

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Mason L. Niblack for the degree Doctor of Education in
(Name of Student) (Degree)

Education
(College Student Personnel Administration) presented on June 11, 1974.
(Major Department) (Date)

Title: COMPARISONS AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND FACULTY
REGARDING PERCEPTIONS OF PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS FOR STUDENT
PERSONNEL SERVICES.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract Approved: _____
(signature)
Charles F. Warnath

The rationale for this study was based upon concern for philosophical foundations of student personnel services which were perceived as incomplete, if not at an early stage of development.

The purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of students, parents, and faculty members, both as individuals and in groups, regarding which philosophic base ought to underlie overall student personnel services in higher education. A secondary purpose was to determine whether respondents appeared to perceive or wished to describe any present philosophic base for the provision of student personnel services.

A questionnaire was developed by the author and designed to be completed by three respondent groups: students, parents, and faculty members. It was based upon four philosophical position statements, three from Harold Taylor: (1) the neo-humanist, (2) the rationalist, and (3) the instrumentalist. The fourth philosophical position statement in the questionnaire para-

~~fourth philosophical position~~ statement in the questionnaire paraphrased the integralist position developed and defined by Tollefson and Bristow and was viewed as an extension of Taylor's approach. The four philosophical position statements in the questionnaire described or defined philosophies of student personnel services, and were statistically compared against one another. The instrument also requested a self-report of demographic and personal data to be measured against the philosophical position choices.

The survey method was used to gather the data. Questionnaires were mailed to respondents. Descriptive data were manually inspected and hand tabulated in chart form. A number of null hypotheses were tested relating either to consistent response patterns or significant differences in perceptions among the respondent groups. Such data were also tabulated in chart form. The findings were reported both in terms of descriptive data and a chi-square measure of independence. All hypotheses were tested to the .05 level and computer analyzed.

The results of the study led to a number of conclusions, among them that the respondents subscribe to different philosophies which they believe ought to underlie student personnel services. There are significant discrepancies in the opinions of students, parents, and faculty members regarding any philosophic position to underlie student personnel services. There was sharp disagreement between students and their parents regarding a philosophical position. The student and parent samples each showed a decided preference for one of the philosophic positions, but it was not the same philosophy, nor was it the same view as that taken by the faculty who showed no decided preference.

The data also indicate that some of the external and demographic variables expected to influence a philosophical position choice for student personnel services in fact did not exert such influence.

Implications from the study are primarily in terms of the apparent dichotomy between overall student personnel services administration and specialty work within the field and a concern for reformulation or recasting of the principles and philosophies underlying student personnel as a higher education methodology. Another of the implications is in terms of the framework in which research in the general area of student personnel services has been designed. The major implication, deriving in part from the foregoing, is a question of survival for the field of student personnel services.

Such implications led to a number of recommendations centering around the preparation of a philosophy designed to underlie student personnel services at a given institution. Other recommendations revolve around the development of much more sophisticated research and more well-defined research instruments to study more comprehensively the implications developed from the present study.

Comparisons Among Students , Parents , and Faculty
Regarding Perceptions of Philosophical Positions
for Student Personnel Services

by

Mason L. Niblack

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Education

June 1975

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Psychology in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department, College Student Personnel Administration

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented -- June 11, 1974

Typed by Fran Schulze and Susan Whittle for Mason L. Niblack

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance and guidance of the thesis committee: Dr. Charles F. Warnath, Dr. Glen Clark, Dr. Edward Heath, Dr. Robert F. McCain, Dr. JoAnne J. Trow.

A much deserved thank you is extended to Dr. C.F. Warnath for his continuing assistance, guidance and inspiration, given not only in preparation of this thesis, but throughout the author's graduate studies at Oregon State.

Acknowledgment is due Dr. Norbert Hartmann for his invaluable assistance with statistical computations and expositions, as well to Dr. A.L. Tollefson who helped develop the theme.

Special acknowledgment is due the women in the author's life, particularly Fran, Willi, Lorna, Helen, Jackie, Joan, Maxine and Susan without whose constructive criticisms and assistance in preparation of the copy, this study could not have been completed.

To that most important woman, Zana, goes appreciation for so much personal sacrifice and continuing support.

Finally, to Stephen and Gina, a thank you and a dedication from their father. He appreciates how patient and forgiving they were although they did not understand why their dad was never home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Importance of the Study	6
	The Problem	8
	Statement of the Problem	8
	Purpose of the Study	8
	Definitions and Limitations	11
	Definitions of terms	11
	Limitations	12
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
	Introduction	14
	Definitions	16
	Chronology of Evaluation Studies	20
	Summary	32
III	DESIGN AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	34
	Introduction	34
	Procedures	36
	Instrument	36
	The Sample Population	38
	Data Collection	40
	Statistical Procedure	40
IV	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	46
	Discussion of Demographic and Descriptive Data Findings	46
	Results: Table II	46
	Results: Table III	51
	Results: Table IV	58
	Results: Table V	62
	Results: Table VI	66
	Results of Test Hypotheses	73
	Null Hypothesis Number One	73
	Null Hypothesis Number Two	75

Null Hypothesis Number Three	75
Null Hypothesis Number Four	78
Null Hypothesis Number Five	80
Null Hypothesis Number Six	82
Null Hypothesis Number Seven	82
Null Hypothesis Number Eight	85
Results: Table XV	87
Respondents' Written Comments	90

V CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 97

Introduction	97
Conclusions	100
Implications	103
Recommendations	106
Summary	109

Bibliography	111
Appendix A, Facsimile of Covering Letter	119
Appendix B, Facsimile of Questionnaire	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table # I, Questionnaires Distributed and Returned	41
Table # II, Numbers and Percentages of Responses of Students	47
Table # III, Numbers and Percentages of Responses of Parents	52
Table # IV, Numbers and Percentages of Responses of Faculty	59
Table # V, Aggregation of Tables II, III, and IV	64
Table # VI, Aggregation of Data from Tables II, III, and IV	67
Table # VII, Responses of Students, Parents and Faculty for Null Hypothesis #1	74
Table # VIII, Responses of Students, Parents and Faculty for Null Hypothesis #2	76
Table # IX, Responses of Students and Parents for Null Hypothesis #3	77
Table # X, Responses of Students and Faculty for Null Hypothesis #4	79
Table # XI, Responses of Parents and Faculty for Null Hypothesis #5	81
Table # XII, Responses of Parents (Native) and Parents (Non-Native) for Null Hypothesis #6	83
Table # XIII, Responses of Students (With Contact) and Parents (With Contact) for Null Hypothesis #7	84
Table # XIV, Responses of Students (With Contact) and Faculty (With Contact) for Null Hypothesis #8	86
Table # XV, Aggregate Table of Results of Tables VII and XIV	88

Comparisons Among Students, Parents, and Faculty

Regarding Perceptions of Philosophical Positions

for Student Personnel Services

Chapter I

Introduction

Student personnel services have a long and varied history, beginning in the Middle Ages when they existed under considerably different structures and conditions from today. In the United States, they have always been a part of institutions of higher education, although most authorities would agree they have been perceived to be (and remain) outside the framework of the formal educational program or ancillary to the "primary" educational objectives of the institution. Activities carried on by present-day student personnel staff were considered for many years in North America the prerogative of instructional faculty or as part of the tasks of academic administrators.

Rapid and major strides in terms of the development of the student personnel group of educational services have come since the end of the first World War with the most rapid change occurring since World War II. The 1920's saw the era of the "psychologists," as Cowley (1956) termed them. They were perhaps the first group who attempted to use somewhat scientific methods in the pursuance of their goals and they used fairly substantive as well as research methodology. Notably, the psychologists

concentrated their efforts on individual counseling which placed heavy stress on individual differences. This approach lasted well into the 1950's and may be observed in the efforts of some student personnel professionals even today.

During the 1920's and 30's, the German philosophy of higher education was implemented in many American institutions. It slowed the development not only of student personnel services, but of other administrative functions as well with its nearly total concern for only intellectual interactions between faculty and students and a concomitant disregard for the personal lives of students.

Tremendous pressures on institutions gave impetus to the student personnel set of educational services after 1940 and the end of World War II accelerated change even more. Burgeoning enrollments, urbanization, societal lifestyle changes, and new personal and social problems faced by students forced the development of new administrative structural patterns. Out of both new structures and demands made by life-style differences, the specialist in student personnel emerged.

What are student personnel services? The answer is not simple, as there is great ambiguity regarding a good definition. In most cases, a definition has come from a highly practical, but simple listing of its perceived functions as described more fully in Chapter II.

However, present-day student personnel services staff in United States

colleges and universities, continuing in roles evolved historically, appear to view their functions much in light of the "Student Personnel Point of View" (American Council on Education, 1937), propounded just prior to World War II. This document focused on the concept of "educating the whole man" and related closely to what Cowley (1938) termed a "holoistic" (later shortened to "holistic") philosophy of education. This continuing approach is operationalized through attempts to integrate personnel services with the total academic thrust of the institution and accomplished more often by the chief student personnel administrator than by the specialist in such student personnel sub-functions as counseling or housing. It also appears that a prime factor in the emphasis on integration of student personnel services with the total educational program of the institution is the data, however relevant, that indicates that learning takes place as often outside the classroom as within it (Shaffer, 1966, Rogers, 1969, and others). Brunson (1959) for example, noted (using the term "guidance" rather than "student personnel work") that,

When guidance, instruction, and administration become focused jointly on the aims of education rather than separately upon specific functions within an organizational structure, the relatedness of their responsibilities becomes clear and makes for cohesion rather than division.

But a number of serious difficulties have emerged in student personnel work. A divisiveness has developed: student personnel seems divided into two groups and divergent sets of actions. Specialists such as

counselors, housing administrators, financial aid staff, etc., verbalize "student personnel guidelines" but the specialization seems to demand that efforts toward their short-range goals cannot be related either to education in a broad sense or to any single mission or objective of the institution. Chief student personnel administrators, on the other hand, seem unable to integrate the functioning of specialists into a total student personnel philosophy, much less into any kind of overall educational philosophy which is espoused either by the institution or higher education in general. Thus student personnel seems a house divided against itself.

Survival, however, has become an even more important concern for educators engaged in the administration of student personnel services on the American (and in many cases, the Canadian) campus. Recent dismissals of leading student personnel administrators, slashed budgets, and reported controversy surrounding the efficacy of student personnel in higher education have combined to produce a feeling of "do or die." Penney (1968) pessimistically disposed of the matter with the flat pronouncement that student personnel would never become a profession - in fact, was a profession "still-born." This prediction appeared to be based on the idea that its disciplinary base was too broad, was not unique, that a claim to eclecticism was in reality an attempt to avoid a "garbage-pail" foundation for its functional responsibilities. Taylor's "instrumentalism" (1952) was accused of overwhelming practitioners sufficiently that narrow specialists had usurped roles formerly

played by supposedly broad-based faculty members. Of course, if Penney's pronouncement becomes or is seen by topmost university administrators as reality, student personnel will inevitably be considered neither a unique nor integral function in higher education - in fact, will fit Penney's expectations that it cannot last the decade in its present form.

It is averred that, at the least "student personnel workers are professionals in search of a function," (Rothman and Keene, 1970). The only point of agreement seems to be tacit acceptance that student personnel workers have inherited many functions and that a Fritz Perls book title -- In and Out the Garbage Pail -- seems to characterize the day-to-day functional responsibilities of the typical student personnel administrator in colleges or universities.

Student personnel professionals also endure alienation from other educators. Emmet (1971), an educational consultant and adjunct professor of higher education, titled an article in a leading educational journal "Student Personnel Services: Who Needs Them?" and two recent national level conferences, one in Canada and one in the United States, have been held with the same theme and title.

Beyond Penney's point of view, many detracting statements regarding student personnel have come in indirect ways. Jencks and Reisman in The Academic Revolution (1968), barely acknowledged the existence of student personnel. Millet (1968) disposed of student personnel services by

simply ignoring their existence. In discussing the role of the various educational units on the campus, he noted that: "a faculty must accordingly be organized into working units of the university enterprise in order to produce certain desired outputs of instruction, research and public service."

Joseph Kauffman (1966) identified part of this problem.

It is clear that conflicts exist between faculty and student personnel staff in most colleges and universities. They may differ in degree--from unwillingness to recognize such staff and their functions, all the way to vocal and vigorous opposition to the concept of student personnel work.

For the most part, however, there is little interaction, communication, or overt strife. The tragedy is that student personnel staff, on many campuses, know more about the reality of education on those campuses than does anyone else. Failure to communicate this awareness and knowledge not only frustrates the student personnel worker but also denies to the faculty those insights, perceptions, and facts which could be of invaluable assistance in shaping the total educational program of the institution.

This is most distressing if student personnel administrators believe that their set of functions is as important in higher education as those of their "academic" colleagues. For no group of educators can hope to be either successful or accepted if their base for services does not find some general agreement.

Importance of the Study. Hopefully, the study may help to point out a new directional course to those searching for an educational rationale for student personnel services in higher education. To the present time, the literature which bears on any philosophies underlying student personnel practice in colleges and universities is not plentiful. The relevant material seems

only to be found in proceedings of various workshops within the profession, in what must now be considered old literature, and by wringing relevance out of writings that appear on practice in the field. This is hardly a situation helpful to the acceptance of student personnel as meaningful educational services.

Perhaps the importance of the study is to expose educators to one strong view that student personnel services can be educational processes, perceived as in line with the thrust of any given institution and perhaps as relevant and meaningful as the classroom experience. It is hoped the study could presume to add another dimension to the attempt to interpret the field, not only to other educators, but as well to registered students, parents of students, faculty, legislators, and others of the public at large, all of whom have a part to play or a point of view to be heard in connection with both the furtherance of higher education and student personnel.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem. The problem was to determine whether, or in what ways, students, parents, and faculty members agree regarding an underlying philosophic base for student personnel services at Oregon State University or what perceptions these groups have regarding the existing rationales for the provision of such services.

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this study was to examine: (1) the perceptions of students, parents, and faculty members regarding the existence of a philosophic base for the provision of student personnel services; (2) their perceptions regarding which philosophic base ought to underlie student personnel services. Other and secondary purposes for the study were to determine whether (3) respondents could determine what philosophical position they wish to exist for student personnel services or even whether they may realize the necessity for such a philosophical position; (4) sufficient knowledge on the part of respondents exists to react appropriately to the questionnaire.

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No consistent response pattern exists among all respondents for a single perception of a philosophical base for student personnel services as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.
2. No consistent response pattern exists among all respondents who

had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more of the student personnel services as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

3. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled students and sampled parents as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.
4. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled students and the sampled faculty as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.
5. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled parents and the sampled faculty as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.
6. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between those parents sampled who are native Oregonians and those who are not as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.
7. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for

student personnel services exist between students who had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more student personnel services to meet their own needs while in college and those parents who had had similar contact as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

8. No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between students who had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more of the student personnel services and the faculty who had had similar contact as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

Time and scope of study factors combined to prevent inclusion of other hypotheses based on additional data collected. Such hypotheses might well be tested, however, in a future study utilizing essentially the same data, but with a different focus.

Definitions and Limitations

Definition of Terms. The following definitions require exposition due to their occasional use in a specific context.

Student Personnel Services: As defined in the questionnaire on page two, student personnel services shall be defined as a composite organization of functions in higher education, generally inclusive of a Counseling Center, the offices of Housing, Placement and Career Planning, Admissions, the College Union and Student Activities, Health and Registration Services, Orientation, Financial Aids, International Education, Judicial or Disciplinary Boards, and "Dean of Students." Occasionally, other functional areas, such as intercollegiate athletics, are included. While its aims and goals vary widely, reflecting the institution within which it operates, it deals primarily with the concerns of registered students as those relate to their various relationships with and within the institution. Its structure is generally one in which each of the directors of a functional area, e.g., the director of housing, reports to an associate dean or dean of students, perhaps to a vice-president for student affairs.

Perceptions: Perception, for purposes of this study, is the importance attached to, judgments about, or personal opinion about the various philosophies and functions described as student personnel services in higher education as reported by respondents.

Philosophy: For purposes of this study, philosophy is defined as a

body of principles underlying the discipline in higher education currently known as student personnel services. Philosophy may embody characteristics, functions, and features, but is not limited to them, and will encompass them.

Faculty: Faculty are teaching personnel and members of academic departments on the main campus of Oregon State University. They may be engaged in research on the campus, but must not have that function as the prime reason for affiliation with the University.

Student: For purposes of this study, students are defined as those individuals who have successfully completed the requirements for at least junior undergraduate standing at Oregon State University as defined by the Registrar's office of the institution or who have transferred into the University with that equivalent.

Parents: For purposes of this study, parents are either the natural parents of the students sampled or legal guardians of the sampled students under twenty-one years of age. Their place of current residence was not a factor in selection as that selection was based on the student random sample.

Limitations: Since the study attempted to measure perceptions only of those affiliated either directly or indirectly with Oregon State University, the findings cannot claim capability of extension or generalization beyond that affiliation.

Words were used in their generally accepted meanings, but the possibi-

bility exists for misinterpretation with so wide and varied a group of respondents in terms of such factors as age, level of education, or prior academic affiliation.

The findings are limited by the assumption that all respondents read the philosophical position choices in the questionnaire carefully and thoroughly.

Certain findings were limited by the decision to sample only upper-division undergraduate students and only their parents.

The U.S. mails were utilized for return of questionnaires. Although this procedure was necessary, the return rate might have been higher and results thus different had there been the ability to exert control over the returns in a better or more personal manner.

The study is limited by the extent to which the lists and rosters of students, parents, and faculty from the computer center of the University was accurate.

The study is limited by the time frame in which the data were gathered, i.e., the spring of the academic year and near the period known as final examination week.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The most casual researcher could not fail to note that the overwhelming majority of literature and studies completed regarding student personnel, particularly in the last fifty years, have to do either with a specific function, e.g., housing, counseling, or are generalized treatises regarding an author's own perceptions or feelings about student personnel methodology in higher education. In fact, a perusal of College Student Personnel Abstracts over the past few years shows that specific functions within the field are listed alphabetically and virtually overwhelm the periodical, at least insofar as "Student Personnel Services" as a general heading takes up only a three or four page section of what is commonly a two-hundred page journal.

Perhaps it was a feeling of extreme discomfort with basic research regarding the underlying assumptions about purposes and goals or undergirding philosophies of student personnel services that led J.B. Patterson (1971) to comment that,

an examination of the literature in student affairs work, and in student personnel work generally, indicated that the organization of the services and the qualifications of workers has been a focus of concern for many years.

Patterson went on...

My experiences consistently reaffirm my perceptions that student affairs and other student personnel services lack clear statements of purposes and goals, functions and services, methods, processes, and skills. Irrespective of the institution, department, or personnel with which I have been associated, I have perceived constant tendencies toward both interdepartment and intra-departmental conflict and role ambiguity. These experiences lead me to question the academic base of student affairs work and to analyze the functions and skills of student affairs workers in detail.

Gordon (1970) expressed no difficulty with a basic underlying philosophy for student personnel services. In an introductory statement to his study of student personnel services at the community college level, he averred that, "the rationale for student personnel services is inherent in the basic philosophy of the Community College." As a result of this feeling of inherent rationale, Gordon questioned neither the basic functions of student personnel nor underlying philosophies as he attempted, in his study, to answer questions only about the general status of student personnel services in public community colleges or what differences might exist among the five public community colleges he studied with respect to the scope of such services. Unfortunately, Gordon's approach appears to be the norm in terms of research studies regarding student personnel work in general or any questions regarding basic underlying assumptions or philosophies related to this field of endeavor.

Definitions

There has, from the beginning, been a great confusion not only about the term student personnel work, but also about definitions regarding the entire "student personnel movement." Gordon (1970) called the confusion, "even among experts, striking to the outsider."

Apparently never challenged, L.B. Hopkins, (1926) for example, described functions in student personnel as:

- a) selection or matriculation,
- b) personal services,
- c) curriculum and teaching,
- d) research, and
- e) coordination.

Arbuckle (1953--again, with no apparent test) did state that, "since 1926 such student personnel services have been enlarged and altered somewhat" over the years.

The period from approximately 1920 until just after the second World War saw the acceptance of Cowley's view (e.g., 1940) that student personnel work consisted of all non-instructional activities within which the "all-around" development of the student was of primary concern. This definition was never put to any apparent practical test of its validity which seemed surprising, since it stressed a clear dichotomy between student personnel work and instruction. However, basic studies on underpinnings for the field or definitions within it simply did not exist except as evaluations of student personnel work in various forms.

In earlier years and treatises, i.e., prior to publication of Student Personnel Work As Deeper Teaching, Lloyd-Jones (1937) indicated that enrollment of students, educational, vocational, and personal counseling, financial aid, testing programs, placement, records, health and, housing, were all "legitimate" student personnel services. This followed Hopkins' lead and exemplified the "listing of functions" approach.

It remained for the American Council of Education to publish, in 1937, the "Student Personnel Point of View," which statement clearly focused on a personal dimension for higher education, laying heavy emphasis on students receiving individual attention through, again, a "whole host" of services.

In 1948, E.H. Hopkins reiterated the simple listing of functions as a definition for student personnel services and in 1949, the American Council on Education published a revised version of the "Student Personnel Point of View," with E.G. Williamson as its editor. This again listed the services which would help to constitute a student personnel program. Somewhat contradictorily, Lloyd-Jones pointed out that providing a collection of services should not be equated with a program, but, coordination of such services was needed to tie them into a program which enabled each service to focus most effectively on the individual student. However, the lack of any coordinated effort generally prevailed until approximately 1950.

During the next ten years, a somewhat broader definition of student personnel work evolved. In summary, it was considered not only as a supplement but as a complement to the instructional program of the institution. Williamson (1961) and Mueller (1961) were early supporters of this "complementary" view. Williamson, while maintaining a "listing" approach to definition, went a step further, defining the field through prominent features about it. "...the term 'student personnel work' refers both to the program of organized services for students and to a point of view about these students."

Wrenn (1948) described the essential features of student personnel work as: "a point of view or pervasive philosophy of education, the student personnel services themselves, and the administration of those services." An important definition came from Lloyd-Jones and Smith in 1954 which described student personnel as a particular and special kind of teaching. However, Feder in 1958 again listed functions. In 1963, Zimmerman, in a treatise on change in the personal dimensions of education and the original "Point of View," recounted the old "host of services,"

a) admissions, b) orientation, c) social activities,
 d) counseling, e) discipline, f) educational & vocational guidance,
 g) financial aid, h) placement, i) records.

In fact, as late as 1965, defining student personnel or attempting to categorize and relate it to higher education still seemed to follow the "listing

of functions" approach, even at the community or junior college level. For example, in 1965, the Committee on Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs presented a report to the Carnegie Corporation (McConnell, 1965) in which the listing approach again appeared. Yoder (1966), reporting on his 1965 doctoral thesis in the Junior College Journal, again identified functions prepared from an "intensive" study of the literature.

Many attempts were made to hedge on student personnel work in terms of its definitive bases as exemplified by Lloyd (1955). He stated that the pattern for development of a student personnel service depends, among other factors, upon the educational philosophy of the institution within which the service operates as well as its size, the institutional budget, the nature of institutional administration, any recognized need for such services as defined, and the traditional and local campus relationship between student and faculty member. However, a summary of difficulties with consistency or agreement on guidelines was clearly made by Wrenn (1955) "...in short, student personnel work has philosophic and psychological foundations which have been only haltingly developed and are disturbingly incomplete." As if that summary were not evidence enough, Klopff (1966) persisted in asking questions that presumably should have been answered, at least tentatively, years ago, beginning with "What is student personnel work?"

Chronology of Evaluation Studies

The studies examined on student personnel services in general terms have not attempted to deal with basic underlying concepts or philosophies. They have rather concentrated on those kinds of things more easily measured, particularly as defensible or as good defenses for activity in the field. Such studies have typically taken the form of evaluations of student personnel programs. The number of evaluation studies or those utilizing instruments of evaluation appears large only in proportion to the number found (virtually none) on studies of perceptions of underlying philosophies for this functional element of higher education.

The first national survey was made by L.B. Hopkins in 1925. Hopkins made several two or three-day visits to fourteen colleges and universities, developing an intuitive sort of ratings scale of student personnel programs according to the functions he saw being performed. He, did not, however, systematically evaluate the separate programs as such at each of the institutions. Hopkins' study did indicate that there was a general acceptance of at least a selected group of functions among constituents within the field. Hopkins evaluated five major areas: selection and matriculation, personal services, curriculum and teaching, research, and coordination. In this sense, the Hopkins study was probably a landmark document in that it was the first attempt both to evaluate and to establish a list of standards for a student personnel program in higher education. Unfortunately, perhaps Hopkins started a trend, as

methods of evaluation of student personnel programs have been, since then, limited to questionnaire and survey type studies, although there appeared a large gap in any kind of evaluative activity from that time until after World War II. The American College Personnel Association Committee on Research and Publications (Blaesser, 1960) reported that, between 1924 and 1940, no papers were presented at any conference on the topic of evaluation of overall programs in student personnel.

Evaluation research was resumed on overall student personnel services in 1948. In that year, Wrenn and Kamm (1948) selected fourteen services, weaving statements about these services into an instrument which they called "An Evaluation Report Form For Student Personnel Services." The fourteen statements in the instrument were based on documentation of the American Council of Education, The American College Personnel Association, The Evaluative Studies of The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and statements analyzed in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research and described services which supposedly constituted an effective and comprehensive student personnel program. The evaluation report form was divided into three parts with weights assigned to certain of the services. The purpose of the weighting was to emphasize that some services, in Wrenn's and Kamm's minds, were apparently more important than others in a total student personnel program. A strength of the Wrenn and Kamm instrument was that its inventory provided a means for respondents to indicate feelings of need for student personnel

services. There were two major weaknesses in this study, according to Ross (1967):

- 1) the reliability of the instrument was never established,
- 2) the instrument called for judgments that can adequately be made only by qualified student personnel specialists or administrators.

Wrenn and Kamm themselves suggested that this, second weakness might be one reason why there were few evaluation studies in the field up to that time, sensing that there were a lack of adequate criteria against which to measure the effectiveness of services. Strang (1950) agreed, pointing out that "little progress has been made in concretely defining the changes that should result from an effective personnel program."

The next attempt at development of an instrument as a criterion against which a student personnel program might be measured was developed by Rackham (1951). Rackham constructed a Student Personnel Services Inventory which covered fifteen activity areas, in his view, the most characteristic of student personnel services programs. The inventory was designed to be completed either by student personnel workers or so-called "independent observers". To accompany the inventory, a profile of student personnel services was constructed by asking ten acknowledged student personnel leaders of the time to weight the relative importance of each of the fifteen items in the original inventory. Combinations of the ten judges' ratings were used to determine the profile which would approximate the "ideal" program. Rackham's idea was that institutions utilizing the Student Person-

nel Services Inventory would compare their own programs with the profile to determine adequacy .

In 1953, Mahler (completed in 1955) utilized the Rackham Inventory to evaluate student personnel programs in four Minnesota colleges . Apparently, Mahler added to the Rackham evaluation study and developed inventory items of his own. In his study, Mahler wanted primarily to discover whether "opinion" scales might effectively be used to secure estimates of the quality of the student personnel programs . Mahler's approach in sampling opinion regarding evaluations of student personnel services was to question the entire faculty and a 10% random sample of the students from each of the four institutions in which he administered his own Inventory . As a test of measurement between his own and Rackham's Inventory , Mahler compared results obtained by the administration of his own test and personal interviews with a random sample of student personnel workers at the four institutions involved in completing Rackham's inventory . In general, Mahler's findings were that his inventory and Rackham's were in high agreement in terms of evaluation of the services .

Also in 1953, Kamm again worked with evaluation of student personnel services , heading up a commission on "Program and Practices Evaluation of a National Association of Student Personnel Administrators" in developing a manual to aid in a systematic approach to such an evaluation . The manual was essentially a summary of data relative to 20 areas of student personnel work .

Remaining concerned about the extent of evaluation being carried on, Kamm contacted forty student personnel administrators of his own selection in 1955 to find out what kind of systematic research was being done with respect to evaluation on the campuses of those administrators. His findings indicated that little was being accomplished, less still being contemplated. Recalling earlier statements in this study, evaluation of some kind was being carried out in specific functional areas of student personnel, but no comprehensive program of evaluation of overall services was going on in that year. Winfrey and Feder (1965) supported concerns of Kamm and their review of the literature for the period of 1960-1965 simply does not mention any comprehensive evaluations of overall student personnel programs. These two authors only reinforce observations already made to the effect that most of the literature in the field was devoted to surveys of existing programs and evaluations of specific services.

The period 1959 through 1966 saw the completion of a number of (particularly doctoral) studies regarding evaluations of student personnel programs, beginning with Fitzgerald's in 1959.

Fitzgerald attempted to determine the instructional faculty's perception of the total student personnel program as well as assess faculty knowledge of the various service functions in the student personnel area. Fitzgerald segregated the services into their various component parts or functional specialties.

Eight categories were utilized in her questionnaire:

- 1) admissions , registrations , and record functions ,
- 2) counseling functions ,
- 3) health services ,
- 4) housing and food services ,
- 5) student activities ,
- 6) placement and financial aids ,
- 7) discipline ,
- 8) "special clinics" and "special services" functions .

Fitzgerald found that faculty recognized student personnel functions as important in the higher education process , but that "the degree of importance depended upon the nature of the service." Faculty tended to rate as most important those services which were in direct support of the institution's "core-academic" functions and concomitantly , determined services not closely tied to perceived core-academic functions to be relatively unimportant.

Fitzgerald's study hinted at concern for underlying philosophy as the respondents were asked to rate "importance" of various student personnel functions . This approach was not followed in the ensuing year or two , however , as there appeared to be an attempt to broaden the bases for judgment about student personnel programs with the use of several data-gathering techniques within the same study , exemplified by Brantley (1960) and Beckers (1962) . Brantley obtained his data not only through the normative processes of searching primary and secondary literature sources , but with six other approaches which included:

- a) conferences with collegiate officials ,
- b) the use of The Evaluation Report Form ,

- c) Inventory of Student Reaction to Student Personnel Services,
- d) a "survey of pupil problems,"
- e) the Kuder Preference test,
- f) a questionnaire.

Beckers was slightly less ambitious, but still used four methods of obtaining data which included:

- a) observation of the student personnel staff at work and outcomes,
- b) interviews with specific student personnel staff members,
- c) a questionnaire that was completed by two groups--faculty and students,
- d) a faculty reporting form.

The Beckers study was organized along the lines of Fitzgerald's in the sense that faculty were the essential respondent group from whom opinions were solicited, but both focus and outcomes were different.

Tamte's study (1962) used an adaptation of the Student Personnel Questionnaire designed and used by Fitzgerald. It was the basic outline of this effort which prompted the development of the queried groups for the present study. Tamte attempted to determine the perceptions of the student personnel program from three groups: faculty, students, and the student personnel staff. Differences in perception were measured among the three groups, the result showing that there were some perceptual differences. Little disagreement appeared related to the importance of student personnel functions, but there was considerable disagreement (implying lack of knowledge) about even the location of the special function office which performed the specialized role. Tamte concluded that there was a need for,

and recommended an increased amount of, "intra-University" communication among students, faculty, and student personnel workers.

In the same year, Bailey and, separately, Rankin (1966) were evaluating student personnel services, using similar techniques to those of Fitzgerald and Tamte, i.e., surveying perceptions of various constituent groups on the college campus. Their instruments were different; Bailey used those developed by Wrenn and Kamm (Reaction Inventory to Student Personnel Services and the Evaluation Report Form), while Rankin used a questionnaire of his own choosing and which he himself developed. Bailey concluded that students perceived student personnel services more negatively than any other group on the campus. He also determined that students whom he felt could profit most from student personnel services were those with the most negative reaction toward them. Since Bailey also concluded that "non-academic" persons perceived student personnel services more positively than other groups at the college, the decision was made in the present study to include parents in the sample, although the outcomes from inclusion of parents were entirely different.

Rankin studied graduate students in particular. His findings indicated that graduate students perceived student personnel services as "fairly important" and seemed in terms of the statistical outcomes, "to be aware" of all the student personnel services available. These graduate students appeared to be satisfied in general terms with the services with which they

had had contact, but did rate several services as less or more satisfactory. It was this particular approach to perceptions that prompted the inclusion in the present study of a "check list" of student personnel services with whom the respondents had had contact.

Other studies have been completed since 1966 regarding evaluations of student personnel services, but only one appeared so different or unique as to require reporting further here. This one, which demands more than a cursory description, was a 1970 effort by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The study was published as Monograph #3 in April of 1970, and was entitled Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community. Since the division of research and program development of NASPA had, in 1966, undertaken a study of values, perceptions, and convictions of student personnel administrators, the division believed a further investigation was necessary within the academic community which would focus on assumptions and beliefs, this time, of specific other members of that academic community. The focus of the study was the role of the "dean of students" and perceptions of that role by these other members of the academic community. Five major groups of respondents were questioned. These were:

- 1) the chief personnel administrator,
- 2) the faculty,
- 3) the president of the institution
- 4) the president of the student body,
- 5) the editor of the student newspaper.

Each of these respondents completed a questionnaire which was designed to elicit responses about assumptions and beliefs in the areas of learning and student development, control of student behavior, campus governance, and the role as well as administrative style of the chief student personnel administrator of the institution. The comprehensive findings of the study are too lengthy to be reported here, but it is important to understand that the assumptions and beliefs of the students, faculty, and others involved in higher education relate closely to perceptions these people may have about student personnel services in general. The study seemed particularly well designed as exemplified by the attempt to elicit responses regarding assumptions and beliefs about the dean of students per se in advance of collecting and interpreting data regarding such things as student roles in the educational process, or campus governance and decision-making. It is the dean of students (still one of the more common titles for the chief student personnel administrator) who is responsible for the entire group of special functions which collectively make up the student personnel services program. Perceptions about underlying beliefs or underlying philosophies for such a total program are ultimately his responsibility in terms of interpretation or translation to practice of those underlying philosophies. In this connection, one or two major findings of the study are worth recounting.

There was strong support for the view that the chief student personnel administrator should be a student advocate and that his professional position

should be so structured as to make him highly accessible to students while at the same time reducing the possibility of his involvement in conflict with them. Particularly the student body presidents and student newspaper editors felt that the chief student personnel administrator should avoid conflict with students on virtually any issue so that it would be easier to "relate" to him. The other major finding was that institutional presidents, apparently feel the chief student personnel administrator should not have, within his primary function, any commitment to student advocacy. Many presidents felt that the major responsibility of the chief student personnel administrator should be maintenance of control on the campus, the enforcement of moral standards, and continuance of "order." Further, such functions should not detract from his other activities. Much of the contemporary literature contradicts the presidents' views, particularly in that other study findings reveal nearly every other constituent group on the campus perceiving a clear conflict between so-called "disciplinary functions" and student advocacy or counseling functions.

Some observations of Dutton, Appleton, and Birch, reflecting the findings of the study, had major implications for the rationale for the present study. They believed that,

Many deans seem not to have a clear conception of their values. Others may understand what they believe, but they fail to espouse vigorously their values out of fear of straining relationships . . . what should be the response of the dean when he is confronted with an important value

judgment? First, he must examine his personal values and convictions and the values and objectives of the academic community. Secondly, he must move to a decision based on the result of his examination....having decided where he stands on an issue he must feed this viewpoint into the decision-making process and actively seek an outcome that has educational merit.

The authors point out that process of examination and decision-making is difficult and requires courage to place one's values above those perceived to be held by the institution when they are in conflict. These statements raised, but did not answer the question that in one sense precipitated the present study: would not the acceptance by the profession of student personnel of a basic underlying philosophy reduce the potential for such frequent conflicts between value judgments of the chief student personnel administrator and those of the others in the academic community--particularly if there were some agreement among a number of individuals and constituent bodies as to what the underlying philosophy should be?

Summary

In nearly all studies of evaluation of activity in the field of student personnel services, the focus was on specific functions, specific services, or programs which student personnel specialists often perform and, as well, on whether respondents in the various studies agreed that specific and separate student personnel services were either: a) generally known about by the campus community at large, or b) approved of or "important." Further, it appears generally true that, as Ross (1967) stated:

While there is a considerable body of knowledge concerning the field of student personnel work, very little has been reported [even] on the evaluation of student personnel programs.

This statement could be carried one step further to indicate that almost nothing has been reported in the literature regarding a study on underlying philosophies for what is viewed by student personnel staff as the field itself. It also appears that recognized authorities in student personnel cannot agree on definitions for the field.

In all the literature related to definitions or evaluations in student personnel services and in all the studies examined, the only measurement procedure discovered was the survey method which, of course, depends upon opinions and feelings of various constituent groups or individuals. Such surveys are the most popular research tool in student personnel work, in part because information obtained from the surveys may provide a base for comparison of one

kind of evaluation vs. another. Each study is limited in scope, particularly to the institution within whose confines the survey was completed, and because each of the individuals doing surveys tended to develop instruments which would serve a particular purpose at a particular time.

Chapter III

Design and Organization of the Study

Introduction

As noted in Chapter II, most studies regarding student personnel have been evaluative of the services and, in all cases perused, the eventual focus was on specific functions or procedures which student personnel workers performed. Almost all such studies were completed by the use of the survey method. This method does incorporate several distinctive faults, one of which is the lack of unbiased control groups, another the difficulty in controlling all variables but the one being studied. However, a major difficulty with other approaches, e.g., the developmental or longitudinal approach, is that they are often costly, particularly in terms of time. Of course, each method has its own limitations and as Wrenn (1951) stated, "there is no fool-proof research design."

The survey method was used in this study, largely because it was the most convenient method to collect the data required and to apply measurements of comparison and variability. Consistency was also a factor; no studies in the general student personnel area were found which used any other method. The most important reason, however, was so that the study could not be perceived as an attempt at analyzing data related to some special or esoteric function within student personnel or as another evaluation

of practice in the field, but rather an exploration of understandings and perceptions of the basic philosophies which should, do, or may, underlie student personnel services. This very basic approach to help define and provide a philosophic base for student personnel services was seemingly best aided by a comparison study which used much descriptive and demographic data in the development of findings capable of analysis.

Procedures

Instrument. A two-page questionnaire was used in this study (see Appendix B). Page one was primarily a self-report of demographic and experiential data about the respondent. Some questions were divided into sections to be answered by only one group or another of the respondents. The second page of the questionnaire was devoted exclusively to a one-paragraph description of what student personnel services appear to be on most American campuses and four one-paragraph statements of philosophies developed by the author which could underlie student personnel services on any campus. The four philosophical positions were written as extractions from existing philosophies of general education.

The four philosophical positions are:

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| 1) neo-humanist | 2) rationalist |
| 3) instrumentalist | 4) integralist |

Three of the four come originally from Harold Taylor (1951) reported primarily by Lloyd-Jones (1951). The fourth comes from Tollefson and Bristow (1964). These four were selected over the dozens of others possible partly because, as Taylor himself says,

No philosophical concept or philosophy of education ever appears in actual existence as a pure form, and no matter how an educator tries, he cannot build an educational institution upon conceptions which then reproduce themselves in reality.

But Brunson and Lloyd-Jones and Smith exemplify the student person-

nel authors who agree that the Taylor positions can represent a logical approach. Taylor's philosophical bases and Lloyd-Jones' interpretations in light of student personnel practice provide at least some underpinnings for a philosophic base.

One other factor influencing the use of Taylor's philosophical conceptions was their use in other studies. For example, Crookston, Keist, Miller, and Ivey (1966) used Taylor's positions in soliciting responses of "parents, students, student leaders, academic and student personnel faculty to the educational mission of the University" as part of a study of attitudes concerning University-student relationships.

The fourth position, the integralist, as propounded by Tollefson and Bristow, is included because, as Tollefson describes it (1971), it is the only new, intact philosophy to be deliberately designed around the existence of cohesive student personnel services and as the only new philosophy since Taylor's conceptions. Excepting certain sections of Crookston's Organizational Model for Student Development (1970), "it appears as opposed to fuzzy goals and objectives, expected outcomes, or ambiguous definitions."

Tollefson indicated three major differences between the neo-humanist, rationalist, or instrumentalist philosophies and the integralist philosophy:

1. The integralist is the only one which appears to lend genuine freedom of choice to the student.

2. It is unitary as opposed to being segmentary or pluralistic.

3. It fits directly with and was developed specifically out of the contemporary objectives of higher education.

There are dozens of other philosophies of both education in general and higher education in particular. Brubacher's Modern Philosophies of Education (1962), Rich's (ed.) Readings in the Philosophies of Education (1959) and Park's Selected Readings in the Philosophy of Education (1963) exhibit such "isms" as: progressivism, existentialism, idealism, pragmatism, and realism. These helped determine the author's selection of Taylor's conceptions and Tollefson's extension as most applicable to the student personnel group in higher education. Lloyd-Jones appears to reinforce the selection stating in this regard:

Taylor has categorized the philosophical principles that underlie programs of education into three general divisions, with which most educational philosophers would agree, in general, although some would break them down into more than three.

The Sample Population. Three categories of individuals affiliated in some way with Oregon State University were chosen to be sampled:

- 1) junior and senior (upper-division) undergraduate students,
- 2) parents of those students,
- 3) members of the teaching faculty of the University.

Students were selected for somewhat obvious reasons and because registered students are the primary target population of student personnel services. Parents of those students were selected because (a) they carry the tax burden of providing higher education in the state of Oregon; because (b) stu-

personnel administrators often verbalize intuitive feelings that no one besides themselves, especially persons outside higher education, knows what they do or why; because (c) Bailey's Study, reported in Chapter II, indicated that "non-academic" persons perceived student personnel services more positively than other groups at the college, but it was questioned whether they could perceive them at all.

Faculty were selected because (a) of the feelings verbalized by student personnel administrators as in (b) above; (b) they have, either in groups such as faculty senates or individually, much to say about operation of institutions in terms of representative input to administrative systems; (c) faculty have historically had and continue to have what are now perceived as student personnel functions to perform; (d) faculty themselves differ sharply, as noted in such works as Caplow and McGee's The Academic Marketplace (1965), on the issue of any pervasive philosophy to underlie faculty activities even within a given single department of the University.

A stratified random sample was selected for the student and parent sample groups by computer, utilizing University lists and rosters for these categories. Junior or senior undergraduate status by Oregon State University definition was calculated and separated by computer and a random sample drawn from this population. The computer printed out on mailing labels the entire faculty list from which a random sample was hand drawn. Those faculty members not on full-time teaching status or teaching at other than main

campus locations were eliminated. Subjects from this portion of the sampled population were chosen using a table of random digits. The total n for the study was 1000 divided into the three categories as follows:

junior and senior undergraduate students	= 400,
those students' parents	= 400,
teaching faculty members	= 200.

Data Collection. A mailing was made to all individuals in the sample populations. The United States mails were used to forward questionnaires to all parents included in the sample group as well as those students who did not have a campus address. The Oregon State University campus mail was utilized for those respondents with a campus address. "Drop-off" boxes were placed at several locations on the campus in order to facilitate return of the questionnaires. The cover letter (see Appendix A) which accompanied each questionnaire indicated that the completed questionnaire could be returned by U.S. mail in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. Table No. I on the following page shows the number and percent of completed and returned questionnaires from the total sample. Although some personal contacts were made with both students and faculty who had failed to return completed questionnaires, the net result of the follow-up did not statistically or significantly affect the percentage return from the distribution.

Statistical Procedure. Descriptive and demographic data were tabled and analyzed and indicative descriptive patterns reported. Not all demographic data were compared with or measured against inferential data as the

TABLE I
 QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RETURNED
 BY THE THREE SAMPLED GROUPS

SAMPLED GROUPS	NUMBER IN SAMPLE	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT RETURNED COMPLETED*
STUDENTS	400	228	57.0
PARENTS	400	165	41.3
FACULTY	200	115	57.5
 TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRES	 1000	 508	 50.8

* Except in the tables for expected and χ^2 values, which were computer-derived and carried to 2 or 3 decimal places, percentages in all tables are reported to 1 decimal place.

addition of further null hypotheses would have broadened the scope and intent of the study to such an extent that revealing data might well have been obscured in terms of their importance.

The chi-square test of independence was used to determine the consistency of response patterns for the various groups or the significance of difference in responses between and among the sample groups. All hypotheses were tested to the .05 level of significance.

The decision was made to restrict the exposition to non-paired chi-square data in order to demonstrate the deliberately rudimentary as well as basic philosophic nature of the study.

As well as the desire to maintain simplicity, there was no means of providing reasonable security of matched student responses with those of their parents. For those returns about which there was complete sureness of pairing, there was an insufficient number to be pair tested.

Paired data comparisons might have been utilized, particularly to remove variations due to pairing characteristics between the sampled students and sampled parents. These would perhaps have yielded a more powerful test than the chi-square test of independence based on non-paired data. However, a particularly powerful test was neither required nor desired. In fact, it might have been possible to use ANOVA (analysis of variance) procedures. Lunney (1970) studied appropriate statistical comparison tests and concluded, among other findings, that:

Often investigators spend much time developing instruments which will yield scores that can be analyzed with parametric statistical tests. If the data they obtain is dichotomous, they use a chi-square test. Complex chi-square tests have been developed, but most of them are difficult to compute...

Lunney showed that, even in some cases with continuous variables as well as dichotomous ones, the use of ANOVA may be well justified for the kinds of measurement and data-recording procedures often done in the statistical research areas of the social sciences.

All data were tabulated according to at least two variables of classification, thus making most appropriate the test for association between these variables by chi-square procedures. Use of such tables, normally called contingency tables, and the appropriate null hypothesis to be tested results in determining that the two classifications are independent, i.e., the probability that an observation will fall in a particular row or column is not affected by the particular row or column to which it may belong. Thus, not rejecting a null hypothesis means one can be confident that the two variables are thus dependent or somehow correlated. In an analysis of data for this study, the variables of classification are groups of people and characteristic categories such as demographic background, present life-style, etc.. The contingency tables thus shown, for example as Nos. VII and VIII, are easily understood.

Therefore, a null hypothesis utilizing such data set down in tables could be phrased in two ways, "the characteristic being tested is independent of the group from which an individual comes and there is no difference between

groups in relation to the characteristic one is testing," or more typically, "no significant difference exists between ...".

Mathematically:

$H_0 : p_{ij} = p_{i.} \cdot p_{.j} \cdot (i= 1,2;\dots,j= 1,2,\dots,c)$ where, p_{ij} = probability of a random object falling in the cell of the i -th row and the j -th column. $p_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^c p_{ij}$ and $p_{.j} = p_{1j} + p_{2j} + \dots + p_{cj}$ with c = number of columns in the table. It can be shown (Wine, 1965) that: $\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^c (n_{ij} - \hat{e}_{ij})^2 / \hat{e}_{ij}$ is approximately χ^2 distributed with $c - 1$ d.f. where n_{ij} = observed frequency in cell ij and \hat{e}_{ij} = estimates of the expected frequency in the i -th row and the j -th column using maximum likelihood estimates for p_{ij} : $\hat{e}_{ij} = n_{i.} \cdot n_{.j} / n$ where $n_{i.}$ = the observed total for row i , then $n_{.j}$ = the observed total for column j and n = the total number of cases in a given contingency table.

Like all statistical analyses, the chi-square is based on certain assumptions if the analysis is to produce dependable results. Particularly for a study such as this, one essential limitation must be recognized: the chi-square is limited to frequency kinds of data. The category may be defined by a measurement, but the raw data within the category are counted for the data to be analyzed. Measurements themselves cannot be analyzed by chi-square.

In certain of the tables, it should be noted that raw data and frequencies would result in small expected values. In some cases, it might have been possible to apply Yates' correction (Chase, 1967) where degrees of freedom

equalled one and no expected frequency should be less than five, but small cells would not and could not distort the results. As Chase puts it,

If cell categories can be reasonably combined to eliminate small cell expectancies this alternative may be considered. However, a posteriori manipulations tend to deteriorate experimental sophistication.

Chapter IV

Results of the Study

Discussion of Demographic & Descriptive Data Findings

All of the descriptive data were tabulated by respondent groups, i.e., students, parents, and faculty. Table V is shown as an aggregation of Tables II, III, and IV for questions answered by all respondents and Table VI is an aggregation of data from Tables II, III and IV in summary terms for questions answered by all respondents.

Results: Table II. Table II displays raw and percentage data from the responses of students to the questionnaire. Nearly 60% of the student respondents were native Oregonians, although a stratified random sample of all upper-division students of the University was selected. Whether or not this statistical percentage of responses from native Oregonians fits with the percentage of native Oregonians attending Oregon State University who were in their junior or senior undergraduate years was not verified. The study did not measure any relationship between a student's native status and his philosophical position choice for student personnel services, although this was tested for the parent sample. The status of native Oregonians for student respondents does not specifically relate to the design of the study. However, this might well be a question of interest to a researcher studying only Oregon students.

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS
TO ALL QUESTIONS GERMANE TO THEM.

n = 228.

QUESTION	n	%
1. Native Oregonian		
a) Yes	131	57.5
b) No	97	42.5
2. Age		
a) 19 (mean age 21.3)	17	7.5
b) 20 (median age 21.5)	39	17.1
c) 21 (modal age 21)	72	31.5
d) 22	43	18.9
e) 23	54	23.7
f) unanswered	3	1.3
3. Sex		
a) Male	138	60.5
b) Female	89	39.0
c) Unspecified	1	.5
4. Did Subject Live in University Housing?		
a) Yes	22	9.6
b) No	206	90.4
14. Services with which the subject has had contact, (dealing with professional or administrative staff member.)		
a) Counseling Center	57	25.0
b) Housing Office	107	46.9
c) Placement and Career Planning	50	21.9
d) Admissions Office	94	41.2
e) College Union and Student Activities	132	57.9

TABLE II - continued

QUESTION	n	%
f) Health Service	189	82.9
g) Orientation	73	32.0
h) Registrar	120	52.6
i) Financial Aids	103	45.2
j) Office of International Education	11	4.8
k) Judicial or Disciplinary Boards	26	11.4
l) Dean of Students Office	49	21.5
Aggregate responses, with some contact	223	97.8
without contact	5	2.2
15. Rating of experience with professional or administrative staff member		
a) Positive	122	53.5
b) Negative	25	11.0
c) Neutral	79	34.6
d) Unknown	2	.9
16. Subject's preferred philosophical position		
a) Neo-humanist	48	21.1
b) Rationalist	24	10.5
c) Instrumentalist	41	17.9
d) Integralist	98	43.0
e) Did not agree with any of above	8	3.5
f) Unusable, unknown, or missing	9	4.0

Responses to question number two regarding age were sought since it was believed that a large percentage of responses from other than the 18 through 25 year-old age group might have skewed statistical results regarding philosophical position choice. However, as can be seen from Table II, this situation was not encountered.

Question three regards sex of respondents. While not an equal breakdown in terms of the random sample selected, the data correlate with the sex ratio of upper-division undergraduate students attending Oregon State University. There are considerably fewer women students than men, owing in part to the nature of the institution.

Question number four was included to allow for an additional hypothesis regarding respondent's residence in terms of his philosophical position choices. Because less than 10% of the entire sample actually lived in university provided housing at the time of completion of the questionnaire, a hypothesis measuring relationship between place of residence and philosophical position choice was not tested.

Table II next displays information about student personnel services within which the subject respondent had had contact with a professional or administrative staff member in a specific department. While it might be challenged that contact with a student personnel staff member could be characterized as purely administrative, the results as related on Table II appear self-evident. The most significant result is the aggregate response, in

which it was discovered that nearly all student respondents had had some kind of contact with a professional or administrative staff member (or believed they had) in at least one of the student personnel services and, as noted by the responses to question number 15, felt that the experience with that professional staff member in more than one-half the cases had been positive. The data indicate that more than one-third of the student respondents felt completely neutral about their experiences with a professional student personnel worker.

Question number 16 was considered the "key" question and was used as the basis for testing all hypotheses. Nearly one-half the student respondents (43%) believed that the integralist philosophy should be that underlying student personnel services, at least on the Oregon State University campus. The next most popular response, the neo-humanist position, showed only one-half the number of responses as the integralist and only 28% of the student response believed that either the rationalist or instrumentalist philosophy should underlie student personnel services. Only eight students did not agree that any of the philosophical positions were appropriate (3.5%). The questionnaire asked that those responding with position choice E, (that they did not agree with any of the above positions), note on the back of the questionnaire why they may have disagreed with any of the statements. Some of these results are reproduced later in Chapter IV.

Nine students drew arrows linking one or more of the position choices,

drew large question marks covering the entire second page of the questionnaire, crossed out certain words considered to be "key" words in the philosophical position choices, or added words to the four position choices which, in the opinion of the author, invalidated the position choice in terms of intent. Such actions were reported as unuseable, unknown, or "missing data" and are reported as such on the contingency tables relating the chi-square data.

Results: Table III. Table III displays raw and percentage data from the responses of parents to all questions germane to them. Less than one-half the parents sampled were native Oregonians as displayed by the responses to question number one. Whether or not this statistical percentage of responses from parents who were native Oregonians fits with any percentage which could be generated for native Oregonians who are parents of college students attending Oregon State University was not and could not be easily verified. As well, such data was of no significance in terms of the present study. In contrast however, one hypothesis (number six) used a chi-square measurement relating native Oregonian parents and non-native Oregonian parents with the philosophical position choice. This is reflected in discussion of the data generated from Table XII.

Question number two dealt with age of the parent respondent group and was included in the questionnaire for much the same reason as the age request was included in the student responses. A large percentage of responses from any age group at the far lower or upper ends of chronological age

TABLE III

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES OF
PARENTS TO ALL QUESTIONS GERMANE TO THEM.

n = 165

QUESTION	n	%
1. Native Oregonian		
a) Yes	74	44.9
b) No	91	55.1
2. Age		
a) 45 or under	15	9.1
b) 46-50 (mean age 49.8)	63	38.2
c) 51-55 (median age 51)	49	29.7
d) 56-60 (modal age 50)	17	10.3
e) Over 60	7	4.2
f) Unanswered	14	8.5
3. Sex		
a) Male	71	43.0
b) Female	85	51.5
c) Unspecified	9	5.5
4. Highest level of formal education		
a) Elementary School	3	1.8
b) High School	70	42.3
c) College	62	37.6
d) Graduate School	29	17.6
e) Unknown	1	.6
5. Highest level of formal education of spouse		
a) Elementary School	5	3.0
b) High School	73	44.3
c) College	63	38.2
d) Graduate School	19	11.5
e) Unknown	5	3.0

TABLE III - continued

QUESTION	n	%
7. Did subject attend Oregon State:		
a) Yes	36	21.8
b) No	54	32.7
c) Not Applicable	75	45.5
8. Did subject's spouse attend Oregon State?		
a) Yes	28	17.0
b) No	54	32.7
c) Not Applicable	83	50.3
9. Occupation of primary wage earner in family		
a) Agriculture (Farmer-Rancher)	15	9.1
b) Trades and Labor	41	24.8
c) Clerical	7	4.2
d) Semi-professional	50	30.3
e) Professional	31	18.9
f) Retired, Unemployed or Disabled	4	2.4
g) Unclassified (13) or Unknown (4)	17	10.3
14. Services with which the subject has had contact (dealing with a professional staff member)		
a) Counseling Center	17	10.3
b) Housing Office	20	12.1
c) Placement and Career Planning	39	23.6
d) Admissions Office	39	23.6
e) College Union and Student Activities	56	33.9
f) Health Services (and Mental Health Clinic)	64	38.8
g) Orientation	19	11.5
h) Registrar	52	31.5
i) Financial Aids	15	9.1
j) Office of International Education	3	1.8
k) Judicial or Disciplinary Boards	1	.6
l) Dean of Students Office	39	23.6
Aggregate responses, with some contact	86	52.8
without contact	79	47.2

TABLE III - continued

QUESTION	n	%
15. Rating of experience with professional or administrative staff member		
a) Positive	47	28.5
b) Negative	7	4.2
c) Neutral	29	17.6
d) Not applicable	82	49.7
16. Subject's preferred philosophical position.		
a) Neo-humanist	64	38.7
b) Rationalist	27	16.4
c) Instrumentalist	25	15.2
d) Integralist	39	23.6
e) Did not agree with any of above	10	6.1

scales for parents would have challenged the validity of chi-square measurements regarding philosophical position choice and the randomness of the parent sample. As was the case with the student response, however, the mean, median, and modal ages of all parents responding to the questionnaire fell in a fairly narrow range.

Question number three (as was the case with Table II regarding student responses) dealt with the sex of parent respondents. There were some author expectations that the female sample return might be considerably higher than the male sample, due to the fact that questionnaires were mailed to the homes of parent respondents. However, nearly as many male respondents in the parent sample completed the questionnaire as female respondents with only 5% left unspecified.

Questions numbered five and six requested the highest level of formal education of both the parent respondent and spouse, in part to determine what percentage of the total parent sample had attended a college or university.

Questions numbered seven and eight made more specific the results from questions numbered five and six and determined whether or not the respondent or the respondent's spouse attended Oregon State University. Aggregate figures would be difficult and unwieldy both to measure and utilize in these categories, but percentage statistics showed that nearly half the respondents had not attended college and that even closer to half the spouses of the

responding parents had not attended any college or university. Time and scope of study factors precluded a hypothesis dealing further with this data. It was not necessary to test a hypothesis regarding attendance at Oregon State University, since over 75% of both the responding parents and their spouses did not attend that institution.

Occupation of primary family wage earner was tested in question number nine. While the responses entered on the questionnaire stated specific (or nearly as specific as they could say) "occupation" of the primary wage earner in the family, these specifics were translated into a series of seven classifications shown as letters "a" through "g" on the questionnaire. The "g" section dealt with unclassified or unknown occupations which fit into none of the other specific categories. Again, time and scope of study factors precluded the testing of a hypothesis with respect to philosophical position choice and occupation of primary family wage earner.

In terms of only the parent sample, the aggregate response to question number 14 is the most significant outcome, perhaps the only one worthy of discussion here. Of the total number of parents attaining a formal educational level equating with college or university, over half had had some contact with a professional staff member in one of the student personnel services. In the original projected null hypotheses, there was one regarding significant difference in perception of a philosophical base for student personnel services between parents who had had contact with a professional staff member and those who had not, much as null hypothesis number seven dealt

with this subject in terms of student responses. This hypothesis was eliminated in the final set tested in order to simplify and clarify the intent of the study and its expected outcomes. As might be expected from results of the previous question, nearly one-half the parent response to question number 15 was not applicable. Of the applicable responses, however, most were positive in terms of inclination of the parent respondent sample.

Question number 16 was again the "key" question and used as a basis for testing all hypotheses in terms of the intent of the study. Nearly 40% of the parent sample believed that a philosophy described as neo-humanist should be the one adopted by student personnel services of the institution which their dependents were attending. The neo-humanist philosophy implies, in large part and for purposes of the study, an in-loco-parentis approach to the registered student. It is equally significant that the integralist philosophy stood next to the neo-humanist in terms of parent response with the rationalist and instrumentalist philosophies both garnering only approximately 16% of the remaining responses.

Ten parents did not agree that any of the philosophical positions should underlie student personnel services (6.1%). Those responding with position choice E were requested to note on the back of the questionnaire, if they wished, why they disagreed with any or all of the philosophical position statements. Samples of these statements are reproduced later in Chapter IV.

None of the parents invalidated a position choice with an attempt to cross out, add words to, or otherwise change parts of the philosophical position choice they circled. Perhaps this means only that parents are more conditioned to certain kinds of responses to questionnaires or are perhaps less inclined to challenge validity or approach.

Results: Table IV. Table IV displays raw and percentage data of responses from faculty to all questions germane to them. Nearly 90% of the faculty sample were not native Oregonians and this question was included only to ascertain if a hypothesis might be tested from a statistically significant sample dealing with differences in approach of native vs. non-native Oregonians to philosophical position choices.

Somewhat the same rationale was used for question number two, again regarding age. A large number of the respondents falling at either end of a broad age scale had potential to skew results of the study for faculty respondents as with the parent sample. While the mean, median, and modal ages did appear as somewhat lower than author-expected chronological levels, they did fall in a relatively narrow range. Nearly 70% of the faculty response came from faculty members between the ages of 36 and 60.

Again, as was expected, the question regarding sex generated more than an 80% response from male faculty members. This is indicative of the percentage of male vs. female teaching faculty members at Oregon State University.

TABLE IV

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES OF
FACULTY TO ALL QUESTIONS GERMANE TO THEM.

n = 115

QUESTION	n	%
1) Native Oregonian		
a) Yes	13	11.3
b) No	102	88.7
2. Age		
a) Under 35	26	22.6
b) 36-45 (mean age 43.5)	41	35.6
c) 46-60 (median age 42)	38	33.0
d) Over 60 (modal age 45)	4	3.5
e) Unanswered	6	5.2
3. Sex		
a) Male	96	83.5
b) Female	17	14.8
c) Unspecified	2	1.7
12. Does subject teach in his specific field?		
a) Yes	103	89.6
b) No	10	8.7
c) Unknown	2	1.7
13. Approximate size of subject's "alma mater" at the time his degree was granted		
a) 0-2500	1	0.9
b) 2500-5000	6	5.2
c) 5000-10000	24	20.9
d) 10001-over	81	70.4
e) Unknown	3	2.6

TABLE IV - continued

QUESTION	n	%
14. Services with which the subject has had contact (dealing with professional or administrative staff member)		
a) Counseling Center	26	22.6
b) Housing Office	66	57.4
c) Placement and Career Planning	48	41.7
d) Admissions Office	59	51.3
e) College Union and Student Activities	58	50.4
f) Health Service	82	71.3
g) Orientation	21	18.3
h) Registrar	52	45.2
i) Financial Aids	36	31.3
j) Office of International Education	14	12.2
k) Judicial or Disciplinary Boards	2	1.7
l) Dean of Students Office	20	17.4
Aggregate response with some contact	106	92.2
without contact	9	7.8
15. Rating of experience with professional or administrative staff member		
a) Positive	62	53.9
b) Negative	11	9.6
c) Neutral	25	21.7
d) Unknown	1	0.9
e) Not answered	16	13.9
16. Subjects' preferred philosophical position		
a) Neo-humanist	11	9.6
b) Rationalist	37	32.2
c) Instrumentalist	16	13.9
d) Integralist	37	32.2
e) Did not agree with any of above	9	7.8
f) Unusable, Unknown, or Missing	5	4.3

Question number 12 determined whether the faculty member was teaching in the field of primary preparation. It was felt that if a significant number of faculty were teaching in disciplines different from those in which they had been trained, this might have generated a comparison with a philosophical position choice. However, such a hypothesis was untestable since nearly 90% of the subjects did teach in the field of their primary preparation.

Question number 13 dealt with the approximate size of the respondent's "alma mater" when the highest earned degree was awarded. Such data were requested in order to generate interest beyond the scope of the present study to deal with responses only of faculty regarding philosophical position choices for student personnel. This is in concert with prior comments regarding certain of the data from Table III in terms of parent responses. Approximately 70% of the faculty members had earned their highest academic degree from an institution of over 10,000 registered students. Ninety per cent of the faculty respondents had graduated from an institution of over 5,000 registered students.

Question number 14 echoed those for students and parents, and was concerned with those student personnel services in which the faculty respondent had had some contact with a professional or administrative staff member. The aggregate responses were again most significant with over 92% of the faculty responding to such contact at some point in their academic careers. Coupling this response to the results of question number 15, the rating of

the experience with a professional staff member is also significant. Only half, approximately, of the respondents felt that their experience with such a staff member had been positive and nearly as many faculty as students felt that the experience had been negative (as will also be shown from data from Table V). Nearly 14% of the faculty respondents did not answer this question.

In terms of respondents' preferred philosophical position, the faculty were evenly split between the rationalist (B) and the integralist (D) philosophies. While the percentage of responses was significantly greater for the rationalist position than for the neo-humanist or instrumentalist, faculty apparently were as disposed toward the integralist theory as the rationalist. Nine faculty members, or 7.8% of the respondents, did not agree with any of the four underlying structured philosophies. Samples of written faculty comments are reported later in Chapter IV.

Five faculty members in some way altered or linked the four position choices which invalidated such positions. One faculty member circled no position choice which consequently became "missing data."

Results: Table V. Table V is an aggregation of Tables II, III and IV. Insofar as each has been reported individually, comments in this section will relate exclusively to comparisons among the three respondent groups.

Native status of all respondents has been discussed in terms of Tables II, III and IV and warrants no further comments. This is also appro-

priate for questions two and three regarding age and sex of respondents. A more significant finding is noted with respect to question number 14 which regards contact with a professional staff member in student personnel services. Both students and faculty showed a high number and percentage of contact, but only slightly over one-half the parent respondents had ever had any contact with a professional staff member. Some implied meanings of this data will be found in the results of tests of hypotheses number seven and eight, although, as noted before, no hypothesis could be tested regarding the parent sample. It is likewise significant that less than one percentage point separates the responses of students and faculty regarding their experiences with student personnel staff members. In each case 53+% of the responses were positive toward the experience, while nearly 50% of the parents either did not respond or their responses were unknown. If tested with the appropriate statistical procedure, a high correlation would result, again between the responses of students and faculty in negative terms to their experiences with student personnel staff members, noting that 11% of the students and nearly 10% of the faculty both felt their experience had been negative. While only slightly over 4% of the parents felt that the experience was a negative one, parents again fell far below students and faculty in terms of rating their experiences neutral.

A side-by-side comparison of responses to the most important question on the questionnaire are revealing. In each case, less than 10% of the respondent group "did not agree" with any of the philosophical position choices,

TABLE V

AGGREGATION OF TABLES II, III, AND IV, FOR
 QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION	STUDENTS		PARENTS		FACULTY	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Native Oregonian						
Yes	131	57.5	74	44.9	13	11.3
No	97	42.5	91	55.1	102	88.7
2. Age						
Mean	21.3		49.8		43.5	
Median	21.5	51	51		42	
Modal	21		50		45	
3. Sex						
Male	138	60.5	71	43.0	96	83.5
Female	89	39.0	85	51.5	17	14.8
Unspecified	1	.5	9	5.5	2	1.7
14. Services with which the subject has had contact (dealing with professional or administrative staff members)						
Aggregate with some contact	223	97.8	86	52.8	106	92.2
without contact	5	2.2	79	47.2	9	7.8

TABLE V - continued

QUESTION	STUDENTS		PARENTS		FACULTY	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
15. Rating of experience						
positive	122	53.5	47	28.5	62	53.9
negative	25	11.0	7	4.2	11	9.6
neutral	79	34.6	29	17.6	25	21.7
Unknown or N/A	2	.9	82	49.7	17	14.8
16. Subject's preferred philosophical position						
A-neo-humanist	42	21.1	64	38.7	11	9.6
B-rationalist	24	10.5	27	16.4	37	32.2
C-instrumentalist	41	17.9	25	15.3	16	13.9
D-integralist	98	43.0	39	23.6	37	32.2
E-did not agree	8	3.5	10	6.1	9	7.8
F-unusable, unknown, or missing data	9	4.0	0	.0	5	4.3

the percentage falling to 3.5 in terms of the student responses. Such a side-by-side comparison also implies some of the findings from the most important hypothesis tested in the study, the results of which are reported on Table VII in terms of hypothesis number one. There was a relatively clear preference for the integralist (D) position on the part of students, and a fairly strong preference on the part of parent respondents for the neo-humanist (A) position. Nearly as strong a response as that of parents for the neo-humanist position was given to the rationalist position on the part of the faculty, although faculty respondents believed as strongly in the integralist (D) position. Less than 18% of any of the respondent groups believed the instrumentalist position (C) to be the appropriate one.

Results: Table VI. Totaling the results of all raw and percentage data from Tables II, III and IV provided more information of a descriptive nature. Questions answered by all respondents dealt with native Oregonian status, sex, services with which the respondent had contact with a professional or administrative staff member in student personnel, a rating of that experience, and the subjects' preferred philosophical position choice. The raw data from each of these five common questions is displayed in Table VI in summary form. This aggregation of data was completed as a means of pursuing information as though data from the three respondent groups combined would serve as a single large sample of a total population.

The results from question number one showed that nearly half the total sample from among the three groups were native Oregonians.

TABLE VI

AGGREGATION OF DATA FROM TABLES II, III AND IV
FOR QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION	n	%
1. Native Oregonian		
a) Yes	218	42.9
b) No	290	57.1
3. Sex		
a) Male	305	60.1
b) Female	191	37.5
c) Unspecified	12	2.4
14. Services with which the subject has had contact (dealing with professional or administrative staff member)		
a) Counseling Centre	100	19.6
b) Housing Office	193	37.9
c) Placement and Career Planning	137	26.9
d) Admissions Office	192	37.7
e) College Union and Student Activities	246	48.4
f) Health Service (and Mental Health Clinic)	335	65.9
g) Orientation	113	22.2
h) Registrar	224	44.0
i) Financial Aids	154	30.3
j) Office of International Education	120	23.6
k) Judicial or Disciplinary Boards	29	5.7
l) Dean of Student Office	108	21.2
Aggregate response with some contact	415	81.7
without contact	93	18.3

TABLE VI - continued

QUESTION	n	%
15. Rating of experience with professional or administrative staff member		
a) Positive	231	45.4
b) Negative	43	8.5
c) Neutral	133	26.2
d) Unknown	3	.6
e) Not Applicable	98	19.3
16. Subjects preferred philosophical position		
a) Neo-humanist	122	24.0
b) Rationalist	88	17.3
c) Instrumentalist	32	16.1
d) Integralist	174	34.2
e) Did not agree with any of above	27	5.3
f) Unusable, Unknown, or Missing data	14	2.8

Since almost nothing has been reported to this point about the individual and specific student personnel services with which a subject or respondent had contact in dealing with a professional staff person, mention should be made of responses to these specific contacts. Nearly 20% of the total sample population had had contact with a student personnel professional (presumably a counselor) in the Counseling Center. This is a slightly higher than expected percentage in light of statistics from the Oregon State University Counseling Center for the years 1969 through 1971, which report that approximately 12% of the total student population in any one year had some contact with a professional counselor (extracted from the annual reports of that Counseling Centre). Approximately 10% of the parent sample had had such contact in terms of the Counseling Center, yet faculty members responding indicated that 22% of them had had such contact. The student response was even larger with an even 25% report of contact with professionals in the Counseling Center.

Of the total sample, somewhat less than 40% had contact with someone in the housing office. Only 12% of the parents responded this way while nearly 60% of the faculty members claimed this kind of contact. The faculty figure is much closer to that of the student response who claimed a nearly 50% contact.

Of the 27% of the total sample response to contact with a Placement and Career Planning student personnel "officer," the faculty were by far the

most frequent claimants of contacts with personnel in this service at a 41% rate, while the average among the other three was approximately 23%.

Proceeding to statistics regarding contact with a professional staff member in the Health Services area, nearly 83% of the students had had some contact with someone in the Health Services while less than 40% of the parent sample responded with report of such contact. This may be due in part to the significant change in Health Services offered over the years.

A general pattern follows with respect to statistics regarding contact with members or administrators on judicial or disciplinary boards. Only one parent reported such contact while two faculty members reported this and 26 of the students checked this response. This may also relate to the differences in structures of the judicial and disciplinary boards occurring over time, but a separate study would be required to determine perceptions about "getting into trouble" and the move from these particular terms of reference for judicial and disciplinary boards during the time the parent sample may have attended college toward "helping" functions which present disciplinary boards profess to perform.

The Dean of Students office on most campuses is the office of the chief student personnel administrator for that campus. The parent sample reported nearly 23% of those responding having had such contact and the faculty and student responses were approximately 17% and 20% respectively. Speculatively, the parent sample may have been responding to the Dean of Students' office

as a disciplinary agency. Disciplinary functions were typically performed by a "Dean of Men" or "Dean of Women" at many American institutions during the time the parent sample may have been attending college. Such disciplinary functions have continued until recent years in many colleges.

Over 80% of the total sample population had some contact with a student personnel administrator; this has implications for the general results of the study as measured by null hypotheses number one and number two, dealing with consistencies in response patterns and reported beginning on the following page.

The ratings of experience with a professional or administrative staff member have been recorded previously in terms of separate group responses. Nearly one-half, or 45.4% of the total sample having had contact with a student personnel professional felt their experience had been positive and approximately one-quarter, or 26.2%, felt neutral about their experiences. Only 8.5% of all respondents felt that the experience had definitely been negative in nature.

One of the most significant findings from the study came from the aggregation of data from Tables II, III and IV respecting the subject's preferred philosophical position choices. Consistent with the individual sample excepting the parents, approximately 35% of the total sample group believed the integralist theory ought to underlie student personnel services, following with the neo-humanist philosophy choice. The rationalist and instrumentalist choices were both considerably behind with 17.3% and 16.1% res-

pectively of the total preferences. These percentage results have important implications in terms of the outlook and intent of the entire study and supporting data from Tables VII through XV will follow and lead to a number of important implications and conclusions as reported in Chapter V.

Results of Test Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis Number One. This reads as follows:

No consistent response pattern exists among all respondents for a single perception of a philosophical base for student personnel services as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

An examination of Table VII on the page following shows that the chi-square measurement at the .05 level of confidence (reported as the χ^2_{α}) equalled 12.592. The measured chi-square for the Table at six degrees of freedom was 58.366 and the expected values are as shown. Clearly, hypothesis one was rejected as the chi-square values fell far beyond the range of acceptance. Columns E and F on the Table reflect expected values not large enough to be measured; those in Column E reflect a respondent's disagreement with any of the preferred philosophical position choices and those in Column F being undifferentiated positions, unuseable data, or missing data with respect to those same position choices. A perusal of this Table and a comparison of the measured chi-square against the critical chi-square validates the implication that all respondents believe very different things about philosophical bases which ought to underlie student personnel services. This is probably the single most important finding from the study and one with much broader implications from those inherent in the study itself. Null hypothesis number one is the broadest and most general of the null hypotheses tested in the study.

TABLE VII

NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS, PARENTS AND FACULTY FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #1.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS	48	21.1	55.57	24	10.5	39.76	41	17.9	37.05	98	43.0	78.62	8	9
PARENTS	64	38.7	40.82	27	16.4	29.21	25	16.2	27.22	39	23.6	57.75	10	0
FACULTY	11	9.4	26.60	37	32.2	19.03	16	13.9	17.74	37	32.2	37.63	9	5

$X^2 = 58.366 \dots @ 6 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots X^2_{\frac{1}{8}} = 12.592 \dots \dots \dots H_0 \#1 = \text{Reject}$

$X^2_{\frac{1}{4}} = .05$ level of confidence for all tables

*E = did not agree with any position choice and was thus not X^2 tested.

**F = undifferentiated position, missing, or unusable data.

Null Hypothesis Number Two. Table VIII on the following page presents the results of the test for null hypothesis number two, again with $\chi^2 = 12.592$. The measured chi-square for the Table was 40.505, leading to a rejection of null hypothesis number two. That hypothesis was developed as follows:

No consistent response pattern exists among all respondents who had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more of the student personnel services as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

Columns E and F in this Table, and for all the Tables following, i.e., IX through XIV, are as reported below Table VII.

As was the case with Table VII, the measured chi-square value fell far outside the range of acceptance leading to rejection, therefore, of the null hypothesis. Personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member, in terms of all respondents, therefore did not offer a preferred philosophical position choice.

Null Hypothesis Number Three. This reads as follows:

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled students and sampled parents as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

The chi-square test of independence revealed the expected values shown on Table number IX and resulted in a chi-square measurement of 23.737 @ 3 d.f., while the χ^2 for this Table = 7.815. From the chi-square test, it appears justifiable to state that there were significant differences in

TABLE VIII

NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS, PARENTS AND FACULTY FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS # 2.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS (n=223)	48	21.5	45.96	24	10.8	42.68	41	18.4	33.92	96	43.0	86.45	6	8
PARENTS	26	30.2	17.15	17	19.8	15.93	8	9.3	12.66	27	31.4	32.26	8	0
FACULTY (n=106)	10	9.4	20.89	37	34.9	19.40	13	12.3	15.42	35	33.0	39.29	9	2

$X^2 = 40.505$... @6 d.f. $X^2_a = 12.592$ $H_0\#2 = \text{Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII

**F = explanation under Table VII

TABLE IX

NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS AND PARENTS FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #3.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS	48	21.1	64.57	24	10.5	29.40	41	17.9	38.05	98	43.0	78.98	8	9
PARENTS	64	38.7	47.43	27	16.4	21.60	25	15.2	27.95	39	23.6	58.02	10	0

$\chi^2 = 23.737 \dots @ 3 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots \chi^2_a = 7.815 \dots \dots \dots H_0 \#3 \text{ Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII
 **F = explanation under Table VII

perceptions of the desired philosophy between the sampled students and sampled parents. Even from the raw data it is clear that students tended to favor the integralist point of view which was reported as philosophical position D, while their parents tended to favor philosophical position choice A, the neo-humanist. A further examination of Table IX shows the chi-square test of independence was significant at the 0.5 level and the null hypothesis was hence rejected.

Null Hypothesis Number Four. This null hypothesis deals again with the sampled students, but replaces the parent sample with the sampled faculty, hypothesizing that:

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled students and the sampled faculty as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

Table X clearly shows the raw and percentage data as well as the expected values giving a chi-square value of 29.371 @ 3 d.f. while the critical chi-square remains at 7.815 at the .05 level of confidence. The chi-square test of independence was significant at this .05 level for the null hypothesis and the hypothesis was rejected. The chi-square test of independence did reveal considerable discrepancy between the sampled students and the sampled faculty regarding their opinions about a philosophical position choice.

The differences between the sampled students and sampled parents as against sampled students and sampled faculty was noteworthy. The chi-square measurement between students and parents was not so high as that

TABLE X
 NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES
 OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #4.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS	48	21.1	39.90	24	10.5	41.25	41	17.9	38.55	98	43.0	91.30	8	9
FACULTY	11	9.6	19.10	37	32.2	19.75	16	13.9	18.45	37	32.2	43.70	9	5

$X^2 = 29.371 \dots @ 3 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots X^2_a = 7.815 \dots \dots \dots H_0 \text{ #4 Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII

**F = explanation under Table VII

measurement between student and the faculty responses, owing in part to the fact that sampled faculty members were more clearly divided on position choices between the rationalist and the integralist while the parent sample clearly favored the neo-humanist position. Of course, the student values remain constant with the integralist position garnering nearly one-half the total sampled choices.

Null Hypothesis Number Five.

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between the sampled parents and the sampled faculty as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

This null hypothesis was proposed in order to measure discrepancies between parents' views and those of faculty members. As may be seen in Table XI, the χ^2 at 7.815 was again used with the resulting chi-square measurement from expected values of 31.034 at 3 d.f.. Again, the chi-square value fell considerably outside the range of acceptance leading to a rejection of null hypothesis number five. The raw and percentage data fairly indicate the parental preference for the (A) or neo-humanist position and the faculty, while not favoring one position in any significant way, did favor other positions as opposed to the neo-humanist, those being the (B) or rationalist and the (D) or integralist position, each with expected values of 25.25 and 29.98 respectively. The chi-square test of independence was significant at the .05 level for the null hypothesis.

TABLE XI
NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES
OF PARENTS AND FACULTY FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #5.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
PARENTS	64	38.7	45.41	27	16.4	38.75	25	15.2	24.82	39	23.6	46.02	10	0
FACULTY	11	9.6	29.59	37	32.2	25.25	16	13.9	16.18	37	32.2	29.98	9	5

$X^2 = 31.034 \dots @ 3 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots \frac{X^2}{a} = 7.815 \dots \dots \dots H_0 \#5 \text{ Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII
 **F = explanation under Table VII

Null Hypothesis Number Six. This null hypothesis was included to determine whether there was an implied difference for philosophical positions between parents of students who were native Oregonians and those who were not native Oregonians, the implications being in terms of residence or native status impact upon parents' values regarding student personnel services in higher education. The hypothesis read:

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between those parents sampled who are native Oregonians and those who are not as measured by responses to the four philosophical position choices for student personnel choices.

The chi-square tests of independence were not significant at the .05 level, the χ^2 equalling 7.815 and the total tabled chi-square from the expected values equalling 2.5953 at 3 d.f.. Hence, null hypothesis number six as displayed in Table XII was not rejected and it is apparent that there are no statistically significant differences in these perceptions based on native status to the state of Oregon.

Null Hypothesis Number Seven. Table XIII displays the numbers, percentages, expected values and chi-square measurements for null hypothesis number seven:

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between students who had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more student personnel services to meet their own needs while in college and those parents who had had similar contact as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

TABLE XII

NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF PARENTS (NATIVE) AND PARENTS (NON-NATIVE) FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #6.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
PARENTS (NATIVE)	32	43.1	29.73	11	14.9	12.54	14	18.9	11.61	15	20.3	18.12	2	
PARENTS (NON-NATIVE)	32	34.2	34.27	16	17.6	14.46	11	12.1	13.39	24	26.4	20.88	8	

$X^2 = 2.5953 \dots @ 3 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots X^2_a = 7.815 \dots \dots \dots H_o \#6 = \text{Do Not Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII.

TABLE XIII

NUMBERS, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS (WITH CONTACT) AND PARENTS (WITH CONTACT) FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #7.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS (WITH CONTACT) (n=223)	48	21.5	58.89	24	10.8	29.86	41	18.4	35.68	96	43.0	89.57	6	8
PARENTS (WITH CONTACT) (n=86)	26	30.2	20.11	17	19.8	11.14	8	9.3	13.31	27	31.4	33.43	8	0

$\chi^2 = 11.208 \dots @ 3 \text{ d.f.} \dots \dots \dots \chi^2_{\alpha} = 7.815 \dots \dots \dots H_0 \#7 \text{ Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII
 **F = explanation under Table VII

This null hypothesis was designed to draw implication about contact with student personnel professional staff members in terms of influencing the beliefs of the sampled respondents about an underlying philosophy. The χ^2_a for Table number XIII was again 7.815 with 3 d.f. and the chi-square measured from the expected values = 11.208. The chi-square test of independence revealed a significant discrepancy between students with contact and parents with contact and null hypothesis number seven was thus rejected. Apparently, no significance can be attached to a respondent whether student or parent, having had personal contact with each other or with a student personnel staff member in terms of such contacts having impact on a philosophical position choice.

Null Hypothesis Number Eight: Table XIV displays the results of chi-square measurements regarding null hypothesis number eight which read as follows:

No significant differences in perceptions of a philosophical base for student personnel services exist between students who had had personal contact with a professional or administrative staff member in one or more of the student personnel services and the faculty who had had similar contact as measured by responses to four philosophical position choices for student personnel services.

This measurement sought to determine if there was a significant discrepancy between students having had perhaps influential contacts with student personnel staff members and faculty who may have had the same kinds of contacts. With an χ^2_a again equalling 7.815 at 3 d.f. and a measured chi-square at 32.395, it was clear that the chi-square test of independence was significant

TABLE XIV

NUMBER, PERCENTAGES AND EXPECTED VALUES OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS
(WITH CONTACT) AND FACULTY (WITH CONTACT) FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS #8.

SAMPLED GROUP	PREFERRED PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION													
	A Neo-humanist			B Rationalist			C Instrumentalist			D Integralist			E *	F **
	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	%	Expected Value	n	n
STUDENTS (WITH CONTACT) (n=223)	48	21.5	39.88	24	10.8	41.94	41	18.4	37.13	96	43.0	90.06	6	8
FACULTY (WITH CONTACT) (n=106)	10	9.4	18.13	37	34.9	19.06	13	12.3	16.88	35	33.0	40.94	9	2

$X^2 = 32.395$. . . @ 3 d.f. $X_a^2 = 7.815$ $H_0\#8 = \text{Reject}$

* E = explanation under Table VII
**F = explanation under Table VII

at the .05 level; thus there were discrepancies and the null hypothesis was rejected. An extension of the information found in Table number XIV could be made in terms of chi-square tests of independence between faculty with contact and faculty without contact as well as between parents with or without contact and students with or without contact, but there appeared no advantage in carrying out such measurements.

Results: Table XV. This is an aggregate table of results for Tables VII-XIV. It indicates the general findings and general results of the study in terms of the chi-square measurements. The null hypotheses, as can be seen from Table XV, are all rejected except number six.

TABLE XV

AGGREGATE TABLE OF RESULTS OF

TABLES VII - XIV

HYPO- THESIS #	TABLE #	CALCULATED χ^2	d.f.	χ^2 a a=.05	CONCLUSION as to REJECT - DO NOT REJECT	NULL HYPO- THESIS
1	VII	58.366	6	12.592	REJECT	No consis- tent response pattern exists... etc.
2	VIII	40.505	6	12.592	REJECT	No consis- tent res- ponse pattern exists... etc.
3	IX	23.737	3	7.815	REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.
4	X	29.371	3	7.815	REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.

TABLE XV - continued

HYPO- THESIS #	TABLE #	CALCULATED χ^2	d.f.	χ^2 a	CONCLUSION as to REJECT - DO NOT REJECT	NULL HYPO- THESIS
5	XI	31.304	3	7.815	REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.
6	XII	2.595	3	7.815	DO NOT REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.
7	XIII	11.208	3	7.815	REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.
8	XIV	32.396	3	7.815	REJECT	No signi- ficant difference exists between ... etc.

Respondents' Written Comments

As described in the section of Chapter IV devoted to descriptive statistics, a number of respondents in all three of the sampled populations chose to disagree with all of the four philosophical position choices provided. A number of those disagreeing accepted the invitation either to write philosophical positions of their own or to make comments regarding feelings they might have regarding student personnel services or higher education in general. In some respects, these written statements are as revelative of the need for the present study and the need to develop meaningful philosophic bases for student personnel as are the quantified data.

Students wrote the fewest number of comments and those tended to center on position choice (D), the integralist, with emphasis on such statements as "so long as it does not restrict the framework", then drawing an arrow to the sentence which included the words "within a framework of policies and options". In circling position choice (D) one student wrote:

The student does not exist in a vacuum of intellectual endeavor. His outlook on life and his problems affect his ability and desire to learn. If a student personnel service does not deal with the whole person they (sic) are not really dealing with the person's ability to learn. Student personnel services should be aware of the total spectrum of services and have enough knowledge of interpersonal relations to know when to refer a person to one of them.

My experiences to date have all been positive; I hope there will be no drastic reduction in student services. They provide much needed help for students.

Several students were very pragmatic while again circling the

integralist as the philosophical position choice. One of these wrote:

As a philosophy, I believe this best exemplifies my beliefs. However, as a philosophy it must be the basis for concrete action or it will be of no use. For example, I believe that the vocational ideas brought forth in position "C" were valuable although too restrictive.

One student did not agree with any of the philosophical position choices and said: "It all sounds fantastic, idealistic, and impossible." This student appeared to reflect the view of some student personnel staff as well as synthesize one of the major problems in student personnel services which helped to generate the study. He asked the question:

Why do student personnel people get so concerned about defining their objectives--aren't people good enough objectives for being? ...you can absolutely overwhelm someone with ideas and words and it all sounds great but it usually doesn't do any good...student personnel needs people concerned with other people who have individual ways of expressing themselves. They must be very flexible, not restricted by any idealistic ideas causing them to think they can even start to help a person blossom into a fantastic, well-rounded, educated, intellectually-mature individual...I think I'm driving at the need for less structure and more care on a gut level--I think.

Students were not the only respondent group to be concerned about a generalized approach to student personnel, but this again fit with certain professional tenets of years ago when there was a strong emphasis on individual differences as reported in Chapter I. In reflecting this approach, one student commented:

Activities become more complicated as the number of people or students on a campus increases. So I do not feel this should promote the loss of individuality in handling individual problems. Student activities must involve intimate contact with

with students, yet often student personnel workers lack the interest, knowledge, and help they could give... student personnel staff should be the 'veterans' of life and have the administrative duty to aim students toward the realization of actual problems and their answers instead of always taking a 'test tube' approach.

Several students, again while circling the integralist position choice (D), were concerned that this might be too idealistic. One student summed up the view of several in saying:

Position (D) is excellent. But I am not sure O.S.U. students are as responsible as you give them credit for. Personally, the irresponsibility toward society exhibited by the O.S.U. students is terrifying.

The approach of the student in making the following comments was also that of several of the other respondents both to the questionnaire and the entire study in general. This student felt that:

If educators would run their job like the rest of the world, something might get done instead of a barrage of questionnaires. The efforts spent on this stuff, if applied to real but not so clear problems, would do a service to the entire society.

Parents also had some things they wanted to say. To cement the idea that much concern was shown for how higher education in general was moving, one parent, playing on the rationalist theme, handwrote a three page document beginning with the quote: "EDUCATION is, first of all, an intellectual development process." Another parent respondent who disagreed with all the position choices, said:

Any well-adjusted student that had the initiative to enroll for formal education should be able to figure out the best means of fitting amicably into mature society...As my rich uncle used

to tell me in my youth, 'there are too many educated fools in this world' and the same things holds true today.

The apparently hostile approach some parents took is exemplified by the following:

Individualized relevant counseling is just plain rotten for any unsure, unpushy student of any age. If you don't know what area you are interested in at once you might as well drop dead ...Such unnecessary requirements as physical education should be absolutely dropped.

In the same vein, another parent felt that "the above are pretty vague, also redundant 'pedogoguese.'" This parent went on: "Just provide intelligent, well-rounded professors who are a good influence on the students, responsible people who inspire constructive effort and not wild revolutionary types."

Although indicating he did not agree with any of the position choices above, this parent seemed to lean heavily towards the neo-humanist approach as he continued that:

Students need to admire steady, sincere, interested, adult influences (sic)...To have them counseling one another is surely the blind leading the blind and tragically many campuses show this in their student personnel staffs.

Specifically circling the (A) or neo-humanist choice, one parent wrote:

Some of our young adults, students, and non-students of today seem to think in terms of 'their rights' ...I would like to think that our higher education systems could guide and teach them that when they take on their share of single 'responsibility' then they have earned some of their 'so-called rights'...

And yet parents, too, are concerned about university size and student

personnel staff attempts to individualize education in large universities.

One male parent in his mid-fifties who has risen to the post of vice-president of a large business in the northwestern United States said : "I graduated from a large university and the only intent there was to 'keep the line moving'."

Particularly those faculty members who believe in the rationalist position, but even those disagreeing with all the position choices had comments to make about an underlying philosophy for student personnel services. Several of these fell into a category described by the following statement-- "Eliminate professional staff in 'student personnel services'...make housing and registrars true service groups--for students' convenience, not for the bureaucrats." Choosing the rationalist position, another faculty member said: "student personnel services should provide basic support to the student necessary to free him from concerns other than his true educational mission." Nearly all faculty circling (E) or who added additional statements to their circled position choice were deprecatory of student personnel services and believed that they should either be drastically restructured or eliminated. One faculty member put it this way:

The University should not promote the total welfare of student, but should make available services and facilities so the student can develop his own total welfare. The University should administer discipline based on a structured set of rules that are clear and understandable. If the student does not like this, he has the right to select some other university that more nearly suits his ideals.

Another faculty member said: "It appears that the services of 'student personnel' might become a major concern of the university. This I would find regrettable." Another faculty member was adamant about a rejection of student personnel services. He wrote:

The University should consist of:

- 1) Students: those, of whatever age, who desire to learn.
- 2) Teachers: those who in addition to a desire to learn have, by virtue of experience, something worthwhile to teach and a desire to teach it.
- 3) Resources Supportive of the Acts of Learning (Research, etc.) and teaching: e.g., libraries, laboratories, etc.
- 4) A minimal number of essential people to maintain the resources.
- 5) NOTHING ELSE.

The University should be set in a greater community which provides adequate medical, social, and cultural facilities for all its citizens including students.

I have four children, one a freshman elsewhere, and would advise them to forego undergraduate education rather than to enroll at O.S.U. (graduate education might be a different story). Professional counseling and medical services on this campus are no worse than on most other campuses, but they are abominable.

Not all the written comments were negative. One faculty member wrote:

Student personnel services are part of the educational enterprise and are thus fundamentally instructional ... the fundamental purpose of student personnel ... is to facilitate the learning process in all aspects of educational endeavor. That educational endeavor is not limited, but stretches as far and as deep as the nature of the young men and women who come to learn. To proscribe the institution in any other fashion is to predetermine the control system of the individual. This is a self-defeating condition which is slowly stifling

our educational efforts. Student personnel services...should assume greater responsibility for providing real opportunities for students to follow through the input of their formal classes in the form of realistic learning opportunities not readily available on the campus itself. Indeed, the future of the university as a useful institution of learning may depend upon the vitality and the viability of student personnel work, as student personnel services is involved in the instruction function. This function should be primarily the providing of an environment both human and physical where a student may learn in his own way and at his own maximum effort levels.

Chapter V

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Introduction

A number of serious difficulties emerge in an historical trace of student personnel work, culminating in the question of survival for the field as a legitimate endeavor in higher education. While staffs of specialists have appeared to direct and administer specific student personnel programs, there has also emerged the involvement of a chief student personnel administrator in the overall affairs of the institution. A dichotomy between specialist and generalist has produced evidence, particularly in the literature for the entire field, that student personnel work in higher education seems a house divided against itself.

It was this division, but more importantly the implication that it was partly responsible for the persistent question of survival that promoted the author to develop a study which would examine some underlying aspects of the field; further, to determine if several sub-groups related to higher education perceived any overall philosophic bases for its existence. It was believed at the outset of this study that one of the prime reasons for the tenuous position of student personnel and a concomitant identity search was that this field of endeavor in higher education had no single philosophical base upon which to build a

set of meaningful and educational services to constituents. Neither, it was believed, was there any agreement among various directly or indirectly-related societal subgroups affiliated with the University regarding a philosophy which ought to underlie this educational field.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine the perceptions of students, parents, and faculty members regarding the existence of a philosophic base for the provision of student personnel services and the perceptions of these individuals or groups regarding which philosophic base, in their estimation, ought to underlie such services in higher education.

Four philosophic bases were used as position choices from study respondents. Three of these bases were developed from philosophical statements of Harold Taylor and were: 1) neo-humanist, 2) rationalist, 3) instrumentalist. The fourth philosophical position was developed by Tollefson and was viewed as an extension of Taylor's three. The fourth position as used in the study was termed the integralist.

The problem was to determine whether, or in what ways, these same students, parents, and faculty members might agree or disagree regarding any underlying philosophical base for student personnel services, at least at Oregon State University.

Accordingly, a questionnaire was developed which tested a number of null hypotheses relating either to a consistent response pattern or significant differences and perceptions of such a philosophic base among students, parents, and faculty members. Respondents were asked to react to the four philosophical

position choices and to respond to requests for demographic and personal data. The questionnaire was developed and administered by the author.

Findings for the study were analyzed and reported both in terms of descriptive data and a chi-square measurement of independence. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, among others, result from the present study.

1. The statistical results indicate that students, parents, and faculty members subscribe not only to different philosophies which they believe ought to underlie student personnel services, but probably also to divergent philosophies of higher education. This conclusion derives from application of Taylor's three general philosophical positions to student personnel services. Taylor's philosophical approaches were developed without direct application at the time to student personnel.

2. There are significant discrepancies in the opinions of students, parents, and faculty members regarding any philosophic position to underlie student personnel as a field of endeavor.

2a. The data indicate that students and their parents find sharp disagreement on a philosophy they believe should underlie student personnel services.

2b. Parents in the sampled population are generally committed to one view of student personnel services in terms of a philosophy sought to underlie it. This is not the same view as that taken either by the sampled students or the sampled faculty.

2c. Students in the sampled population are generally committed to one philosophical position desired to underlie student personnel services.

2d. Faculty in the sampled population are not heavily committed to one

view of student personnel services or its underlying philosophical bases .

3. The data indicate that personal contact with a professional staff member in a student personnel service did not apparently affect a respondent's choice of a philosophical base for student personnel services . Neither did there appear any consistency between or among respondent groups with respect to contact with a professional staff member affecting philosophical position choice , as tested by null hypotheses two , three , seven , and eight .

4a. The data indicate that a number of respondents , primarily parents , believe the student to be at a developmental stage to require the institution to promote his total welfare . Student personnel staff should thus maintain overriding concern for students' "human and legal" rights , as well as have special responsibilities to protect such rights , administer discipline , and aid in full moral , emotional , and social development of the student population . This view was described in the study as the neo-humanist .

4b. The data indicate that there are those respondents (primarily faculty) who believe that cultivation of the intellect is the exclusive goal of higher education and the prime rationale for the existence of colleges or universities and that student personnel , however structured , should utilize this theory in its functioning . This is described in the study as the rationalist position .

4c. The data indicate that only a small proportion of each respondent group believe that while the student might well be educable in the Cowley "holistic"

sense , he requires aid from student personnel experts in a specialty area who could lend such aid with individual competencies wholly outside a classroom orientation or perceived "core-academic" functions of the institution. This view was regarded in the study as the instrumentalist.

4d. The data indicate that there are those respondents who believe the student to be a "whole person" , one who may be educated by any part or all of his collegiate environment or any or all of the people with whom he may have day-to-day contact. This is the philosophic position regarded as the integralist. The sampled students were the most active proponents of this particular view .

5. It is apparent from a simple inspection of both inferential and descriptive data that some of the variables the author expected to exert an influence on philosophical position choice in fact did not exert such influence. One hypothesis used to test the assumption of influence (hypothesis number six) indicated no difference in approach to a philosophical position because parents were or were not native Oregonians .

Implications

Harold Pepinsky had a very positive view about the "new breed" of student personnel professionals in 1964. He said then:

In the 'multiversity' setting, a new kind of student personnel worker is beginning to appear ... he has idealism, zeal, and a trunkful of practical know-how, which includes the ability to conduct and assimilate the results of research.

This perception was dramatically different in 1972. In the most recent student personnel monograph published by the American College Personnel Association, Brown (1972) said:

The plethora of publications about the dilemma of higher education is matched only by the continual self-flagellation of college student personnel workers at conventions and in professional journals. Both sources declare a crisis exists and propound the need for change ... [student personnel work] has been having an identity crisis for some time. It came through the most trying periods of student unrest unscathed, but also without any laurels. Student personnel staff have ascended to institutional positions equivalent to vice-presidencies, but few are consulted for advice regarding the total institution. In the eyes of many faculty, student personnel workers are second class citizens, and students see them as not being much different from other members of the establishment, although more paternalistic ... such painful soul searching [as is going on] is hardly the sign of a completely healthy, confident profession.

Student personnel work, in general, appears to be in a state of disarray, perhaps even in a state of some panic. Practitioners seem to be leaving the field at any good opportunity and bright, idealistic new professionals with

zeal and know-how seem to reject entry-level positions for those in what they perceive as more rewarding professions. As well, aggravated by simple pressures from within the institution, the inability of the various specific services to coordinate their efforts has left student personnel as a field apparently impotent.

It was believed that one major difficulty was the neglect by student personnel generalists of their research responsibilities. Most of the research is concentrated in special areas, particularly counseling, virtually nothing having been done with regard to research which would be toward reformulation or recasting of the principles and philosophies underlying student personnel methodology in higher education. Research efforts in specific areas under the general student personnel rubric appear more qualitative as well as quantitative than those in the areas of student personnel administration itself. Chapter II clearly indicates the kind of research which has been completed in general student personnel terms, the primary emphasis being on evaluation of whether or not services were "important".

Another major implication is not in terms of whether more research should be accomplished, or the kind of research to be done, but the framework in which research is designed. Many "authorities", speaking to their colleagues in the field, have recently pressed for a change in the role of the student personnel educator and to move him to a role as a behavioral scientist. Much of the fanfare surrounding the contemporary and popular student development concept

assumes that behavioral scientists are the best proponents of a new image for the old student personnel worker. So long as one does not simply shed an old name and assume a new one which is perceived as a cloak of academic responsibility, the move toward the behavioral scientist image may be positive. Behavioral scientists, by definition, do appear to understand research in a different context from that usually completed by student personnel administrators.

While it seems a "given" in contemporary student personnel work that one must not speak of a dichotomy between student personnel administration or student personnel specialty work and instruction, no such consensus exists regarding a marriage between specialization and generalization in the field itself. Concomitantly, no consensus, according to the present study, exists among students, parents, and faculty members regarding any kind of philosophy to underlie student personnel as a whole. This lack of consensus has strong implications when juxtaposed with the divergence in approach between chief student personnel administrators with overall responsibilities and instrumentalist specialists.

Simply stated, student personnel may not survive, such a judgment based on the existence of neither a single philosophic base for its separate and loosely-related service functions nor a single perception of its total role in higher education.

Recommendations

1. The chief student personnel administrator on a given campus should work toward defining a body of knowledge and set of principles of professional practice for student personnel work on that particular campus. Such educational leaders should also delineate, then implement a single philosophy of student personnel work which is consistent with the basic philosophy and mission of the institution. The imposing but disjointed, specialized, and disparate array of functions that characterizes student personnel services, particularly on a large college or university campus, should consolidate themselves under a single philosophy that has meaning and importance in terms of that institution.
2. The chief student personnel administrator on a university campus should prepare what he or she believes to be the educational philosophy or philosophical position desired to underlie the student personnel program at that institution. Since there is some evidence that the diversity of the separate functions and programs as specialty areas within the student personnel is great, the chief student administrator should also initiate an in-depth discussion of such a position with the entire student personnel staff towards consensus and a narrowing of the gap.
3. Student personnel professionals across America should take a united and well-defined stand on such issues as whether student personnel staff

activities are a part of simply defined and specifically determined services or fit with the objectives of the institution in terms of any focus on human development and learning.

4. Programs in what is presently termed student personnel services or student personnel work, should be an integral part of a broad liberal education for all students and be based on at least two major assumptions:

a. there is an underlying philosophy which is generally accepted by all educators in the field of student development;

b. as Koile suggested (1966), students and scholars may come in any human form and be members of virtually any other subgroup in the campus community inclusive of faculty, support staff, and others.

5. More information regarding the total student personnel program, at least at Oregon State University, should be given to all students, parents, and faculty.

6. Much more sophisticated research, beyond the (deliberately) basic effort in the present study, should be undertaken to further clarify the lack of philosophical underpinnings or the differences in approach to student personnel services among academically related groups of people. Coupled to this recommendation, an instrument of considerable sophistication should be developed which might be applicable to more than one institution of higher education to be used not only in the evaluation of student personnel services, but in the comparison of student personnel services among institutions. As

well, further research should be conducted and measurements made utilizing the data generated from but outside the scope and limitations of the present study.

Summary

Berdie began a summation of a re-definition of college student personnel in 1966 with what he called "obvious" statements. His feeling that student personnel work is an integral part of the whole higher education process is echoed by the author of the present study. The purposes of student personnel work are or should be the purposes of all higher education. The methodologies, separate and often disparate as they may be, are finally those of education in other collegiate settings.

But student personnel work remains, as Koile termed it, forever the bridesmaid. It often, in fact, is never a member of the wedding party. Yet it is as bureaucratic as any other facet of higher education today, particularly in large universities. Simple attempts, therefore, to have chief student personnel administrators be as effective as specialists appear in their respective specialties will not do.

No one has all the answers, but one suggested avenue of approach seems, like Berdie's statements, to be obvious. All those engaged in student personnel work, perhaps all those professionally engaged in higher education, need to examine many philosophies, then choose one to arrive at a resulting rationale of the place of student personnel services within higher education.

Unless student personnel is doomed to go, as Matthew Arnold put it,

"Wandering
Between two worlds,
One dead,
The other powerless to be born,"

student personnel professionals themselves must be the ones to find a common philosophical ground, begin to share that with faculty members and administrators, of course with registered students, then begin to apply lessons that similarity of persons and perspective can teach. The cooperative spirit engendered and a high degree of professional and personal involvement with the lives of all members of the academic community can combine to cause our systems of higher education to become what they have the potential to be and student personnel to be an important educational methodology based on a viable set of underlying philosophical principles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(limited to works cited)

BOOKS, BOOK EXCERPTS, & MONOGRAPHS

- Arbuckle, D.S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. Toronto, McGraw-Hill Books Inc. 1953. p. 23.
- Blaesser, W.W. "Student Personnel Work - College and University." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Chester W. Harris (ed.). 3d ed. New York, MacMillan Co. 1960. p. 1423.
- Brown, R.D. Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education - A Return to the Academy. Washington, D.C., Monograph No. 16, American College Personnel Association. 1972. p. 9-10.
- Brubacher, J.S. Modern Philosophies of Education. New York, McGraw-Hill Co. 1962. 373 p.
- Brunson, M.A. Guidance: An Integrating Process in Higher Education. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1959. p. 24.
- Caplow, Theodore and R.J. McGee, The Academic Market Place. New York, Anchor Books (Doubleday & Company, Inc.). 1965. 226 p.
- Chase, C.I., Elementary Statistical Procedures. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1967. p. 183-184.
- Dutton, T.B., J.R. Appleton, E.E. Birch. Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community. Bloomington, Indiana. Monograph No. 3, The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. April, 1970. 55 p.
- Jencks, C. and D. Riesman. The Academic Revolution. New York, Anchor Books (Doubleday & Company, Inc.). 1969. 580 p.
- Kauffman, J.F. "The Student in Higher Education." The College and the Student. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education. 1966. p. 141-162.

- Klopf, G. (ed.). College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. Student Personnel Series, Monograph No. 7. Washington, D.C., American Personnel and Guidance Association. 1966. p. vii.
- Lloyd, W.P. Student Personnel Services in Universities of the World. Washington, D.C. American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1955. p. ii.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther. "Personnel Work and General Education." General Education 51st Year Book, Part I. Chicago, National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press. 1951. p. 214-229.
- _____, and M.R. Smith (eds.). Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954. p. 361.
- McConnell, T.R., and others. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.
- Millet, J.D. Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education. Kent, Ohio, The Kent State University Press. 1968. p. 87.
- Mueller, K.H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1961. 570 p.
- Park, Joe. Selected Readings in the Philosophy of Education. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1963. 433 p.
- Rich, J.M. (ed.). Readings in the Philosophy of Education. 3d. ed. Belmont, California, Wadsworth Company, Inc. 1959. 393 p.
- Rogers, C.R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio, Merrill Company. 1969. 359 p.
- Shaffer, R.H. and W.D. Martinson. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York, The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc. 1966. 115 p.
- _____. "Issues and Problems in the Organization, Administration and Development of College Student Personnel Programs in the Years Ahead." p. 9. Klopf, G. (ed.). College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. Student Personnel Series, Monograph No. 7. Washington, D.C. American Personnel and Guidance Association. 1966.

- Taylor, Harold. "Philosophical Foundations of General Education."
General Education 51st Year Book, Part I. Chicago, National
Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press.
1951. P. 20-45.
- Williamson, E.G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities.
New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1961. 474 p.
- Wine, R.L. Statistics for Scientists and Engineers. Englewood Cliffs,
New Jersey, Prentice-Hall. 1964. P. 583-585.
- Wrenn, C.G. Student Personnel Work in College. New York, Ronald Press.
1951. p. 487.
- "Philosophical & Psychological Bases of Student Personnel
Services in Education." Personnel Services in Education. N.B.
Henry (ed.). Chicago, The University of Chicago Press. 1955. p. 46.

ARTICLES, JOURNALS, PERIODICALS

Berdie, R.F. "Student Personnel Work: Definition and Redefinition." Journal of College Student Personnel 7(3): 131-136. May, 1966.

Cowley, W.H. "The Nature of Student Personnel Work." Educational Record XVII: 199-226. April, 1936.

"Intelligence is Not Enough." Vital Speeches of the Day. November 15, 1938. p. 74.

"European Influences Upon American Higher Education." The Educational Record XX: 165-190. April, 1939.

"History and Philosophy of Student Personnel Work." Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women III: 153-162. June, 1940.

"Student Personnel Services in Retrospect and Prospect." School and Society 85(2103): 19-22. January, 1957.

Crookston, B.B. "An Organizational Model for Student Development." NASPA Journal 10(1): 3-13, July, 1972.

Emmett, T.A. "Student Personnel Services - Who Needs Them?" College and University Business 51(5): 47-49. 1971.

Fitzgerald, L.E. "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." The Journal of College Student Personnel III (4): 169-179. June, 1962.

Hopkins, E.H. "The Essentials of a Student Personnel Program." Educational and Psychological Measurement. 8(3): 430-450. Autumn, 1948.

Hopkins, L.B. "Personnel Procedure in Education." Educational Record Supplement. 7: 3-93. October, 1926.

Kamm, R.B. "How Effective Are Our Student Personnel Programs?" Personnel and Guidance Journal XXXIII: 316-334. February, 1955.

Koile, E.A. "Student Affairs: Forever the Bridesmaid." NASPA Journal 4(2): 65-72. October, 1966.

- Lloyd-Jones, Esther. "What is this Thing called Personnel Work?" Occupations 15: 718-723. May, 1937.
- Lunney, G.H. "Using Analysis of Variance with a Dichotomous Dependent Variable: An Empirical Study." Journal of Educational Measurement 7(4): 263-269. Winter, 1970.
- Penney, J.F. "Student Personnel Work: A Profession Stillborn." Personnel and Guidance Journal 47: 958-962. 1969.
- Pepinsky, H.B. "The Student Personnel Worker for all Seasons." Journal of the NAWDC 27(2): 29-94. Winter, 1964.
- Rackham, E.N. "The Need for Adequate Criteria When Evaluating College Student Personnel Programs." Educational and Psychological Measurement 11: 691-99. Winter, 1951.
- Shaffer, R.H. "Meeting the Challenges of Today's Students." NASPA Journal 4(4): 177-182. April, 1967.
- Strang, R. "Major Limitations in Current Evaluation Studies." Educational and Psychological Measurement 10: 533. 1950.
- Williamson, E.C. "The Student Personnel Point of View." American Council on Education Series I (3). 1937.
- _____. "The Student Personnel Point of View - (Revised)." American Council on Education Series VI XIII(13). 1949.
- Winfrey, J.K. and D.D. Feder. "Non-Instructional Services." Review of Educational Research 35: 318-334. October, 1965.
- Wrenn, C.G. and R.B. Kamm. "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student Personnel Program." School and Society 67: 267. 1948.
- Yoder, M.D. "Development of Guidelines for Student Personnel Services in the Two-Year Community College." Junior College Journal 37: 38. October, 1966.
- Zimmerman, W.D. "The Changing Nature of the Personal Dimension of Education." Liberal Education 49: 522. December, 1963.

ABSTRACTS

- Bailey, D.B. "An Evaluation of Student Personnel Services in a College as Perceived by the Formal Organizational Units of the College Community." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Dissertation Abstracts 28: 415-A. 1966.
- Beckers, W.H. "An Evaluation of the Student Personnel Program at Auburn University School of Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1961. Dissertation Abstracts 22(1): 2298. 1962.
- Brantley, E.J. "A Study of the Student Personnel Program at Clark College." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado. Dissertation Abstracts XXI (11): 3372. 1960.
- Mahler, C.A. "A Study of Student and Faculty Reactions to Student Personnel Work." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Dissertation Abstracts 15(12). 1955.
- Rankin, G.E. "Graduating Seniors' Perceptions of Student Personnel Services at Colorado State College." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado. Dissertation Abstracts 27: 2406-A. 1966.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Crookston, B.B., R.T. Keist, C.D. Miller, A.E. Ivey. "A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students." Student Services Research Reports: Number 17. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado. October, 1966.
- Fitzgerald, L.E. "A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Services." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University. 1959.
- Gordon, P.A. "Student Personnel Services in Alberta Public Colleges." Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada. 1970.
- Kamm, R.B. "Evaluation Aids." Paper Read at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 35th Anniversary Conference. Urbana, Illinois. 1953.
- Patterson, J.B. "Student Affairs in Alberta Universities: A Role for Social Workers?" Unpublished master's thesis, School of Social Welfare, The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada. 1971.
- Ross, M.A. "Administration, Faculty and Student Personnel Workers Evaluation of Student Personnel Functions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education Administration, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. 204 p. 1967.
- Tamte, James. "How Faculty, Student Personnel Workers, and Students Perceive Student Personnel Functions at the University of Denver." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Denver, Denver, Colorado. June, 1962.
- Tollefson, A.L. and R.M. Bristow, "Philosophy of College Student Personnel Services, An Integralist Point of View and Functional Relations Concept." Address to the Student Personnel Association of California Colleges, San Luis Obispo, California. October 10, 1964.
- Warnath, C.F. "Annual Report, Oregon State University Counseling Center." Corvallis, Oregon. 1969-70-71.

OTHER

Arnold, Matthew. "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse." 1855; in Rickard, S.T. "The Role of the Chief Student Personnel Administrator. Revisited." NASPA Journal 9(3) p.219-226. January, 1972.

Rothman and Keene. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1970. Other particulars unknown.

Tollefson, A.L. - Interviews with the author and statements to various classes in Student Personnel Administration, Oregon State University, 1971.

APPENDIX A

FACSIMILE OF COVERING LETTER

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
School of Education
May 15, 1972

Dear Student, Parent, or Faculty Member:

As you know, colleges today are experiencing many problems -- problems which apparently do not give way to easy solutions. All of us have had different reactions to decisions made or actions taken on the part of college or university administrators and faculty in attempting to solve these problems. Also noted are many differences of opinion relating to both actions and perspective of another campus group -- Student Personnel Administrators.

We need your help! -- even if you know little about Student Personnel Services. We would like to know what philosophy you believe should underlie the Student Personnel services and functions. Your responses will also help meet academic requirements for the undersigned student.

For students and faculty, we realize the end of Spring Term is near; we ask that you complete and return the enclosed questionnaire as soon as possible. We would also appreciate a prompt return from parents; the results will be much more helpful and meaningful if a large return can be realized. Please return the questionnaire in the envelope provided -- for parents, by return mail, for faculty and students through the campus mail which requires no stamp. Completed questionnaires may also be left in the Student Services offices on the second floor of the Administrative Services building or at the Activities desk in the Memorial Union.

Since results will be computerized, you will not be personally identified with any of your answers. For this reason and to insure our objectivity, you need not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire unless you wish to do so. Please feel free, however, to make any comments you wish on the back of any page.

If you do not wish to complete the questionnaire once you have started, please return it anyway as even incomplete answers will help us. If you have time, please tell us why you did not finish.

The completion time for the questionnaire is less than five (5) minutes.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important project!

Sincerely,

(signed)

Mason L. Niblack
Graduate Student

(signed)

Arthur L. Tollefson
Professor of Education
and Coordinator, College
Student Personnel Admin-
istration Program

APPENDIX B
FACSIMILE OF
QUESTIONNAIRE ON PERCEPTIONS OF
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Please circle your answer choice or fill in the appropriate blank.

(ALL RESPONDENTS)

- (1) Are you a native Oregonian? ---YES---NO (2) AGE (3) Sex - M - F
-

(STUDENTS)

- (4) Do you now live in University housing? ---YES---NO, if YES, circle which: RESIDENCE HALL FRATERNITY SORORITY CO-OPERATIVE MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING
-

(PARENTS ONLY)

- (5) Highest level of formal education: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HIGH SCHOOL COLLEGE GRADUATE SCHOOL
- (6) Highest level of formal education of spouse: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HIGH SCHOOL COLLEGE GRADUATE SCHOOL
- (7) Did you attend Oregon State University? ---YES---NO
- (8) Spouse? ---YES---NO
- (9) Occupation of primary wage earner in family _____
(Please be as specific as possible)
-

(FACULTY ONLY)

- (10) From what college was your last degree granted? _____
- (11) Field or discipline in which granted _____
- (12) Do you now teach in this specific field? ---YES---NO If not, what is the field in which you now teach?
- (13) Approx. size of your "alma mater" at the time your degree was granted _____
-

(ALL RESPONDENTS)

(14) Please circle any of the services listed below within which you had a personal contact at any college with a professional or administrative staff member -- to meet your own needs, not, for example, those of your children or your students.

COUNSELING CENTER

COLLEGE UNION &
STUDENT ACTIVITIES

FINANCIAL AIDS

HOUSING OFFICE (in-
cludes cooperatives &
married student housing)

HEALTH SERVICE
(& Mental Health
Clinic)

OFFICE OF INTER-
NATIONAL EDU-
CATION

PLACEMENT & CAREER
PLANNING

ORIENTATION
(new student
programs)

JUDICIAL OR
DISCIPLINARY
BOARDS

ADMISSIONS OFFICE

REGISTRAR

DEAN OF
STUDENTS
OFFICE

(15) How would you generally rate your experience(s) with professionals or administrative staff members in those services you have circled?

POSITIVE -----NEUTRAL -----NEGATIVE -----

Student personnel services on many campuses throughout the United States and many other countries is a composite organization of functions in higher education, inclusive of all the specialty areas listed above. Occasionally, other functional areas such as intercollegiate athletics, are included. While its aims and goals vary widely, reflecting the institution within which it operates, it deals primarily with the concerns of registered students and their various relationships with the institution. Its structure is generally one in which each of the directors of a functional area, e.g., the director of housing, reports to an associate dean or dean of students, perhaps to a vice-president for student affairs.

(16) OF THE FOLLOWING FOUR PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE LETTER IN THE LEFT MARGIN DESIGNATING THE STATEMENT THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PERSONAL PREFERENCE FOR A BASIS FOR ALL STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES.

- A. The college or university should promote the total welfare of each student. All student personnel staff have special responsibility to develop personal contacts with the individual student, protecting his human and legal rights, but administering discipline when perceived necessary. Such staff have the responsibility to aid in the full moral, spiritual, emotional, and healthy social development of students and should persist in promoting a knowledge and cultivation of ideas and values that sustain our cultural heritage and traditions.
- B. Since intellectual development or the cultivation of man's reason is the sole aim of higher education, student personnel services should be primarily concerned that the student is able and motivated to attend classes, lectures, and laboratories, and that he is attending them in a fit condition to learn. Secondary student personnel functions should be to provide ancillary social and recreational activities to meet diversionary needs and maintain physical and mental health.
- C. Colleges and universities are complex, many-faceted social institutions, but should concentrate on instruction in the specific uses of knowledge and in the teaching of vocational skills. Student personnel professional experts should thus provide many separate, non-instructional and highly specialized services which will aid the student individually as well as helping him find his own way to a rich, full life. The student personnel professionals, who may not be educators, must aid the student in terms of their own individual competencies which are outside those of the college classroom.
- D. All services of a college or university should function in an integrated fashion to provide educational development in all aspects of the student's life. Student personnel specialists, using educational methods different from instructional specialists, should act affirmatively, not only outside the classroom but also in dealing with instructional affairs when student needs and interests make such action appropriate. Since most college students are adults, professional services should be provided within a framework of policies and options designed to provide each student with as much freedom of choice, as few constrictions upon his actions and as much responsibility for his actions as is appropriate for any other adult citizen.
- E. I do not agree with any of the above.
(Please feel free to describe what you believe should be the educational philosophy underlying student personnel services in higher education. Use the back of these pages or attach additional pages.)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS PROJECT!!