

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

BAKER, WENDY LOU

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESOURCE TRENDS
AND STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES**

Michigan State University

PH.D.

1980

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1980

by

Baker, Wendy Lou

All Rights Reserved

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
RESOURCE TRENDS AND STUDENT PERSONNEL
PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES**

By

Wendy Lou Baker

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESOURCE TRENDS AND STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By

Wendy Lou Baker

The Purpose

This study was designed to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. In assessing the relationship between declining resources and institutional student personnel programs, this study focused on perceptions about funding as well as implementation and delivery of student personnel programs and services.

The Methodology

The population to be surveyed was defined as executive level educational administrators at all four-year public and private bachelor's degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan. Research hypotheses were developed from the questions for investigation. After a thorough review of the literature, a questionnaire was developed,

piloted and administered by mail to the research population. Of the 152 questionnaires mailed, 120 usable responses (78.9 percent) were received and included in the study. Data was analyzed and hypotheses were tested using programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. All programs were run on Michigan State University's CDC 750 computer.

The Findings

Institutional decision-makers from Michigan four-year colleges and universities predicted a slight increase in enrollments during 1980-85 and a steady state enrollment situation from 1985-90 for their respective institutions. A similar, but slightly less favorable, pattern followed for ten year predictions. Additionally, the population anticipated an increase in resources (constant dollars) over the next decade (1980-90).

Institutional decision-makers tend to view instruction as a primary priority in allocation of resources. Student services, while low on the funding priority list, will probably not be eliminated as an entity by most institutions. However, cuts in the current level of funding for student services may be anticipated during periods of decreased resources for institutions.

The individual student personnel programs which may be affected by a change in enrollment and resources are health services, admissions, financial aids, international student programs, new student orientation, and placement.

It appears, but not at a significant level, that health services and international student programs may be negatively affected while admissions, financial aids, new student orientation and placement may be affected in a positive way. Further, it was determined that executive level educational administrators from Michigan public institutions do not differ significantly in their responses to survey questions than do administrators at Michigan private schools. Areas where differences were found are in responses to resource allocation questions for religious activities and volunteer programs; in responses to criteria applied in the evaluation of new student orientation and religious activities; and in responses to which unit should have primary responsibility for financial aids, registrar and religious activities. It was also determined that executive level administrators from Michigan institutions of varying sizes do not differ significantly in their responses to the survey questions. Statistically significant differences were found in responses to resource allocation to religious activities and international programs; and in responses to criteria applied in evaluation of health services, placement, religious activities and residence halls. Further, it was found that executive level educational administrators from Michigan institutions do not significantly differ by position in their responses to the survey questions.

Finally, the data revealed, but not at a significant level, a trend towards funding priorities for service-oriented

programs rather than developmental/educational programs. Moreover, the findings determined, but not at a significant level, that administrators advocate increased funding primarily to student services and programs which will insure for the economic survival of the institution (admissions, financial aids and placement) in the decade of 1980-90.

© Copyright by

WENDY LOU BAKER
1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation and thanks is extended to the members of my doctoral advisory committee: Dr. Louis Stamatakos, Chair; Dr. Gary North, Dr. Max Raines and Dr. James Rainey. Their guidance and support, in addition to their clarifying questions, analytical commentary and evaluative remarks, enhanced the educational process.

A special thanks is expressed to Claire and Hugo Minetti, my parents-in-law, for their support, interest and encouragement.

I am grateful to Barbara Baker and Bob Froh, my sister and brother-in-law, whose questions challenged my thinking and contributed to the development of the study. Sincere appreciation is extended to Barb who, by example, has served as a model for my professional and personal development.

Very special thanks and gratitude is expressed to my parents, Marion and Wilbur Baker, for their love, patience and many sacrifices. The wisdom of their convictions has provided a lifetime of learning.

Heartfelt appreciation and very special thanks is expressed to my best friend and husband, Bob. His analytical abilities and professional experience contributed valuable guidance and expertise; while his love, support and enthusiasm provided a great source of motivation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Rationale for the Study	4
Summary of Related Literature	6
Definitions	8
Research Questions	11
Null Hypotheses	12
Limitations of the Study	13
Assumptions of Study	15
Methodology	16
Selection of the Population	16
Instrument	17
Data Collection	18
Data Analysis	18
Organization of the Study	19
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	20
Introduction	20
Resources in Higher Education	21
Resources: Declining Enrollments	22
Resources: Governmental, Private and Tuition Sources	25
Overview of Student Personnel Literature	30
Student Personnel: Future Directions	39
Declining Resources and Student Personnel Programs	44
Conclusion	59
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	61
Testable Hypotheses	62
Selection of Population	63

CHAPTER	Page
Development of the Instrument	68
Data Collection	72
Data Analysis	73
Summary	74
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	76
Introduction	76
Data Analysis	79
Analysis of Respondents	80
Response Rates	82
Summary of Responses to Questions	85
Discussion	100
Results of Hypotheses Testing	103
Summary of Responses by Program	134
Additional Findings	134
Summary of Findings	149
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	153
Introduction	153
Summary of the Development of the Study	155
Hypotheses	156
Conclusions and Discussion	160
Summary of Conclusions	165
Interpretation and Inferences	167
Recommendations and Implications for Student Affairs	174
Suggested Areas for Future Research	176
Conclusion	179
APPENDICES	181
APPENDIX	
A. Survey Instrument	181
B. Cover Letter	187
C. Follow-Up Letter	188
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	189

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1. Composition of Population	69
4.1. Analysis of Population	78
4.2. Analysis of Population/Number of Respondents .	83
4.3. Composition of Population	84
4.4. Recommendations for Program Allocation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	88
4.5. Given a Budget Cut or Resource Allocation Which Did Not Keep Pace with Inflation, What Recommendations Would You Anticipate Making for Each of the Student Services/ Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	93
4.6. Given Services/Programs of High Quality in All Areas, Which of the Following Should be the <u>Primary Criteria</u> Applied in the Evaluation of Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Responses)	96
4.7. Which of the Following Units Should Have the Primary Responsibility for Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Responses)	98
4.8. Place a Check in Column #4 Identifying Those Services/Programs Implemented at Your Institution (Reported as Per- centage of Respondents)	101
4.9. Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-85) and Recommended Allocation to Instruction (Reported as Percent of Respondents)	105

Table	Page
4.10. Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for Health Services (Reported as Percent of Respondents)	107
4.11. Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Admissions (Reported as Percent of Respondents)	108
4.12. Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Financial Aids (Reported as Percent of Respondents)	109
4.13. Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for International Student Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	110
4.14. Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for New Student Orientation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	111
4.15. Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Placement (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	112
4.16. Significant Chi Square Variable Effects for Student Services/Programs	113
4.17. Given Services/Programs of High Quality in All Areas, Which of the Following Should be the <u>Primary Criteria</u> Applied in the Evaluation of Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	115
4.18. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Funding Recommendation for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	118
4.19. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Funding Recommendations for Volunteer Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	119

Table	Page
4.20. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Criteria for New Student Orientation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	120
4.21. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Criteria for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	121
4.22. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Financial Aids (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	122
4.23. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Registrar (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	123
4.24. Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	124
4.25. Relationship of Institutional Size and Funding Recommendation for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	126
4.26. Relationship of Institutional Size and Funding Recommendation for International Program (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	127
4.27. Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Health Services (Reported at Percentage of Respondents.	129
4.28. Relation of Institutional Size and Criteria for Placement (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	130
4.29. Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	131
4.30. Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Residence Halls (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	132

Table	Page
4.31. Relationship of Position and Funding Recommendation for International Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	135
4.32. Relationship of Position and Criteria for International Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	136
4.33. Relationship of Position and Unit of Responsibility for International Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)	137
4.34. Relationship of Position and Unit of Responsibility for Volunteer Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents) . . .	138
4.35. Significant Chi Square and Variable Effects for Programs	139

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The projected decline of resources in higher education in the decade of 1980-90 has been well documented by demographers as well as educators. Resources, which traditionally have come from student tuition, federal and state allocations and private sources, are dwindling and are predicted to decline further in the coming decade. Moreover, the inflationary economy has increased demand for resources and further exacerbates the problem of declining revenue.

Specifically, the projected decline in the size of the college-age population and the anticipated decrease in college enrollment signifies a decrease in income from tuition. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the size of the traditional college-age population (18-21 years of age) will decrease by 18 percent in the next decade (Centra, 1979). Additionally, the 1977 edition of Projections of Educational Statistics and the 1974 projections from the Carnegie Council forecast a decline in the rate of attendance at colleges and universities (Centra, 1979).

Coupled with these demographic changes, educators, politicians and resources analysts predict decreasing

revenues for higher education. In addition to dollars not keeping pace with inflation, the 1980 federal budget for higher education calls for reductions in spending below the 1979 allocations (Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1979). As a result, public institutions will be forced to rely heavily on state funding. Although changes in the level of state funding are difficult to determine on a national scale, the recent support for tax limitation proposals in ten different states provides an indication of an uncertain financial future for some public institutions (Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 4, 1979). Additionally, the private sector of higher education has become increasingly dependent on federal and state funds. Private institutions lacking wealthy alumni, large endowment funds and upper-middle class students are extremely dependent on public funds (student aid dollars, research grants) (Howe, 1979). In fact in the decade of the seventies, 129 independent colleges closed (Howe, 1979).

The effect of these trends on programs in higher education will be significant and must be anticipated. More specifically, the relationship between limited resources, declining enrollments and student personnel programs in higher education must be analyzed and assessed. Because the field of student personnel experienced great expansion in the fifties and sixties and professional training programs graduated record numbers of students in the early seventies, the profession is not philosophically nor

practically prepared to deal with the next decade of limited resources (Ferrari, 1972).

Additionally, within the broader context of the university, student personnel programs are especially vulnerable in an era of fiscal restraint. Because student personnel programs are primarily viewed as support services, university decision-makers often consider the program as secondary to the primary academic mission of the university. As a result, student personnel programs often receive lower priority in resource allocation. Further, student services traditionally have been limited in their capacity to generate revenue and are supported primarily by dollars from the general fund. Finally, historically the importance of the role of the student personnel educator has been a source of controversy among faculty (Humphries, 1977).

Thus, analysis of the relationship between limited resources and declining enrollments on student personnel programs is necessary to assist professionals in this field in anticipating, planning for, and managing change.

Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. In assessing the relationship between declining resources

and institutional student personnel programs, this study will focus on perceptions about funding as well as implementation and delivery of student personnel programs and services.

In a broader and practical sense, it is the intention of this investigator to provide administrators in higher education and, specifically student personnel professionals, with information about the potential impact of declining enrollments and dwindling resources in higher education. It is further intended that the information generated from the study will assist the student personnel educator in preparing for and managing change. Finally, although limited, it is the intention of this investigator to provide useful information about future trends in the student personnel profession. Perceptions relative to the need for professionals in the field and the type of training necessary in the next decade are useful to educators responsible for professional preparation programs as well as practitioners in the field.

Rationale for the Study

The profession of student personnel has evolved from a combination of economic, social, and political trends and higher education's response to these variables. In order for educators to be responsive to change, it is critical to have accurate and ample information about current trends.

While there is a great deal of quantitative data and literature about the decline of enrollment and scarce resources, there is little information about the potential relationship of these trends to student personnel services/programs in American colleges and universities. In fact, much of the literature describes future trends in the field of student personnel, but it does not consider the possibility of a cause/effect relationship with the factors of declining enrollments and resources. In addition to the dearth of analytical literature, there is limited information and research of a prescriptive nature.

Additionally, much of the existing literature about trends in student personnel programs/services is generated by professionals and theoreticians within the field. It is the intent of this investigator to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators. This group was selected because of their primary responsibility for institutional resource decision-making and management; and because of their knowledge, experience and broad institutional perspective about resource allocation for colleges and universities (Barzun, 1968).

Therefore, this study will document the factors of enrollment decline and scarce resources in 1980-90 and assess the relationship of these variables to student personnel services/programs in selected Michigan colleges and universities. Because of the absence of related literature in the field, this study is designed to contribute to the

body of student personnel literature and to provide assistance to student affairs educators as they plan for the future. Finally, this study may provide a perceptual foundation from which student personnel professionals can generate further analysis as well as prescription for future direction.

Summary of Related Literature

Literature related to this study includes documentation of resource trends in the United States as well as the State of Michigan. Information about declining enrollments, decreasing federal and state allocations for higher education, and dwindling private funds will serve as a foundation. While this study provides documentation surrounding the premise of declining enrollments and scarce resources in the next decade, it does not present an exhaustive account of the literature in these areas. Since the focus of the study is the relationship of resource trends to the programs of the student personnel profession, a comprehensive review of the literature on the evolution of student personnel as well as future trends is included.

In consideration of the enrollment and resource predictions, it is necessary for educators and administrators of educational institutions to analyze the predictions and act accordingly. More specifically, the impact of these trends on the area of student personnel in higher education must be assessed. While the decline in enrollment and

resources is well documented, there is a relatively small body of literature related to the impact of these trends on student personnel. Moreover, within the existing literature, there is controversy and polarized opinions.

Some researchers suggest the total elimination of the student personnel division (Humphries, 1977). Additionally, some campuses have found it necessary to reduce the amount and diversity of services. Other schools have selected to assign the student personnel functions to faculty. Lewis calls for the use of peers or paraprofessionals in the functional areas (Lewis, 1973). On the other hand, Balderston sees the crisis of the 80s as an opportunity for the student personnel administrator to emerge as a "driving force." He sees retrenchment and subsequent surplus of faculty as an opportunity for student personnel educators to integrate academic faculty into their program. Further, he sees the student personnel professional as becoming more involved in general administration because of the transferability of generalist skills and competencies (Balderston, 1974).

Another researcher, Harvey, calls for a strong philosophic stance on the issue of student development in order to bridge the potential dichotomy of vocational/professional training and liberal arts education. Harvey suggests that the student personnel professional should be a significant force in helping institutions grope with this philosophical dilemma (1976). Thus, it is apparent that

student personnel is perceived as a vulnerable unit in colleges and universities. While many educators speculate that this area will fall victim to budget cuts, there is limited and conflicting knowledge about the nature and magnitude of such constraints.

Although the student personnel literature related to a decline in enrollment and resources is limited, there is a great deal of information about the history and evolution of student personnel. To gain perspective on the next decade, it is important to understand the history of the profession. Knowledge about the history of a profession provides insights as to why the profession exists; what role it plays in higher education; and what are its philosophic foundations. These insights often lead to a greater understanding of the present status of the profession and provide a more credible foundation on which to build predictions. A complete review of the literature related to this study includes an historical account of the development of the student personnel profession as well as research and publications about future trends in the field.

Definitions

The following terms which appear throughout this study are defined as follows:

Resources. A general term to describe revenue which is derived from tuition, state funding, federal funding and

private gifts and grants to support the college and/or university.

Student Services. The college or university non-academic program(s) which is designed to meet the educational, social, physical, recreational and emotional needs of students and is carried out in support of the formal academic process.

Student Personnel Program/Student Affairs. The college or university program which is concerned with both the educational and personal development of students in primarily nonclassroom activities and the administration of services which support and complement the formal academic learning process.

Student Development. A philosophic statement and/or operational philosophy which advocates the integration of affective and cognitive learning. Founded in the theories of developmental psychologists, the theory of student development suggests that educational activities/programs should be designed to meet developmental needs of students.

Student Personnel. A general term defining an eclectic body of knowledge that seeks to describe the behavior of student populations and related activities and prescribe methodologies to maximize the educational process. Also used to describe a philosophic position advocating the treatment of students as individuals and assumption of partial responsibility to assist in their holistic development.

Chief Executive Officer/President.¹ The principal administrative official responsible for the direction of all affairs and operations of an institution of higher education. This position usually reports to a governing board.

Executive Vice President/Vice President for Operations. The principal administrative official responsible for all or most major functions and operations of an institution of higher education under the direction of the Chief Executive Officer. Acts in the capacity of Chief Executive Officer in his absence.

Chief Academic Officer/Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The senior administrative official responsible for the direction of the academic program of the institution. Typical functions include academic planning, teaching, research, extension, admissions, registrar and coordination of interdepartmental affairs. Reports to the Chief Executive Office.

Chief Business Officer/Vice President for Financial Affairs. The senior administrative official responsible for the direction of the business and financial affairs. Functions supervised typically include accounting, purchasing, physical plant, personnel services, food services and

¹Definitions for executive level educational administrators are taken from: D. P. Jones, "A Manual for Budgeting and Accounting for Manpower Resources in Postsecondary Education. Technical Report #84." National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

auxiliary enterprises. These functions may also include computer services, investment budgets and security.

Reports to the Chief Executive Office.

Chief Student Personnel Officer/Vice President for Student Affairs. The senior administrative official responsible for the direction of the student personnel program. Functions typically include student counseling and testing, residence halls, placement, student activities, financial aids and health services. Reports to the Chief Executive Officer.

Research Questions

In more specific terms, this study will attempt to respond to the following questions as perceived by executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities.

- (1) Will student personnel programs and services be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90? If so, what will be the nature of the change? Which services will be affected? How will these services be affected?
- (2) What criteria are applied to assess the effectiveness and economy of student personnel services?
- (3) What differences in responses, if any, exist between respondents from public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan?

- (4) What differences in responses, if any, exist between respondents from universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan?
- (5) What differences in response, if any, exist between executive level educational administrators, by position, in Michigan colleges and universities.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a:

Student personnel programs and services will not be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90.

Hypothesis 1b:

There are no significant differences in the effect of declining resources on individual student services.

Hypothesis 2:

Respondents do not differ significantly in their responses to what criteria is applied to assess effectiveness and economy of student services.

Hypothesis 3:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 4:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 5:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities by position.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in scope and interpretation is bound by the following variables:

- (1) The findings in this study are specific to four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. The degree to which these findings can be generalized to four-year colleges and universities in other states is influenced by the corresponding social, educational, demographic and economic factors. The vulnerability of the economy of the State of Michigan relative to being a single industry economy places Michigan in a particularly unique economic situation. Though the findings may reflect trends in the profession, the degree of generalizability is limited.
- (2) This study is designed to assess the relationship, if any, between declining resources and student services. While this investigator recognizes that the field of student personnel encompasses more than a service orientation, an assessment of the services is the central focus. The relationship of declining resources and student development components of

student personnel should be considered in a future study.

- (3) A comprehensive study of declining resources and dwindling enrollments and their relationship to the totality of student personnel programs would include a thorough examination of institutional fiscal policy; institutional resources; the philosophy and values of institutional decision-makers; and economic trends. Information of this nature and magnitude is not readily available, is highly confidential, and is beyond the scope of this investigator's resources.
- (4) It is important to note that the responses in this study reflect only the perceptions of the individuals surveyed. The cumulative data from a single institution cannot be interpreted as an institutional decision, policy or direction. Moreover, the findings represent only perceptions and opinions of respondents. It is critical to note that the amount of experience, the educational level and commitment to planning of the respondents varies and may affect their responses.
- (5) For purposes of uniformity, this investigator selected four-year public and private bachelor's degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan with a headcount enrollment of more than 500 students as determined by the 1978-79 Fact Book

on Higher Education in Michigan. By employing this definition, some Michigan institutions were excluded.

Assumptions of Study

In investigating this problem, the researcher made the following assumptions. These assumptions, if violated, could influence the findings.

- (1) Data was gathered through survey technique. Survey research is considered an accepted methodology in social science fields (Ostroth, 1979).
- (2) It was assumed that the same individuals to whom the instrument was sent were the respondents.
- (3) It was assumed that the survey instrument was understood by respondents and that respondents used their best professional judgement in providing honest replies.
- (4) It was assumed that administrators in selected positions (President, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President for Financial Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs) have ample information, sufficient professional experience and a broad institutional perspective to provide responses to the questions.

Methodology

Selection of the Population

The population was defined as executive level educational administrators at all four-year public and private bachelor's degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan with headcount enrollments of 500 or more students. The executive level educational administrators include individuals in the positions of Chief Executive/President, Chief Academic Officer/Provost, Chief Budget Officer/Vice President for Financial Affairs, and Chief Student Personnel Officer/Vice President for Student Affairs. In case of different titles, individuals with primary responsibility for the program were included in the study.

These individuals were selected as participants in the study because of their decision-making responsibility for institutional programs and resource allocation.

The list of participants was generated from the Education Directory-Colleges and Universities 1978-79 published by the National Center for Educational Statistics. Because of the small and manageable number of participants, the entire population was included in the sample. One hundred and fifty-two institutional decision-makers from thirty-eight colleges and universities made up the population. General Motors Institute requested exclusion from the study because of their unique governance and funding structure.

Instrument

Information was gathered through the administration of a written questionnaire. The instrument was designed to (1) assess perceptions of the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs; (2) assess perceptions about the relationship of declining resources and specific student personnel programs/services; (3) assess the primary criteria used in program justification; and (4) assess unit of ultimate responsibility for implementation of the program/service.

The survey was composed of seventy-seven forced answer items with ample opportunity for comment and open-ended responses. The primary questions solicited responses for seventeen student services. The questions asked for perceptions relative to resource allocation; primary criteria for having the program/service; primary responsibility for implementation of the program/service; and availability of the program/service at the respondent's institution.

The instrument was pilot tested by two academic administrators at Michigan State University; two management/budget administrators at Michigan State University; and two student personnel administrators at the above institution. A research consultant reviewed the questionnaire. Changes were made based on comments from the pilot group and the survey was rewritten. Face validity of the questionnaire was assumed from this process.

Data Collection

Data was collected by mailing the questionnaire to each participant. The survey, a personally addressed cover letter and self-addressed stamped envelope was sent to each participant on January 14, 1980. A personalized follow-up letter, questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope was sent to all nonrespondents on February 18, 1980. Of the 152 questionnaires mailed, 120 responses were received. In total, responses were received from 78.9 percent of the population sampled.

Data Analysis

The information from each questionnaire was coded and key punched for computer analysis. Data was analyzed using programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Bent, and Hull, 1970). All programs were run on Michigan State University's CDC 750 computer. Descriptive information was tabulated using the subprogram Frequencies. Measures of association, chi square and Fisher's Exact Coefficient, were calculated through the use of the subprogram Crosstabulation. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was applied to determine if differences exist between programs of a service nature and programs of a developmental/educational focus. The .05 alpha level was selected as the criterion of significance.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I included the introduction to the topic. It outlined the purpose of the study, rationale for the study, summary of related literature, definitions and questions for investigation. Limitations of the study, assumptions of the study, research hypotheses and a review of methodology were also included.

Chapter II provides documentation from the research and literature about the decline in enrollment and dwindling resources in the coming decade. It also includes a detailed review of the literature and research about the development and future of the student personnel profession.

Chapter III provides a detailed discussion of the design of the study, including the selection of the sample, data collection, and procedures of data analysis.

Chapter IV contains the data analysis and results of the study.

Chapter V contains a summary discussion and interpretation of the findings and conclusions drawn from these findings. This chapter also includes recommendations, implications, suggested areas for future research and additional inferences and speculations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature related to the relationship of declining resources in higher education in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in higher education is presented in three parts. The first part includes selected research and factual information about resources for higher education in 1980-90. The second component presents an overview of literature detailing the field of student personnel. The third part contains a comprehensive review of the published research about the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs.

The research describing resources in higher education includes information about enrollment patterns in post secondary institutions in the United States and, more specifically, in Michigan. Additionally, the resource literature includes a review of major issues impacting resources in the decade of 1980-90 at the federal level and in the State of Michigan. Specific resource issues related to public and private institutions are included. Presented as selected research, this literature review is intended to

identify the major trends related to resources for higher education in 1980-90.

The overview of the literature of the field of student personnel includes a history of the field; a topical account of major philosophic positions of the profession; and a review of current and future trends in student personnel.

The primary literature review describes research about the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs. While this body of theory and research is limited, it falls into the following categories: (1) the need for clarification of goals and purposes in the profession of student personnel; (2) the need for better management techniques and more strict accountability systems; (3) suggestions for reorganization of colleges and universities as well as student personnel divisions; and (4) general trends in the field of student personnel that are tangentially related to declining resources.

Resources in Higher Education

The history of American higher education is characterized by continuous and rapid growth. Since 1932, the number of public institutions has increased at a rate of twenty-one per year and the number of private institutions has increased at a rate of fifteen per year (Carnes, 1977). In fact, not only have the number of institutions increased at a rapid rate, but so have the size of the institutions,

the number of students and employees, and the size of the institutional budgets. Between 1949-50 and 1969-70, Avery reports that revenues of higher education increased more than six times (Avery, 1978). This extreme growth mode has left the industry of higher education poorly prepared to face current and future economic conditions of steady state and/or retrenchment. Predictions range from Leslie's feeling that there will be continued expansion at a slower rate (Leslie, 1980) to Folder's statement that higher education is in a "new depression" (Folder, 1977).

Resources: Declining Enrollments

Enrollment patterns in American colleges and universities are basically affected by two variables: (1) the size of the traditional college-age population, and (2) the rate of college attendance. Forecasters predict a general decline in the next ten years in both of these areas. The U.S. Census Bureau predicts that from 1980-85, there will be 1.7 million fewer eighteen to twenty-one year olds in the United States than during the previous five-year period (Centra, 1979). Further, the Bureau indicates that in the next ten years, there will be an 18 percent decline in the size of this age group (1979). The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education predicts that by 1997, the traditional college-age population (eighteen to twenty-four) will decline by 23 percent (1980). Moreover, a recent issue of "The Chronicle of Higher Education" provides data

indicating that the academic year 1976-77 marked a peak in the number of graduating high school seniors (XVII, 1, 1979). These demographers predict that the number of graduating seniors will change from 3,149,000 in 1976-77 to 2,740,000 in 1986-87 (1979). While predictions vary and statistics are analyzed in varying formats, the general consensus indicated a clear downward trend in the college-age population in the next ten year period.

This general trend of decline in student population is also reflected by forecasters in the State of Michigan. The Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University recently prepared a comprehensive study of enrollment patterns in Michigan. The research endorses two models which attempt to project enrollments into the decade of 1990. The Hecker-Ignatovich model (1979) predicts a 28.6 to 34.4 percent decline in the pool of juniors and seniors in high school from 1975-1990. They anticipate that two-thirds of this decline will occur between 1980 and 1985. Another researcher, Moor (1979), predicts a 10 to 15 percent decrease in the eighteen to twenty-one year old group from 1975-1990.

In addition to this anticipated decline in the number of potential college enrollees, the actual rate of attendance at American colleges and universities is expected to decrease. Although educators and forecasters differ in their assessment of the magnitude of the decline, they generally agree on the direction of the change. The National Center for Educational Statistics reports that in the past

year enough students to fill sixty small private colleges have disappeared (Centra, 1979). The Carnegie Council's prediction is less severe. It suggests that higher education will experience a peak enrollment of 10.7 million in 1980 with a downward trend to 10.3 million in 1985 (1974). Of a more dire nature is Cartter's forecast of a 6 percent decline of full-time equivalent students in the 1980s (Centra, 1979). On the other hand, Bowen is quite optimistic about enrollment. Because of major social change in the United States, he sees college population doubling in size (Centra, 1979).

In concert with Bowen, the final report of the Carnegie Council, "Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education," describes the changing complexion of student bodies in higher education. The Council predicts a 3 percent increase in nontraditional students. In fact, it reports that enrollment problems will be offset by older students, women, minorities and international students. By the year 2000, the Carnegie Council predicts that colleges and universities will enroll more women than men; as many people over twenty-one as twenty-one and under; and almost as many part-time as full-time students (Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1980).

The varied intensity of predictions by noted authorities is related to interpretation of economic and educational trends. Some of these issues receiving subjective analysis are: (1) the role of private higher education;

(2) future direction of government assistance programs; (3) the impact of part-time students; (4) geographic preference and college student migration; (5) the impact of older adults, nondegree and nontraditional students; (6) analysis of job market and economic trends; (7) recruitment efforts by the military; and (8) public opinion about higher education and the value of a college degree. Thus, while predictions are skewed, the general trend indicates a decline in enrollment.

The subjective factors affecting rate of attendance in post secondary institutions are applicable to populations in the State of Michigan. In fact, according to the study from the Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University, the national participation rates in higher education would provide the best available source in assessing Michigan participation rates in higher education (1979). Additionally, one model included in the study suggests that total enrollment in Michigan colleges and universities will decrease by 5.2 percent during 1975-1990. Another prediction suggests that the decrease in enrollees will be 17.2 percent. Thus, it appears that enrollment of nontraditional students will not be large enough to offset the population decline of eighteen to twenty-one year olds.

Resources: Governmental, Private
and Tuition Sources

The anticipated decline in resources exacerbates the enrollment problem. While parameters surrounding economic

trends and fiscal policy are not as definable as those of population statistics, the following perceptions signify a downward trend in financing higher education. On the federal level, the change in the 1980 higher education allocations will not keep pace with inflation. President Carter's proposed 1980 fiscal budget calls for a cut totaling \$500 million less than the previous year (The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1979). Given the government's estimated inflation rate of 6 to 7 percent, this cut back is significant. Additionally, spending for student aid was cut by \$260 million (The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1979).

While the impact of declining resources at the state level varies by state, general consensus indicates that the states with tax limitation legislation will significantly cut spending for two-year post secondary institutions. Depending on the state, other four-year institutions may also feel the effects of a recessionary economy.

More specifically, funding for higher education in the State of Michigan has dwindled in the past two decades. According to information from the Michigan Department of Management and Budget, the percentage of the general fund allocated to departments and agencies in four-year institutions of higher education has decreased from a rate of 18.2 percent in fiscal year 1962-63 to 14 percent in 1977-78. The current estimate for the fiscal year, 1978-79, is a 14.2

percent allocation (Office of the Budget, Department of Management and Budget, State of Michigan, 1980).

A similar pattern emerges as educators consider the program budget for four-year institutions in Michigan. In 1962-63, 21.9 percent of the general fund was allocated towards educational programs in higher education. This allocation has declined to 17.2 percent in 1977-78. The estimate for fiscal year 1978-79 is 18.3 percent (Office of the Budget, 1980).

According to Change Magazine's Economic Prospect Report (1980), the economic indicators show a mixed picture. They suggest that revenues will remain strong, but rates of inflation may bring about a decline in constant dollars. In general, the rate of inflation will erode the purchasing power of all sources of funding (federal, state, private and tuition). Folder points out that in the economic recession of 1974-75, half of the states showed a decline in constant dollar appropriation per student. He believes that higher education learned that its priority for funding was not as high as previously indicated (1977). Additionally, fixed costs and plant expenditures are victimized by inflation and cannot be proportionately reduced to reflect a decline in population.

Representing a more positive attitude, Leslie believes that continued expansion of governmental support will alleviate the problem. He predicts that income from tuition fees and voluntary giving will continue to grow,

but at a slow rate. Leslie's predictions take into account the rate of inflation (1980).

In considering allocation to specific programs in higher education, information from the Michigan Department of Management and Budget reveals limited support for student services. The percentages of increase of state expenditures by program, from 1975-76 to 1979-80, highlight the funding priorities of the State of Michigan. Instruction .376 percent, Research .436 percent, Public Service .216 percent, Academic Support .308 percent, Student Services .081 percent, Institutional Support .339 percent, Plant Operation .585 percent (Department of Management and Budget, Education Division, 1979). These percentages indicate a trend towards declining financial support for four-year institutions of higher education in Michigan as well as limited support for student services/programs in four-year institutions in Michigan.

Additionally, the private sector in American higher education is and will be gravely affected. Since 1950, student enrollment in private schools has drastically declined. The percentage of total college student enrollment in the private sector was 50 percent in 1950. In the twenty subsequent years, that figure dropped to 22 percent (Howe, 1979). This trend marks a significant change in the direction of tuition dollars. Thus, it appears that the private school's ability to attract grants and private funding is crucial to its survival. Moreover, according to

Howe, the ability of a private school in the 1980s to cut or consolidate programs without compromising quality is crucial (1979).

Further complicating the future resource picture for private education is the role of the federal and state government. In recent years, private institutions have become increasingly dependent on public funds (student aid and research grants). According to Howe, "While student aid from state and federal governments is of considerable assistance to public colleges, it has become the lifeblood of much of private undergraduate education" (1979, p. 29). He cites church related and primarily black colleges as being especially vulnerable. Thus, the future financial picture for private education is not only dependent on its ability to attract students and private sources of funding, but also on institutional success in the political arena.

Finally, colleges and universities will be particularly hard hit by the fiscal realities of the 1980s because (1) higher education is considered to be a lean industry; (2) colleges and universities are hit harder by inflation because they cannot pass the cost increase directly to the consumer; (3) institutions of higher education cannot easily reduce expenses in proportion to decreased enrollments; (4) there is a general public disillusionment about the value of a college degree as well as of the college experience (Howe, 1979). Further complicating these fiscal issues, recent federal legislation mandating expenditures for social

programs (affirmative action, women's intercollegiate athletics, handicapper students, Occupational Safety and Health Act (O.S.H.A.), Employee Retirement Income Security Act (E.R.I.S.A.), environmental legislation) will significantly impact the resource picture for higher education (Avery, 1978).

In summary, it appears that there is widespread agreement among demographers, educators and politicians that the number of traditional college age (eighteen to twenty-four) students will decline. Simultaneously, their rate of college attendance is also predicted to decline. Opinions and factual evidence vary as to the impact of non-traditional students on college enrollments. In general, resource analysts predict a decline in constant dollars for higher education. While resources will continue to rise, inflation will limit purchasing power. Analysts differ on the degree of severity which the resource question will impact higher education. Their predictions range from a period of steady state to full retrenchment.

Overview of Student Personnel Literature

The literature chronicling the past, present and future directions for the profession of student personnel is characterized by (1) a changing and evolving conceptual base; (2) a lack of congruence over the professions' purposes and goals among members of the profession and between constituent bodies of the university; and (3) proposals for

reorganizing the delivery systems of student affairs in higher education. In discussing the history and development of student personnel, Prior believes that the field has grown without planning. In his opinion, the result has caused definitional problems, role conflict and false expectations (1973). Penney writes that the profession has not achieved adequate recognition within higher education and that the field has diluted its impact by becoming fragmented and overspecialized (1969). McIntyre supports Penney's indictment by citing that student personnel educators have failed to become involved in campus decision-making or planning. He further suggests that the past perceptions of the student personnel worker's primary functions (administration and control) are primarily responsible for the present peripheral role. McIntyre concludes that student affairs and academic affairs have traditionally been separate functions (1975). Therefore, as educators attempt to anticipate future trends in student personnel, the lack of unified direction emerges as a critical issue.

More specifically, as educators consider the relationship between declining resources and dwindling enrollments, the profession of student personnel emerges as a vulnerable component in higher education. Although the student personnel literature reflects much thought about definitional problems of the field, there is very limited research on the relationship between fiscal constraints, enrollment decline in the coming decade and the profession

of student personnel. The research related to this relationship is confined to broad based themes calling for integration into the mainstream of the university (Crookston, 1972; Brown, 1972; Lewis, 1973), development of a comprehensive definition for the profession (Chandler, 1973; Cross, 1973), and reorganization of the implementation of student personnel services (Parker, 1971; Brown, 1972; Miller and Prince, 1976; Appleton, Moore and Vinton, 1978). In fact, there exists very limited research and theory surrounding the specific relationship between declining resources and student personnel programs. In summary, the following literature review includes an evolutionary account of the major "schools of thought," an assessment of current thinking in the profession, and a review of future trends. Literature which reflects the relationship of declining resources and student personnel will be given special emphasis.

According to Rudolph, the administration of pre-Civil War colleges and universities consisted of a president, treasurer and a part-time librarian. However, the rapid growth era of 1860-1933 dictated new services, and subsequently, additional administrators to oversee new services. The hiring of individuals to serve exclusively in administrative capacities developed from the need to free faculty from the responsibility of institutional management (1962). The addition of new services brought about specialization of job responsibilities and functions.

By the 1900s, specific people were hired to perform specialized roles. According to Rudolph, these new administrative positions emerged according to the following chronology.

First a secretary of the faculty, then a registrar, then in succession a vice president, a dean, a dean of women, a chief business officer, an assistant dean, a dean of men, a director of admissions, and in time a corps of administrative assistants to the president who were in charge of anything and everything; public relations, church relations, civic relations, student relations and faculty relations (1962, pp. 434-435).

Thus, the field of student personnel began as a service component meeting an administrative need in higher education.

It was not until after World War II that these functional/service components expanded their administrative role to include an educational component. First, counselors were employed to deal with students' out-of-class problems. In 1938 the Committee on College Personnel of the American Council on Education adopted "The Student Personnel Point of View." This statement posits four assumptions about students. (1) The individual must be considered as a whole; (2) each student is a unique person and must be treated as such; (3) the total environment of the student is educational and must be used to achieve his or her full development; (4) the major responsibility for a student's personal and social development rests with the student and his or her personal resources (Miller and Prince, 1976, p. 4). Thus, "The Student Personnel Point of View" provided a philosophic foundation for the profession.

In the post World War II growth era of higher education, student services were expanded to meet the needs of a large and more diverse student population. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 had a significant impact on services such as housing and financial aids. The founding of the Veteran's Administration in 1943 provided impetus for development of placement as a college student personnel service. Paralleling the growth mode of these services was a need for teachers and researchers. As a result college and university faculty began narrowing their roles and no longer saw the diversity of student services as part of their responsibility (Packwood, 1977). Thus, the increase in services, coupled with the need for specialists to administer the services, spurred the growth of the profession of student personnel.

Simultaneously, an emerging body of literature provided further validation for the young field. Wrenn suggested that student personnel services, in concert with classroom instruction, should make up the educational program of the institution (Wrenn, 1951). Mueller outlined the four primary objectives of student personnel. They are: (1) preserving, transmitting and enriching culture; (2) developing all aspects of culture; (3) training for citizenship; and (4) training for leadership (Mueller, 1970). Shaffer and Martinson suggested that it is the responsibility of student personnel educators to provide

an appropriate campus climate as well as deliver services (Shaffer and Martinson, 1969).

By 1970, student personnel emerged as a professional field founded in an educational philosophy with the primary mission of delivery of services to students. However, at this time many theorists were in the process of advocating an expanded role of student personnel administrators. In 1972, the Council of the Student Personnel Associations issued a statement criticizing the service mode of the profession. The Council felt that services were being done to and for students and not with them (1972). These philosophic trends, coupled with the writings of Crookston (1972, 1975, 1976), Chandler (1973), and Brown (1972) gave rise to the emergence of the theory of student development. Brown, a proponent of student development, defines the concept in Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education. He believes that the intellectual and personal development of students should be intertwined. He reconceptualizes student personnel by emphasizing a student development mode (Brown, 1972).

Crookston, a critic of the traditional "Student Personnel Point of View" also emerges as a leader in the construction of student development theory. He defines student development as:

The application of the philosophy and principles of human development in the educational setting. Human development refers to growth, development, and fulfillment of the individual throughout life as a realized person and effective, productive citizen,

and the growth and development of society (Crookston, 1976, p. 26).

Moreover, according to Berry, student development requires cognitive mastery along with personal development of cultural awareness, value systems, self awareness, interpersonal skills and community responsibility (Berry, 1976).

Founded in the human development theories of Blos (1941), Tryon and Lilienthal (1950), Havighurst (1953), Erickson (1959, 1963), Blocker (1966), and Chickering (1969), the concept of student development has emerged as the major theoretical position for the student personnel profession. Miller feels that the emergence of student development is a planned response to changes in higher education (change from an elitist to an egalitarian enterprise; development of experiential learning; rise of community colleges). He calls for a two-phase implementation:

(1) defining the nature of learning and identifying the fundamental goals and premises of higher education; and
(2) model building (Miller, 1975). Jones cites student development as moving away from the control function into a new role of caring, education and development. He calls for the integration of student personnel with academics. He sees student development as a primary rather than a support function (Jones, 1978). Hurst and Ivey also support the developmental philosophy. Chastising student personnel educators for being crisis oriented and reactive, they call for future planning and a proactive posture (Hurst and Ivey,

1971). Crookston, further supporting student development, views the environment as a learning place. He calls for the systematic coordination and integration of campus environments so that the individual will develop a symbiotic relationship with the community (Crookston, 1972). Thus, the notion of student development is widely accepted among student personnel educators.

Understanding and general acceptance of student development is not as widespread outside of the profession. Cross, a supporter of student development, raises the question of implementation on campus. She suggests that practitioners should be careful not to promise more than that which can be delivered. She further questions the roles which student personnel educators play and calls for better definition (Cross, 1973). Other components of the university hold a more pragmatic view of student personnel educators. In a study of goal congruence for student personnel programs, Terenzini found that if student development is to be implemented, college and university presidents must be more fully convinced of its value. Further, he found that college presidents tend to view student personnel educators as managers of services and not educators (Terenzini, 1972). In an earlier study by Dutton, Appleton and Birch, the findings revealed general consistency among college presidents and deans of students on the role of the chief student personnel officer. However, presidents were more likely to say that the dean's primary responsibility is to

students rather than the institution (Dutton, Appleton, Birch, 1970). The discrepancy in findings of these two studies is probably due to the change in philosophic mission from a service orientation (1970) to student development orientation (1972).

Simultaneous to the emergence of the student development philosophy, literature advocating an integrationist philosophy emerged. Theorists who support a co-curricular model believe that student personnel educators must collaborate with faculty and develop a coordinated curriculum (Marshall and Sorochty, 1976). McIntyre calls for goal congruence between student personnel staff and university administrators. Further, he suggests an integral role in planning and decision-making (McIntyre, 1975). Harvey sees student personnel roles as merging with administrative roles in the university and views an integrated approach as the result (Harvey, 1976). Jones also sees student personnel administrators merging with general administration. He advocates an integrated community where faculty would be used in student personnel positions. This model would create closer ties and foster understanding between faculty and student personnel educators (Jones, 1978).

Other theorists support a stronger integration concept. Crookston (1972), Brown (1972) and others call for student development to be fully integrated into the mainstream of the university as a primary function. Abel (1973) and Lewis (1973) recommend that student personnel educators

develop courses; teach skills; and become part of the curriculum. Berry (1976) suggests coursework related to human development and life style planning. Brooks (1974) calls for tenure of chief student personnel administrators to add an academic dimension. In his study, Brooks found that 44 percent of the student personnel administrators are not affiliated with a department and are therefore not eligible for tenure (Brooks, 1974).

On the other hand, Shaffer presents a more pessimistic viewpoint. He believes that student personnel has failed to mature as part of the total system. He states that for student personnel to remain a significant component in higher education, it must contribute to the total organization (Shaffer, 1973). Writing five years later, Blaesser also stresses university-wide acceptance. He maintains that the long term impact of the student development movement will be dependent on the understanding, support and acceptance of top level administrators. He adds that integration into the mainstream will come only through major organizational change (Blaesser, 1978).

Student Personnel: Future Directions

In addition to the large body of literature supporting the student service mode, advocating student development concepts, and calling for integration models, there is also a great deal of professional writing which calls for goal congruence, role clarity and boundary definitions.

Astmann calls student personnel services "a large complex of operations with a vague ill-defined purpose" (Astmann, 1975, p. 66). He states that faculty perceive student services as a necessary evil and that when under financial pressure, faculty will emerge with a "survival of the fittest" attitude. According to the faculty sampled in his study, student services are peripheral (1975). Crookston cites a terminology problem. He states that faculty are not aware of the philosophy and mission of student development; that the student service mode is still popular among faculty; and that a name change will not correct their perceptions (Crookston, 1974). Chandler, believing that roles are not adequately defined, calls for a separation of the managerial and developmental functions. Functional distinctions of this nature may eliminate some confusion (Chandler, 1973). Lewis reports that faculty feel a sense of general uneasiness about student personnel and its relationship to faculty and students. As a result, he calls for formal job descriptions and regular staff evaluations (Lewis, 1973). Cross also calls for better definition of roles. In reacting to the roles of diagnostician, programmer, technologist and behavioral scientist (Brown, 1972), Cross cautions that ambiguous roles are difficult to evaluate and may suggest more than that which can be delivered. She suggests the function of research as a critical role for student personnel educators (Cross, 1973).

Dressel, writing in The Journal of Higher Education, is most critical of student personnel work. This writer accuses student personnel workers of attempting to seize everything that is nonacademic and taking anything that is not allocated to the faculty. Dressel further criticizes student personnel for its diverse and nebulous goals, such as: (1) understanding the college student as a learner and person; (2) facilitating communication between students and others in the institution and community; and (3) interpreting goals, values and objectives. Dressel calls for a more restricted concept of student personnel and a clearer statement of benefits. He feels that student personnel educators should define their mission by responding to the following questions: What are the benefits? To whom do the benefits accrue? How can they be measured? Into what natural subgroups do the functions and benefits of student personnel work fall? Dressel continues to outline the definitional problem by suggesting that student personnel educators also have an evaluation problem. Quantitative evaluation with measurable outcomes is fairly straightforward (number of students served, kind of records kept, extent to which services are used). However, qualitative evaluation methods pose a measurement problem. Because of this dilemma, Dressel accuses student personnel educators of steering away from using good evaluation techniques. He suggests assessment indices to measure (1) general satisfaction/dissatisfaction of students, faculty and

administrators with student personnel work; (2) increase in retention rates due to better selection of programs or careers; or (3) development of skills by students as a result of interaction (Dressel, 1973). Thus, it appears that while theorists of student personnel/student development have attempted to provide a clear conceptual framework, confusion over goals, priorities and roles is evident in the literature.

Further review of the literature citing trends in student personnel reveals repeated suggestion for reorganization of the university structure and student personnel areas. At the macro level, Kramer predicts future increased interest in redesigning university organizational structure. He advocates greater attention to the area of information dissemination by creating a university affairs office. He views this office as a research and service agency with the task of providing relevant assistance to promote education and growth. This office would be assigned to identify issues, problems and needs, and facilitate resources to meet these needs. Reporting to the Provost, Kramer sees this office staffed by student personnel educators (Kramer, 1975). Parker advocates a different type of student information center. He suggests that student personnel educators should accumulate and disseminate knowledge about students and their development to the wider community. Moreover, he advocates the provision of consultants to create educational programs and provide assistance to

members of the university community (Parker, 1971).

Appleton, Moore and Vinton propose a model for the integration of academic units and student affairs. They suggest a "hub-spoke" model where the chief student personnel officer on campus would routinely coordinate meetings with representatives from each academic area. In order for student personnel to be more closely aligned with academic affairs, it is critical to provide a mechanism that links services with administration (Appleton, Moore and Vinton, 1978).

Dressel proposes a realignment of student personnel functions to better reflect function and focus on competencies. His restructure includes: (1) administrative and fiduciary functions (admissions, records, registration, financial aids); managerial and coordination (residence halls, student activities); information and therapeutic areas (orientation, counseling, advising, remedial programs); law and order functions (student rights and grievances) (1973).

Other researchers suggest a division of student personnel functions into managerial activities and educational/developmental functions. According to Prior, the management office would handle areas of responsibility, such as student rights, discipline, security and maintenance. The education unit may include advising, counseling services, orientation, special projects and developmental programs (Prior, 1973). Prince and Miller support this

model stating that a separation of the developmental functions from crisis management and problems is necessary. The separation would allow for student affairs administrators to be perceived in an educational role (1976). Chandler advocates a three-way division: (1) managerial-service; (2) student development; and (3) judicial control (1973). While Miller and Prince report that 80 percent of the institutions surveyed by Crookston and Atkynes in 1974 had a traditional centralized line-staff structure, the current literature suggests movement towards new organizational models (1976, p. 157).

Declining Resources and Student Personnel Programs

Literature which specifically addresses the relationship of dwindling resources, declining enrollments and student personnel programs broadly defines some trends and responses. Matson suggests that student services are often an area hit during retrenchment because administrators avoid cutting academic programs, which are universally viewed as primary programs. Moreover, she feels that administrators believe student personnel programs can absorb cuts without showing adverse effects (Matson, 1978).

A general theme seems to surround the need for clarification of goals and purposes in an era of fiscal limitations and tight accountability. Harpel calls for an end to student affairs program justification based on idealistic/humanitarian platitudes. He suggests that

student affairs administrators are vulnerable in the area of management skills. In addition to the development of a sound philosophic rationale, he suggests that attention should be given to planning, budgeting and evaluation (Harpel, 1976). Lewis (1973), Shaffer (1973), Fischer (1973) and others also call for accountability systems, clarification of roles and development of open relationships with component parts of the institution. Shaffer calls for enforcement of budget restrictions; development of new evaluation procedures; and use of cost/benefit analysis techniques. Further, he suggests that institutions should prohibit hiring staff with limited and narrow perceptions of their roles. In addition, in an era of fiscal constraint, he calls for the need to build a realistic power base; to use consultants effectively; to develop their roles through research; and to sensitize personnel staff to the institutional governance structure. Shaffer seems to advocate a mainstream role for student affairs. He suggests that as a service model, student personnel is "an expensive luxury with an insatiable appetite for funds and staff" (1973, p. 388). Further, the service function is a difficult one to evaluate (1973). Dressel advocates a similar posture of tight accountability and good evaluation. He questions whether the benefits justify the costs and suggests the emergence of an institutional value conflict. "Are student personnel programs

worth the cost in comparison with other programs?" (1973, p. 24).

Matson also calls for the development of a workable system of accountability to be used in decisions regarding allocation of resources. She criticizes administrators for a "more of the same" attitude in response to program increases. She suggests that in the current era of declining resources, administrators should evaluate outcomes and critically analyze programs rather than make across-the-board cuts. In fact, she advocates a program budget as opposed to zero-based budgeting (Matson, 1978).

Further literature related to the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs calls for use of sophisticated management techniques to meet the demands of tight accountability. In a recent study, Meabon, Sims, Suddick and Alley surveyed student affairs units in post secondary education to examine the degree to which management techniques were used. They concluded that the implementation of these tools (statement of purpose, goal statement, written objectives, job description, evaluation, reward) was not universal. Less than half of the institutions reported involvement in annual reviews of accomplishments. Half of the population reported implementation of management by objectives framework (Meabon, Sims, Suddick, and Alley, 1978).

While Boylan (1973) and others call for applications from management theory, Shoemer and Snapp suggest the use

of N.C.H.E.M.S. models (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems). Shoemer and Snapp suggest that unless student personnel administrators develop and use N.C.H.E.M.S. tools, they will lose the accountability and funding battles. The development of accountability systems, formula budgeting and computer technology demands exact and consistent communication between decision-makers.

N.C.H.E.M.S. provides for consistency of communication between administrators and to federal agencies. Shoemer and Snapp also make the point that the program classification structure defines student personnel as a support function rather than a primary program (Shoemer and Snapp, 1977). Tucker also advocates a more managerial mode for university administrators. He suggests that they develop a better data base to include trends, ratios and variance in order to recognize important financial warning signals (Tucker, 1977).

In an attempt to build a data base and gain an understanding of costs of student personnel programs, the Research and Program Development Division of N.A.S.P.A. (National Association for Student Personnel Administrators) conducted a cost study. The purpose of the project was to provide student affairs administrators with cost data for planning and budgeting. Because of a small return from the participants (39 percent), the findings are inconclusive. General trends indicate that expenditures per student decrease as enrollments increase. Public institutions

spend more dollars per student than private institutions. Major research universities spend more per student than four-year colleges. Accumulation of this type of data will become increasingly more important in an era of no growth and tight budgets (Woodard and Birch, 1977).

In describing future trends in student personnel, some researchers and theoreticians have speculated about the impact of declining resources on student personnel programs and provide prescriptions for action. Rhatigan sees a survival mentality for student personnel. He feels "a cannibalistic assault will be made on all non-instructional areas." He suggests that student affairs administrators give careful thought to the question of across the board cuts, program cuts or the development of self-financing programs. He urges student affairs administrators to attempt to participate in institutional planning and the development of "retrenchment contingency" plans (Rhatigan, 1975). Kniefelkamp also expresses concern over decline of quality, destructive ways of competing for students and the prospect of facing rigid defensive faculties. She sees the potential for increased fragmentation of faculty and student affairs (Kniefelkamp, 1980). Wellington also fears a splintering effect on institutional components and cautions student personnel administrators to develop programs that are congruent with institutional purposes. To do this, he suggests that student personnel educators become involved at various levels of institutional

governance and demand organizational changes leading to integration of business, academic and student affairs programs (Wellington, 1976). Blaesser reinforces this notion in his statement that ". . . student development programs will make minimal progress in higher education without intentional application of sound approaches to organizational change" (1978). Further, in order to respond to changing student demands and needs, Biggs calls for long range planning and not cosmetic changes (1979).

In addition to literature citing prescriptive actions for student affairs administrators, some researchers provide a descriptive analysis of current and future implications. Hakala states "The resource allocation problem resulting from a leveling off in college growth is the appearance of excess capacity, or at least misplaced resources" (Hakala, 1974). Further, he expresses concern for displaced personnel during a time of retrenchment. Because higher education and particularly student affairs, are labor intensive enterprises, budget cuts often mean personnel cuts. He fears that very specialized staff, such as student personnel educators in the service areas, will not survive reallocation of resource dollars (1974).

Employing a force-field analysis, Harvey looks at student development and its future. He views the consequences of fiscal issues as the driving force. Declining resources will force student affairs into an accountability mode. He suggests that smaller numbers of students will

provide the opportunity for development of quality programs. "As the fiscal stability of higher education begins to rest more fully on FTE or tuition income, higher education becomes more attuned to needs of students. Student centeredness is no longer a philosophic imperative, but a fiscal one" (Harvey, 1976, p. 94). He sees the surplus of faculty as a driving force towards the integration of academic and student affairs. Appleton, Moore and Vinton concur with the view that under increased economic pressure, faculty are more inclined to participate in advising and recruiting (1978). Further, Harvey believes that competition from vocationally oriented institutions such as business, churches and proprietary schools as meeting needs in the vocational education, area and therefore, providing an opportunity for higher education to deal with developmental concerns. Further, the Carnegie Commission reports a 7 percent return on the investment in higher education and Harvey views this fact as a driving force.

In terms of restraining forces, Harvey cites the move towards vocationalism; inadequate models of student development; faculty unions; and faculty allegiance to a discipline. He calls for student personnel workers to become "scholarly practitioners" with well developed skills in evaluation, organizational development, planning, budgeting and conflict resolution (1976). Lewis supports this role for student affairs' educators. He calls for staff in the classroom, formal job descriptions, staff

evaluation, establishment of leadership retreats, skill development workshops and implementations of the recommendations from the Newman Report and Carnegie Commission (Lewis, 1973).

Examining budget cuts and their impact on services, Ferrari found that services maintained would be financial aids, registrar, admission, counseling, minority student programs and dean of students' activities. The programs receiving less support were fraternities and sororities, international programs, student personnel research and student activities (Ferrari, 1972).

Looking at student personnel as a service oriented program, J. W. Humphries addresses the question, "Is there a future for the student personnel professional in American higher education?" He raises the issue of the student personnel educator as being neither faculty nor administration and suggests that without tenure, rank and departmental affiliation, positions and people are expendable. The job functions can be reassigned. He suggests that in tight fiscal times, it is difficult to defend a student service function. In his words, "Fiscal pressures produced and continue to produce casualties. Some institutions, in drastic economic moves, have eliminated student personnel divisions; others have imposed substantial staff reductions. A few institutions are experimenting with organizational patterns that place all student personnel functions in the hands of the faculty as they were previously" (Humphries,

1977). He further suggests that the survival of services rest with an independent fee structure. Humphries urges student personnel educators to address the issue of their roles in higher education (1977).

In considering the relationship of limited resources and student personnel programs, some literature addresses the supply/demand issue relative to human resource planning. Armstrong, Campbell and Ostroth conclude that for several years, there have been more graduates from student personnel training programs than available professional positions. Their analysis of the 1977 N.A.S.P.A. (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators) employment market reveals that the greatest number of positions were entry level housing jobs (Armstrong, Campbell and Ostroth, 1978). As early as 1974, Escott found an adverse market condition. Figures from the 1974 N.A.S.P.A. Placement Service show an entry level selection ratio of 1:0.9; a middle management ratio of 1:1.7; and an upper management ratio of 1:3. In addition, 10 percent of the available positions required some special training which is not traditionally part of the student personnel training and curriculum. Because the job market is a barometer for changes in the field, Escott advocates use of placement data in planning human resource needs for the profession of student personnel (Escott, 1974).

Ferrari also urges development of comprehensive human resource planning. In the 1972 national manpower study, Ferrari surveyed student personnel educators at

1,659 colleges and universities. Because of a low rate of return (26 percent), the generalizability of the data is limited. However, some interesting trends became evident. Ferrari reports that only 43 percent of student personnel staff have formal student personnel training and that the remaining 57 percent have backgrounds in counseling, psychology and the behavioral sciences. His findings indicate that this proportion is likely to continue at the same level. Reporting no increases in staff positions from 1972-75, but large increases in the number of student personnel graduates for the same period, Ferrari concludes that there will be an imbalance in the supply-demand ratio (Ferrari, 1972).

Other researchers report a stable student personnel job market. Packwood reports that in the 1973-74 survey of student personnel graduates, 95 percent were employed. However, 24 percent of the candidates earning master's degrees accepted positions in residence halls. Further, 15 percent of the total number of graduates accepted positions outside of the student personnel field (Packwood, 1976). Greer, Blaesser, Herron and Harle also report a stable market. Their study, supported by A.C.P.A. (American College Personnel Association), Commission XII, found that from 1975 to 1976, there were 191 graduates in student personnel. Fifty-nine percent of these graduates were employed in the field. Six percent were unable to find positions in specific geographic areas and 5 percent were

not able to find employment in the profession. These researchers conclude that the number of graduates of student personnel programs finding employment outside of the profession is partially responsible for the stable market. In 1976-77, 1,049 graduates from college student personnel were reported and 59 percent of this group were placed in the field. Nineteen percent took positions outside of the profession (Greer, Blaesser, Herron and Harle, 1978). While research indicates conflicting opinion regarding the job market for student personnel trained professionals, some general trends emerge. There is an increase in the number of students taking entry level housing positions; a developing trend towards more candidates accepting positions outside of the profession; and a generally favorable market condition for employers.

There is evidence in the literature of some research describing general trends in student personnel that seem to be related to the anticipation of declining resources. Kramer reports seven influential factors on the field of student personnel. He predicts (1) growth rates will be low; (2) ethos of accountability will exert pressure; (3) increased interest in redesigning university organizational structure; (4) students will enjoy more freedom; (5) as costs rise, there will be an effort to maximize efficiency and productivity; (6) age mix will become more heterogeneous; and (7) interplay between constituent groups will become more political and less paternalistic

(Kramer, 1975). As a result of these trends, he also makes some predictions for future programs. In the housing area, he sees a shift from educational/developmental functions towards the business and management areas. In career planning and placement, he sees employment trends as playing a significant role in institutional planning. Better data collection and dissemination will be necessary. He predicts that academic advising will become the province of the faculty, which may give rise to peer group advising. Student activities will be more controlled by students. Health Services will be taken over by external agencies and provide health care on a fee structure basis (Kramer, 1975).

Young used a modified delphi technique to assess perceptions of forty representatives from New England colleges and universities on the future of student affairs. The sample included students, faculty, academic deans, and deans of students. The conclusion suggested five areas of critical concern. They are: (1) institutional racism and sexism; (2) cost effectiveness and evaluation in programs; (3) increased student responsibility in the educational setting; (4) development of specialists and consultants in student affairs; and (5) attention to career development (Young, 1978).

Nelson (1979) recently completed a study designed to determine the extent to which college and university student personnel administrators perceive changes that may take place in student personnel services and programs as a result

of enrollment and budget reductions. Taking a functional approach rather than organizational, he concludes that some services and programs would be affected. However, he found a lack of congruence among respondents as to which programs would be affected. In general, he cited the areas of operating budgets, professional and administrative staff, counseling centers, student activities, health centers and activities of the dean of student's office would be most likely to be affected. Those activities least likely to be impacted are recruitment and admissions, registrar, orientation, placement, financial aids, residence halls, academic assistance programs, bookstore, security and food services. Based on this data, Nelson also concluded that there will possibly be an increase in nonprofessional student personnel administrators in student affairs programs. He sees paraprofessionals and students as assuming responsibilities in view of fiscal exigencies.

Another trend in evidence throughout the literature is the call for responsive action to meet the needs of "new students" (Rhatigan, 1975; Cross, 1975). Cross has described these new students as nontraditional college students who have specialized needs. They are older; many are married; they represent minority groups; they may be returning to higher education. Cross challenges higher education to be more responsive to their unique needs (Cross, 1975). In addition to meeting the needs of new learners, it is also necessary to consider the needs of traditional

college students. Because of declining enrollments in higher education, researchers predict a "student market" in college selection and a subsequent consumer orientation (Biggs and Skinner, 1979). Dressel cites that the responsibility of student personnel educators is to insure that students develop useful competencies (Dressel, 1973). Lewis emphasizes establishment of leadership training and skill development workshops (Lewis, 1973).

As the literature points to new needs in higher education, new roles for student personnel administrators have emerged. Student affairs personnel should be responsible for fostering open communications among constituent groups (Crookston, 1972); for developing an expertise in group process and conflict management (Lewis, 1973); for acting as consultants to constituent groups on human development (Parker, 1971); for collecting and disseminating data (Kramer, 1975); for research and education on human development (Shaffer, 1973; Cross, 1973); for integrating student affairs and academic areas (Marshall and Sorochty, 1976; Abel, 1973; Harvey, 1974; Miller and Prince, 1976); and for the development of efficient and effective management systems (Harpel, 1976; Matson, 1978; Meabon, Sims, Suddick and Alley, 1978; Shoemer and Snapp, 1977).

In a more general sense, Kniefelkamp outlines her perceptions of "conditions threatening the community." She is concerned that constituent groups in higher education will become separated and fragmented when confronted with

the reality of an era of limitations. She predicts competition for valuable resources as well as power and influence. In an era of declining enrollments, she predicts that institutions may admit numbers of poorly prepared, underqualified students. The institution may not prepare to meet the needs of these new students, and more importantly, the student may not be prepared for failure (Knefelkamp, 1980).

The Carnegie Commission also attempts to address these concerns. They identify "signs of survival" as being the lowering of admissions standards, the search for non-traditional students, increased emphasis on retention of nontraditional students, the turn towards vocationalism, grade inflation to retain students and increased faculty interest in collective bargaining. Attempting to guard against these problems, the latest report from the Carnegie Commission recommends the following: Educators should (1) analyze factors likely to affect future enrollments (demography, changing population mix, labor market changes, fiscal trends); (2) insist on institution-wide and system-wide planning; (3) encourage strong leadership; (4) give priority to maintenance of quality; (5) encourage innovation and flexibility; (6) strive for effective use of resources; (7) seek support from private sources; and (8) improve programs for recruitment and retention (Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1980).

Conclusion

The review of the literature includes information documenting the general trend towards declining resources for higher education in 1980-90. Included in the literature related to resources is information about declining enrollments in higher education. Declining enrollments, which mean fewer tuition dollars, are the result of a decrease in the size of the traditional college-age population and a decrease in the rate of attendance. Additionally, information about federal, state and private funding is included. Research and literature as to the impact of declining resources on public and private four-year institutions is reviewed.

Secondly, an historical review of the major philosophic positions of the student personnel profession was presented. The evolution of the field from a primarily service component (1900-1920) to a field founded in a well integrated theory of human development (1972-present) was described. Research findings by proponents of "The Student Personnel Point of View" and of student development were presented. Writing of future issues and trends, such as a call for goal congruence, greater integration with the other components of the university, were also reported.

Finally, literature related to the relationship between student personnel and declining resources was presented. The published research on this topic is limited

and existing work presents only general and vague ideas. Primarily, researchers call for better definition of roles and clarification of purposes in order to justify expenditures for student services in tight fiscal times. Moreover, researchers suggest implementation of more sophisticated management techniques to aide in acting effectively in an era of tight accountability. Some general trends in higher education which are related to or suggest a relationship between declining resources and student personnel programs were reviewed and the dominant theme suggests a concern for fragmentation of component parts of the university in the coming decade of limited resources.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in a random sample of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. In order to provide more focus to the study, the following questions for investigation were developed.

- (1) Will student personnel programs and services be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90? If so, what will be the nature of the change? Which services will be affected? How will these services be affected?
- (2) What criteria are applied to assess the effectiveness and economy of student personnel services?
- (3) What differences in responses, if any, exist between public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan?
- (4) What differences in responses, if any, exist between universities of more than 20,000 students;

colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan?

- (5) What differences in response, if any, exist between executive level educational administrators, by position, in Michigan colleges and universities?

In attempting to provide a thorough investigation of the primary research questions and offer responses to the more specific questions for investigation, the investigator included the following components in the design of the study and research methodology. Null hypotheses were presented based on the five research questions previously outlined. The population studied was described and justification was provided. The development of the instrument was detailed and a copy of the final product may be found in Appendix A. Finally, the methodology for collection and analysis of the data was outlined. A brief summary of the process concludes the chapter.

Testable Hypotheses

Based on the five questions for investigation, null hypotheses were developed. The following hypotheses were tested through analysis of the responses to the developed survey questions.

Hypothesis 1a:

Student personnel programs and services will not be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90.

Hypothesis 1b:

There are no significant differences in the effect of declining resources on individual student services.

Hypothesis 2:

Respondents do not differ significantly in their responses to what criteria is applied to assess effectiveness and economy of student services.

Hypothesis 3:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 4:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 5:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities by position.

Selection of Population

The general purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between declining resources and student personnel programs in colleges and universities. The primary criteria employed in defining the population were (1) who are the individuals in Michigan colleges and universities with the primary responsibility for institutional resource management and decision-making; (2) who are the individuals which seem to have the most experience and knowledge in

resource allocation in colleges and universities; (3) will this group of people be manageable in terms of accessibility and interest in participation? Based upon literature supporting items 1 and 2 of the above criteria, this investigator selected executive level educational decision-makers as the population to be included in the study (Barzun, 1970).

The executive level educational administrators include individuals in the positions of Chief Executive/President, Chief Academic Officer/Provost, Chief Budget Officer/Vice President for Financial Affairs, and Chief Student Personnel Officer/Vice President for Student Affairs. If institutions used different titles, the individual with primary responsibility for the area/program was included. These specific educational administrators were selected because the literature on decision-making in institutions of higher education supports the notion that the power, authority and influence related to institutional management is derived from the governing board and is vested in the position of the president. According to Barzun, "the president can do whatever he wishes" (1968, p. 96). The Vice President for Academic Affairs was selected since he dually represents the president as well as the faculty through the department chairs and the dean. The Vice President for Financial Affairs was included since this position represents the most wholistic view of the fiscal state of the institution. The Vice President for Student Affairs was selected since this position has primary

responsibility for the program under study. Further, these four executive level positions were consistently represented in organizational structures at various institutions. Other vice presidential positions were not included because of overly specialized job responsibilities as well as the fact that such positions were often unique to a particular campus. Thus, the four executive level educational administrators were selected because of their primary responsibility for institutional resource decision-making and management, and because of their knowledge, experience and broad institutional perspective in resource allocation decisions for colleges and universities.

In addition to defining the population as executive level educational administrators, the population was further narrowed to include only administrators from four-year public and private bachelor's degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan with headcount enrollments of 500 or more students. The decision to include administrators from a single state was made because of consistency of state funding. Because decisions about programs are made based on availability of resources, and resources include state as well as federal appropriations, inclusion of a population drawn from a single state would increase the reliability of the data. Secondly, the selection of Michigan institutional decision-makers was made because of the investigator's proximity to the institution, access to

information and familiarity with the system of higher education.

Further, it was decided to include four-year public and private institutions. Both public and private institutions were included since differences in perceptions of administrators at public institutions and at private schools is a question for investigation. Because four-year bachelor's degree-granting institutions have similar educational missions and serve a similar clientele, differences in perceptions between public and private four-year institutional administrators about student personnel programs are legitimate comparisons and may suggest future trends. Two year schools, junior and community colleges, and nonbachelor degree-granting institutions were not included in the population for the following reasons. As a group of institutions, they often rely heavily on local/community funding or private sources; they serve a different clientele; and have a different educational mission. Because of these differences, the student personnel programs at two year institutions may have a different educational thrust than the programs at four year schools. These differences would make comparisons of specific programs impossible and would make general comparison subject to questions of validity.

Institutions with headcount enrollments of less than 500 students were eliminated since many of these schools do not have the resources and/or the student demand

to support a comprehensive student personnel program. In making this determination, the measure of headcount was used rather than FTE (full time equivalent) since most student personnel programs are usually not funded based on FTE. Part-time students have access to and use student services/programs as well as full-time students and may use programs/services to the same extent.

General Motors Institute was included in the original population, but requested exclusion from the study because of its unique governance and funding structure. G.M.I. is the only accredited undergraduate college maintained by a single industrial corporation. Secondly, all students at G.M.I. are required to participate in cooperative education. Under this plan, students spend alternating twelve-week periods in academic preparation at G.M.I. and in work experiences at their sponsoring General Motors division. This institution-wide involvement in cooperative education has an impact upon the student affairs program by providing specialized services/programs and altering the traditional student affairs programs to meet the needs of co-op students at this unique institution. Furthermore, student affairs programs are supported by allocations from General Motors Corporation.

Based on the definition, the list of institutions was generated from the 1978-79 Fact Book on Higher Education in Michigan. The population of executive level educational administrators was determined from the Educational

Directory-Colleges and Universities 1978-79, published by the National Center for Educational Statistics. An attempt was made to update this list through informal contacts with faculty and administrators at Michigan State University and through telephone inquiry to the president's office at the respective institution. The final list included the names, titles and addresses of presidents, vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for financial affairs and vice presidents for student affairs at all four-year bachelor degree-granting institutions with headcount enrollments of 500 or more students in the State of Michigan. Because of the small and manageable number of participants, the entire population was included in the sample. One hundred and fifty-two institutional decision-makers from thirty-eight colleges and universities made up the population. Table 3.1 provides a description of the population.

Development of the Instrument

After an extensive review of the literature and analysis of the problem, the questionnaire was developed (see Appendix A). The instrument was designed to solicit information and perceptions that would provide a data base for hypotheses testing. More specifically, the instrument was designed to (1) assess perceptions about the relationship of decreasing revenues and student personnel programs; (2) assess perceptions about the relationship of resource limitations and specific student personnel programs/

Table 3.1.--Composition of Population.

Variable	Number in Population	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Respondents from:			
Public Institutions	60	56	93.33
Private Institutions	92	64	69.56
Respondents from:			
Small Institutions	104	84	80.76
Medium Size Institutions	32	23	71.87
Large Institutions	16	13	81.25
Respondents from:			
President	38	28	78.68
Vice President for Academic Affairs	38	33	86.84
Vice President for Financial Affairs	38	30	78.94
Vice President for Student Affairs	38	29	76.31

services; (3) assess the primary criteria used in program justification; (4) assess perceptions about the locus of primary responsibility for administration of programs/services; and (5) gather information on what programs/services are offered at each institution. Thus, it was expected that responses from the questionnaire would provide answers to the following general questions: who should be responsible for various student services; what criteria should be used for program evaluation; and how should dollars be allocated in light of declining resources?

The survey was composed of seventy-seven forced answer items with numerous provisions for open-ended responses. The first section solicited information about the respondents' attitudes about declining enrollments and resource reductions at their respective institutions. This section was included to gain a perspective about the respondent's frame of reference. Secondly, the questionnaire addressed the general issue of resource allocation to university-wide program areas as defined by the Education Division of the Department of Management and Budget of the State of Michigan. The major portion of the instrument included four questions directed towards seventeen student services/programs. The list of the seventeen student services was generated from a review of the student affairs literature and informal interviews with student affairs practitioners at four-year institutions (Packwood, 1977). The four primary questions asked for (1) respondent's

perceptions relative to resource allocation; (2) primary criteria for having the program/service; (3) primary responsibility for implementation of the program/service; and (4) availability of the program/service at the respondent's institution. For questions 1, 2 and 3, respondents were asked to answer for all services/programs and to assume that all services/programs are of high quality. This qualification, and the use of hypothetical questions, were employed to solicit opinions based on professional expertise and to avoid local institutional bias.

The instrument was pilot tested by two academic administrators; two management/budget administrators; and two student personnel administrators at Michigan State University. The questionnaire was administered to each member of the pilot group. After completing the survey, a patterned verbal interview was conducted with each participant. Additionally, members of the pilot group made general comments. These individual sessions were designed to seek input on question bias, vagueness or confusion; to assess time and ease of completion of the questionnaire; to evaluate completeness and intelligibility of directions; and to determine general attitudes about the degree to which the questionnaire fits the purpose of the study. A research consultant reviewed the questionnaire. Based on comments from the pilot group and the research consultant, changes were made and the survey was rewritten. Face validity of the questionnaire was assumed from this

process. The final draft of the instrument, a seventy-seven item questionnaire, was typed and printed.

Data Collection

Data was collected by direct mailing of the final questionnaire to each member of the population. The questionnaire, a personally addressed cover letter (see Appendix B) and self-addressed stamped envelope was sent to each participant on January 14, 1980. Participants were promised that the individual identity of their responses would be kept confidential. Instruments were not coded for individual identification because identity by position and institution was of primary interest and was requested in the information section of the questionnaire.

A personalized follow-up (see Appendix C), questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope was sent to all nonrespondents on February 18, 1980. Of the one hundred and fifty-two questionnaires mailed, one hundred and twenty completed and usable questionnaires were returned. Responses received after April 1, 1980 were not included in the study. The responses were evenly divided across position: twenty-eight responses received from chief executives; thirty-three responses were received from chief academic officers; thirty responses were received from chief financial officers; and twenty-nine questionnaires were received from chief student personnel officers. In total,

responses were received from one hundred and twenty participants which represents 78.9 percent of the population sampled.

Data Analysis

The information received from each questionnaire was coded and key punched for computer analysis. During the coding process, it was necessary in some cases for this investigator to interpret responses. Responses to open-ended questions were gathered and will appear in Chapter IV.

Data was analyzed using computer programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Bent and Hull, 1970). All programs were entered and run on the CDC 750 computer at Michigan State University.

Because the nature of the data collected was nominal and ordinal (as opposed to interval data), the most practically useful analysis of the data was tabulation of frequencies and percentage frequencies of response. This type of descriptive information was tabulated using the SPSS subprogram Frequencies. The results supplied data on all questionnaire items in the following formats: frequencies, percentage frequencies, and where applicable, means, standard deviations, and ranges. To test the research hypotheses, measures of association, chi square and Fisher's Exact Test (used in cases where cell size is less than five) were calculated using subprogram Crosstabulation (Hays, 1973).

To determine if responses differed due to service nature of program or developmental/education focus, additional analysis was performed. The list of seventeen services/programs was divided into two groups. The division, as determined through a series of informal interviews with ten practicing student personnel educators, were (1) those programs which are considered to be primarily educational/developmental in their mission and (2) those programs which are primarily for the purpose of providing a necessary service to the student body. Cells were collapsed across programs into these two groups and a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was applied.

In determining the rejection or acceptance of the null hypotheses, the level of significance for each test was set at the standard .05 level. The investigator felt that use of a smaller alpha level, such as .01, would impose too strict of a test for exploratory research designed to assess trends and perceptions. On the other hand, using a more liberal alpha level, such as .1, would increase the risk of making a Type 1 error because of the use of multiple chi square tests (Hays, 1973). Thus, the .05 alpha level was selected as the criterion for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis.

Summary

The content of this chapter is a detailed account of the procedures established and followed by the

investigator in carrying out the study. The original idea for investigation became a study when the problem was defined as a clear, concise statement of purpose. As previously stated, the purpose of this study is to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. The purpose of the study was reiterated in this chapter as the guiding principle in the design of the questions for investigation and formulation of research hypotheses. Additionally, the definition of the population and design of the instrument were developed in accordance with the original statement of purpose and described in the chapter. Moreover, the collection and analysis of the data followed established and conventional procedures. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The findings from the survey of executive level administrators of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan are presented in this chapter. The findings include data collected from the administration of the questionnaire by mail; tabulation of the data on the CDC 750 computer at M.S.U.; and treatment of the data for the purpose of hypothesis testing.

The study is designed to assess perceptions of executive level education administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. More specifically, the study was designed to gain responses to the following questions as perceived by executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities.

- (1) Will student personnel programs and services be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90? If so, what will be the nature of the

change? Which services will be affected? How will these services be affected?

- (2) What criteria are applied to assess the effectiveness and economy of student personnel services?
- (3) What differences in responses, if any, exist between respondents from public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan?
- (4) What differences in responses, if any, exist between respondents from universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan?
- (5) What differences in response, if any, exist between executive level educational administrators by position in Michigan colleges and universities.

The instrument was designed to solicit information and perceptions that would provide responses to the five research questions, and subsequently, for the purpose of testing the null hypotheses. The survey was composed of seventy-seven forced answer items. The instrument asked some general questions to provide the investigator with demographic data about the respondent's institution (see Table 4.1). The next section solicited information about the respondent's perceptions about declining enrollments and resource reductions at their respective institutions. Further, the questionnaire addressed the general issue of resource allocation to university-wide program area. The

Table 4.1.--Analysis of Population.

	Number of Responses	Relative Frequency Percentages
<u>Status</u>		
Public	56	46.7
Private	64	53.3
<u>Size</u>		
Up to 7,500	84	70.0
7,500 to 20,000	23	19.2
20,000 or more	13	10.8
<u>Position</u>		
President	28	23.3
Vice President for Academic Affairs	33	27.5
Vice President for Financial Affairs	30	25.0
Vice President for Student Affairs	29	24.2

major portion of the instrument included four questions directed towards seventeen student services/programs. The four primary questions asked (1) respondent's perceptions relative to resource allocation; (2) primary criteria for offering the program/service; (3) primary responsibility for implementation of the program/service; and (4) availability of the program/service at the respondent's institution. Data for all questions are presented in this chapter.

Analysis of data was performed to consider differences in responses from administrators of public and private institutions; from institutions of varying size; and from administrators representing different positions at the institutions. Data was further analyzed to assess differences in responses for service-oriented student personnel programs and educational/developmental focused programs. The findings are presented in this chapter.

Data Analysis

Returned questionnaires were reviewed and evaluated for inclusion in the study. One hundred and twenty (78.9 percent) usable questionnaires were coded and the data was transferred to data processing cards. Data analysis techniques were selected based on the questions for investigation and testable hypotheses. Computer programs from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences were used to aid in data tabulation and analysis. Programs were entered and run on the CDC 750 computer at Michigan State University.

Several data analysis techniques were used in order to present the material in a meaningful format and in order to test the research hypotheses. The SPSS subprogram frequencies was used to tabulate description information for all questions. To determine relationships between responses and the independent variables of public/private status; size of institution and position at institution, measures of association, such as chi square and Fisher's Exact Test, were calculated by employing the SPSS subprogram Cross-tabulation. To determine if responses differed due to service nature of program or developmental/educational focus, a multivariate analysis of variance was applied. The .05 alpha level was selected as the criteria for accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses.

Analysis of Respondents

The survey group used in this study included the total population of presidents, vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for financial affairs and vice presidents for student affairs at all four-year bachelor degree-granting institutions with headcount enrollments of 500 or more students in the State of Michigan. This includes 152 institutional decision makers from thirty-eight colleges and universities. Since the purpose of the study is to assess individual perceptions, the unit of analysis is individual responses and not institutional responses.

The survey group was selected based on the following assumptions made by this investigator. Individuals with primary responsibility for major program areas (academic affairs, student affairs, financial affairs):

1. should hold an institutional perspective and, therefore, respond with a well developed awareness of the critical issues, philosophies and policies of their institution.
2. typically have years of experience in the industry of higher education and their response should reflect experience and wisdom.
3. are promoted and/or hired based on a certain level of professional competence and, therefore, competence and experience should provide the basis for response.
4. have worked in higher education and should have sophisticated perceptions and well-developed attitudes about trends and issues in higher education.

Finally, the literature supports the notion that institutional decision-making is usually executed at the presidential and executive level (Barzun, 1968). Therefore, in attempting to study the relationship between declining resources and student personnel programs in colleges and universities, this investigator determined that individuals in the positions of chief executive, chief academic officer,

chief budget officer and chief student personnel officer would provide quality responses. Based on their institutional perspective, sophisticated level of experience, competence and awareness, quality of response was assumed.

Response Rates

Executive level administrators from thirty-eight colleges and universities were included in the study. A total of 120 usable responses were received from a population of 152. The overall response rate was 78.9 percent. In examining the breakdown of respondents by the variables of public/private status; size; and position, it is evident that cell sizes vary greatly. Tables 4.2 and 4.3 provide a detailed analysis of the population and percentage of response. Further breakdown of the response by two or more variables would involve empty cells and therefore, would eliminate valid statistical analysis. Therefore, responses were analyzed independently by the three variables of status, size, and position.

Percentage of responses to total population seem fairly consistent across levels with the exception of the public/private category. Ninety-three percent of the administrators from public institutions responded as compared with 70 percent of the administrators from private schools. There is a small variation in response rate within the levels of size and position.

Table 4.2.--Analysis of Population/Number of Respondents.

	Up to 7,500	7,500 to 20,000	20,000 or More
<u>President</u>			
Public	4	6	2
Private	16	0	0
<u>Vice President for Academic Affairs</u>			
Public	5	6	3
Private	18	1	0
<u>Vice President for Financial Affairs</u>			
Public	4	6	4
Private	16	0	0
<u>Vice President for Student Affairs</u>			
Public	8	4	4
Private	13	0	0

Table 4.3.--Composition of Population.

	Number of Institutions	Number in Population	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
<u>Institutional Status</u>				
Public Institutions	15	60	56	93.33
Private Institutions	23	92	64	69.56
<u>Size</u>				
Up to 7,500	26	104	84	80.76
7,500 to 20,000	8	32	23	71.87
20,000 or more	4	16	13	81.25
<u>Position</u>				
President	38	38	28	78.68
Vice President for Academic Affairs	38	38	33	86.84
Vice President for Financial Affairs	38	38	30	78.94
Vice President for Student Affairs	38	38	29	76.31

Summary of Responses to Questions

Do you think that your institution will experience a change in enrollment in the next five years?

yes 86.7%

no 13.3%

In the next ten years?

yes 87.5%

no 8.3%

What do you anticipate to be the magnitude of the change in enrollment at your institution in the next five years?

increase 0-10% 33.3%

decrease 0-10% 30.0%

increase 10-20% 19.2%

decrease 10-20% 4.2%

increase 20-30% 1.7%

decrease 20-30% 0.0%

increase 30% or more 1.7%

decrease 30% or more 0.0%

no response 10.0%

In the next ten years?

increase 0-10% 25.0%

decrease 0-10% 23.3%

increase 10-20% 13.3%

decrease 10-20% 15.0%

increase 20-30% 5.0%

decrease 20-30% 2.5%

increase 30% or more 2.5%

decrease 30% or more 0.0%

no response 13.3%

Anticipating the impact of inflation, do you think that your institution will experience a change in resources (i.e., tuition revenue, state appropriations, private gifts) in the next five years?

yes 91.7% no 7.5% no response .8%

In the next ten years?

yes 90.0% no 4.2% no response 5.8%

What do you anticipate to be the magnitude of the change in resources at your institution in the next five years?

increase 0-10%	<u>26.7%</u>
decrease 0-10%	<u>11.7%</u>
increase 10-20%	<u>25.0%</u>
decrease 10-20%	<u>.8%</u>
increase 20-30%	<u>13.3%</u>
decrease 20-30%	<u>1.7%</u>
increase 30% or more	<u>10.8%</u>
decrease 30% or more	<u>0.0%</u>
no response	<u>10.0%</u>

In the next ten years?

increase 0-10%	<u>15.0%</u>
decrease 0-10%	<u>12.5%</u>
increase 10-20%	<u>20.8%</u>
decrease 10-20%	<u>2.5%</u>
increase 20-30%	<u>2.5%</u>
decrease 20-30%	<u>10.8%</u>
increase 30% or more	<u>20.8%</u>

decrease 30% or more	<u>0.0%</u>
no response	<u>15.0%</u>

If your institution were to experience a significant decline in resources or if resource allocations did not keep up with inflation, what recommendations would you anticipate making in the allocation of resources to the following program areas?

- 1 - increase allocation to raise funding level
- 2 - maintain allocation at current funding level
- 3 - decrease allocation
- 4 - eliminate program

Responses are presented in Table 4.4.

Additional Comments

This particular question received a great deal of attention from respondents in the "Additional Comment" section. Responses ranged from justification of recommendation to further explanation to comment about confusion over the question. It is evident that two respondents interpreted and answered the question for their particular institution and did not consider the hypothetical nature of the question. Their comments were as follows:

"Our current resources are adequate. We have maintained a balanced budget for the last five years. Without a fundraising office"

"Do not anticipate a decline."

Table 4.4.--Recommendations for Program Allocation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 - Increase resources to raise funding level	2 - Maintain program at current funding level	3 - Cut program funding	4 - Eliminate program	No Response
Instruction	32.5	44.2	14.2	4.2	5.0
Research	5.0	35.8	34.2	9.2	15.8
Public Service	6.7	21.7	49.2	12.5	10.0
Academic Support	20.0	55.0	19.2	.8	5.0
Student Services	5.8	44.2	44.2	.8	5.0
Plant Operation	10.8	48.3	35.8	5.0	5.0

It is unclear as to how many respondents interpreted the question relative to their institution and did not consider the hypothetical nature of the question.

The "no response" rate for this question was quite high. It ranged from 5 to 15.8 percent across the categories. Some questionnaires carried explanations for "non-response." Comments are as follows:

"For a major, complex instructional/research institution, you cannot categorically determine which programs would be maintained and which programs would be decreased or eliminated. For example, in the instructional area, some programs would be reduced or eliminated and other programs may receive additional funding. It is anticipated that all categories would be subject to an adjustment based on the objectives and needs of the University at the time rather than reflect across-the-board increases or decreases."

"I anticipate growth, not decline."

"I would assume selective program eliminations in all components of the budget."

Individuals who responded for this question often provided rationale and/or further discussion about their response. General comments and comments relative to specific program areas are presented below.

"As a small private institution we would curtail research and public service; try to maintain instruction and academic support. If things got worse, then student services and plant operation would become 3's (decrease allocation). I think in any institution instruction and academic support must remain top priority."

"Academic/instruction are clear priorities if resources dwindle."

"All of the areas are equally important and must be maintained."

"Priorities for General Fund program allocations are likely to favor mission of instruction and academic support. Research programs, which are primarily funded outside of the General Fund, would be maintained at current levels as would the necessary plant operations. In terms of constant dollars, they would be required to become more efficient, more productive, or less extensive. The reductions for public service and student services would most likely be tied to increasing self-support resources and/or program reductions."

"One would find it necessary to make adjustments in all areas. Though the percent amount in each area would not be the same."

"I expect hard times due to inflation, increased tuition costs and return to straight instructional activities."

One Vice President for Academic Affairs ranked the program areas in the following way:

"(1) Instruction, (2) academic support, (3) research, (4) student services, (5) plant operation, (6) public service."

"This is a difficult question to answer. Given the above condition, we would probably reduce those academic programs in which enrollment had declined."

Comments relative to specific program areas are presented below.

Instruction

"Quality of faculty must be maintained."

"An increase would be recommended only if decline in resources was in areas other than enrollment generated."

Research

"Would consider maintaining at current level adequate; major research thrusts should be a U. of M. and M.S.U."

"Faculty should continue to seek their own funding for research."

Public Service

"Allocations could be decreased and programs might be eliminated if available in or through some state or community agency."

Student Services.

"Presently moving much of this activity to being self supporting."

"Certain areas could be reduced if, for example, they would be available in the community."

"It might be possible to lower the cost for services. Generally, that means cut or eliminate them."

This individual continues and suggests a cost effective model for integration of student development with instruction. He states that the idea is "not unlike the 'old' liberal arts notion of learning."

Plant Operation

"Costs would not be met with maintenance at current levels (fuel). Some reallocation within the area would have to be made."

"It costs more to maintain. On small campus the building costs almost determine the program expense. Balancing the practical needs with the important notion that the learning/ed. process is central, is the dilemma of administration."

Responses to questions about student services/
programs.

Given a budget cut or resource allocation which did not keep pace with inflation, what recommendations would you anticipate making for each of the student services/ programs?

Responses to this question are presented in Table 4.5. In addition to the seventeen services/programs included in the list, respondents added three programs. Each of the following programs appear once as a suggestion for inclusion in the study: cultural events, campus safety and university relations. Because of the low frequency of response for each of these suggested programs, they will not be included in the analysis.

Additional Comments

Open ended comments were limited for this question. Four respondents suggested that they could not answer the question because they did not have responsibility for the program areas. The following comments provide examples of the responses.

"Subprogram allocations would be the responsibility of the Vice President for Student Services."

Other nonrespondents suggested that when taken out of context, it is extremely difficult to respond to resource allocation to programs. One comment suggests:

"My actions in an actual situation would depend so much on the options available at the time, the amount of the cut, and the overall situation both internally and externally."

Two other voluntary comments suggest the use of external funding sources for student services/programs.

"Indicating (4) as a response for health services and volunteer programs does not necessarily mean the elimination of these programs, but the fact that they should be funded or supported through other means. For example, except for a single staff coordinator the

Table 4.5.--Given a Budget Cut or Resource Allocation Which Did Not Keep Pace with Inflation, What Recommendations Would You Anticipate Making for Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)?

	1 - Increase funding above current level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding to base level	4 - Eliminate service or program	No Response
Academic Advising/Career Planning	29.2	58.3	7.5	.8	4.2
Admissions/Recruitment	56.7	35.0	5.0	0.0	3.3
Counseling Center	3.3	52.5	34.2	4.2	5.8
Dean of Students Office	.8	49.2	41.7	1.7	6.7
Field Experience Programs	5.0	32.5	40.8	14.2	7.5
Financial Aids	27.5	64.2	4.2	0.0	4.2
Health Services	.8	35.8	42.5	10.8	10.0
International Student Programs	1.7	25.0	43.3	21.7	8.3
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	2.5	45.8	44.2	2.5	5.0
New Student Orientation	9.2	61.7	24.2	.8	4.2
Placement	11.7	64.2	19.2	.8	4.2
Registrar	.8	73.3	21.7	.8	3.3
Religious Activities	1.7	31.7	34.2	20.0	12.5

Table 4.5.--Continued.

	1 - Increase funding above current level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding to base level	4 - Eliminate service or program	No Response
Residence Hall Programs	2.5	50.8	33.3	.8	12.5
Student Activities	2.5	46.7	45.0	1.7	4.2
Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	6.7	49.2	30.8	6.7	6.7
Volunteer Programs	.8	16.7	44.2	28.3	10.0

volunteer program could be totally voluntary at no cost to the University. In the area of health services, it may be necessary to use other facilities or services available within the community."

Another comment suggested a similar attitude.

"Funding decreases in most subprograms would probably be linked to other sources of support."

Given services/programs of high quality in all areas, which of the following should be the primary criteria applied in the evaluation of each of the student services/programs?

Responses to this question are presented in Table 4.6. There were no additional comments.

Which of the following units should have primary responsibility for each of the student services/programs?

Responses to this question are presented in Table 4.7.

Additional Comments

Some additional comments were made. One respondent commented,

"There is a proliferation of counseling on most campuses, most of which is poor. Thus, I question both the maintenance and need of such."

The same respondent also added that religious activities is the responsibility of the church rather than the university.

Table 4.6.--Given Services/Programs of High Quality in All Areas, Which of the Following Should be the Primary Criteria Applied in the Evaluation of Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Responses)?

	1 - Economic survival	2 - Philosophic mission	3 - Morale	4 - Political realities	5 - Service is not necessary	No Response
Academic Advising/ Career Planning	33.3	55.0	7.5	0.0	.8	3.3
Admissions/Recruitment	95.0	1.7	.8	0.0	0.0	2.5
Counseling Center	2.5	51.7	35.8	.8	5.8	3.3
Dean of Students Office	8.3	34.2	43.3	7.5	2.5	4.2
Field Experience Programs	4.2	55.8	11.7	7.5	15.0	5.8
Financial Aids	79.2	15.8	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7
Health Services	5.0	16.7	45.8	10.0	17.5	5.0
International Student Programs	2.5	31.7	16.7	12.5	30.8	5.8
Intramural & Recrea- tional Athletics	.8	14.2	69.2	5.8	6.7	3.3
New Student Orientation	15.8	47.5	26.7	.8	5.8	3.3

Table 4.6.--Continued.

	1 - Economic survival	2 - Philosophic mission	3 - Morale	4 - Political realities	5 - Service is not necessary	No Response
Placement	26.7	45.8	15.0	7.5	1.7	3.3
Registrar	42.5	34.2	14.2	5.0	0.0	4.2
Religious Activities	.8	40.0	16.7	6.7	29.2	6.7
Residence Hall Programs	10.8	20.8	46.7	s 5.8	6.7	9.2
Student Activities	1.7	20.8	66.7	5.0	2.5	3.3
Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	1.7	41.7	10.0	32.5	8.3	5.8
Volunteer Programs	3.3	23.3	16.7	5.8	42.5	8.3

Table 4.7.--Which of the Following Units Should Have the Primary Responsibility for Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Responses)?

	1 - Academic Affairs	2 - Student Affairs	3 - Business and Finance	4 - External Agent	5 - Other	No Response
Academic Advising/Career Planning	75.8	19.2	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5
Admissions/Recruitment	47.5	41.7	1.7	.8	5.8	2.5
Counseling Center	10.0	85.0	0.0	.8	.8	3.3
Dean of Students Office	2.5	93.3	.8	0.0	.8	2.5
Field Experience Programs	78.3	10.8	.8	1.7	1.7	6.7
Financial Aids	20.0	47.5	30.8	0.0	0.0	1.7
Health Services	0.0	85.8	1.7	8.3	0.0	4.2
International Student Programs	41.7	50.0	0.0	.8	1.7	5.8
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	17.5	74.2	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.3
New Student Orientation	28.3	70.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Placement	23.3	72.5	.8	0.0	.8	2.5
Registrar	75.0	20.8	1.7	0.0	.8	1.7

Table 4.7.--Continued.

	1 - Academic Affairs	2 - Student Affairs	3 - Business and Finance	4 - External Agent	5 - Other	No Response
Religious Activities	1.7	74.2	0.0	10.8	7.5	5.8
Residence Hall Programs	.8	86.7	5.8	1.7	0.0	5.0
Student Activities	.8	95.8	.8	0.0	0.0	2.5
Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	23.3	65.8	5.0	.8	0.0	5.0
Volunteer Programs	5.0	75.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	10.0

Place a check in Column #4 identifying those services/ programs implemented at your institution.

Responses to the question are presented in Table 4.8. No additional comments were made.

Discussion

Based on the tabulation of percentages of responses, it appears that there are some general trends. The data indicated a clear trend (86.7 percent) towards a change in enrollment in the next five years. Sixty-two percent of those respondents indicating a change anticipated an increase in enrollment in the next five years. Thirty-three percent of the respondents indicating a change in enrollment predicted an increase of 0-10 percent; 30 percent of the respondents anticipated a decrease of 0-10 percent. Ten year predictions were more conservative. While 87.5 percent of the population saw a change in enrollment over the next ten years, only 52.9 percent predicted an increase. Twenty-five percent saw an increase of 0-10 percent; and 23 percent anticipated a decrease of 0-10 percent.

The data also indicated a trend towards a change in resources in the next five years (91.7 percent responded affirmatively). Eighty-four percent predicted an increase in resources at their respective institutions. In the next ten years, 90 percent of the population indicated a change in resources and 79.4 percent suggest an increase. Some

Table 4.8.--Place a Check in Column #4 Identifying Those Services/Programs Implemented at Your Institution (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	Yes	No	No Response
Academic Advising/Career Planning	95.0	3.3	1.7
Admissions/Recruitment	97.5	.8	1.7
Counseling Center	88.3	10.0	1.7
Dean of Students Office	88.3	10.0	1.7
Field Experience Programs	84.2	14.2	1.7
Financial Aids	97.5	.8	1.7
Health Services	87.5	10.8	1.7
International Student Programs	76.7	21.7	1.7
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	95.8	2.5	1.7
New Student Orientation	96.7	1.7	1.7
Placement	94.2	4.2	1.7
Registrar	98.3	0.0	1.7
Religious Activities	75.8	22.5	1.7
Residence Hall Programs	82.5	15.8	1.7
Student Activities	95.0	3.3	1.7
Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	79.2	19.2	1.7
Volunteer Programs	65.0	33.3	1.7

confusion and uncertainty related to this question is suggested by a 10 percent and 15 percent "no response" rate.

In the area of resource allocation to primary institutional program areas, the data indicated a clear priority for support to Instruction (80.7 percent favor increasing or maintaining funding levels) and for Academic Support (78.9 percent support increasing or maintaining funding levels). Support for increasing or maintaining funding for research seemed to be a lower priority (48 percent). Supporting comments suggested that academic institutions should continue to seek external funding for research projects.

The questions related to specific student services/programs asked four basic questions regarding (1) resource allocation; (2) primary criteria for program; (3) locus of primary responsibility for program; and (4) whether program is implemented at respective institution. Responses to the resource question revealed strong support for increasing funding for admissions (56.7 percent). The only programs which no respondents would consider eliminating were admissions and financial aids. Programs which also received strong support were academic advising/career planning, registrar, placement and new student orientation. Programs which respondents endorsed for decreasing funding were volunteer programs, student activities, intramural and recreational athletics, international students programs, health services, dean of students office and field experience programs. In considering the question related to primary criteria applied

in the evaluation of programs, those programs receiving relatively high percentages in the "service is not necessary" category were volunteer programs, religious activities and intramural/recreational athletics.

The question regarding who should have primary responsibility showed a fairly even response rate divided between academic and student affairs. Additionally the data indicated that high percentages of the responding institutions implement the specific service/program.

Results of Hypotheses Testing

The first null hypothesis is divided in two parts to explore the possible relationship between resources and student personnel programs/services and between resources and individual student personnel programs.

Hypothesis 1a:

Student personnel programs and services will not be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90.

Hypothesis 1b:

There are no significant differences in the effect of declining resources on individual student services/programs.

Each of the subhypotheses was tested using the chi-square statistic to test for an interaction between response to resource change and program allocation. In testing Hypothesis 1a, resources were defined as (1) enrollment

change in the next five years; (2) enrollment change in the next ten years; (3) resource change in the next five years; and (4) resource change in the next ten years. The institutional program areas included (1) instruction; (2) research; (3) public service; (4) academic support; (5) student services; and (6) plant operation. None of the tests were significant at the .05 level with the exception of instruction. There was a significant relationship (.0154 level) between resource predictions in the next five years and allocations to instruction. Table 4.9 illustrates the findings. It appears that the significant relationship is based on perceptions that funding will increase and that the increment will probably be allocated to raise or at least maintain the funding level for instructional programs. The relationship between anticipated resources and funding allocations for student affairs was significant at the .9347 level. Table 4.4 provided a detailed analysis of responses regarding resource allocation to program areas. It appears that while the student service program at each institution may not experience an increase in funding, it will also probably not be eliminated. Responses show a clear funding priority towards instruction.

In testing Hypothesis 1b, resources were defined in the same mode as for Hypothesis 1a. Student services/programs were defined as (1) academic advising/career planning; (2) admissions/recruitment; (3) counseling center; (4) dean of students office; (5) field experience programs;

Table 4.9.--Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-85) and Recommended Allocation to Instruction (Reported as Percent of Respondents).

Anticipated Resource Change in Next Five Years	1 - Increase to raise funding level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Decrease 0-10%	3.9	5.8	2.9	1.0
Increase 0-10%	10.7	15.5	2.9	1.9
Increase 10-20%	9.7	11.7	2.9	1.0
Increase 20-30%	4.9	5.8	4.9	0.0
Increase 30% or more	6.8	4.9	1.0	0.0

Significant at .0154 level.

Chi square 33.28968 with 18 d.f.

(6) financial aids; (7) health services; (8) international student programs; (9) intramural and recreational athletics; (10) new student orientation; (11) placement; (12) registrar; (13) religious activities; (14) residence hall programs; (15) student activities; (16) support programs for special groups (women, minorities, handicappers); (17) volunteer programs. This test revealed six significant relationships. There was an interaction between enrollment change in the next ten years and funding recommendation for health services; enrollment change in the next five years and funding allocation to admissions and financial aids; resource change in the next ten years and resource recommendations for international programs and new student orientation; resource change in the next five years and placement services. The findings are presented in Tables 4.10 to 4.15.

Hypothesis 2

Respondents do not differ significantly in their responses to what criteria is applied to assess effectiveness and economy of student services.

To test this hypothesis the chi square statistical test was used to determine if there are significant differences between respondents of public-private institutions; institutions of varying sizes; and respondents in four different positions and their responses to the question of what criteria is applied to assess the effectiveness and economy of student services. Table 4.16 presents

Table 4.10.--Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for Health Services (Reported as Percent of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	0.0	1.0	2.1	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	0.0	8.2	7.2	2.1
Decrease 0-10%	0.0	11.3	9.3	5.2
Increase 0-10%	0.0	11.3	16.5	2.1
Increase 10-20%	0.0	5.2	9.3	0.0
Increase 20-30%	1.0	3.1	2.1	0.0
Increase 30% or more	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.1

Significant at .0194 level.

Chi square = 32.45927 with 18 d.f.

Table 4.11.--Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Admissions (Reported as Percent of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	6.7	9.5	4.8	0.0
Decrease 0-10%	23.8	12.4	1.0	0.0
Increase 0-10%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Increase 10-20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Increase 20-30%	3.8	1.0	0.0	0.0
Increase 30% or more	23.8	9.5	0.0	0.0

Significant at the .0057 level.

Chi square - 24.83164 with 10 d.f.

Table 4.12.--Relationship Between Change in Enrollment (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Financial Aids (Reported as Percent of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	1.9	16.3	2.9	0.0
Decrease 0-10%	9.6	26.9	0.0	0.0
Increase 0-10%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Increase 10-20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Increase 20-30%	1.9	2.9	0.0	0.0
Increase 30% or more	14.4	19.2	0.0	0.0

Significant at the .0004 level.

Chi square = 32.27478 with 10 d.f.

Table 4.13.--Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for International Student Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Decrease 10-20%	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Decrease 0-10%	0.0	3.1	10.4	2.1
Increase 0-10%	0.0	4.2	10.4	4.2
Increase 10-20%	0.0	6.3	11.5	5.2
Increase 20-30%	0.0	2.1	8.3	2.1
Increase 30% or more	0.0	6.3	8.3	9.4

Significant at the .0033 level.

Chi square = 38.55906 with 18 d.f.

Table 4.14.--Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-90) and Funding Recommendation for New Student Orientation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	0.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
Decrease 0-10%	2.0	10.2	3.1	0.0
Increase 0-10%	0.0	16.3	2.0	0.0
Increase 10-20%	0.0	14.3	9.2	0.0
Increase 20-30%	1.0	9.2	2.0	1.0
Increase 30% or more	7.1	10.2	6.1	0.0

Significant at the .0419 level.

Chi square = 29.56238 with 18 d.f.

Table 4.15.--Relationship Between Change in Resources (1980-85) and Funding Recommendation for Placement (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Decrease 30% or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 20-30%	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0
Decrease 10-20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease 0-10%	1.0	10.6	1.9	0.0
Increase 0-10%	4.8	19.2	6.7	0.0
Increase 10-20%	2.9	17.3	5.8	0.0
Increase 20-30%	2.9	9.6	1.9	0.0
Increase 30% or more	1.9	8.7	1.9	0.0

Significant at the .0000 level.

Chi square = 107.31497 with 18 d.f.

**Table 4.16.--Significant Chi Square Variable Effects for Student Services/
Programs.**

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Health Services	18.60005	8	.0172	Size
Placement	16.61517	8	.0344	Size
Religious Activities	26.98729	8	.0007	Size
Residence Halls	24.15738	8	.0022	Size
Orientation	14.40363	4	.0061	Public/Private Status
Religious Activities	45.76205	4	.0000	Public/Private Status
International Student Programs	23.66466	12	.0226	Position

the data for the chi square scores at the .05 level of significance. Statistical differences were found for health services, placement, religious activities, residence halls, orientation and international student programs.

Table 4.17 presents a percentage breakdown of responses to the question of primary criteria and reveals that the service receiving highest funding priority (admissions) is critical for the economic survival of the institution (95 percent of responses).

Hypothesis 3

There are no significant differences in responses about student services/programs between executive level educational administrators of public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan.

This hypothesis was tested using the chi-square statistic with institutional status (public or private) as a variable and responses to questions as the other variable. The possible responses to the question related to funding recommendations were 1 - increase funding above the current level; 2 - maintain funding at current level; 3 - decrease funding to base level; 4 - eliminate service or program. None of the chi-square values were significant at the .05 level with two exceptions. There was a significant relationship between institutional status and funding recommendation for Religious Activities and Volunteer

Table 4.17.--Given Services/Programs of High Quality in All Areas, Which of the Following Should be the Primary Criteria Applied in the Evaluation of Each of the Student Services/Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents)?

	1 - Economic Survival	2 - Philosophic Mission	3 - Morale	4 - Political Realities	5 - Service is not Necessary	No Response
Academic Advising/Career Planning	33.3	55.0	7.5	0.0	.8	3.3
Admissions/Recruitment	95.0	1.7	.8	0.0	0.0	2.5
Counseling Center	2.5	51.7	35.8	.8	5.8	3.3
Dean of Students Office	8.3	34.2	54.4	7.5	2.5	4.2
Field Experience Programs	4.2	55.8	11.7	7.5	15.0	5.8
Financial Aids	79.2	15.8	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7
Health Services	5.0	16.7	45.8	10.0	17.5	5.0
International Student Programs	2.5	31.7	16.7	12.5	30.8	5.8
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	.8	14.2	69.2	5.8	6.7	3.3
New Student Orientation	15.8	47.5	26.7	.8	5.8	3.3
Placement	26.7	45.8	15.0	7.5	1.7	3.3
Registrar	42.5	34.2	14.2	5.2	0.0	4.2

Table 4.17.--Continued.

	1 - Economic Survival	2 - Philosophic Mission	3 - Morale	4 - Political Realities	5 - Service is not Necessary	No Response
Religious Activities	.8	40.0	16.7	6.7	29.2	6.7
Residence Hall Programs	10.8	20.8	46.7	5.8	6.7	9.2
Student Activities	1.7	20.8	66.7	5.0	2.5	3.3
Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	1.7	41.7	10.0	32.5	8.3	5.8
Volunteer Programs	3.3	23.3	16.7	5.8	42.5	8.3

Programs. Tables 4.18 through 4.19 illustrate the significant relationships.

The possible responses to the question related to primary criteria applied in the evaluation of each student service/program were 1 - economic survival; 2 - philosophic mission; 3 - morale; 4 - political realities; 5 - service is not necessary. There was an interaction between the variables at the .05 level for two programs: New Student Orientation and Religious Activities. The values illustrating the significant relationship can be found in Tables 4.20 and 4.21.

The third question involves the issue of which unit should have primary responsibility for each student service/program. The possible responses were: 1 - Academic Affairs; 2 - Student Affairs; 3 - Business and Finance; 4 - Service should be contracted/assigned to an external agent; 5 - other (specify). None of the chi-square values were significant at the .05 level with the exception of three relationships. There was a significant relationship between the variable of public/private status and attitudes about the unit of primary responsibilities for the following programs: Financial Aids, Registrar and Religious Activities. Tables 4.22 through 4.24 detail the findings.

In testing Hypothesis 3, respondents were divided into categories of public and private institutional status. Responses to questions related to resource recommendations, criteria for implementation; and unit of responsibility for

**Table 4.18.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Funding Recommendation
for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).**

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Public	1.0	5.7	21.0	20.0
Private	1.0	30.5	18.1	2.9

Significant at the .0000 level.

Chi square = 31.34196 with 3 d.f.

Table 4.19.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Funding Recommendations for Volunteer Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Public	.9	4.6	24.1	19.4
Private	0.0	13.9	25.0	12.0

Significant at the .0488 level.

Chi square = 7.86688 with 3 d.f.

Table 4.20.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Criteria for New Student Orientation (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Institutional Status	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Public	10.3	27.6	8.6	.9	0.0
Private	6.0	21.6	19.0	0.0	6.0

Significant at the .0061 level.

Chi square = 14.40363 with 4 d.f.

Table 4.21.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Criteria for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Public	0.0	5.4	13.4	2.7	25.0
Private	.9	37.5	4.5	4.5	6.3

Significant at the .0000 level.

Chi square = 45.76205 with 4 d.f.

Table 4.22.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Financial Aids (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Institutional Status	Academic Affairs	Student Affairs	Business and Finance	Service Should Be Contracted or Assigned	Other
Public	11.0	28.8	6.8	0.0	0.0
Private	9.3	19.5	24.6	0.0	0.0

Significant at the .0010 level.

Chi square = 13.72912 with 2 d.f.

Table 4.23.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Registrar (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Institutional Status	Academic Affairs	Student Affairs	Business and Finance	Service Should Be Contracted or Assigned	Other
Public	28.8	15.3	1.7	0.0	.8
Private	47.5	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

Significant at the .0053 level.

Chi square = 12.73393 with 3 d.f.

Table 4.24.--Relationship Between Institutional Status and Unit of Responsibility for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Institutional Status	Academic Affairs	Student Affairs	Business and Finance	Services Should Be Contracted or Assigned	Other
Public	0.0	37.2	0.0	8.0	.9
Private	1.8	41.6	0.0	3.5	7.1

Significant at the .0294 level.

Chi square = 8.98863 with 3 d.f.

seventeen student services/programs were crossed with institutional status. Very few of these tests (seven out of fifty-one) produced a chi square value significant at the .05 level. Relationships were revealed for religious activities and volunteer programs in the area of funding recommendations. Relationships were significant for new student orientation and religious activities for criteria applied in evaluation. Interaction was found for financial aids, religious activities and registrar for primary unit of responsibility.

Hypothesis 4

There are no significant differences in responses about student services/programs between executive level educational administrators of universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square contingency table. The variables were size of institution and response to the three fundamental questions of funding recommendation, primary criteria and unit of responsibility for each of the student services/programs. The test which crossed institutional size and funding recommendation produced two significant relationships at the .05 level. Tables 4.25 and 4.26 illustrate the interaction for

Table 4.25.--Relationship of Institutional Size and Funding Recommendation for Religious Activities (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Size	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Up to 7,500	1.9	34.3	26.7	5.7
7,500 - 20,000	0.0	1.9	8.6	9.5
20,000 or more	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.6

Significant at the .0000 level.

Chi square = 35.71285 with 6 d.f.

Table 4.26.--Relationship of Institutional Size and Funding Recommendation for International Program (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Size	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
Up to 7,500	0.0	22.7	29.1	16.1
7,500 - 20,000	1.8	.9	11.8	6.4
20,000 or more	0.0	3.6	6.4	.9

Significant at the .0144 level.

Chi square = 15.87530 with 8 d.f.

Religious Activities and International Programs. There were four significant interactions when institutional size was crossed with criteria for economy and effectiveness of the program. The relationship for Health Services was significant at the .0172 level; Placement was significant at .0344 level; Religious Activities were significant at the .0007 level; and the interaction was significant at the .0022 level for Residence Halls.

None of the chi-square values were significant at the .05 level for the interaction between size and unit of responsibility. Tables 4.27 through 4.30 present the data.

In conclusion, to test Hypothesis 4, respondents were divided into three groups based on the size of their respective institutions. Responses to the fundamental questions of funding recommendations; criteria for program implementation; and unit of analysis for seventeen student services/programs were crossed with the variable of institutional size. Significant chi-square values were produced for five programs: Religious Activities (two interactions), Health Services, Placement, and Residence Halls. There were no significant differences for the remaining forty-six chi-square tests.

Hypothesis 5

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities by position.

**Table 4.27.--Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Health Services
(Reported as Percentage of Respondents).**

Size	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Up to 7,500	3.5	14.9	35.1	3.5	12.3
7,500 - 20,000	.9	2.6	10.5	2.6	3.5
20,000 or more	.9	0.0	2.6	4.4	2.6

Significant at the .0172 level.

Chi square = 18.60005 with 8 d.f.

Table 4.28.--Relation of Institutional Size and Criteria for Placement (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Size	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Up to 7,500	20.7	27.6	14.7	6.0	1.7
7,500 - 20,000	6.9	10.3	.9	.9	0.0
20,000 or more	0.0	9.5	0.0	.9	0.0

Significant at the .0344 level.

Chi square = 16.61517 with 8 d.f.

**Table 4.29.--Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Religious Activities
(Reported as Percentage of Respondents).**

Size	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Up to 7,500	.9	39.3	8.9	5.4	14.3
7,500 to 20,000	0.0	2.7	4.5	1.8	11.6
20,000 or more	0.0	.9	4.5	0.0	5.4

Significant at the .0007 level.

Chi square = 26.98729 with 8 d.f.

**Table 4.30.--Relationship of Institutional Size and Criteria for Residence Halls
(Reported as Percentage of Respondents).**

Size	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
Up to 7,500	5.5	12.8	39.4	3.7	6.4
7,500 - 20,000	6.4	5.5	9.2	0.0	0.0
20,000 or more	0.0	4.6	2.8	2.8	.9

Significant at the .0022 level.

Chi square = 24.15738 with 8 d.f.

In testing this hypothesis, chi-square contingency tables were used to test for a relationship between the variable of position and institution and responses to the survey questions of funding recommendations; criteria for program implementation; and unit of analysis. The level of the position variables were: President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Financial Affairs, and Vice President for Student Affairs. When tested with the variable of the funding recommendation question, none of the chi square values were significant at the .05 level except for a single significant relationship for International Programs. This chi-square test was significant at the .0133 level.

In testing for a relationship between position at respective institution and criteria for applied in evaluation, there was a single significant relationship for International Programs. This test showed significance at the .0226 level.

Responses to the final question asking where the locus of primary responsibility for each program should be was also tested for differences between position. Significant chi-square relationships at the .05 level were found for International Programs and Volunteer Programs. International Programs was significant at the .0077 level and Volunteer Programs was significant at the .0297 level.

The test for Hypothesis 4 used a series of chi-square contingency tables. The column variable was

position at institution and there were four levels. The row variable included responses to three fundamental questions. The chi-square test at the .05 level of significance revealed four significant relationships. These interactions occurred with International Programs for responses to all questions and with Volunteer Programs for response to the question of Primary responsibility for unit. Tables 4.31 through 4.34 represent the relationship.

Summary of Responses by Program

By testing hypotheses 3, 4 and 5, a few significant relationships were revealed. Table 4.35 provides an account of the programs/services showing a significant relationship with the variables of institutional status, size and position and the responses to the questions. It appears that the services/programs likely to be influenced by one or more variables are Financial Aids, Health Services, International Student Programs, New Student Orientation, Placement, Registrar, Religious Activities, Residence Hall Programs and Volunteer Programs.

Additional Findings

As the investigator became familiar with the data, it appeared that the student personnel programs/services which received the least support in the response to the funding allocation question were of a developmental/educational nature rather than service oriented. To determine if there was a relationship between funding recommendations

Table 4.31.--Relationship of Position and Funding Recommendation for International Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Program	1 - Increase funding to raise level	2 - Maintain funding at current level	3 - Decrease funding	4 - Eliminate program
President	1.8	8.2	5.5	6.4
Vice President for Academic Affairs	0.0	7.3	15.5	4.5
Vice President for Financial Affairs	0.0	1.8	13.6	9.1
Vice President for Student Affairs	0.0	10.0	12.7	3.6

Significant at the .0133 level.

Chi square = 20.84971 with 9 d.f.

**Table 4.32.--Relationship of Position and Criteria for International Programs
(Reported as Percentage of Respondents).**

Position	1 Economic Survival	2 Philosophic Mission	3 Morale	4 Political Realities	5 Unnecessary Service
President	.9	9.7	1.8	1.8	8.0
Vice President for Academic Affairs	0.0	8.8	9.7	3.5	6.2
Vice President for Financial Affairs	0.0	3.5	2.7	4.4	13.3
Vice President for Student Affairs	1.8	11.5	3.5	3.5	5.3

Significant at the .0226 level.

Chi square = 23.66466 with 12 d.f.

Table 4.33.--Relationship of Position and Unit of Responsibility for International Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Position	1 Academic Affairs	2 Student Affairs	3 Business and Finance	4 Service Should Be Contracted/ Assigned	5 Other
President	12.4	8.0	0.0	.9	.9
Vice President for Academic Affairs	15.9	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vice President for Financial Affairs	12.4	10.6	0.0	0.0	.9
Vice President for Student Affairs	3.5	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Significant at the .0077 level.

Chi square = 22.39726 with 9 d.f.

Table 4.34.--Relationship of Position and Unit of Responsibility for Volunteer Programs (Reported as Percentage of Respondents).

Position	1 Academic Affairs	2 Student Affairs	3 Business and Finance	4 Service Should Be Contracted/ Assigned	5 Other
President	.9	18.5	2.8	0.0	.9
Vice President for Academic Affairs	.9	25.9	0.0	0.0	1.9
Vice President for Financial Affairs	2.8	16.7	.9	0.0	.9
Vice President for Student Affairs	.9	22.2	0.0	3.7	0.0

Significant at the .0297 level.

Chi square = 22.78028 with 12 d.f.

Table 4.35.--Significant Chi Square and Variable Effects for Programs.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Responses to question, "Given a budget cut or resource allocation which did not keep pace with inflation, what recommendations would you anticipate making for each of the student services/ programs?"				
Academic Advising/ Career Planning	1.79340	3	.6490	
	6.45169	6	.4264	
	5.82359	8	.7674	
Admissions/ Recruitment	4.10680	2	.1283	
	4.43687	4	.3501	
	10.31030	6	.1122	
Counseling Center	1.54266	3	.6725	
	5.92982	6	.4311	
	5.02027	9	.8325	
Dean of Student Office	3.19817	3	.3621	
	10.64233	6	.1001	
	10.53787	9	.3087	
Field Experience Programs	1.99759	3	.5729	
	10.04761	6	.1227	
	10.44433	9	.3157	
Financial Aids	.12937	2	.9374	
	3.95290	4	.4124	
	.91951	6	.9885	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Health Services	5.71819	3	.1262	
	8.63618	6	.1951	
	5.59082	9	.7801	
International Student Programs	4.40612	3	.2208	
	15.87530	6	.0144	Size
	20.84971	9	.0133	Position
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	5.61911	3	.1317	
	5.41852	6	.4914	
	15.48205	9	.0785	
New Student Orientation	1.39713	3	.7062	
	9.13010	6	.1664	
	8.76455	9	.4593	
Placement	3.02661	3	.3875	
	3.01614	6	.8068	
	11.25186	9	.2588	
Registrar	1.87649	3	.5984	
	1.37148	6	.9676	
	12.18989	9	.2028	
Religious Activities	31.34196	3	.0000	Public/Private Status
	35.71285	6	.0000	Size
	8.44512	9	.4900	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Residence Hall	3.26012	3	.3532	
Programs	6.81979	6	.3378	
	13.33406	9	.1481	
Student Activities	3.98326	3	.2633	
	9.84496	6	.1313	
	13.42528	9	.1443	
Support Programs for	6.51034	3	.0893	
Special Groups	5.74768	6	.4520	
	4.65622	9	.8632	
Volunteer Programs	7.86688	3	.0488	Public/ Private Status
	5.81156	6	.4446	
	11.57525	9	.2383	

Responses to question, "Given services/programs of high quality in all areas, which of the following should be the primary criteria applied in the evaluation of each of the student services/programs?"

Academic Advising/	1.85522	3	.6030
Career Planning	6.05169	6	.4174
	5.92539	9	.7474

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Admissions/Recruitment	3.47081	2	.1763	
	7.73909	4	.1016	
	9.34680	6	.1550	
Counseling Center	1.81662	4	.7694	
	6.68523	8	.5709	
	10.39101	12	.5817	
Dean of Students Office	4.93872	4	.2936	
	9.45000	8	.3058	
	11.51523	12	.4854	
Field Experience Programs	5.36024	4	.2523	
	4.15417	8	.8430	
	8.46976	12	.7474	
Financial Aids	3.72739	3	.2924	
	8.20590	6	.2234	
	9.87526	9	.3607	
Health Services	8.15107	4	.0862	
	18.60005	8	.0172	Size
	7.60667	12	.8151	
International Student Programs	2.70801	4	.6078	
	3.49941	8	.8992	
	23.66466	12	.0226	Position

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	8.99216	4	.0613	
	11.80401	8	.1602	
	15.12975	12	.2344	
New Student Orientation	14.40363	4	.0061	Public/ Private Status
	15.00836	8	.0590	
	7.36151	12	.8328	
Placement	2.47101	4	.6498	
	16.61517	8	.0344	Size
	9.22040	12	.6840	
Registrar	2.71122	3	.4383	
	4.55574	6	.6019	
	12.21245	9	.2016	
Religious Activities	45.76205	4	.0000	Public/ Private Status
	26.98729	8	.0007	Size
	19.46997	12	.0778	
Residence Hall Programs	5.92046	4	.2052	
	24.15738	8	.0022	Size
	13.78376	12	.3147	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Student Activities	3.79314	4	.4347	
	8.86448	8	.3539	
	14.89158	12	.2474	
Support Programs for Special Groups	6.24065	4	.1819	
	11.69884	8	.1652	
	18.95270	12	.0897	
Volunteer Programs	9.40087	4	.0518	
	14.64894	8	.0663	
	9.89778	12	.6249	
Responses to question, "Which of the following units should have primary responsibility for each of the student services/programs?"				
Academic Advising/ Career Planning	1.01611	2	.6017	
	5.60011	4	.2311	
	7.43684	6	.2823	
Admissions/Recruitment	6.27262	4	.1797	
	5.28698	8	.7265	
	17.84288	12	.1205	
Counseling Center	4.70224	3	.1949	
	4.65119	6	.5893	
	9.39500	9	.4016	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Dean of Students Office	2.24399	3	.5233	
	5.18500	6	.5203	
	7.09745	9	.6270	
Field Experience Programs	2.98042	4	.5611	
	9.30026	8	.3176	
	12.14782	12	.4339	
Financial Aids	13.72912	2	.0010	Public/ Private Status
	7.71567	4	.1026	
	5.72380	6	.4548	
Health Services	3.86564	2	.1447	
	3.35795	4	.4998	
	4.63253	6	.5917	
International Student Programs	4.26712	3	.2340	
	8.82070	6	.1839	
	22.39726	9	.0077	Position
Intramural & Recreational Athletics	.44558	2	.8003	
	1.76540	4	.7788	
	2.38136	6	.8815	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
New Student Orientation	.07070	2	.7903	
	1.86524	2	.3935	
	7.19659	3	.0659	
Placement	3.98462	3	.2631	
	1.31632	6	.9708	
	11.45065	9	.2461	
Registrar	12.73393	3	.0053	Public/ Private Status
	10.11292	6	.1200	
	10.95086	9	.2791	
Religious Activities	8.98863	3	.0294	Public/ Private Status
	4.97820	6	.5466	
	5.36086	9	.6018	
Residence Hall Programs	.70904	3	.1944	
	11.89681	6	.0643	
	6.67000	9	.6714	
Student Activities	1.80505	2	.4055	
	11.89681	6	.0643	
	5.91252	6	.4331	

Table 4.35.--Continued.

Program	Chi Square	df	Significance	Significant Variable
Support Programs for Special Groups	1.44552	3	.6949	
	1.75604	6	.9407	
	9.15205	9	.4234	
Volunteer Programs	6.92802	4	.1397	
	6.26206	8	.6179	
	22.78028	12	.0297	Position

and the educational or services nature of student personnel programs, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was applied. The list of seventeen services/programs was divided into two groups. The division, determined through a series of informal interviews with ten practicing student personnel educators, was (1) those programs which are considered to be primarily educational/developmental in their mission (academic advising, counseling center, field experience programs, international programs, intramural and recreational athletics, new student orientation, religious activities, residence hall programs, student activities, support programs and volunteer programs); and (2) those programs which are primarily for the purpose of administering a necessary service to the student body (admissions, dean of students office, financial aids, health services, placement and the registrar). Cells were collapsed across programs into these two groups. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess the interaction of institutional status with responses to the question of funding recommendations with the variable of developmental programs or services. Two additional multivariate analysis of variances tests were performed replacing the variable of institutional status with size and position. None of the tests produced a significant "f" score at the .05 level.

Additionally, chi square tests were performed to determine if there was a relationship between responses to the three questions (resource allocation, criteria applied

to program and locus of responsibility) and the responses question determining whether or not the institution sponsored the specific program. No significant chi square statistics at the .05 level were found. The lack of significant findings implies independence between responses about programs and possible bias based on programs at the respective institution.

Summary of Findings

This chapter contained an analysis of the data from the study. One hundred and twenty responses (78.9 percent of the population) were included in the study. The population was evenly distributed across variable levels. The rate of return was fairly consistent across institutions ranging from 69.56 percent of the private schools to 93.33 percent of the public institutions.

While there was overwhelming agreement that institutions of higher education will experience a change in enrollment in the next five and ten years, responses about the direction of the change were evenly distributed between an increase and decrease. Moreover, there was strong agreement related to change in resources in the next five and ten years; however, approximately 75 percent of the respondents anticipated an increase in resources in the next five years and about 60 percent of the group predicted an increase in resources in the next ten years.

The findings of the study revealed a significant relationship between resource predictions for the next five years and responses to the question of resource allocation for institutional program of instruction (in a budget year where dollars did not keep pace with inflation). There were no other significant relationships between resource and enrollment predictions and response to the funding allocation question for programs of research, public service, academic support, student services and plant operation.

In examining responses to funding recommendations for seventeen student services/programs, six significant relationships were observed. There was an interaction between predicted enrollment change for 1980-90 and funding recommendation for Health Services; between predicted enrollment change for 1980-85 and funding recommendations for Admissions and Financial Aids; between predicted resource change for 1980-90 and funding recommendation for International Programs and New Student Orientation; and between anticipated resource change for 1980-85 and funding allocation for Placement Services.

The analysis of responses between administrators of public and private institutions revealed significant differences for some program areas. There was a significant relationship between institutional status and funding recommendation for Religious Activities and Volunteer Programs; between institutional status and criteria for evaluation

for New Student Orientation and Religious Activities; and between public/private status and locus of responsibility for programs of Financial Aids, Registrar and Religious Activities.

In investigating differences in responses between institutions of varying size, some significant differences were observed for Student Services/Programs. There was a significant interaction between size of institution and funding recommendation for Religious Activities and International Programs; and between size of institution and criteria for evaluation for Health Services, Placement Services, Religious Activities and Residence Halls. There were no significant relationships between size of institution and locus of responsibility for individual student services/programs.

A significant relationship for the variables of position at institution and recommendation for funding was found for International Programs. Additionally there was also an interaction between position and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness and economy of International Programs. In testing for significant differences between position at institution and attitudes about locus of responsibility for program area, International Programs and Volunteer Programs showed an interaction.

No significant differences were found between attitudes about programs of an educational/developmental nature and programs of a service orientation. However, findings

indicate a general trend towards more support for service programs than developmental programs and less of a tendency to eliminate service programs than developmental/educational programs during resource reduction periods.

While these findings reveal some significant interactions between variables, a cause/effect relationship cannot be deduced from the data. Conclusions, interpretation, inferences and general trends will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The evolution and development of the profession of student personnel has closely paralleled a period of enormous growth and expanded resources in American higher education. Since 1932, the number of public and private institutions of higher education have increased at a rate of twelve per year (Carnes, 1977). Moreover the size of the institutions, the number of employees and institutional budgets have increased. Between 1949-50 and 1969-70, revenues for higher education increased more than six times (Avery, 1978). This extreme growth period in higher education brought the development of new programs and the expansion of existing programs to meet the needs of larger and more diverse student populations.

In this growth era, the profession of student personnel emerged from an undefined collection of administrative and support services into a specialized field founded in educational philosophy and developmental psychology. The adoption of "The Student Personnel Point of View" in 1938 and expanded implementation of services and programs

in the forties provided the catalyst for the emerging profession. Student personnel programs and services continued to develop in the fifties and sixties. By 1970, the growth mode was evident as practitioners and theorists of student personnel began to advocate an expanded educational role for the profession. This new role, encompassing the concept of co-curricular education for human development, gave rise to new services and new programs.

Because the field of student personnel evolved and developed during this explosive growth mode in higher education (1940-75), it is crucial to consider the future of the profession in view of the projected decline of resources in higher education in the decade of 1980-90. It is anticipated that resources for higher education, which traditionally have come from tuition, federal and state allocations and private sources will significantly decline in the next decade (Centra, 1977; Cartter, 1979; Change Magazine's Economic Prospect Report, 1980; Howe, 1979). While demographers, researchers, and resource analysts differ on their perceptions of the magnitude of this downward trend, there is general agreement that higher education must prepare to face the conditions of steady state and/or retrenchment. Thus, the great expansion of student personnel programs and services in the fifties and sixties may be subjected to more careful administrative scrutiny in the eighties. Because student personnel programs are primarily viewed as support services, university decision-makers often

consider the program as secondary to the primary academic mission of the university and, therefore, may receive lower priority in resource allocation.

Thus, this study was designed to provide an initial broad based assessment of the perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources and student personnel programs. It was the intent of this investigator to provide student personnel professionals with information regarding the attitudes of institutional decision-makers about allocations to student personnel programs and to identify potentially vulnerable program areas for further study. Analysis of the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs may assist professionals in the field in anticipating, planning for and managing changes as well as provide a foundation for further investigation.

Summary of the Development of the Study

This study was designed to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan with headcount enrollment of 500 or more students. In assessing the relationship between declining resources and institutional student personnel programs, this study focused on perceptions about funding as well as implementation and

delivery of student personnel programs and services. Further, this study was designed to assess differences in perceptions of administrators in public and private institutions of varying size. Differences in perceptions of administrators, by position, were also studied.

An introduction to and overview of the study was provided in Chapter I. Included in the chapter were the definition of the problem, statement of purpose, supporting comments about the need for the study and a summary of the related literature. The design of the study was outlined; limitations and assumptions of the study were defined; research questions and hypotheses were also detailed.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a:

Student personnel programs and services will not be affected by declining resources in the decade of 1980-90.

Hypothesis 1b:

There are no significant differences in the effect of declining resources on individual student services.

Hypothesis 2:

Respondents do not differ significantly in their responses to what criteria is applied to assess effectiveness and economy of student services.

Hypothesis 3:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of public and private four-year institutions in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 4:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators of universities of more than 20,000 students; colleges and universities of 7,500 to 20,000 students; and colleges and universities of less than 7,500 students in the State of Michigan.

Hypothesis 5:

There are no significant differences in responses between executive level educational administrators in Michigan colleges and universities by position.

The second chapter contained a review of the related literature pertinent to the purpose of the study. Included was selected research and factual information about resources for higher education in 1980-90; an overview of the literature detailing the field of student personnel; and a comprehensive review of the published research about the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs.

The selected literature describing resources in higher education included information about enrollment trends in higher education in the United States and, more specifically in Michigan. Included in this section was a review of the major issues expected to affect resources in the decade of 1980-90 at both the federal and state levels. The review of this literature was intended to identify the major trends related to resources for higher education in 1980-90 and to provide documentation of this current downward trend for resources in higher education.

The overview of the literature of the field of student personnel included a history of the field; an account of major philosophic positions of the profession; and a review of current and future trends in student personnel. This section also identified the major proponents and theorists in the profession as well as critics of the field.

The primary literature review described research about the relationship of declining resources and student personnel programs. This body of literature, although limited, follows four primary themes: (1) the need for clarification of goals and purposes in the profession of student personnel; (2) the need for better management techniques and more strict accountability systems; (3) suggestions for reorganization of colleges and universities as well as student personnel divisions; and (4) general trends in the field of student personnel that are tangentially related to declining resources.

The body of literature investigating and analyzing resource trends and student personnel programs and services was found to be scarce and limited in scope. The survey of the related and relevant literature demonstrated the lack of published research related to this study and supported the need for the study.

Detailed description of the research methodology and the design of the study was presented in Chapter III. The research design included collection of data through the

administration of a written questionnaire. The population was defined as executive level educational administrators at all four-year public and private bachelor's degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan with head-count enrollments of 500 or more students. The executive level educational administrators included individuals in the positions of Chief Executive/President, Chief Academic Officer/Provost, Chief Budget Officer/Vice President for Financial Affairs, and Chief Student Personnel Officer/Vice President for Student Affairs. One hundred and fifty-two institutional decision-makers from thirty-eight colleges and universities made up the population.

The instrument was developed, pilot tested and sent by mail to the defined population. One month later, a follow-up letter was sent to nonrespondents. Of the 152 questionnaires mailed, 120 responses were received (78.9 percent of the population).

Chapter IV included the tabulated data collected from the administration of the questionnaire and an analysis of the data for the purpose of hypothesis testing. Data was tabulated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences subprogram "Frequencies." To test the research hypotheses, measures of association were calculated using the subprogram "Crosstabulation." To determine if responses differed due to service nature of program or developmental/educational focus, a multivariate analysis of variance was applied.

Chapter V presents the findings and conclusions of the study; interpretation of the research; and inferences from research findings. This chapter also includes recommendations, implications, and suggested areas for future research.

Conclusions and Discussion

The findings of the study and related interpretative remarks provide the factual base and documentation from which the following conclusions are drawn. Discussion, supporting the conclusions, is also presented.

Institutional decision-makers from Michigan four-year colleges and universities predicted a slight increase in enrollments during 1980-85 and a steady state enrollment situation from 1985-90 for their respective institutions. In total, 56 percent of the respondents predicted an increase in enrollment in the next five years, 1980-85. A similar, but slightly less favorable, pattern followed for ten year predictions.

Additionally, the same group of administrators anticipated an increase in resources (constant dollars) over the next decade (1980-90). In total, 75.8 percent of the respondents anticipate an increase in resources between 1980-85. Predictions for the total decade were more conservative with 59 percent of the respondents reporting an increase in resources. Moreover, it is important to note that respondents were asked to consider the impact of

inflation and to report resource changes in terms of constant dollars.

Given the predicted leveling off of enrollments and tuition dollars and accounting for increased fixed costs resulting from inflation, college and university administrators must anticipate greater participation in funding higher education by the state, federal government and/or private sources. Sizeable increases in tuition cost may also be anticipated.

Additionally, it appears that institutional decision-makers seem to have a more favorable view of the resource question for Michigan colleges and universities than that which is represented in the current literature. Institutional bias and/or lack of accurate and current management information systems for resource planning may be responsible for part of the discrepancy. On the other hand, the media may be responsible for reporting isolated facts and/or exaggerated claims as fact rather than opinion.

A second conclusion reveals that institutional decision-makers view instruction as a primary priority in the allocation of resources. In response to the hypothetical question, "if your institution were to experience a decline in resources or if resource allocations did not keep pace with inflation, what recommendations would you anticipate making in the allocation of resources to the following program areas," 33 percent stated that they would increase resources to raise the funding level for

instruction. Responses indicate the following priority for program areas: instruction, academic support, plant operation, student services, research and public service. The low priority rating for research may be based on comments reflecting attitudes that research should be funded by external agencies. Public services, a low funding priority, will most likely experience a decline of activity during retrenchment. Student services, while low on the priority list, will probably not be eliminated as an entity by most institutions. However, cuts in the current level of funding for student services may be anticipated during periods of decreased resources for institutions.

Further conclusions indicate that the individual students service programs, which were predicted to be vulnerable in the event of a decrease in resource allocations, are health services, international student programs and volunteer programs. Responses for these services suggest the following priority: admissions/recruitment, financial aids, academic advising/career planning, placement, new student orientation, registrar, residence hall programs, dean of students office, field experience programs, health services, religious activities, international student programs, and volunteer programs.

In considering the primary criteria applied in the evaluation of services/programs, those programs which respondents believed had a primarily economic mission are: admissions/recruitment, financial aids, and registrar. The

services which were considered to be evaluated on a philosophic criteria are: academic advising/career planning, counseling center, field experience programs, new student orientation, placement, religious activities, and support programs for special groups. Programs with a primary criteria of morale are considered to be: dean of students office, health services, intramural and recreational athletics, residence hall programs, and student activities. Programs considered to be unnecessary by the respondents are international student programs and volunteer programs. Based on these findings, it appears that services with a primarily administrative function and economic mission will be maintained and may experience an increase in resources (admissions, financial aids, placement). Programs/service whose activities can be provided by another agency or program are vulnerable (health services, international programs, volunteer programs).

It is further concluded that with the exception of a few cases, the variables of public/private status, size of institution, and position at institution did not influence responses. In examining the relationship between public and private status and responses to the questions, only seven of a possible fifty-one tests (representing 13.7 percent) were significant. Considering the variable of institutional size as related to responses to the questions, six of fifty-one tests (11.8 percent) showed significance. Studying the relationship between the variable of position at

institution, only four of a possible fifty-one tests (7.8 percent) showed significance. Thus, it appears that the variables of institutional status, institutional size and administrative position at the institution influence perceptions as to how dollars to student services should be allocated in a period of retrenchment; as to what criteria should be applied in assessing the effectiveness and economy of student services; and as to which unit should have primary responsibility for program implementation. These findings and conclusions seem to indicate that decision-making in institutions is performed by individuals who hold a cosmopolitan view of higher education and of the role and mission of student personnel. The lack of differences between administrators from various positions suggests that most institutions employ an operational wholistic philosophy.

Finally, it was concluded that there is a trend towards funding priorities for service-oriented programs rather than developmental/educational programs. Although this finding was not determined to be statistically significant, the descriptive data supports the trend. Thus, it seems that if higher education in the State of Michigan experiences resource allocations which do not keep pace with inflation, the profession of student personnel may be forced into a strong service mode to justify programs. The component of student development is, and will become even more so, a second priority for educational administrators.

Summary of Conclusions

1. Administrators included in the population of this study tend to predict a steady state enrollment situation for their respective institutions over the next decade. Additionally, administrators included in the population of this study anticipate an increase in resources (constant dollars) over the next ten years.
2. Administrators from the population indicated, but not significantly so, that institutions will not eliminate the institution-wide student personnel program; however, there was strong support for the notion, but not at a significant level, that student personnel programs may be cut to decrease funding level. Administrators were in strong support that instructional programs should be a clear priority in allocation of funds.
3. The individual student personnel programs which may be affected by a change in enrollment and resources are health services, admissions, financial aids, international student programs, new student orientation, and placement. It appears, but not at a significant level, that health services, international student programs and volunteer programs may be negatively affected while admissions, financial aids, new student orientation and placement may be affected in a positive way.

4. Administrators do not significantly differ in their responses and attitudes about what criteria should be applied to assess the effectiveness and economy of student services. It appears that programs with a primarily administrative function and economic mission will be maintained and may experience an increase in resources. Programs/services whose activities can be provided by another agency are vulnerable.
5. Executive level educational administrators from Michigan public institutions do not differ significantly in their responses to survey questions than do administrators at Michigan private schools. Areas where differences were found are in responses to resource allocation questions for religious activities and volunteer programs, in responses to criteria applied in the evaluation of new student orientation, religious activities, and responses to which unit should have primary responsibility for financial aids, registrar and religious activities.
6. Executive level administrators from Michigan institutions of varying sizes do not differ significantly in their responses to the survey questions. Statistically significant differences were found in responses to resource allocation to religious activities and international programs; and in

responses to criteria applied in evaluation of health services, placement, religious activities and residence halls.

7. Executive level educational administrators from Michigan institutions do not significantly differ by position in their responses to the survey questions. The only statistically significant differences were found in responses to the questions of resource allocation, criteria applied in evaluation of services, and primary unit of responsibility for international student programs. Additionally, respondents differed significantly in their attitudes about the primary unit of responsibility for volunteer programs.
8. There seems to be a trend towards funding priorities for service oriented programs rather than developmental/educational programs.

Interpretation and Inferences

The summary of responses to institutional enrollment and resource predictions present findings that differ from the literature. According to the population of institutional decision-makers from Michigan, the anticipated enrollment change will not be the drastic decline predicted by researchers and demographers. Fifty-six percent of the respondents to this study predict an increase of varying magnitudes in the enrollments at their institutions from

1980-1985. Forty-six percent predict an increase in the next ten years. This finding is in conflict with Centra who reports that according to the United States Census Bureau, the size of the traditional college-age population (eighteen to twenty-one years of age) will decrease by 18 percent in the next decade. Moreover, a decline in the rate of attendance is also predicted (Centra, 1979). In the State of Michigan, predictions indicate a 28.6 to 34.4 percent decline in the pool of junior and senior students in high school from 1975-1990 (Hecker-Ignatovich, 1979). Another model anticipates a 10 to 15 percent decrease in the eighteen to twenty-one age group between 1975-1990 (Moor, 1979). The anticipated increase of nontraditional learners (older students, women, minorities and international students) may change the complexion of student bodies and may offset the anticipated enrollment decline (Centra, 1979; "The Chronicle of Higher Education," XVII, 20, 1980).

The responses to the resource question demonstrates a clear attitude that dollars and resources will increase. Almost 76 percent of the survey respondents anticipate an increase of varying intensities in resources over the next five years and 59 percent anticipate an increase in resources over the next ten years. This finding is also in conflict with reports from the literature. However, because institutions have multiple and varied funding sources, and because the parameters surrounding economic trends are difficult to accurately define and assess, the comparison

between the survey findings and the literature review may not be valid. Some general trends which suggest a decline in resources are: (1) a five million dollar cut in President Carter's fiscal budget allocation to higher education in 1980 ("The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVII, 20, 1980); (2) a two hundred and sixty million dollar cut in the student aid budget ("The Chronicle of Higher Education," XVII, 20, 1980); and (3) rates of inflation to erode and bring about a decline in purchasing power (Change Magazine, 1980). In the State of Michigan the percentage of the general fund allocated to higher education has decreased from a rate of 18.2 percent in 1962-63 to 14 percent in 1977-78 (Office of the Budget, Department of Management and Budget, State of Michigan, 1980).

Thus, a discrepancy between predictions from the survey respondents and the literature is evident. In considering this finding it is important to note that mathematical models for demographic predictions may be fairly reliable, but the myriad of intangible, human factors can often create whimsical change, are subject to varied interpretations, and cannot be totally controlled for in the experimental setting. Moreover, predictions related to funding and resource allocation are often altered in the political arena, can be controlled by popular vote, or affected by the dominant societal-cultural values of the era. Another factor which may contribute to a more positive attitude on the part of the survey respondents is the issue

of institutional bias. Although administrators must approach these issues in a realistic fashion, it is difficult, and often not prudent, to predict a large decline in enrollment or resources, and simultaneously, support programs designed to increase enrollment and resources.

In addition to the discrepancy for enrollment and resource trends, the findings provide an interesting comparison of priorities in the allocation of funds to institutional programs. The summary of findings from institutional decision-makers suggests a clear funding priority for instruction. In fact in terms of priority ordering, the mean scores suggest allocations to programs in descending order: Instruction, Academic Support, Plant Operation, Student Services, Research and Public Service. The percent of increase of allocations to program areas by the State of Michigan show different priority rankings. The state allocated dollars to programs in the following order (from highest to lowest): Plant Operation, Research, Instruction, Academic Support, Public Service and Student Services. Based on comments from the survey, many university administrators responded to the research question with a low recommendation for funding research because of their desire to seek and gain support from external agencies. Thus, it appears that the philosophic ideal for the university administrator (external funding for research, large allocation of dollars to instruction, and low overhead from

physical plant) is often altered by the fiscal demands of an inflationary economy.

In examining the individual student personnel programs which may be affected by a change in enrollment and resources, it is apparent that the service-oriented administrative functional areas of admissions, financial aids and placement will probably be influenced in a positive way.

While the statistically significant relationships should be further examined, interpretation of the descriptive data reveals some general trends. The recommendation was to cut funding for health services in view of anticipated decline of enrollments in the next ten years. The recommendation for admissions and financial aid was to increase or maintain funding in spite of a slight increase in enrollments in the next five years. This recommendation may be influenced by the anticipated decline in enrollments and subsequent need to improve these services. The descriptive fundings for funding allocation to international programs showed strong support for decreasing funding and some support for eliminating programs in spite of predictions that resources for institutions will experience a small increase over the next five years. While the relationship for new student orientation is difficult to assess, 65 percent of the respondents suggest that funding should be maintained in the next ten years, in spite of small increases in resources. There is also strong support for maintaining

funding of placement in light of five year resource predictions of some increase. Thus, in the coming era of consumer orientation towards education and of institutional marketing to attract students, it seems that administrators are stating a clear priority towards services that deliver a tangible, highly desired product. Allocations to new student orientation also showed an interaction with the variables of enrollment and resource change. This priority seems to indicate that in addition to recruiting, admitting, financing and eventually placing students, a student's adjustment to higher education is important. Not only is it critical in an educational/developmental way, but it is also crucial for retention.

Finally, it is important to note that when responses were analyzed by institutional public/private status; by size; and by position, there were very few significant findings. The programs which showed the greatest number of significant differences were health services, international student programs, religious activities and volunteer programs. It seems that these programs may be particularly vulnerable if budget reductions are enacted. Many respondents commented that health services might be handled by a "pay as you go" mode; by community facilities; or contracted to an external agency. The differences in responses for religious activities seem to be related to the public/private and institutional size variables. Because many of the small private schools in Michigan

are religiously affiliated, this finding is consistent with existing data. The significant relationships related to international programs and volunteer programs seem to reflect the attitude that these are expendable "frills" and unnecessary programs during retrenchment periods. Both of these programs developed in the sixties and seventies growth era in higher education. Moreover, they fit the sixties dominant value of social consciousness, brotherhood and relevancy. In some cases, volunteer programs have attempted to change their "big brother/socially redeeming" image into a more contemporary student orientation towards career development. This changing image is exemplified in a name change from volunteer programs to service learning centers. However, in spite of the philosophic and name change, administrators seem to have selected field experience programs (espousing a mission similar to service learning centers) as a priority for funding. The findings related to international student programs present an interesting dichotomy between the responses of executive level administrators in the population and the literature. While the data suggests that funding for the program should be cut (43.3 percent) and, in some cases eliminated (21.7 percent), the literature calls for more developmental programs to meet the needs of "new students" (women, minorities, international students) (Rhatigan, 1975; Cross, 1975).

Included in the results of the study, but not developed as an hypothesis, is the finding that there are no

significant differences in respondent's attitudes about greater resource allocation to service-oriented programs than for developmental/educational programs. Although this test did not show a statistically significant relationship, the descriptive data indicates a priority for funding service-oriented programs.

Recommendations and Implications for Student Affairs

The nature of the study is primarily investigative and designed to serve as a point of departure for further research. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to make specific recommendations based on this preliminary study. However, the following recommendations present some general suggestions for practitioners in the field.

- (1) It appears that there is strong consensus among executive level educational administrators that admissions/recruitment should be a priority in the decade of 1980-90. Administrators indicated overwhelmingly that even if budget allocations did not keep pace with inflation, resources allocated to admissions should still be increased. While admissions/recruitment programs are becoming increasingly important as the eighteen to twenty-one year old age group drops off, it is the recommendation of this investigator that retention be considered as an equally important factor. It is the responsibility of student personnel

professionals to make college and university administrative decision-makers aware of the role of student personnel services/programs in retention. Typically, students who leave college during their first year do so because of an inability to adjust. In higher education emphasis is placed primarily on "developing competence," but educators often fail to insure for the achievement of other developmental competencies (Chickering, 1969). Thus, it seems that student personnel professionals should identify and articulate their role relative to student retention as well as admissions, and should work towards implementation of programs geared towards the development of students' emotional, social and intellectual maturity.

- (2) The findings of the study and related subjective comments indicated that very little long or short term planning is undertaken for student personnel programs. The development of a five and ten year plan for student personnel programs is critical for the purpose of reiterating goals, defining objectives and designing activities for the future as well as insuring that the direction of the student personnel program is in concert with the overall mission of the college or university. Secondly, it is critical to develop a contingency plan so that periods of retrenchment do not greatly

alter the long term role and mission of the student affairs program. A comprehensive self study combined with the utilization of an external consultant team may be necessary towards this planning effort.

Suggested Areas for Future Research

A secondary purpose of this study was to provide information on trends in student services in the decade of 1980-90. Based on findings from this type of investigative research, it is further intended that the conclusions, in addition to other implications from the data, may provide a catalyst for further study. While the research questions related to this study were answered, the following recommendations for future research are presented as a result of this study.

- (1) Findings from this study only determine whether or not there is a significant relationship between any two variables under investigation. While the descriptive data provides a foundation from which to speculate about a cause/effect relationship, additional and more detailed analysis is necessary. For example, the relationship between funding recommendations and health services may be examined to consider specific attitudes about the funding and implementation of health services.
- (2) Many respondents suggest the "pay as you go" model for implementation of some student services.

Because this model seems to be implemented at some institutions and seriously considered at others, a thorough cost/benefit analysis of this funding model for student services should be undertaken.

- (3) This study indicates that executive level administrators tend to favor program elimination in some cases rather than percentage cuts "across the board." Further investigation is needed to document this general perception. Additionally, if services are to be continued, questions about quality should be addressed. For example, if institutions were to experience severe budget cuts, will programs be maintained with limited personnel as primarily administrative functions or will programs lose their educational/developmental component?
- (4) An indepth, microscopic study of an institution that is operating under fiscal constraint and maintaining student services/programs would provide an interesting and helpful case study approach to the problem. Because many quantitative problems arise during social science research projects, and because the scientific method often limits the scope of research that is nonquantitative, the case study approach may provide meaningful information.
- (5) Further research regarding the relationship of resource recommendations and criteria applied in the evaluation of student personnel services/programs

is necessary. Are the programs and services, whose primary criteria for success is economic survival for the institution, likely to be strongly endorsed for funding? What is the relationship of funding recommendations for the programs whose primary criteria is founded in the philosophic mission of the institution.

- (6) The Nelson study (1979) considered perceptions of student personnel professionals about the projected effects of enrollment and budget reductions on student personnel services. It would be interesting to investigate the perceptions and attitudes of practicing student personnel professionals as compared with those of executive level educational administrators. When the findings of this study were analyzed by administrative position, very few significant differences were produced. Thus, it appears that the chief student personnel officer's perceptions of funding student personnel services do not differ from other executive level administrators. However, how do the perceptions of other student personnel professionals, who may not hold an institutional perspective, compare with attitudes of executive level administrators?
- (7) Results of this study seem to indicate that there is very limited long or short range planning occurring for student services/programs for the decade

of 1980-90. Of the 120 responses, only four administrators from the same institution volunteered the information that their school had developed a contingency plan in the event of budget reductions. An investigation about the amount, quality and time span of institutional planning for student services should be undertaken.

- (8) The relationship of declining resources, student personnel programs/services and training programs for student personnel educators is an area for further investigation. Given future trends in student personnel programs, what skills and competencies should be considered as priorities for training programs during the next decade? Additionally, it may become important to develop comprehensive human resource planning for the profession. Questions such as, "Is human resource planning necessary?" and "Who should assume the responsibility?" must be investigated.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to assess perceptions of executive level educational administrators about the relationship between declining resources in the decade of 1980-90 and student personnel programs in the population of four-year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. The most significant findings of this study reveal that

perceptions of the population of administrators about enrollment and resources in the next five to ten years are in conflict with the literature. The survey population predictions range from a steady state situation to increased enrollment and resources, while the literature predicts a decrease or steady state. Further, it was found that executive level educational administrators tend to share similar perceptions about student services/programs. Finally, the study revealed that administrators advocate increased funding primarily to student services and programs which will insure for the economic survival of the institution (admissions, financial aids and placement) in the decade of 1980-90.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Institutional Data

Institution: _____

Institutional Status: Public _____ Private _____

Institutional Enrollment (headcount): up to 7,500 _____ 7,500-20,000 _____ 20,000 or more _____

What is the title of your position at your institution? _____

Do you think that your institution will experience a change in enrollment in the next five years? Yes _____ No _____ In the next ten years? Yes _____ No _____

What do you anticipate to be the magnitude of the change in enrollment at your institution in the next five years? _____ In the next ten years? _____

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| a. increase 0-10% | e. increase 20-30% |
| b. decrease 0-10% | f. decrease 20-30% |
| c. increase 10-20% | g. increase 30% or more |
| d. decrease 10-20% | h. decrease 30% or more |

Anticipating the impact of inflation, do you think that your institution will experience a change in resources (i.e., tuition revenue, state appropriations, private gifts) in the next five years? Yes _____ No _____ In the next ten years? Yes _____ No _____

What do you anticipate to be the magnitude of the change in resources at your institution in the next five years? ____ In the next ten years? ____

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| a. increase 0-10% | e. increase 20-30% |
| b. decrease 0-10% | f. decrease 20-30% |
| c. increase 10-20% | g. increase 30% or more |
| d. decrease 10-20% | h. decrease 30% or more |

If your institution were to experience a significant decline in resources or if resource allocations did not keep up with inflation, what recommendations would you anticipate making in the allocation of resources to the following program areas? Please circle appropriate response according to the following recommendations: (1) increase allocation to raise funding level; (2) maintain allocation at current funding level; (3) decrease allocation; (4) eliminate program.

Instruction	1	2	3	4
Research	1	2	3	4
Public Service	1	2	3	4

Academic Support	1	2	3	4
Student Services	1	2	3	4
Plant Operation	1	2	3	4

Additional Comments:

IN RESPONDING TO ALL QUESTIONS,
ASSUME THAT EACH STUDENT SERVICE/
PROGRAM IS OF HIGH QUALITY.

Given a budget cut or resource
allocation which did not keep pace
with inflation, what recommendations
would you anticipate making for
each of the student services/pro-
grams? Place appropriate number
in Column #1. RESPOND FOR ALL
SERVICES/PROGRAMS.

- 1 - Increase funding above the current level.
- 2 - Maintain funding at current level.
- 3 - Decrease funding to base level.
- 4 - Eliminate service or program.

Additional Comments:

#1

PROGRAMS

	Academic Advising/Career Planning
	Admissions/Recruitment
	Counseling Center
	Dean of Students Office
	Field Experience Programs
	Financial Aids
	Health Services
	International Student Programs
	Intramural & Recreational Athletics
	New Student Orientation
	Placement
	Registrar
	Religious Activities
	Residence Hall Programs
	Student Activities
	Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)
	Volunteer Programs
	Other - please describe _____

	#2	#1	PROGRAMS
<p>Given services/programs of high quality in all areas, which of the following should be the <u>primary criteria</u> applied in the evaluation of each of the student services/programs? Place appropriate number in Column #2. RESPOND FOR ALL SERVICES/PROGRAMS.</p> <p>1 - Service is necessary for the <u>economic survival</u> of institution.</p> <p>2 - Service is necessary to carry out the <u>philosophic mission</u> of the institution.</p> <p>3 - Service is necessary to maintain the <u>general morale</u> of students, faculty and staff of the institution.</p> <p>4 - Service is necessary because of <u>political realities</u>.</p> <p>5 - Service is not necessary.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p>			Academic Advising/Career Planning
			Admissions/Recruitment
			Counseling Center
			Dean of Students Office
			Field Experience Programs
			Financial Aids
			Health Services
			International Student Programs
			Intramural & Recreational Athletics
			New Student Orientation
			Placement
			Registrar
			Religious Activities
			Residence Hall Programs
			Student Activities
		Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)	
		Volunteer Programs	
		Other - please describe	

	#3	#2	#1	PROGRAMS
<p>Which of the following units should have primary responsibility for each of the student services/programs? Place number in Column #3. RESPOND FOR ALL SERVICES/PROGRAMS.</p> <p>1 - Academic Affairs</p> <p>2 - Student Affairs</p> <p>3 - Business and Finance</p> <p>4 - Service should be contracted/assigned to an external agent</p> <p>5 - Other - specify</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p>				Academic Advising/Career Planning
				Admissions/Recruitment
				Counseling Center
				Dean of Students Office
				Field Experience Programs
				Financial Aids
				Health Services
				International Student Programs
				Intramural & Recreational Athletics
				New Student Orientation
				Placement
				Registrar
				Religious Activities
				Residence Hall Programs
				Student Activities
				Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)
				Volunteer Programs
			Other - please describe	

	#4	#3	#2	#1	PROGRAMS
Place a check in Column #4 identify- ing those services/ programs implemented at your institution. Additional Comments:					Academic Advising/Career Planning
					Admissions/Recruitment
					Counseling Center
					Dean of Students Office
					Field Experience Programs
					Financial Aids
					Health Services
					International Student Programs
					Intramural & Recreational Athletics
					New Student Orientation
					Placement
					Registrar
					Religious Activities
					Residence Hall Programs
					Student Activities
					Support Programs for Special Groups (women, minorities, handicappers)
					Volunteer Programs
					Other - please describe _____

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING • COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
TELEPHONE 517/355-5163

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

January 14, 1980

I am writing to request your assistance with a research project supported by the Department of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University. The purpose of the project is to assess perceptions of executive level Michigan college and university administrators about the relationship between declining resources and student personnel services/programs in the decade of 1980-90.

Your institutional perspective, level of responsibility and experience in higher education makes your contribution to this study necessary and valuable. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope. All responses will be held in strict confidence.

A final copy of the report will be made available to you. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation in helping us complete this study.

Sincerely,

Wendy L. Baker
Acting Director
Engineering Cooperative
Education
Primary Investigator
(517) 355-5163

Louis C. Stamatakos
Professor
Dept. of Administration and
Higher Education
(517) 353-5220

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING • COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
TELEPHONE 517/355-5163

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

February 18, 1980

Several weeks ago, Louis Stamatakos and I requested your assistance by asking you to complete and return a questionnaire. The questionnaire was part of a study to assess perceptions of executive level Michigan college and university administrators about the relationship between declining resources and student personnel services/programs in the decade of 1980-90.

To the best of our knowledge, we have not received a response from you. For your convenience, I have enclosed an additional questionnaire. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope prior to March 10.

Your time and cooperation with this study is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wendy L. Baker, Acting Director
Engineering Cooperative Education
Primary Investigator
(517) 355-5163

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, J. "Moving Toward the 80's in Student Personnel." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 36 (Summer 1973): 155-158.
- Appleton, James R.; Moore, Paul L.; and Vinton, John C. "A Model for the Effective Delivery of Student Services in Academic Schools and Departments." Journal of Higher Education 49 (1978): 372-381.
- Armstrong, Michael R.; Campbell, Thomas J.; and Ostroth, D. David. "The Employment Situation in College and University Student Personnel." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 16 #1 (Summer 1978): 51-58.
- Astmann, Stephen K. "Faculty Perceptions of the Student Personnel Staff: Implications for Survivors." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38 (Winter 1975): 65-72.
- Avery, R. Stanton. "Some Reflections on the Current Position and Future Outlook of American Higher Education." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Conference Presentation, Kansas City, April 3, 1978.
- Balderston, F. Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publisher, 1974.
- Barzun, Jacques. The American University. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.
- Berry, Margaret. "The State of Student Affairs: A Review of the Literature." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 13 (Winter 1976): 2-4.
- Biggs, Donald A., and Skinner, Kenneth. "A Decision-Making Approach to Planning in Student Personnel." Journal of College Student Personnel 20 (May 1979): 258-264.

- Blaesser, Willard W. "Organization Change and Student Development." Journal of College Student Personnel 19 #2 (March 1978): 109-118.
- Blocher, D. H. Developmental Counseling. New York: Ronald, 1966.
- Blos, P. The Adolescent Personality: A Study of Individual Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century, 1941.
- Boutwell, W. K. "Formula Budgeting on the Downside." New Directions for Higher Education 1 (Summer 1973): 41-50.
- Bowen, Frank M., and Glenney, Lyman A. "State Budgeting for Higher Education: State Fiscal Stringency and Public Higher Education." ERIC Document. ED 159 978.
- Boylan, Hunter R. "Approaching Accountability: Some Steps Along the Way." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 10 (1973): 322-327.
- Brooks, Gary D., and Avila, Jose F. "The Chief Student Personnel Administrator and His Staff: A Profile." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 11 (Spring 1974): 41-47.
- Brown, R. D. Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy. Student Personnel Series No. 16. Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1972.
- Carnes, Bruce M. "A Profile of Private Liberal Arts Colleges." ERIC Document. ED 157 446.
- Centra, John A. "Reading the Enrollment Barometer." Change Magazine 11 (April 1970): 50, 51, 62.
- Centra, John A. "College Enrollment in the 1980s." Journal of Higher Education 51 (1980): 18-39.
- Chandler, Everett M. "Student Affairs Administration in Transition." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (September 1973): 392-398.
- "Change's Economic Prospect Report for 1980." Change Magazine 11 #8 (November-December 1979).
- Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publisher, 1969.

"The Chronicle of Higher Education."

January 29, 1979	XVII, 20	3, 4, 6
September 25, 1979	XVII, 4	8
September 5, 1979	XVII, 1	1, 12, 13
January 28, 1980		

Crookston, B. B. "Milieu Management." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 13 (Summer 1975): 45-55.

Crookston, B. B. "Student Personnel - All Hail and Fairwell!" Personnel and Guidance Journal 55 (September 1976): 26-29.

Crookston, B. B. "An Organizational Model for Student Development." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 10 #1 (July 1972): 3-13.

Cross, K. P. "Student Personnel Work as a Profession." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (1973): 77-81.

Davis, Carolyn K., and Dougherty, Edward A. "Program Discontinuation: Its Role in Strategies of Resource Allocation and Planning for Colleges and Universities." ERIC Document. ED 153 553.

Dressel, Paul T. "Measuring the Benefits of Student Personnel Work." Journal of Higher Education XLIV (January 1973): 15-26.

Dutton, Thomas B.; Appleton, James R.; and Birch, Edward E. "Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Division of Research and Publications, Monograph No. 3 (April, 1970).

Erikson, E. H. "Identity and the Life Cycle." In G. S. Klein (Ed.), Psychological Issues. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

Escott, Stanley B. "Placement Services 1974: A Report and Analysis." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 12 (Fall 1974): 84-89.

Ferrari, M. R. "National Study of Student Personnel Manpower Planning - 1972." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 10 (October 1972): 91-100.

- Fisher, G. A. "Accountability of Student Personnel." Community College Review 1 (1973): 42-48.
- Folder, John. "Prospects for Higher Education Finance in the Next Decade." Journal of Education Finance 3.3 (Fall 1977): 187-198.
- Greer, Richard M.; Blaesser, Willard W.; Herron, Ronald D.; and Horle, Reid F. "College Student Personnel Graduate Placement." Journal of College Student Personnel 19 (July 1978): 342-348.
- Hakala, Donald R. "Resource Allocation Problems of Reduced Growth in College Enrollment." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 25.1 (January 1974): 40-43.
- Harpel, Richard L. "Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation in Student Affairs Programs: A Manual for Administrators." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 14 (Summer 1976).
- Harvey, Thomas R. "Some Future Directions for Student Personnel Administration." Journal of College Student Personnel 15 (July 1974): 244-246.
- Harvey, Thomas R. "Student Development and the Future of Higher Education: A Force Analysis." Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (March 1976): 90-95.
- Havighurst, R. J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longman's, 1953.
- Hays, William L. Statistics for the Social Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Howe, Howard II. "What Future for the Private College?" Change Magazine 11 (May/June 1979): 28-31, 70.
- Humphries, Jack W. "Student Personnel Professionals: Is There a Future?" Educational Record 58 (Winter 1977): 59-65.
- Hurst, James, and Ivey, Allen E. "Towards a Radicalization of Student Personnel." Journal of College Student Personnel 12 (1971): 165-176.
- Jones, D. P. "A Manual for Budgeting and Accounting for Manpower Resources in Postsecondary Education." Technical Report #84. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

- Jones, John D. "Student Personnel Work: Current State and Future Directions." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 15 (Spring 1978): 2-11.
- Knefelkamp, L. Lee. "Faculty and Student Development in the 80's: Renewing the Community of Scholars." Session 41 - National Conference on Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, March 7, 1980.
- Kramer, Howard C. "Futuristic Student Services: One Perspective." Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 38 (Winter 1975): 80-86.
- Leslie, Larry L. "The Financial Prospects for Higher Education in the 1980's." Journal of Higher Education 51 (1980): 1-17.
- Lewis, C. L. "College Student Personnel: A Current Estimate." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (January 1973): 5-9.
- Marshall, J. F., and Sorochty, R. W. "Assessing the Need to Reorganize: A Process Model." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 14 (Fall 1976): 13-16.
- Matson, Jane E. "Reductions and Student Services." New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.
- McIntyre, James. "Student Personnel: The Challenge of the Future." Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 38 (Winter 1975): 59-64.
- Meabon, David L.; Sims, O. Suthern; Suddick, David E.; and Alley, Barbara. "Management Techniques in Student Affairs: A National Study." Journal of College Student Personnel 19 (May 1978): 211-230.
- Miller, T. K. "A Student Development Model for Student Affairs in Tomorrow's Higher Education." Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (1975): 334-341.
- Miller, T. K., and Prince, J. S. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publisher, 1976.

- Mueller, K. H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Mueller, K. H. "The Future of the Campus Personnel Worker." Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 31 #3 (Spring 1968): 132-140.
- Mueller, K. H. "Student Personnel Work in Higher Education: Philosophy and Framework." In College Student Personnel: Readings and Bibliographies, edited by L. E. Fitzgerald et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970).
- Nelson, Jackie. "The Effects of Enrollment and Budget Reductions on College and University Personnel Services and Programs." Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1979.
- Nelson, Jack, and Murphy, Harold. "The Projected Effects of Enrollment and Budget Reductions on Student Personnel Services." Journal of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 17 (Spring 1980): 2-10.
- Nie, N. H.; Bent, D. H.; and Hull, C. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan (April 1979). Unpublished Document.
- Ostroth, Don David. "Procedures and Criteria Used in Selecting Entry-Level College Student Personnel Professionals." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1980.
- Packwood, William T. "College Student Personnel Graduate Placement." Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (1976): 22-27.
- Packwood, William T. College Student Personnel Services. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1977.
- Parker, Clyde A. "Institutional Self-Renewal in Higher Education." Journal of College Student Personnel 12 (1975): 405-409.
- Penney, James F. "Student Personnel Work: A Profession Still Born." Personnel and Guidance Journal 47 (June 1969): 958-962.

- Podolsky, Arthur, and Smith, Carolyn R. Education Directory for Colleges and Universities 1978-79. National Center for Educational Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
- Prior, John J. "The Reorganization of Student Personnel Services: Facing Reality." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (1973): 202-205.
- Rhatigan, James J. "Looking Forward to the 1980's." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 17 (Autumn 1979): 2-11.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Schmidt, M. R. "College Student Personnel: Two Alternatives for the Future." Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (September 1975): 354-355.
- Shaffer, R. H., and Martinson, W. D. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1969.
- Shaffer, R. H. "An Emerging Role of Student Personnel - Contributing to Organizational Effectiveness." Journal of College Student Personnel 14 (September 1973): 386-391.
- Shoemer, J., and Snapp, M. K. "Student Personnel as a Primary Educational Function: A Battle Lost." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 14 (Winter 1977): 48-51.
- Teeter, Ruskin. "What the Carnegie Commission Says to Student Personnel Administrators?" Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 38 (Winter 1975): 70-72.
- Terenzini, Patrick. "The Goals of Student Personnel Work: Views from the Top." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administration 11 (October 1973): 31-35.
- Tryon, C., and Lilienthal, J. W. "Developmental Tasks: The Concept and Its Importance." In Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools. Washington: National Education Association, 1950.
- Tucker, John M. "Planning for Curtailed Enrollments." American School and University 50.2 (October 1977): 46-48.

- Wellington, Arthur M. "From Policy and Programming in Student Personnel." Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (July 1976): 327-333.
- Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Wise, W. Max. "Major Developments to Influence College Students in the Late '70's." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 14 (Fall 1976): 2-12.
- Witkowski, Edward H. "The Economy and the University: Economic Aspects of Declining Enrollments." Journal of Higher Education XLV #1 (January 1974).
- Woodard, Dudley B. Jr., and Birch, Edward E. "NASPA Student Affairs Cost Study." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 15.1 (Summer 1977): 20-23.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1951.
- Young, Bernadine. "Perspectives on the Future of Student Affairs: A Modified Delphi Study in Higher Education." Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978.
- 1978-79 Fact Book on Higher Education in Michigan, Michigan Department of Education - Higher Education Management Services, July, 1979.
- 1979-80 Michigan Higher Education Executive Budget Funding Model - Selected Data, Comparisons and Trends. Department of Management and Budget, Education Division - March 1979.