to the items in Part I, Factor I.

Of the respondents, 44% felt that any form of "professional freedom," possibly such as feeling free to speak their minds on controversial issues, was either moderately or greatly limited, with deans and assistant deans of men seeing the most limitations and deans and assistant deans of students, as groups, reporting the greatest amount of freedom.

About one in every four respondents saw the level of bureaucracy as a major problem, but about one-third reported it to be generally helpful and responsive to them in the performance of their duties.

Again dealing with the university structure, a fairly high level of consensus was present in all eight positions relative to their views of the institution's resistance to the goals of their department; almost one-half reported moderate or strong resistance to what they felt their former department was trying to accomplish.

But with the exception of the deans of students and assistant deans of women, responses were about equally divided concerning their views on the institution's openness

TABLE 6.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor I, Part I.
(in per cents)

Item and response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Existence of "professional freedom"									
no professional freedom	10.0	6.9	11.6	11.8	5.4	21.4	6.5	8.3	9.3
limited professional freedom	26.9	31.0	46.5	47.1	35.1	21.4	45.2	33.3	33.6
fairly broad professional freedom	28.5	36.2	32.6	35.3	24.3	42.9	38.7	29.2	31.6
same as faculty	34.6	24.1	9.3	5.9	35.1	14.3	9.7	29.2	25.1
Level of bureaucracy									
essentially unworkable	6.9	5.2	14.0	5.9	10.8	20.0	19.4	4.3	9.3
greatly hindered performance	19.2	15.5	23.3	23.5	16.2	6.7	22.6	17.4	18.6
sometimes interfered	33.1	48.3	41.9	47.1	32.4	20.0	41.9	39.1	37.9
generally responsive	40.8	31.0	20.9	23.5	37.8	53.3	16.1	39.1	33.9
Superior's appreciation of subordinates									
knew and appreciated little	18.5	19.0	23.3	11.8	28.0	13.3	32.3	4.2	19.9
had some knowledge	30.8	27.6	34.9	41.2	15.8	40.0	29.0	25.0	29.5
knew and appreciated rather fully	24.6	27.6	23.3	29.4	36.8	33.3	19.4	33.3	27.0
knew and appreciated well	26.2	25.9	18.6	17.6	18.4	13.3	19.4	37.5	23.6
Resistance by instit. of SPW goals									
strong resistance	17.1	17.5	16.7	31.3	13.2	40.0	25.8	16.7	19.0
moderate resistance	28.7	29.8	45.2	25.0	26.3	0.0	25.8	25.0	28.7
some resistance at times	38.8	33.3	23.8	37.5	39.5	46.7	32.3	37.5	35.8
little or no resistance	15.5	19.3	14.3	6.3	21.1	13.3	16.1	20.8	16.5
Institution's openness to change									
extremely resistive	8.5	1.8	16.3	23.5	10.5	0.0	19.4	4.2	9.6
only occurs under strong pressure	27.0	45.6	37.2	29.4	44.7	33.3	41.9	45.8	36.4
occurs when based on substantial cause	48.1	38.6	39.5	47.1	36.9	60.0	35.3	37.5	42.9
open to immed. meaningful change	15.5	14.0	7.0	0.0	7.9	6.7	3.2	12.5	11.0

TABLE 6.--Continued.

Item and response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Confidence in subordinates shown by									
superiors									
not at all	6.2	10.3	9.3	5.9	2.6	13.3	19.4	0.0	7.8
were condescending	17.7	20.7	39.5	35.3	23.7	20.0	35.5	16.7	23.9
substantial confidence	38.5	36.2	20.9	23.5	36.8	40.0	41.9	29.2	35.4
complete confidence	32.3	37.9	27.9	47.1	42.1	60.0	29.0	33.3	35.4
Opportunity for promotion									
almost no chance for promotion	36.2	25.9	37.2	5.9	55.3	40.0	40.0	16.7	34.4
little chance for promotion	26.2	43.1	37.2	47.1	34.2	53.3	33.3	20.8	33.5
good chance for promotion	32.3	20.7	23.3	41.2	5.3	6.7	20.0	41.7	25.4
promotion almost certain in near future	3.8	10.3	2.3	5.9	5.3	0.0	3.3	20.8	5.9

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of men; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

to change. The two exceptions appeared to have seen the institution more responsive to change than the other six.

Slightly over one half of the sample perceived that superiors had either a moderate or high level of appreciation for the problems faced by their subordinates, whereas about one in five felt that superiors knew and appreciated little.

Also the respondents felt that their superiors saw them as capable. This was illustrated by the fact that about two-thirds of the total felt that their superiors had shown either substantial or complete confidence in them. This figure would have been even higher were it not for the deans of men and directors of housing, who both reported a much lower level of confidence.

A contrasting finding was that over two-thirds of the total group perceived poor chances for their promotion in the near future. The only exception to the pattern was in the assistant director of housing position in which almost the same results were found, but in the opposite direction.

Part I, Factor II--Prestige and Training

Table 7 contains a summary of responses to items in Part I, Factor II.

A strong consensus appeared when the respondents were asked to rate their opinion of the adequacy of their academic, informal, and in-service training for their former

TABLE 7.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor II, Part I.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Adequacy of training for position									
totally inadequate	.8	5.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	8.3	2.5
fairly insufficient	10.8	6.9	14.0	11.8	8.1	13.3	9.7	0.0	9.6
fairly adequate	44.6	46.6	53.5	52.9	48.6	20.0	45.2	62.5	47.0
well prepared	43.8	41.4	30.2	35.3	43.2	66.7	38.7	29.2	40.8
Prestige in eyes of students									
very low	1.6	1.7	2.3	0.0	5.3	6.7	6.5	4.2	2.8
moderately low	11.6	15.5	25.6	29.4	10.5	6.7	16.1	41.7	16.9
moderately high	49.6	65.5	55.8	58.8	55.3	73.3	67.7	50.0	56.6
very high	37.2	15.5	16.3	11.8	28.9	13.3	9.7	4.2	23.4
Compatibility of new position with training									
less in line	16.3	31.3	12.5	33.3	21.4	53.9	17.9	38.1	22.5
equally in line	20.8	25.9	37.2	35.3	23.7	26.7	25.8	39.1	26.5
slightly more in line	37.7	34.5	20.9	17.6	23.7	13.3	19.4	26.1	29.3
much more in line	23.1	20.7	11.6	11.8	23.7	40.0	9.7	26.1	20.6
Perceived conflict between counseling and discipline									
conflict greatly affected effectiveness	11.5	15.5	23.3	17.6	5.3	0.0	12.9	12.5	12.9
often reduced effectiveness	17.7	10.3	27.9	11.8	15.8	0.0	16.1	25.0	16.9
sometimes interfered with effectiveness	38.5	36.2	20.9	23.5	36.8	40.0	41.9	29.2	34.8
no real conflict	32.3	37.9	27.9	47.1	42.1	60.0	29.0	33.3	35.4

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of women; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

position, with almost 90% feeling adequately or well prepared for the position that they left.

Consistent with this perception, there are indications that the former student personnel workers did not leave their former position because the new position they were assuming was more appropriate to their background. When asked if they felt that their present position was more in line with their training and preparation than their prior position, only a little over 40% indicated that it was either slightly or much more appropriate. About one fourth saw it as less in line. The remainder saw the two positions as equivalent regarding their preparation.

A conflict between discipline and counseling, perceived or real, did not appear to significantly interfere with the former student personnel workers' being able to effectively function in their former position. Only slightly over one fourth of the sample felt that the conflict either often or greatly detracted from their effectiveness.

Possibly the perceptions of a lack of conflict between counseling and discipline were related to the view that the respondent's former role was generally felt to be prestigious in the eyes of the student body. Only two in every ten people in the sample felt that the level of prestige would have been rated either moderately or very low by the students.

Part I, Factor III--Definition
of the Position

Table 8 contains a summary of the responses to items contained in Part I, Factor III.

Most of the former student personnel workers sampled reported that the amount of responsibility they held in their former position was just about right for the job, but not indicated in any of the tables or appendices was the frequency of handwritten addenda to this question adding that too often, the respondents felt, the degree of responsibility far exceeded the authority contained in the position.

A dichotomy appeared in the responses to the question inquiring about the level of involvement in disciplinary affairs. The full deans had the greatest amount of disciplinary responsibilities with the assistants in every case being much less involved. About 65% of the full deans felt that they were very much involved in disciplinary matters, whereas only slightly over 40% of the assistants gave similar responses. It was interesting to note that deans of men saw themselves "very much involved" almost twice as often as did deans of women.

The majority of former student personnel workers had faculty status, with exceptions to the pattern being found only in the housing office, and in the assistant dean of women position. Almost 20% more of the assistant deans of men had faculty status than did their female counterparts.

TABLE 8.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor III, Part I.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Level of responsibility held									
too much responsibility	28.5	13.8	14.0	5.9	16.2	20.0	19.4	4.2	19.2
proper amount of responsibility	53.8	60.3	55.8	52.9	67.6	53.3	45.2	58.3	56.1
too little responsibility	14.6	20.7	23.3	35.3	10.8	13.3	29.0	29.2	19.4
almost no responsibility	3.1	5.2	7.0	5.9	2.7	13.3	6.5	8.3	5.1
Degree of involvement in discip.									
very much involved	74.4	43.1	83.7	23.5	44.7	26.7	54.8	33.3	58.3
frequently involved	14.0	22.4	11.6	23.5	36.8	13.3	25.8	16.7	19.2
sometimes involved	10.1	25.9	4.7	35.3	18.4	46.3	16.1	37.5	18.0
seldom or never involved	1.6	8.6	0.0	17.6	0.0	13.3	3.2	12.5	4.5
Faculty status									
had faculty status	71.3	48.3	67.4	58.8	68.4	40.0	32.2	33.3	58.9
had no faculty status	28.7	50.0	32.6	41.2	31.6	60.0	67.7	66.7	40.8

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of men; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

Part I, Factor IV--Orientation
Towards Change

Table 9 contains a summary of the responses to questions contained in Part I, Factor IV.

Despite moderate differences in response, when asked to describe the rate of change that was occurring in their former departments, the respondents generally seemed to feel that their departments had been either moderately or greatly changing. In every case, however, the assistants tended to see less change than did their immediate superiors.

Some student activism was reported to be present at more than 95% of the colleges and universities where the former student personnel workers had been employed. It is interesting to note that the factor analysis indicated such a close relationship between change in the department and student activism. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation, computed preliminary to the factor analysis, found responses to these two questions to be the most highly correlated of any two items in Part I (sig. at 1% level).

Part II (reasons for leaving)

What reasons did former student personnel workers see as influencing their decisions to leave? This was the general question raised in Part II of the student personnel attrition study instrument. The results of Part II are grouped by factors, and summarized below.

TABLE 9.---Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor IV, Part I.

Item and Responses	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Level of student activism									
no student activism	5.4	1.7	7.1	11.8	2.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	4.8
little student activism	24.6	27.6	33.3	29.4	26.3	40.0	54.8	33.3	30.4
moderate amount of activism	56.2	46.6	52.4	52.9	65.8	53.3	35.5	41.7	52.1
great deal of activism	13.8	24.1	7.1	5.9	5.3	6.7	9.7	12.5	12.7
Departmental rate of change									
no change	2.3	1.7	9.5	5.9	10.5	0.0	3.2	12.5	4.8
little change	13.8	20.7	16.7	35.3	18.4	40.0	22.6	25.0	19.4
moderate change	48.5	37.9	38.1	29.4	39.5	53.4	41.9	25.0	41.7
great deal of change	35.4	39.7	35.7	29.4	31.6	6.7	32.3	37.5	34.1

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of men; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

Part II, Factor I--Openness

Table 10 contains a summary of the responses to questions contained in Part II, Factor I. The responses in Factor I can logically be divided further into the sub-factors of openness within the institution and openness within the department.

Institutional resistance to innovation and change was cited as a "contributing" or "major" consideration in nearly half of the responses. The two positions apparently most disturbed by any resistance to change in the institution were the deans of men and directors of housing, where only about one third of the group saw the resistance to change as "not a factor" in their decision to leave.

Resistance by the institution to the goals that their former department held important was a "major" or "contributing" factor for about 45% of the sample surveyed.

The institutional structure had a negative influence again with more than half of the respondents reporting that the extent of bureaucracy was either a "major consideration" (22.3%), or a "contributing factor" (30.4%) in their decision to leave.

Limited professional freedom did not appear to be too great a reason to leave, with the responses fairly consistent by position. Of the total sample, 11% described it as a "major consideration" and 23% as a "contributing factor."

TABLE 10.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor I, Part II.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Departmental rate of change a major consideration	13.8	12.1	18.6	23.5	15.8	26.7	26.7	13.0	16.4
a contributing factor	20.0	25.9	34.9	41.2	26.3	6.7	20.0	13.0	23.4
not a factor	66.7	62.1	46.5	35.3	57.9	66.7	53.3	73.9	60.2
Amount of "profess. freedom" a major consideration	11.5	13.8	11.6	5.9	13.2	20.0	10.0	4.2	11.5
a contributing factor	20.0	20.7	34.9	35.3	10.5	13.3	40.0	16.7	22.8
not a factor	68.5	65.5	53.5	58.8	76.3	66.7	50.0	79.2	65.6
Bureaucracy a major consideration	16.9	25.9	30.2	17.6	23.7	26.7	40.0	4.2	22.3
a contributing factor	32.3	24.1	48.8	52.9	13.2	6.7	26.7	33.3	30.4
not a factor	50.8	50.0	20.9	29.4	63.2	66.7	33.3	62.5	47.3
✓ Degree of responsibility a major consideration	4.6	8.6	9.4	11.8	10.5	20.0	23.3	12.5	9.6
a contributing factor	13.1	20.7	32.6	35.3	10.5	6.7	20.0	25.0	18.6
not a factor	82.3	70.7	58.1	52.9	78.9	73.3	56.7	62.5	71.8
Appreciation by superiors a major consideration	25.4	17.2	32.6	23.5	21.1	26.7	36.7	12.5	24.5
a contributing factor	24.6	31.0	41.9	35.3	15.8	13.3	26.7	20.8	26.8
not a factor	50.0	51.7	25.6	41.2	63.2	60.0	36.7	66.7	48.7
Resistance to SPW goals a major consideration	16.2	17.5	11.9	12.5	10.5	20.0	25.8	8.3	15.6
a contributing factor	29.2	29.8	35.7	18.8	28.9	13.3	32.3	33.3	29.5
not a factor	54.6	52.6	52.4	68.9	60.5	66.7	41.9	58.3	55.0
Attitude toward dept. goals a major consideration	3.8	7.0	4.7	5.9	13.2	40.0	12.9	8.3	8.2
a contributing factor	14.6	24.6	27.9	52.9	7.9	0.0	22.6	29.2	20.0
not a factor	81.5	68.4	67.4	41.2	78.9	60.0	64.5	62.5	71.8
Instit. resist. to change a major consideration	13.8	13.8	16.3	23.5	13.2	20.0	25.8	12.5	15.7
a contributing factor	23.1	32.8	39.5	41.2	28.9	6.7	38.7	25.0	28.9
not a factor	63.1	53.4	44.2	35.3	57.9	73.3	35.5	62.5	55.3

TABLE 10.--Continued.

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Level of decision making a major consideration	10.8	12.1	23.3	23.5	15.8	20.0	38.7	8.3	16.3
a contributing factor	22.3	31.0	27.9	52.9	15.8	13.3	22.6	29.2	25.3
not a factor	66.9	56.9	48.8	23.5	68.4	66.7	38.7	62.5	58.4
Confidence expressed by super. a major consideration	14.6	12.1	18.6	5.9	18.4	6.7	25.8	0.0	14.3
a contributing factor	17.7	10.3	20.9	29.4	13.2	0.0	29.0	20.8	17.4
not a factor	66.7	77.6	60.5	64.7	68.4	93.3	45.2	79.2	68.3
Clarity of objectives a major consideration	3.1	5.2	20.0	29.4	15.8	13.3	22.6	4.2	10.4
a contributing factor	21.7	27.6	44.2	29.4	5.3	13.3	35.5	29.2	25.4
not a factor	75.2	67.2	34.9	41.2	78.9	73.3	41.9	66.7	64.2
Internal politics a major consideration	27.7	24.1	41.9	23.5	28.9	20.0	48.4	4.2	28.7
a contributing factor	24.6	17.2	27.9	35.3	10.5	20.0	19.4	33.3	22.8
not a factor	47.7	58.6	30.2	41.2	60.5	60.0	32.3	62.5	48.6

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals assistant dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals assistant dean of men; DOW equals assistant dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals assistant director of housing.

When asked whether they felt that the rate of change in their former department was a consideration in their decision to leave the profession, about 60% of the total sample said that it was not a factor, but approximately one out of six former student personnel workers saw it as a "major consideration."

Only about one in twelve of the former student personnel workers felt that a disagreement with their former department's goals were a "major" reason for leaving, in contrast with the almost three fourths who did not think that it had influenced them at all.

About one third of the responding sample reported that the clarity of the objectives of their position was either a major or contributing factor in their decision to leave their former position. Again, deans and assistant deans of men and directors of housing proved to be exceptions, with over 60% of these groups reporting the lack of clear objectives as influencing their decisions.

Although responses to the paired question in Part I indicated that nearly one third of the respondents reported that little or no confidence in them was expressed by their superiors, it appeared that in most cases, the lack of expressed confidence was not a major factor influencing the former student personnel worker to leave. Nearly seven of every ten respondents indicated that it was not even an element of consideration. It is interesting to note that while well

over 90% of the deans of women stated that indicated confidence in them was "not a factor," less than half of that percentage of their immediate assistants agreed.

However confidence and appreciation were two different things. Feeling appreciated by superiors appeared to be important to the majority of former student personnel workers in that one-fourth reported a lack of expressed appreciation contributed in a major way to their departure. An additional quarter saw it as "a contributing factor." Deans and assistant deans of men and directors of housing attributed lack of appreciation for their performance as a factor more frequently than did the other positions.

Almost 40% of the directors of housing reported the level of decision making to be "a major consideration" in their decision to leave; however, they appeared to be an exception to the general pattern. When the entire sample was considered, only about 16% indicated that same amount of importance assigned to the level of decision making. An additional 25% of the respondents felt it to be "a contributing factor."

The level of responsibility contained in their former position did not seem to exert too great an effect on the rate of student personnel attrition. Almost three-quarters of the entire sample listed it as "not a factor."

However this was not the case with the issue of "internal politics." It appeared that this element in the respondents former environment frequently contributed to attrition.

Nearly 30% of the total sample stated this reason as a "major consideration" in their decision to leave the field. This question received the highest percentage of "major consideration" markings of any item in the research instrument. An additional 23% reported it to be "a contributing factor." In all cases the assistants to each of the positions credited this reason for leaving less frequently than did the immediately superior position.

Part II, Factor II--Prestige

Table 11 contains a summary of the responses to questions contained in Part II, Factor II.

Only about one of every 18 respondents reported that lack of involvement in the educational function of the institution was "a major consideration" in their decision to abandon the student personnel profession. In contrast, over 75% indicated that it was "not a factor." A closer examination of the results shows that several assistant deans of men, assistant deans of women, and directors of housing all apparently wanted to be more involved in the educational function than they were at the time.

As would be expected, considering the relatively high number of the sample who reported that their former position had faculty status, few of the former student personnel workers reported a lack of faculty status to be a factor influencing their decision to leave.

If faculty status was considered to be prestigious, it should be obvious why only about one-fourth of the total

TABLE 11.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor II, Part II.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Faculty status									
a major consideration	1.5	1.7	2.3	5.9	5.3	6.7	6.7	4.2	3.1
a contributing factor	7.7	8.6	9.3	11.8	5.3	20.0	13.3	16.7	9.6
not a factor	90.0	89.7	88.4	82.4	89.5	73.3	80.0	79.2	87.0
Prestige in eyes of instit.									
a major consideration	3.8	3.4	7.0	5.9	7.9	6.7	13.3	12.5	6.2
a contributing factor	16.2	19.0	20.9	23.5	13.2	13.3	30.0	33.3	19.4
not a factor	80.0	77.6	72.1	70.6	78.9	80.0	56.7	54.2	74.4
Salary									
a major consideration	3.8	13.8	18.6	17.6	7.9	6.7	16.1	29.2	11.2
a contributing factor	14.6	27.6	25.6	64.7	13.2	6.7	25.8	12.5	20.8
not a factor	81.5	58.6	55.8	17.6	78.9	86.7	58.1	58.3	69.0
Educ. function of position									
a major consideration	4.6	6.9	2.3	11.8	5.3	13.3	9.7	4.2	5.9
a contributing factor	16.9	6.9	20.9	41.2	7.9	26.7	32.3	25.0	18.3
not a factor	78.5	86.2	76.7	47.1	86.8	60.0	58.1	70.8	75.8

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals assistant dean of students; DOM equals asst. dean of men; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; and ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

sample felt low prestige in the eyes of the institution to be a factor in their attrition, and only six per cent of the total saw it as "a major consideration."

A very wide range of responses were given to the question concerning salary. Over 80% of the deans of students reported salary not to be a factor, while only 17% of the assistant deans of men gave the same response. It is also interesting to note that nearly 90% of the assistant dean of men's distaff counterparts felt that it was also not a factor. In this day of women's liberation movements, this response was especially intriguing.

Part II, Factor III--Training and Discipline

A summary of the responses to questions contained in Part II, Factor III can be found in Table 12. Greater compatibility of training with their new position relative to their former student personnel position did not seem to be a significant motivating factor causing attrition in the sample, constant across all of the positions of interest. Less than one-third felt that the new position that they were assuming was more appropriate to their background.

As might have been expected after reading the previous paragraph, as a rule the former student personnel workers in the sample felt that the training in their background had adequately prepared them for the position that they had left. There were no large deviations from the stated pattern.

While almost 80% of the sample had reported that they were either frequently or very much involved in discipline

TABLE 12.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor III, Part II.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Adequacy of training for new position									
a major consideration	12.3	8.6	16.5	5.9	13.2	6.7	13.3	20.8	12.4
a contributing factor	21.5	19.0	25.6	17.6	13.2	13.3	30.0	16.7	20.6
not a factor	66.2	72.4	58.1	76.5	73.7	80.0	56.7	62.5	67.0
Involvement in discipline									
a major consideration	10.1	5.2	32.6	5.9	7.9	0.0	6.7	8.3	10.7
a contributing factor	24.0	22.4	18.6	29.4	23.7	6.7	36.7	25.0	23.7
not a factor	65.9	72.4	48.8	64.7	68.4	93.3	56.7	66.7	65.6
Adequacy of training for former position									
a major consideration	5.4	3.4	2.3	0.0	7.9	6.7	0.0	4.2	4.2
a contributing factor	12.3	6.9	20.9	5.9	5.3	6.7	16.1	12.5	11.5
not a factor	82.3	89.7	76.7	94.1	86.8	86.7	83.9	83.3	84.3
Counseling and discip. conflict									
a major consideration	5.4	8.6	20.9	0.0	7.9	0.0	6.5	12.5	8.1
a contributing factor	23.1	17.2	25.6	35.3	13.2	6.7	29.0	16.7	21.3
not a factor	71.5	74.1	53.5	64.7	78.9	93.3	64.5	70.8	70.5

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of women; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

in their former position, only about one-third saw that involvement as contributing to their departure from the profession. A notable exception to this finding was in the dean of men position where more than one-half saw it as a factor; most of that as a "major consideration."

Part II, Factor IV--Personal

A summary of the responses to the questions contained in Part II, Factor IV can be found in Table 13.

Any demands placed on the former student personnel workers by their children apparently were not significant enough to encourage the people in the sample to have sought another career. Only in the case of the assistant deans of men did more than 20% of any group feel it to exert any influence on their decision.

Similar results were found when the sample was asked the same question relative to marriage; however, this time there were some exceptions. The demands of marriage were felt to be a "major consideration" by 11.8% of the assistant deans of men, 18.5% of the deans of women, and 33.3% of the assistant deans of women.

Major Reason for Leaving the Student Personnel Profession

Each of the respondents was asked, through an open-ended question, what they felt was the major reason influencing their decision to leave the profession. Table 14 indicates that there was no general pattern in the responses. The most frequent response, with 17.7%, was that the former

TABLE 13.--Frequency distribution of items contained in Factor IV, Part II.
(in per cents)

Item and Response	DOS	ADOS	DOM	ADOM	DOW	ADOW	DOH	ADOH	TOTAL
Demands of children									
a major consideration	5.4	5.2	7.0	11.8	5.3	6.7	6.5	0.0	5.6
a contributing factor	13.8	5.2	11.6	11.8	5.3	6.7	6.5	8.3	9.8
not a factor	80.8	89.7	81.4	76.5	89.5	86.7	87.1	91.7	84.6
Demands of marriage									
a major consideration	6.9	8.6	9.3	11.8	18.4	33.3	6.5	4.2	9.8
a contributing factor	13.1	8.6	7.0	29.4	5.3	6.7	12.9	12.5	11.2
not a factor	80.0	82.8	83.7	58.8	76.3	60.0	80.6	83.3	78.9

Legend: DOS equals dean of students; ADOS equals asst. dean of students; DOM equals dean of men; ADOM equals asst. dean of men; DOW equals dean of women; ADOW equals asst. dean of women; DOH equals director of housing; ADOH equals asst. director of housing.

TABLE 14.--Stated major reasons for leaving student personnel work.
(in per cents)

Stated reason	per cent
1. Found new position more attractive	17.7%
2. Incompatible with immediate superiors	8.5
3. Wanted to teach	5.9
4. Salary	5.1
5. Opposition to the president	4.8
5. Stale, just needed a change	4.8
5. Unable to influence policy	4.8
8. Talents or philosophy not compatible with department	4.2
9. Wanted to do graduate work	3.7
10. Personal reasons	3.4
10. Internal politics	3.4
12. Physical or mental health	3.1
12. Too much work involved	3.1
14. Marriage	2.8
15. No opportunity for promotion	2.5
16. Student activism	2.3
16. Too much resistance from faculty and president	2.3
16. Demands placed on family life	2.3
19. Too much involvement with discipline	2.0
20. Lack of support from within institution	1.4
None listed, or "other"	25.9

student personnel worker simply found the new position to be more attractive than their former position. One important indication of these results was the small number of responses that were not covered by questions in the research instrument; however, at least one respondent left for a reason not included in the instrument. He stated that his major reason for leaving college student personnel work was to get away from "these damn questionnaires."

Length of Student Personnel Experience

When asked about their length of tenure in the student personnel profession it appeared that most of the former student personnel workers had been fairly permanently employed in the area of student affairs. Of the 360 respondents, 28.1% had been in the profession for nine or more years, and the median student personnel experience for the sample of former student personnel workers was five years. Only a little over 30% had been in the field for less than four years. A complete listing of the respondents' length of time in the profession can be found in Appendix C.

Analysis of Variance

The repeated measures design of analysis of variance was used to investigate for differences between categories of sub-groups of former student personnel workers, and to test the four null hypotheses. A t-ratio test was used to locate the major areas where significant differences occurred. A summary of F-ratios may be found in Table 15.

TABLE 15.--F-ratios for differences in "reasons for leaving student personnel work" and perceptions of the former environment.

	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio
Differences in perception of former environment by position	7, 351	2.706**
Differences in reasons for leaving profession by position	7, 351	2.747**
Differences in perception of former environment by sex	1, 357	.844 NS
Differences in reasons for leaving profession by sex	1, 357	1.596 NS
Differences in perception of former environment by enrollment of institution	1, 339	2.489 NS
Differences in reasons for leaving profession by enrollment of institution	1, 339	3.343 NS
Differences in perception of former environment by academic training	1, 351	2.366 NS
Differences in reasons for leaving profession by academic training	1, 351	4.308*

* Significant at 5% level.

** Significant at 1% level.

NS Not significant.

Differences by Former Position

The first hypothesis, which was initially stated in Chapter I, and then again in a testable form in Chapter III, dealt with reasons for leaving the student personnel profession that might be differentiated by former position. In a null form, the hypothesis was stated as,

No differences in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by category of former position, as measured by the student personnel attrition study instrument.

The repeated measures design of the analysis of variance produced an F-ratio of 2.747, which was significant at the 1% level and permitted the rejection of the null hypothesis.

A t-ratio to test for differences between means permitted an identification of just where the differences by former position lay.

Former directors of housing more frequently cited items in Factor I as reasons for leaving the student personnel profession than did the group as a whole (sig. at 5% level). In other words, former directors of housing mentioned bureaucracy, lack of appreciation by superiors, level of decision making, lack of responsibility, and internal politics as reasons for leaving the profession more frequently than did the total sample.

Factor II, or "Prestige" related items (faculty status, salary, and/or prestige in the eyes of students and the institution as a whole) were mentioned more frequently as reasons influencing the decision to leave the student affairs

profession by assistant directors of housing (sig. at 5% level), and assistant deans of men (1% level) than were related by the total sample.

Deans of men more frequently attributed reasons of a conflict between counseling and discipline, involvement in disciplinary matters, and adequacy of training (Factor III) as reasons for attrition more often than did the sample as a whole.

Deans of students differed from the sample as a whole in both the areas of "Openness" (Factor I, sig. at 5% level) and Prestige (Factor II, sig. at 1% level). However, in both instances the former deans of students attributed these reasons for leaving the profession significantly less frequently.

When the F-ratio test was applied to differences in the perception of the former environment, differences significant at the 1% level were also found by former position.

Differences by Sex

The second hypothesis tested was concerned with reasons for leaving the student personnel profession that might differ between males and females. The hypothesis, as stated in null form said, "No difference in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by sex in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument." The F-ratio generated by the analysis of variance was not significant at any level, therefore, the null hypothesis for different reasons for leaving the profession by sex cannot be rejected.

The statistical analysis also indicated that males and females in the sample did not significantly differ in their perceptions of the environment of the institution of their prior student personnel position.

Differences by the Enrollment of the Institution
of the Prior Student Personnel Employment

The third hypothesis to be tested dealt with differential reasons for leaving the student personnel profession by the enrollment of the institution of the respondents' prior student personnel position. The null hypothesis for this test was stated as, "No differences in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by the enrollment of the institution of the former student personnel position on the student personnel attrition study instrument." The F-ratio indicated that again it was not possible to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore one cannot say that reasons of leaving the student personnel profession varied by the size of the institution.

Also, when the data relating to perceptions of the environment of the former position were subjected to an F-ratio test, no significant differences were found by the enrollment of the institution of the prior student personnel position.

Differences in Formal Academic Training
in College Student Personnel Work

As stated previously, significant academic training in college student personnel work was defined as having

completed at least a minor in a graduate degree program in college student personnel work or in a closely related area. The fourth hypothesis tested related to whether former student personnel workers with significant academic student personnel training left the profession for reasons different from those former workers with no significant training. As stated as a null hypothesis, it said that, "No differences in reasons for leaving the profession will be found by the absence or presence of significant academic student personnel training in response to the student personnel attrition study instrument." An F-ratio of 4.308 permitted the rejection of the null hypothesis at the 5% level. The results therefore indicated that those former student personnel workers with no academic student personnel training did leave the profession for reasons different from those with training.

As was the case in the test for differences by position, a t-ratio was used to determine in what areas the differences could be found. The only significant t-ratio uncovered was on Factor I (Openness, sig. at 5% level). Those student personnel workers with no significant academic student personnel training tended to leave the profession less frequently for reason of bureaucracy, resistance to change, lack of appreciation, level of decision making, and the other elements in Factor I, than did the total sample.

No significant differences were found by the F-ratio test in perceptions of the environment of the former student personnel position by the presence or absence of significant academic student personnel or closely related training.

Summary

Chapter IV has presented the analysis of the data gained through responses to the research instrument. The statistical analysis using the repeated measures design of analysis of variance has permitted the rejection of two of the four null hypotheses.

Null hypothesis I, which stated that no differences would be found by category of former position was rejected at the 1% level of significance. Also rejected was null hypothesis IV, which stated that no differences in reasons for leaving the student personnel profession would be found by the absence or presence of significant academic student personnel training.

A review of the frequency distributions of Part I indicated that a lack of opportunity for promotion, a lack of appreciation of superiors for subordinates' problems, heavy involvement in disciplinary affairs, and frequent student activism was perceived by many respondents as common in the environment of their former position. Most of the respondents felt that they had been adequately or well prepared for the demands of their former position. Their prior position was held to be prestigious in the eyes

of both the institution in general and the student body. Less than half of the respondents stated that their training was more compatible with their new position than was their former job.

Responses to Part II indicated that the most frequent reason for leaving dealt with what was called "internal politics" within their former departments. Other frequent considerations reported as factors in the former student personnel workers' decisions to leave were a lack of expressed appreciation for their talents by their superiors, the level of bureaucracy, perceived resistance by the institution to innovation and change, and resistance within the institution to the goals of the student personnel department.

When asked directly why they left the profession, the sample's responses were quite varied, but the most frequent response was that they just saw their new position as more attractive to them than was their former student personnel position.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V summarizes the study as a whole. It will briefly review the purposes of the study, the sample used and how it was identified, the research instrument and how it was developed, and the results. This chapter also will contain the conclusions, recommendations, and implications for research that the student personnel attrition study offers.

Summary

Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to determine if selected sub-groups within the student personnel profession left the field for differential reasons. The sub-groups investigated were categorized by former position, by sex, by enrollment of the institution of the prior student personnel employment, and by the absence or presence of significant student personnel or closely related academic training. An important, but secondary, purpose of this study was to examine and identify reasons why student

personnel workers decided to leave the student affairs profession for another occupation.

Objectives

Prior to the research, five major objectives for the study were established. They were:

1. to develop an instrument that would provide the data necessary to answer the questions suggested in the purposes of the study.
2. to determine differential reasons for various sub-groups leaving the student personnel profession.
3. to determine why the former student personnel workers in the sample left the profession.
4. to tabulate, analyze, present, and conclude the findings accurately and clearly.
5. to develop recommendations for further research in the area.

The Sample

The sample used in the student personnel attrition study consisted of former student personnel workers who had left the profession sometime between August, 1966 and October, 1969, had shown a commitment to the profession prior to leaving, and who had held one of the following eight positions:

1. Dean of students
2. Assistant dean of students
3. Dean of men
4. Assistant dean of men
5. Dean of women

6. Assistant dean of women
7. Director of housing
8. Assistant director of housing

The sample was identified through the cooperation of 87.2% of the voting delegates to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), who were asked to furnish the names and forwarding addresses of people formerly in their department, who met the established criteria.

The 737 voting delegates to NASPA who responded submitted the names of 652 former student personnel workers, 471 of whom received the instrument (others had insufficient addresses, or were found not to meet the stated criteria).

Approximately 80% of those receiving the instrument satisfactorily completed and returned it. The two mailings that were required were concluded during the first quarter of 1970.

Design and Procedures

In brief, the design of the study consisted of four phases. First was the identification of the sample, which has just been discussed, second was the formation of a questionnaire which would accomplish the purposes and objectives of the study, third was the surveying of the sample, and fourth was the use of statistical analyses which would most accurately examine and clearly present the results.

The research instrument was an original questionnaire which was constructed by presenting the thoughts, theories,

research and speculation of writers in the student personnel literature in the form of researchable questions. More precisely, the review of the literature was used to identify areas of potential dissatisfaction and unhappiness in student personnel work that could affect attrition. From the literature was developed a large question pool which was reduced after consultation with authorities in college student personnel work and research design. Bias examination and a modified pre-test further reduced the questions to the number that were contained in the questionnaire.

The format of the instrument included two major parts. Part I requested the respondent to evaluate various elements within the institution of his former position, and Part II asked him to state whether he felt that many of those same elements were "a major consideration," "a contributing factor," or "not a factor" in his decision to abandon the profession. The research instrument also incorporated various demographic and open-ended questions to gain further information that could not be garnered through the type questions asked in Parts I and II.

Statistical analysis for the student personnel attrition study was conducted in three major parts.

1. A frequency distribution was formed for each of the eight position categories, and for the group as a whole. The purpose of the frequency distribution was to present the data in a way that exposed responses to individual questions in a systematic manner.

2. The data were factor analyzed. A factor analysis groups items both by relatedness to one another and non-relatedness between factors. It was felt that groups of highly related questions would prove to be superior to any individual item as a discriminating test of the areas of interest in this study. Factor scores were generated for each respondent, and in turn were used as data input into the final phase of the statistical analysis.
3. The last statistical technique applied to the data was an analysis of variance for repeated measures. The repeated measures design was superior to other types of analysis of variance because it permitted the use of unequal group sizes. Its purpose was the discovery of statistically significant differences in responses to the research instrument by the various sub-groups that were studied.

Results of the Analysis

The factor analysis provided four significant factors in each of Parts I and II. The results that appeared in the frequency distributions will be summarized in the order suggested by the factor analysis.

Factor I of Part I was arbitrarily assigned the descriptive name of "Openness," because the items that were contained in that factor appeared to have that commonality. Several questions in this portion of Part I revealed what

could be considered negative elements in the environment of the former position. The question receiving the largest response in the least favorable alternatives (numbers 1 and 2) was the one dealing with prospects for promotion, with over two-thirds of the sample seeing little or no chance of professional advancement. Another item indicating what might be a major area contributing to dissatisfaction was concerned with open or covert resistance to the student personnel department's goals by elements within the institution, with almost half of the respondents perceiving either moderate or strong opposition. Other questions indicating negative perceptions of the former position's environment dealt with a lack of "professional freedom," a lack of appreciation by superiors, and the institution's lack of openness to change and innovation.

Factor II of Part I was labeled "Prestige and Training." In general, the respondents saw the elements of the environment in this area in a fairly favorable light. Adequacy of their training for their former position and their prestige in the eyes of the students received an especially high number of positive responses.

Items in Factor III appeared to relate to the definition of the former position. Results indicated that the former student personnel workers had been very much concerned with disciplinary matters. Almost 80% reported that they had been either very much, or frequently involved in this

facet of student life. About 40% of the sample implied dissatisfaction with the amount of responsibility embodied in their former position.

Factor IV indicated a high correlation between the level of student activism on the campus and the rate of departmental change; in fact, exactly the same percentage (4.8%) that saw no student activism reported that there was no change in their former department.

Part II dealt with reasons for leaving the profession and the first factor to be identified was similar enough to Part I, Factor I to be given the same name--Openness. Internal politics, lack of appreciation by superiors, and bureaucracy were all repeatedly cited as reasons contributing to attrition. In fact, less than half of the sample failed to cite internal politics as a factor in their decision. The institution's resistance to change, the level of departmental decision making, and the institution's attitude toward the student personnel department's goals were also often referred to, but not so frequently as the first three. The respondents' attitude towards the goals of the former department and their level of responsibility appeared to least influence attrition.

Items in Factor II querying reasons for leaving the student personnel profession all dealt with some form of "Prestige." Faculty status, prestige in the eyes of the institution, salary, and the educational function of their

former positions all appeared to affect only a few former student personnel workers in their decision to abandon the student affairs field.

"Training and discipline" appeared to be the common elements in Factor III. Again this factor did not seem to influence many to enter another profession. The most common reasons for leaving student personnel found among items in Factor III were on the questions dealing with adequacy of training for the position and the level of involvement in disciplinary matters. In each case, a little over a third of the sample ascribed those reasons to be at least a "contributing factor."

The personal reasons of Factor IV again did not appear to be significant in contributing to decisions to leave the profession. Only by examining the results by position does a slight exception emerge. Some former deans of men and deans and assistant deans of women did attribute the demands placed on them by marriage as a factor in their decision to leave the student affairs profession.

The analysis of variance F-ratio tests permitted the rejection of two of the four null hypotheses. Null hypothesis I, which stated that no differences were present by category of former position, was rejected at the 1% level of significance. A further examination of the results, using a simple t-ratio test for differences between means, found that former assistant directors of housing and assistant

deans of men more frequently mentioned prestige related items as elements contributing to their attrition than did the total sample. Apparently "training and discipline" related elements encouraged deans of men to depart more frequently, as did aspects concerning "Openness" for directors of housing. Deans of students significantly differed from the entire group in that they tended to attribute reasons of "Openness" and "Prestige" less frequently as influencing their attrition.

The analysis of variance also discovered that the different categories of positions differed from one another in their perceptions of the environment of their prior position (sig. at 1% level).

The second null hypothesis rejected (at the 5% level) dealt with differential reasons for leaving the profession between those with no significant academic student personnel training, and those with training. The test by t-ratio uncovered only one set of differences between means; and it was that those former student personnel workers with no significant academic student personnel preparations tended to leave the student affairs profession for reasons of bureaucracy, resistance to change, appreciation, professional freedom, and other items in Factor I, less frequently than did the group as a whole. Those with significant academic student personnel training did not appear to view the

environment of their former position any differently than did those with no significant training.

The analysis of variance did not allow the rejection of the null hypotheses concerning differences by sex or by the enrollment of the institution of the prior student personnel position. Also, no differences were discovered between males and females, nor between former student personnel workers from small (less than 7,500 students) and large schools (7,500 or more students) in their perceptions of their former environments.

Conclusions

It is possible to reach several conclusions after a thorough examination of the data and findings of this study.

1. It may be concluded that the instrument that was developed and used for the student personnel attrition study proved to be an effective means of discriminating between categories in at least two sub-groups of former student personnel workers. However, no significant differences were found with categories of sub-groups based on sex and enrollment of the institution of prior student personnel employment. This lack of differences could be interpreted in one of two ways. One interpretation could be that differences between subdivisions on these two variables might have existed, but that the instrument was unable to discriminate between them. It could also be hypothesized that no differences did exist. Two bits of information suggested that the latter of the two cases was the accurate interpretation. First, few

responses were received to the open-ended question inquiring into previously unmentioned reasons for leaving the profession. Secondly, the question inquiring into the respondent's perception of the major reason for leaving the profession elicited responses that closely corresponded with the areas investigated in the main portion of the instrument. Therefore, it is further believed that the instrument would have been adequate in identifying differences by sex or enrollment, had they existed.

2. It may be concluded that attrition from college student personnel work was frequent and possibly increasing. Of the 737 colleges and universities represented by the cooperating voting delegates to NASPA, nearly one half reported that at least one person from their institution had abandoned the student personnel profession when they departed the student affairs position at that institution, and some universities indicated that as many as seven people had left the profession from that school. An incidental and unanticipated discovery was that there was evidence to indicate that the rate of attrition is rapidly growing--possibly in geometric proportions. Of the former student personnel workers sampled, 11.3% stated that they had left the profession three years ago, 27.9% two years ago, and 51.5% left only last year

(the remaining 10.3% neglected to respond on this item). This rate of increase can be seen as approximately a 1:2:4 ratio.

It is not the role of this researcher to ascertain whether an attrition problem does exist, only those people directly involved--students and university officials--can make that conclusion; however, the results imply that the level of attrition is such that problems could be present or arise.

3. The rejection of null hypothesis I led to the conclusion that people from different positions tended to leave the profession for different reasons. It also appeared that people from different positions tended to view their former environment differently.
4. Former student personnel workers with significant academic student personnel or closely related training tended to leave the profession for reasons different from those with no significant training. This conclusion was based on the rejection of null hypothesis IV.
5. It may be concluded that former student personnel workers most frequently left the field for reasons relating to openness and interpersonal relations. This conclusion was based on the frequency with which items in Part II, Factor I of the research instrument were given as reasons for attrition. The most frequently cited reasons for leaving the profession were, in order; internal politics,

lack of appreciation by superiors, and bureaucracy. All of these items imply a closed department; both structurally and interpersonally.

6. It may be concluded that the former student personnel workers sampled only infrequently left the profession for reasons that might be classified as "personal" in nature. Questions inquiring into health, marriage, and children received minimal responses, which in turn indicated that they were not important considerations in the former student personnel worker's decision to quit the profession. Furthermore, personal reasons were seldom mentioned in response to the open-ended question concerning the major reason for leaving the profession. The only minor exception to this pattern was in the cases of assistant deans of men, and deans and assistant deans of women, all of whom slightly more frequently cited the reason of marriage as a factor in their decision.

Recommendations

The results and conclusions of this study led to several recommendations which, if followed, could possibly contribute to a reduction in the rate of attrition from student affairs.

1. Since attrition was apparently most strongly influenced by elements dealing with openness, it is recommended that student personnel departments first look at

themselves and how they are viewed by the people working within them. Some of the same questions that were asked in Part I of the research instrument could be modified for departmental self-evaluation. Some questions which may need to be asked could include: are the procedures and bureaucracy of the department helpful, or rather something to overcome? are the talents for decision making within the department most effectively used? what are the real criteria on which promotions are based?

2. Responses also indicated that often what might be labeled "inter-personal openness" was also a factor contributing to attrition. Student affairs departments should examine all aspects of their inter-personal environments. Are unnecessary restrictions formally or informally placed on workers relative to their "professional freedom?" Are the limits, if any, really necessary, or do they just make it more comfortable for the superiors? Do internal bickering and behind the scenes politicking play a major role in the day-to-day operations of the department? Are workers recognized as human beings with human needs and feelings? Are workers complimented for good work and encouraged in looking at old problems in creative ways? Is there open and comfortable communications between levels within the department? What is the general morale of the department?

3. Responses to the research instrument further indicated that many times resistance within the institution was perceived toward the goals and objectives of the student personnel departments; therefore, it is recommended that departments make a concerted effort to explain what they hope to accomplish to all elements of the institution in order to dispel any inaccurate ideas. In most cases, any attitudes that the objectives of the student personnel department are contradictory rather than complementary to the other elements within the college or university, are absurd. Closer cooperation between all facets of the institution will most frequently contribute to the accomplishment of the college's goals and objectives.

In conclusion, this researcher feels that a clearer recognition of the potential problem areas in student personnel departments could be the first step toward the reduction of much unnecessary attrition from college student affairs work.

Implications for Further Research

The student personnel attrition study has illustrated the need for further research in patterns of career mobility, especially as it relates to attrition. There are many ways in which this task could be accomplished.

1. An in-depth longitudinal study beginning with graduating student personnel students and continuing for several years might help to better understand the dynamics of

mobility. Standardized and original instruments investigating personality characteristics and role perception could be administered at the outset of the study and at the conclusion (an arbitrary number of years later). The sample could be then later followed-up to determine if there were any apparent predictors in the results of the instruments of any mobility that might have occurred in the interim.

2. The relationship between professional training and mobility and attrition needs to be better understood. Relevant questions pertaining to professional preparation include: a. does the professional training adequately prepare the new student personnel worker for the world that awaits him on his new job? b. is the assumption that is frequently made in hiring practices, that a person with a graduate degree in student personnel will tend to persist in the profession longer than one without a professional degree, supported by empirical data? c. are there patterns of personal values that are related to mobility?
3. Uncovered in this study, but unrelated to its specific objectives, was the finding that the apparent rate of attrition is increasing. One possible explanation of the apparent phenomenon is that the voting delegates to NASPA, who supplied the information, tended to be selective in their memories in more frequently recalling

those people who had been in their departments most recently. A second feasible explanation is that the findings are substantially correct, and that attrition from student personnel work is increasing rapidly. Research needs to be done to determine which, if either, of these explanations is actually correct.

4. An additional area of potentially fruitful inquiry of the dynamics of mobility and attrition would be the development of a study complementary to this student personnel attrition research, but directed at those people who remain in the profession. Just how do they differ from those who abandoned the field, such as the ones in this survey?
5. A limitation of this study was that the research instrument had to be quite broad so that it would be applicable to former student personnel workers from each of the eight categories of positions and from a wide variety of institutional types. An in-depth study investigating one specific position at one type of institution, such as directors of housing at large state universities, is needed. This would allow the use of a more precise instrument designed for that group, or case studies as methods of investigation.
6. A final recommendation for further research is that this study, or a similar one, be periodically replicated to permit the maintenance of a current view of the situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ahmann, J. Stanley, and Marvin D. Glock. Evaluating Pupil Growth. Second edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.
2. Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.
3. Austin, C. Grey. "Student Protests and the Establishment." The Journal of Higher Education, 39 (1968) 223-225.
4. Ayres, Archie; Phillip Tripp, and John Russel. Student Services Administration in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.
5. Cameron, A. R. An Analysis of the Interests, Educational Preparation and Vocational Background of Student Personnel Deans. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1965.
6. Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
7. Cox, D. R. Planning of Experiments. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
8. Downie, N. M., and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
9. Dutton, Thomas B. "Research Needs and Priorities in Student Personnel Work." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 5 (April 1968), 339-343.
10. Dutton, Thomas B.; James R. Appleton; and Edward E. Birch. Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community. The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Monograph Series No. 3, Bloomington, Ind., April 1970.

11. Foy, James. Career Patterns of Student Personnel Administrators. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
12. Grant, W. Harold. "The Dean and Student Value Development." 51st Anniversary Conference Papers, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, (April 1969), 22-27.
13. Greenhouse, Samuel W., and Seymour Geisser. "On Methods in Analysis of Profile Data." Psychometrika, 24 (1959), 95-112.
14. Greenleaf, Elizabeth A. "How Others See Us." The Journal of College Student Personnel, (1969), 225-231.
15. Hayes, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
16. Hodgkinson, H. L. "Governance and Relevance for those over Thirty." Paper read at the American Association for Higher Education, Summer Conference, Dallas, July 1968, as reported by College Student Personnel Abstracts (1969), 191.
17. Ingraham, Mark H. The Mirror of Brass: The Compensation and Working Conditions of College and University Administrators. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
18. Kenniston, Kenneth. "Deans and Dissenters." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 5 (1967), 183-193.
19. Klopff, Gordon J., editor. College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Monograph Series No. 7, Washington, D. C.: 1966.
20. Klotsche, J. M., and William Butler. "Should Student Personnel Administrators be Given Tenure?" The Journal of College Student Personnel Administrators, 8 (1967), 225-230.
21. Koile, Earl A. "Student Affairs: Forever the Bridesmaid." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 4 (1966), 65-72.

22. Leonard, Eugenie. The Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
23. Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
24. _____. The Human Organization, Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
25. Lloyd-Jones, Ester. A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education. First edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
26. Lloyd-Jones, Esther, and Margaret R. Smith. Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching. First edition, New York: Harper, 1954.
27. Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
28. _____. "Three Dilemmas of the Student Personnel Profession and their Resolution." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 29 (1966) 81-91.
29. Nonnamaker, Eldon Ray. The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.
30. Nygreen, Glenn. "Professional Status for Student Personnel Administrators?" The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 3 (January 1968), 289.
31. Payne, Stanley L. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1951.
32. Peter, Laurence J., and Raymond Hull. The Peter Principal. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1969.
33. Pruitt, Anne S. "The Differential Rewards of Student Personnel Work." The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 30 (Fall 1966), 40-45.

34. Raines, Max R. "Progress Report on the National Study of Junior College Student Personnel Programs." 45th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, March 1965, Dallas, Texas, as reported in College Student Personnel Abstracts, (Fall 1967), 67.
35. Riker, Phillip. College Housing as Learning Centers. American College Personnel Association Monograph, Student Personnel Series No. 3, Washington, D.C., 1965.
36. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
37. Shaffer, Robert H. Student Personnel Services In Higher Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
38. _____. "Meeting the Challenges of Today's Students." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 4 (1967), 177-182.
39. Sheldon, Miriam. "Contemporary Challenges to Traditional Concepts." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, 6 (1968), 3-9.
40. Sherburne, Paul R. Rates and Patterns of Mobility of Student Personnel Administrators: A Pilot Study in the Western Conference Institutions of Higher Education. Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.
41. Siegal, Max, editor. The Counseling of College Students: Function, Practice and Technique. New York: Free Press, 1968.
42. Stamatakos, Louis C. Resolution to the Annual Business Meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1966.
43. Stinchcombe, Arthur L. Constructing Social Theories. New York: Harcourt, Brice and World, Inc., 1968.
44. Underwood, Benton J.; Carl P. Duncan; Janet A. Taylor; and John W. Cotton. Elementary Statistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

45. Upcraft, Lee. Role Expectations for Chief Student Personnel Administrators in Large Universities. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
46. Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
47. Williamson, E. G., and J. D. Foley. Counseling and Discipline. First edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.
48. Wolfle, Dael. Factor Analysis to 1940. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940.
49. Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1951.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ATTRITION STUDY INSTRUMENT

Directions--Respond to the following questions by circling the appropriate number or filling in the blank.

Name _____ 1-3
(for use in records ONLY)

How many years experience have you had in a college student personnel position? _____ 4

Sex

1. Male
2. Female

How long ago did you leave your last student personnel position? _____ 5

What was the enrollment of the institution of your former student personnel position? 6

1. Less than 1500
2. 1500-2749
3. 2750-7499
4. 7500-20,000
5. Over 20,000

Marital status _____

Please list college degrees earned, with majors and minors, if any. 7-8

Degree	Major	Minor	Minor
--------	-------	-------	-------

Part I

Many college student personnel departments are undergoing a period of change in function. Which statement best describes the rate of change in your former department? 9

1. No change
2. Little or no change
3. Moderate change
4. A great deal of change

Which statement best described the level of student activism in the institution of your former position? 10

1. No student activism
2. Little student activism
3. A moderate amount of student activism
4. A great deal of student activism

Did your former position offer a form of "professional freedom" similar to your teaching colleagues' "academic freedom?" 11

1. No professional freedom
2. Professional freedom only in limited areas
3. Fairly broad professional freedom
4. Essentially the same freedom as the teaching faculty

How would you describe the opportunity for promotion in your former position? 12

1. Almost no chance for promotion
2. Little chance for promotion
3. Good chances for promotion
4. Almost certain of promotion in the near future

What was the level of prestige of your former position in the eyes of the rest of the institution, generally? 13

1. Very low
2. Moderately low
3. Moderately high
4. Very high

How would you rate the adequacy of your training for your former position (a combination of formal, informal and in-service training)? 14

1. Totally inadequate
2. Fairly insufficient
3. Fairly adequate
4. Well prepared

How many duties did you have in your former position that you did not personally consider to be student personnel duties? 15

1. A great many
2. Some
3. A few
4. None

Which statement best describes your former position? 16

1. Essentially unworkable because of the level of bureaucracy
2. Bureaucracy and red tape greatly hindered my performance

3. Bureaucracy sometimes interfered with my performance
4. The bureaucracy was generally responsive and helpful in the performance of my duties in my former position

Which statement would best describe your former position? 17

1. Had too much responsibility
2. Had about the proper amount of responsibility
3. Had too little responsibility
4. Had almost no responsibility

How well did superiors appreciate the problems faced by subordinates? 18

1. Knew and appreciated little
2. Had some knowledge
3. Knew and appreciated rather fully
4. Knew and appreciated very well

What was the extent of your responsibility in disciplinary matters in your former position? 19

1. Very much involved
2. Frequently involved
3. Sometimes involved
4. Seldom or never involved

What was the level of prestige of your position in the eyes of the students, generally? 20

1. Very low
2. Moderately low
3. Moderately high
4. Very high

How would you describe the geographical location of the institution of your former position? 21

1. Very unappealing to me
2. Moderately unappealing to me
3. Somewhat attractive to me
4. Very attractive to me

How much resistance, hidden or open, was there to your former department's goals in the institution? 22

1. Strong resistance
2. Moderate resistance
3. Some resistance at times
4. Little or no resistance

How closely did you agree with your former departments goals? 23

1. Very little agreement
2. Moderate disagreement
3. Moderate agreement
4. Almost full agreement

Which statement best describes the institution which employed you in your former position? 24

1. Intransigent, extremely resistive to change
2. Change occurred only under strong pressure or evidence
3. Change occurred when based on substantial evidence or justification
4. Open to immediate meaningful change

Did your former position have faculty status? 25

1. Yes
2. No

How would you describe your salary in your former position? 26

1. Very inadequate
2. Rather low
3. Sufficient for the position
4. Very good

Do you feel that the position you now hold is more in line with your training and preparation than was your former position? 27

1. Less in line with preparation
2. Equally in line with preparation
3. Slightly more in line with preparation
4. Much more in line with preparation

In your former department, at what level were decisions usually made? 28

1. Almost completely at the top
2. Policy at the top, but with some limited delegation
3. Broad policy at the top, more delegation
4. Throughout

In your previous position did your superiors show confidence in their subordinates? 29

1. Not at all
2. They were condescending
3. Substantial confidence
4. Complete confidence

Did you perceive a conflict between counseling and discipline in your former position? 30

1. Serious conflict, greatly affecting my own effectiveness
2. Frequent conflict, often detracting from my effectiveness
3. Sometimes interfered with my effectiveness
4. No real conflict

How did you see your level of involvement in the educational function of the institution of your former position? 31

1. Little or no involvement in the educational function
2. Some involvement in the educational function
3. Moderate amount of involvement in the educational function
4. Greatly involved in the educational function

How clearly were the actual objectives of your former position defined? 32

1. Not at all
2. Only slightly
3. Fairly well
4. Very clearly

Part II

In the following section, place a check mark in the appropriate column to the right of the question.

	A major consider- ation	A contri- buting factor	Not a factor
Was the degree of openness to change in your former department a factor in your decision to leave your former position? (33)			
Was the level of student activism a factor in your leaving? (34)			
Was a lack of "professional freedom" a factor in your leaving? (35)			
Was the lack of faculty status a factor in your leaving? (36)			
Was the level of prestige your former position held in the eyes of the rest of the instit. a factor in your leaving? (37)			
Was the compatibility of your training with your new position a factor in your leaving? (38)			
Were your non-student personnel duties a factor in your leaving? (39)			
Was bureaucracy a factor in your leaving? (40)			
Was the lack of responsibility held by your former position a factor in your leaving? (41)			
Was the level of understanding and appreciation your superiors had for the problems inherent in your position a factor in your leaving? (42)			

	A major consider- ation	A contri- buting factor	Not a factor
Was the level of involvement in disciplinary matters a factor in your leaving? (43)			
Was geographical location a factor contributing to your change in position? (44)			
Was covert or overt resistance to the goals of your former department by the institution a factor in your leaving? (45)			
Was your attitude toward your department's goals a factor in your leaving? (46)			
Was institutional resistance to innovation and change, if it existed, a factor in your leaving your former position? (47)			
Was the lack of faculty status, if it existed, a factor in your leaving? (48)			
Was salary a factor in your leaving? (49)			
Was the level of departmental decision making a factor in your leaving? (50)			
Was the lack of appropriate training and preparation for your former position a factor in your leaving? (51)			
Was the level of confidence in you as expressed by your superiors a factor in your leaving? (52)			
Was a conflict between counseling and discipline, if it existed, a factor in your leaving? (53)			

	A major consider- ation	A contri- buting factor	Not a factor
Were the demands of your children, if any, a factor in your leaving? (54)			
Were the demands of marriage a factor in your leaving your former position? (55)			
Was your personal physical health a factor in your leaving? (56)			
Was the degree of <u>non</u> -involvement in the educational function of your institution a factor in your leaving? (57)			
Was a lack of clarity of explanation of the objectives of your position a factor in your leaving your former position? (58)			
Was internal politics a factor in your leaving? (59)			

Were there any other factors influencing your decision to leave that you have not already mentioned? _____ If yes, what were they? (60-61)

What was your former position? _____ (62)

What did you like best about your former position? _____ (63)

What did you like least about your former position? _____ (64)

What was the major factor influencing your decision to leave your former position? _____ (65)

Additional comments: (66-67)

APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO NASPA VOTING DELEGATES
AND TO RESEARCH SAMPLE

Justin Morrill College Snyder Hall

December 8, 1969

Dear :

Because of your administrative leadership position and commitment to the college student personnel profession as seen by your status as voting delegate of NASPA, you undoubtedly are aware that many student personnel workers are leaving their jobs for another field outside of college student personnel work. Very possibly this attrition has caused difficulties in your own department.

Thomas B. Dutton, director of the NASPA Division of Research and Publications has written that research needs to be done in order to determine " . . . what factors influence attrition or continuation in (college student personnel work)."

I am attempting to answer the question suggested by Dr. Dutton's statement and need your help if I am to be successful. I am asking for you (or your secretary or assistant) to provide me with the names and current forwarding addresses, if you have them, of the people who have met the criteria below and who, to the best of your knowledge, are no longer in a college or university student personnel position. For the purpose of my study I am only concerned with those who have worked in your institution's student personnel division during the past 3 years (since September, 1966). The positions that I am specifically interested in are:

1. The chief student personnel administrator.
2. The student personnel worker with responsibility for male students, and his immediate assistant(s).
3. The student personnel worker with responsibility for female students and her immediate assistant(s).
4. The director of the student personnel housing program and his immediate assistant(s).

This research is important and in order to be valid, it must be done with a representative sample. Only you and others like you can supply me with that sample. Please take a moment of your or your secretary's time to fill out the postage-paid address form. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Cordially yours,

Walter B. Shaw
Instructor, Justin Morrill College
Michigan State University

Enclosure

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Justin Morrill College Snyder Hall

January 17, 1970

Dear NASPA Voting Delegate:

Several weeks ago I sent you and the other voting delegates to NASPA a letter requesting assistance in a research project concerning factors influencing attrition of college student personnel workers. Although I have received most of the replies, I have not yet received your reply. In order for this study to be complete I would like to have 100% response if at all possible.

All that I am requesting from you are the names and current forwarding addresses of persons who formerly held the following positions in your department and who are no longer engaged in those or equivalent positions at any institution and have not died or retired. The positions that I am concerned with are:

1. The chief student personnel administrator.
2. The student personnel worker with responsibility for male students, and his immediate assistant(s).
3. The student personnel worker with responsibility for female students, and her immediate assistant(s).
4. The director of the student personnel housing program and his immediate assistant(s).

Attrition from our field is a serious problem which needs to be more fully understood and only you or your associates can supply the information necessary for proper investigation.

Please complete the enclosed pre-paid card. If you have no one who meets the stated criteria, just check the box marked "None." This information is also important. Also, please sign the card, which will help me with my records.

I am looking forward to your response.

Cordially,

Walter B. Shaw
Instructor, Justin Morrill College
Michigan State University

Enclosure
WBS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Justin Morrill College

March 3, 1970

I am asking for your cooperation in a research project that will help us to better understand the reasons why people leave college student personnel work.

I understand that you have worked in college student personnel work as a dean of students, dean of men, dean of women or as director of housing, or were an immediate assistant to one of these positions sometime during the past three and one half years. I also understand that you are no longer employed in one of these positions. I intend these titles to be generic rather than specific because I am interested in positions with other titles that perform these same duties.

Please take about 15 minutes of your time and fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the prepaid envelope. Your name is requested ONLY to allow me to follow-up on anyone who does not respond. It will not be used in the report or in any other tabulation. Name associated data will be held in complete confidence.

Attrition from these areas in the student personnel profession is a big problem about which much has been speculated; however, an examination of the literature in the field indicates that probably this study is the first systematic national survey of the phenomena.

Only you and others like you who have left these areas can supply the information necessary to allow for a more clear understanding of the dynamics of this aspect of mobility. Please take the short time necessary to allow for a formulation of a representative picture of the situation.

If for some reason my information is incorrect and you have not worked in one of these occupational areas, are still employed in one of the positions, or left the position prior to August, 1966, you don't need to complete the questionnaire; however, please do return the form anyway, with a note explaining why you don't meet the criteria.

The success of this study completely depends upon your cooperation. Thanking you in advance, I am,

Yours truly,

Walter B. Shaw
Instructor

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Justin Morrill College

From:

Walter B. Shaw
Justin Morrill College
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

A few weeks ago I asked your cooperation in completing a brief questionnaire. As of yet I have not received your response. If you have only forgotten, please take the few minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire. I have enclosed a second copy.

If you hesitated to reply because you desired greater anonymity than my personal assurances of confidentiality offered, please complete and return the questionnaire unsigned. If you choose the second option, please sign and return the signed enclosed card in a separate mailing. If you, as several did, have already returned the questionnaire unsigned, just complete the card and mail it.

Once again, I am asking for your help in a national survey of certain former student personnel workers who have left the profession sometime since August, 1966. The positions I am interested in are those which generally have the duties usually assigned to positions most frequently called Dean of Students, Dean of Women, Dean of Men, and Director of Housing. I am also interested in people who have served as immediate assistants to any of these positions. If my information is incorrect, and you do not meet the criteria I have just stated, only return a note explaining why you do not meet the criteria.

Attrition from college student personnel work is a major problem in American higher education today. To the best of my knowledge, this study is the first systematic attempt to more fully understand the dynamics of attrition. Only you and people like you have the true answers to the questions that this study raises.

I hope that I can count on your help in this study. It is important to me and potentially important to the college student personnel profession.

Yours truly,

Walter B. Shaw
Instructor

Enclosures/ 2

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS NOT INCLUDED
IN TEXT OF DOCUMENT

QUESTIONS IN PART I NOT
INCLUDED IN THE TEXT OF
THE DOCUMENT

	Number	Per cent of total
Level of prestige in eyes of institution		
very low	16	4.5
moderately low	108	30.3
moderately high	181	50.8
very high	51	14.3
Amount of non-student personnel duties		
a great many	50	14.0
some	110	30.9
few	123	34.6
none	73	20.5
Geographical location		
very unappealing	31	8.7
moderately unappealing	44	12.4
somewhat attractive	98	27.6
very attractive	182	51.3
Agreement with departmental goals		
very little agreement	26	7.4
moderate disagreement	53	15.0
moderate agreement	91	25.8
almost full agreement	183	51.0
Salary		
very inadequate	32	9.1
rather low	114	32.4
sufficient for position	163	46.3
very good	42	11.9
Level of decision making		
almost completely at top level	84	23.7
policy at top, limited delegation	94	26.5
broad policy at top, more		
delegation	104	29.3
throughout	73	20.6
Involvement in educational function		
little or no involvement	64	18.0
some involvement	101	28.4
moderate involvement	85	23.9
greatly involved	106	29.8

	Number	Per cent of total
Clarity of position's objectives		
not at all clear	35	9.8
only slightly understood	120	33.7
fairly clear	152	42.7
very clear	49	13.8

QUESTIONS IN PART II NOT
INCLUDED IN THE TEXT OF
THE DOCUMENT

Non-student personnel duties		
a major consideration	18	5.1
a contributing factor	66	18.6
not a factor	271	76.3
Geographical location		
a major consideration	16	4.5
a contributing factor	31	8.8
not a factor	307	86.7
Health		
a major consideration	18	5.1
a contributing factor	43	12.1
not a factor	294	82.6

OTHER QUESTIONS NOT
INCLUDED IN THE TEXT
OF THE DOCUMENT

Highest earned degree		
B.A., B.S. or less	32	9.0
M.A., M.S. or M. Ed.	166	46.6
Graduate or professional work beyond masters level but not doctorate	36	10.1
Ph. D. or Ed. D.	117	32.9
Marital status		
single	91	25.6
married	254	71.3
divorced	3	.8
separated	1	.3
widowed or widower	4	1.1

	Number	Per cent of total
Years of experience in a student personnel position		
1 year	21	6.0
2 years	53	15.1
3 "	47	13.4
4 "	42	11.9
5 "	28	7.0
6 "	20	5.7
7 "	19	5.4
8 "	23	6.5
9 or more years	99	28.1
Best liked aspect of former position		
prestige or power	24	6.8
working with students	244	68.7
co-workers	33	9.3
opportunity to influence policy	13	3.7
geographical location	3	.8
experience gained	9	2.5
freedom offered by position	13	3.7
other, or no response	21	6.0
Least liked aspect of former position		
lack of trust, authority, or responsibility	25	7.1
general direction of department	29	8.2
lack of understanding of SPW by top administrators	18	5.1
discipline	59	16.7
superiors	31	8.8
resistance to change	12	3.4
generally disliked position	7	2.0
hours, routine, too much to do	72	20.3
interference by people outside dept.	36	10.2
other, or none listed	71	20.0

WALTER BAXTER SHAW

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Final Examination: July 28, 1970

Dissertation: A Study of Attrition Among Selected
Former Student Personnel Workers

Outline of Studies: Major Subject: Administration and
Higher Education

Minor Subject: Anthropology

Biographical
Information:

Born, June 8, 1942, Greenville,
South Carolina

Undergraduate Degree: Miami
University, Oxford, Ohio, 1960-64,
B.A.

Graduate Degrees: Miami University,
Oxford, Ohio, 1964-66, M.S., Michigan
State University, 1968-70

Experience:

Residence Assistant, Miami University
1964. Head Resident, Miami University
1965. Assistant Swim Coach, Miami
University, 1964-66. Graduate
Assistant to the Executive Dean for
Student Affairs, Miami University,
1965-66. Assistant Dean of Students,
State University of New York, College
at Potsdam, 1966-68. Research
Assistant, Justin Morrill College,
Michigan State University, 1968-69.
Instructor, Justin Morrill College,
Michigan State University, 1969-70.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293106278470