AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

<u>Stephen Elliott Roth</u> for the degree of <u>Doctor of Philosophy</u>
in <u>College Student Services Administration</u> presented on
<u>December 6, 1983</u>.

Title: <u>Attitudes of Executive Level Administrators Regard-</u>
<u>ing the Purpose of Student Services in Higher Education</u>

Abstract approved: <u>Redacted for Privacy</u>
          J. Roger Penh

The purpose of the research was to determine the atti-
tude of executive administrators in higher education toward
the purpose of student services, and to measure the consis-
tency with which they held the attitude. Three major
schools of thought about purpose were identified and de-
fined: the administrative, student personnel, and student
development perspectives. The population to be studied was
defined as the presidents, academic vice presidents, and
business vice presidents of four-year institutions in the
western states. A new instrument was designed to measure
relative preference for the three perspectives and to meas-
ure degrees of congruence. The instrument was constructed
so as to provide a measurement of attitude not only toward
the purpose of student services in general, but also toward
the purpose of ten specific functions associated with stu-
dent affairs work.

It was found that most administrators were supportive
of the student personnel point of view. They preferred that
student services programs remain in the extracurriculum,

that they provide direct support for students, and that they embrace pragmatic goals consonant with the institutional mission. With a few exceptions, they were not inclined to accept human development theory as a basis for shaping the institutional environment; neither did they desire a minimal level of non-educational, "housekeeping" services for students.

Although most administrators were inclined to support the student personnel perspective, they were not necessarily consistent in their preferences. Their responses often varied depending upon the type of program described. Only the concept that student services programs should be educational and supportive of the institutional mission was consistently held. Whenever a perspective other than student personnel was perceived to better represent this concept for a specific function, administrators were not reluctant to temporarily abandon their general attitude in favor of a different perspective.

The findings suggested that executive administrators were not inclined to accept a single model to define what student services should do. Instead, they appeared to prefer a flexible, pragmatic approach which attempts to strike a balance between institutional interests and student needs.

Attitudes of Executive Level Administrators

Regarding the Purpose of Student Services

in Higher Education

by

Stephen Elliott Roth

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

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

Completed December 6, 1983

Commencement June 1984

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of College Student Services Administration in
charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Post-Secondary Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented___December 6, 1983_____

Typed by Stephen Elliott Roth

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Attitudes of Executive Level Administrators

Regarding the Purpose of Student Services

in Higher Education

Chapter I - INTRODUCTION

Background

Financial pressure has become the dominant issue of
American higher education in the 1980's. It has created a
climate marked by preoccupation with budget processes,
insufficient resources, cost efficiency, and accountability.
Many institutions, faced with constantly rising costs and
diminishing revenues, are closely examining their operating
budgets. Expenditures considered necessary ten years ago
are now more often viewed as unaffordable luxuries. Program
evaluation has become a major activity, forcing deans,
directors, and department heads to assemble well-thought-out
justifications in support of the continued existence of
threatened programs.

Student services departments or divisions are not
immune to this pressure. On many campuses they have been
singled out as primary targets for budget reductions -- in
some instances for outright elimination (Tilley, 1973,
1979). Chief student affairs officers have discovered that
resource allocation is a competitive struggle among diverse
campus constituencies. Despite their tradition of service
to the campus, administrators of student services are find-

ing that their appeals for support are often outweighed by faculty, who can claim that their activities are at the true center of the college or university (Astmann, 1975).

Ironically, at the very time that the student services profession most needs to clearly articulate its mission and its place within the campus community, it finds itself unable to agree on a broadly acceptable definition of its professional identity (Rhatigan, 1975; Penn, Manspeaker and Millette, 1975). The last two decades have seen the profession in a state of constant turmoil, as its members argue over questions of purpose, functions, theoretical foundations, and relationships to various campus constituencies (Williamson, 1961; Penney, 1969; Brown, 1972; Parker, 1974; Plato, 1978). Despite the movement toward a sound theoretical base, there is as yet no concensus on a rationale for student services. Disagreement over professional identity and purpose is further complicated by a split between those who see their role as essentially managerial or administrative and those who view their primary role as that of "helping" or counseling students (Penn et al., 1975; Bloland, 1979; Laudicina, 1980).

While many different positions have been articulated, there have been three clearly identifiable schools of thought about the purpose of student services. These may be called, respectively, the "administrative," "student personnel," and "student development" perspectives.

The administrative or "housekeeping" perspective is the

oldest and yet least distinct of the three. Its purpose may be defined as the effective and efficient provision of student-related services in support of the institution. This outlook is not heavily influenced by any particular philosophy or theory, but rather stems from the historical roots of the field, whose initial role was the administration of those extra-curricular responsibilities formerly handled by the faculty (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). It suggests an organization whose primary commitment is to the institution (COSPA, 1972), and whose primary rationale is to support the academic mission of the campus. A student services professional operating purely from this perspective would see himself or herself as an administrator rather than a counselor, and would likely believe in a minimal approach to student affairs programs and services.

The second of the three perspectives, student personnel, stresses the total growth of students in a social environment. It asserts that education includes students' physical, social, emotional, and spiritual development as well as their intellectual growth (Williamson, 1949), and thus is concerned with the student as a "whole person." Elements of this perspective can be traced back to the early colonial colleges, but its formal origins date from 1937, when the American Council on Education published The Student Personnel Point of View (1937). It suggests an organization whose primary commitment is to the socialization of students and which focuses on out-of-class experiences. A student

services professional espousing the student personnel out-look would operate in the role of a counselor or social worker, and would be most concerned with extracurricular programs and activities.

The third viewpoint, student development, is based on the application of human development concepts to higher education (Miller and Prince, 1977). Operating from a theoretical foundation in humanistic psychology, it is concerned with helping students reach their fullest poten-tial as human beings. It suggests an organization which seeks to shape the total environment of the institution -- both in and out of the classroom -- for the purpose of creating a developmental milieu for its students (Brown, 1972). Proponents of the student development outlook have been in the forefront of the movement within the profession to create a theoretical basis from which student services would operate. A professional committed to this perspective would see himself or herself primarily as an educator in the same sense as a college or university faculty member. The distinction between the curricular and the extra-curricular -- a distinguishing characteristic of the student personnel perspective -- is generally denied by the student develop-ment viewpoint.

Despite the diversity embodied in these three perspec-tives, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In practice most student affairs divisions operate under some combination of the three. As abstractions they nonetheless

represent widely differing conceptions as to the purpose of a student services division, its relationship to the campus, and the functions it ought to perform (Laudicina, 1980).

Statement of the Problem

A major characteristic of the continuing debate in student services is that it has been for the most part an internal dialogue. Except on rare occasions, the profession has not included members of the higher education community outside of student services in its discussions. Moreover, it has seldom asked those outside the profession -- particularly other administrators -- what they believe student services ought to contribute. Instead, student services researchers have compared perceptions of faculty, students, and/or student services professionals (Fitzgerald, 1962; Pinsky and Marks, 1980); or have described the role of the chief student affairs officer (Blackburn, 1969; Bloland, 1979); or have studied the relationship between chief student affairs officers and their presidents (Terenzini, 1973; Tilley, 1979).

Thus the profession in its ambivalence has tended toward introspection at the expense of interaction with other parts of the campus community. There is a not-so-subtle irony in the fact that while the profession earnestly desires to be "part of the heart and soul" of higher education (Arquist and Farragher, 1982), it has been reluctant to include faculty and administrator contributions in its

search for identity and purpose. In the current era of financial constraints it seems especially important to determine whether campus administrators share the same goals and purposes for student services as do members of the student services profession. Are the goals of student services compatible with institutional goals and congruent with the attitudes of campus administrators? If they instead tend to create a division between the student affairs staff and the college or university administration (Smith, 1982), then the profession can only expect to find itself further isolated and increasingly vulnerable.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this research is to determine the attitudes of campus administrators toward the purpose of student services. More specifically, the study is to focus on a measure of congruence; that is, whether administrators are more likely to agree with one perspective over others. The rationale for the study is based on two assumptions. The first is that top-level campus administrators (presidents and vice-presidents) are likely to have the final decision on resource allocations, or at the least will have a strong influence on the allocation process. The second assumption is that a student services department or division is more vulnerable to budget reductions if its perceived purpose and/or goals are at variance with the mission of the institution or the thinking of administrators outside of student

services.

In the context of these assumptions, the following research questions will be explored:

1. Of the three historical rationales for the existence of student services -- the administrative, student personnel, and student development points of view -- which is most likely to coincide with the attitudes of campus administrators regarding the proper purpose of specific student services functions?

2. What are the attitudes of campus administrators regarding the proper purpose of student services as a whole?

3. Are campus administrators consistent in their views regarding the purpose of student services?

4. Are there significant differences in the attitudes of different types of campus administrators?

5. Are there significant differences with respect to the type of institution?

Limitations

The line of inquiry which led to the research questions posed above resulted in the development of a new instrument significantly different from previous designs intended to measure perceptions about student services. While the instrument appears relatively sound, and has held up well to appropriate checks of reliability and validity, it will take some replications of the research, along with modifications of the instrument, before the conclusions drawn from the

research can be unequivocally asserted.

For reasons of economy it was decided to limit the survey population to colleges and universities in the western United States. Any conclusions drawn from the study should be considered as descriptive of colleges and universities located only in the western portion of the nation. The population is further restricted to four-year institutions who offer at least the Bachelor's degree.

Finally, it should be noted that there are certain innate limitations which apply to an attitudinal survey using mailed questionnaires. The researcher must assume that the original intent of the questions are understood by respondents, and that respondents answer honestly. In this survey there is some risk that respondents may give answers which are based less on their personal opinions and more on what they believe is the existing philosophy of their chief student affairs officer. The researcher's only means to combat such "contamination" of the data is to provide respondents with clear instructions and then to carefully apply internal checks for reliability.

Definitions

An <u>attitude</u> is a learned disposition to respond to an object (or a group of objects) in a favorable or unfavorable way (Allport, 1935). Attitudes belong to the affective realm; they are functions of an individual's beliefs about

an object and exert a variable degree of influence to an individual's behavior (Fishbein, 1967).[1]

Campus administrator refers to those officials on a college or university campus whose primary function is the administration of some program or division of the institution, or the administration of the institution as a whole. Of concern to this study are the following types of administrators:

1. The president is defined as the chief executive officer of the institution, responsible for the entire mission of the campus and reporting to a board of trustees or to a system administration.

2. The academic vice president is the chief academic officer of the institution, responsible for the academic mission of the campus and reporting to the president.

3. The business vice president is the chief financial and/or administrative officer of the institution, responsible for finance, budget, auxiliary services and physical plant, and reporting to the president.

---

[1]Not all psychologists accept this definition, preferring instead a multidimensional concept which considers attitudes to be composed of cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements. See Cook and Selltiz (1964).

4. The <u>chief student affairs officer</u>, whose title may be vice president for student affairs or dean of students, is responsible for the overall direction of a student services division. He or she usually reports to the president.

Chapter II - REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Attitude and Attitude Measurement

The literature surrounding the measurement of attitudes is enormous, encompassing sources in virtually all of the social sciences. For this reason the discussion which follows is concerned only with a review of the concept of attitude and its measurement as each pertains to the subject of this study.

Over the years there have been hundreds of definitions of attitude and almost as many theories. Gordon Allport (1935), after reviewing many such definitions, concluded that most researchers agreed that attitude was essentially a simple, unidimensional concept: a learned disposition to respond to an object in a favorable or unfavorable manner. This was certainly the concept held by the eminent L.L. Thurston, who referred to attitude as "the amount of affect for or against a psychological object" (1931, p. 261).

Allport himself disagreed, believing instead that there was a qualitative, multidimensional character to attitude which was being ignored by measurement instruments which produced a single score. His suggestion was not immediately supported, but in time a considerable segment of related psychological theory began to adopt the multidimensional approach. Chein (1948) argued that a true attitude was represented by consistent beliefs about the object, con-

sistent amount of affect towards the object, and consistent behavior with respect to the object. Chein's assertion fit well with behaviorists, since it implied that behavior could be used as a source of measurement rather than self-reported emotions (Campbell, 1963).

Attitude theory was eventually dominated by the multidimensional concept. As summarized by Katz and Stotland (1959), this involved a complex formula of three components: 1) the cognitive (one's beliefs about an object); 2) the affective (one's feelings of a favorable or unfavorable nature about the object); and 3) the conative (one's behavior or action tendency towards an object). These components were said to interact with each other to produce an "attitude" towards an object. Summers (1970) pointed out that consistency among the three components would have to be an essential basis for any measurement of attitude. Thus a consequence of the multidimensional concept was that its measurement would require a multiple indicator technique.

As is not uncommon in the social sciences, the theory of attitudes and the practice of measuring them did not move on parallel tracks. Although a number of efforts have been made to develop multidimensional measurements (e.g., Campbell and Fiske, 1959; Cook and Selltiz, 1964), probably more attention and use has been made of single score methods which imply a unidimensional concept. Two major examples were the Guttman Scale (Guttman, 1944) and the Semantic Differential (Osgood, Tannenbaum, and Suci, 1957).

Fishbein (1967) argued that this divergence between theory and research was not incidental. Researchers, while often acknowledging the existence of the three components, were primarily interested in measuring the affective component, which they considered the "essence of attitude." Fishbein pointed to a substantial body of evidence to support his argument, including a number of studies which supported the unidimensional idea that attitudes were a function of beliefs rather than the latter being a component of the former (e.g., Rosenberg, 1960; Zajone, 1954; Fishbein, 1963, 1965).

Thus the development of attitude measurement has moved along two separate lines, depending upon whether the researcher accepted a unidimensional or multidimensional definition of attitude. In the course of this development a pragmatic trend emerged. Researchers found that, in addition to traditional measurements of the affective component, one could focus on the other two components and -- if the object of interest was indeed an attitude -- come up with measurements of acceptable reliability and validity. Zajone (1960) and Scott (1969) each developed indices of the cognitive component which could be used in attitude measurement. Significant relationships between behavior and attitude were also found using scales based on observations of behavior (Carr and Roberts, 1965; Bandura, Blanchard and Ritter, 1969).

Dawes (1972) took matters one step further. He classi-

fied measures of attitude as being either representational or indexical. Representational measurements involved a two-way correspondence between the property of the object being measured and a property of the measurement scale. The scale in effect "represented" the property of the object being measured. Index measurement was defined as involving a one-way correspondence only; the property of the object could be placed on a scale of measurement -- an index -- but the index itself would not be a true scale and could not be used to predict unobserved attitudes. Dawes pointed out that while representational measurement provided a more precise outcome and a means of prediction, index measurement was equally valuable for its usefulness; it could be used to provide descriptions of properties and to make limited predictions about events "external to those used to obtain the index" (Dawes, 1972, p. 15).

One would have to conclude from a review of the literature that the investigation of attitudes has proceeded on a broad front, encompassing a superabundance of definitions, theories, and methodologies. While this has often created a series of claims, criticisms, and counterclaims, it has also produced a prevailing mood of pragmatism, resulting in a variety of potential tools for investigators. While some theorists would obviously disapprove of the proliferation of concepts and methods, others would likely agree with Fishbein (1967, p. 479), who concluded:

> It seems that these different types of instru-
> ments, or approaches, are attempting to measure

the same thing; each is attempting to arrive at a single score that will represent how favorable or unfavorable the individual is toward the attitude object in question.

Perceptions of Student Services

There have been only a handful of attempts to systematically assess attitudes about student services, and of these only a few have tried to focus on the question of purpose. Most studies have instead examined perceptions of student services functions, typically comparing the perceptions of different campus groups (e.g., students, faculty, and student services personnel). Shuman (1972) compared perceptions of faculty, administrators, and student personnel administrators at a mid-western university. He found that faculty and administrators considered most important those functions which were directly related to the academic mission of the institution. McIver (1976) replicated the study at the University of Oklahoma and arrived at a similar conclusion. However, both studies failed to include top-level administrators in their populations. Instead they defined administrators as academic deans and department heads. Neither study could thus provide insight into the attitudes of presidents and vice-presidents.

The Shuman and McIver studies were typical of the largest group of research regarding perceptions of student services. Such projects have tended to focus on the perceived importance of specific functions (Kamm, 1950; Zimmer-

man, 1963; Rankin, 1966; Jones, 1972); or have compared faculty perceptions to those held by students or student services professionals (Johnson, 1968; Troescher, 1969; Moyer, 1974; Pinsky and Marks, 1980). In either instance, the studies were more helpful in analyzing the roles of functions than in determining attitudes regarding the rationale for student services.

Two studies came much closer to a measurement of attitudes towards purpose. In both cases the persons surveyed were faculty members rather than administrators. Fitzgerald (1962) developed a questionnaire intended to determine faculty perceptions of the importance and quality of certain student services functions as well as an indication of the degree of faculty knowledge about the actual provision of services. The functions contained in the questionnaire were mostly derived from "The Student Personnel Point of View" (Williamson et al., 1949). Thus responses to the questionnaire provided some indication of faculty support for the student personnel perspective. Fitzgerald's conclusions suggested that faculty agreement with such a perspective was not consistent. Her respondents ranked highest those functions which supported the academic program (e.g., advising, assisting the development of study skills). They were less supportive of functions that involved socialization (student activities) or which had little direct relation to academics (food service, discipline, and certain placement activities).

Fitzgerald's study was aimed primarily at functions rather than purpose, and thus was not able to draw a clear picture of faculty attitudes towards student services as a whole. The functions which she included in her instrument were not systematically differentiated by perspective, and could not be used to compare the degree of support between administrative and student personnel outlooks. Moreover, her study was limited to faculty at a single institution, precluding inference of her conclusions to a broader population.

Astmann (1975) surveyed faculty attitudes toward student services at a small, private, liberal arts college in the East, using both a written questionnaire and personal interviews. He described the campus climate as one of "survival of the fittest," as different campus groups competed for increasingly scarce funding. Astmann reported much stronger feelings about student services than Fitzgerald had discovered a decade and more earlier. He found that faculty tended to divide student services functions into two groups: those that were considered essentially administrative-bureaucratic and those considered to be specifically helpful to students. The former included housing, financial aid, health, and the office of the dean of students; the latter was limited to counseling, placement, and certain student activities functions.

Astmanns's study might suggest that faculty would lean towards a student personnel perspective. However, he point-

ed out that "Noticeably lacking in the overall faculty perception . . . was a larger philosophical grasp of the basic purpose of student personnel services." (Astmann, 1975, p. 66). The implication was that faculty attitudes were more the result of budgetary anxieties than they were of the perceived purpose of student services. As with Fitzgerald, Astmann's conclusions were limited to a single campus; no inferences could be made to a larger audience.

The one component common to all of the studies mentioned to this point has been their exclusion of campus administrators above the level of dean. Shuman and McIver defined administrators as deans and department heads; Fitzgerald and Astmann ignored all levels of administration and focused on faculty groups, largely on the premise that closer identification with faculty was most necessary for the continued growth of the student services profession. Additionally, the scope of each of these studies was limited to a single campus, and thus in any event would have provided only a few administrator responses to each researcher.

Administrator Attitudes

Within the literature there have been only two surveys which have included administrator attitudes and a national sample of institutions. In both instances, a major purpose of the study was to compare perceptions of campus presidents with those of chief student affairs officers.

Dutton, Appleton and Birch (1970) examined the question

of how members of the academic community perceived the role and functions of the chief student affairs officer (CSAO). Their survey population included presidents, faculty, student leaders, and deans or vice-presidents of student affairs. It was found that CSAOs and presidents were generally in agreement on a number of principles regarding the CSAO's role, including: 1) the importance of the relationship between the CSAO and students; 2) the importance of social and personal development of students as institutional objectives; and 3) the involvement of the CSAO in campus governance and decision-making. However, presidents were significantly more inclined than CSAOs to place importance on the need for control and order of student behavior. Presidents also indicated that CSAOs should uphold institutional standards and values, and were more likely to believe that the CSAO's first responsibility was to the institution rather than to students.

The Dutton et al. (1970) study provided some clues about the attitudes of campus administrators -- at least those of campus presidents -- but the picture which they drew was not consistent. On the one hand presidents believed that CSAOs should have a definite commitment to their students; on the other hand, presidents also tended to believe that the CSAO's primary responsibility was to the institution. In the same manner, presidents believed in the importance of student social and personal development and the importance of manipulating the campus environment to

foster student development; yet they also believed that students should adopt institutional standards and values, and that CSAOs should attempt to influence students to do so. Finally, although presidents tended to believe in the importance of the CSAO's relationship with students, they also were more inclined to believe that administrative responsibilities should take precedence over the student relationship. From this it might be inferred that presidents' attitudes tended to fall between the major perspectives -- under some circumstances adopting an administrative perspective, at other times taking a student personnel or student development outlook.

Conclusions about attitudes toward purpose which could be drawn from this study were clouded because the study focused on the chief student affairs officer, not on student services as a whole. Presidents were not asked what student affairs divisions should contribute to the institution, nor what the functional boundaries of student services should be. Thus, while the project was successful in describing the actual and perceived roles of the CSAO, it could only hint at the perceived purpose of the profession.

Terenzini (1973) attempted to examine the views of college and university presidents regarding the goals of student services programs and functions. He sent copies of the Student Personnel Purpose Q-Sort (Blackburn, 1969) to the presidents and chief student affairs officers of 350 institutions which had been randomly selected from across

the United States. The Q-Sort consisted of eighty state-
ments of differing purposes for various student services
programs. Respondents were asked to place each statement on
a nine-point Likert scale to indicate whether they agreed or
disagreed with the statement.

Terenzini found that presidents tended to prefer those
goals which reflected the student personnel perspective.
Among the functions most supported were student activities,
counseling, advising, and orientation. Presidents were less
inclined to favor goals that called for increased student
participation in governance and manipulation of the environ-
ment to enhance human development. Presidents were least
supportive of goals which suggested an active student ser-
vices role in academic affairs. Additionally, Terenzini
found that presidents were not in agreement with goals which
concerned the maintenance of standards of behavior or the
encouragement of student adoption of institutional values.

From his study, Terenzini concluded that campus presi-
dents favored traditional roles for student services. He
suggested that they favored a "services" model -- by impli-
cation a "housekeeping" outlook. However, the goals con-
tained in the Q-Sort did not contain many administrative
statements, and the statements with which presidents most
agreed involved the kind of programs and contact between
student services worker and student which have been con-
sidered representative of the student personnel point of
view.

Terenzini also concluded that presidents favored a complete separation of student services from academic programs. This conclusion, when added to the lack of presidential support for human development programs, caused Terenzini to decide that most campuses were not yet ready to accept the concepts embodied in the student development perspective.

Terenzini's conclusions were in only partial agreement with the findings of Dutton et al., (1970). Terenzini's presidents appeared to be much more consistent in their outlook than those surveyed by Dutton. Moreover, Dutton found that presidents considered discipline, standards of student behavior, and student adoption of institutional values to be highly important; Terenzini arrived at almost an opposite conclusion.

The differences between the two studies may have been due to Terenzini's use of the Q-Sort instrument. In the context of the three major perspectives, the goal statements contained in the Q-Sort tended to emphasize the student personnel and student development points of view at the expense of the administrative perspective. Additionally, the Q-Sort required considerable time to complete. The eighty statements had to be physically manipulated by the respondent, and there were limits as to how many statements could be placed on any one of the nine points in the Likert scale used in the instrument. It is possible that for a busy campus president this method was not conducive to com-

pleting the instrument. The fact that Terenzini received usable responses from only 72 presidents (out of 350 contacted) suggests that his findings were not necessarily definitive. Finally, the two instruments used by Dutton and Terenzini were not measuring the same thing. Dutton and his associates were looking at the roles and responsibilities of chief student affairs officers; Terenzini was examining attitudes towards specific program goals. Thus while some general inferences could be made from each study for comparison, it would be risky to compare more specific conclusions.

Summary

A review of the literature has shown the lack of research focusing on the purpose of student services. The majority of studies have examined the relative importance of specific functions, with no attempt to systematically assess the underlying rationales. As a rule, campus administrators -- except for deans and department heads -- were excluded from the survey populations, in part because the researchers tended to examine only a single campus. Of the two studies which did examine attitudes of campus administrators -- in both cases presidents -- the Dutton project was more concerned with perceptions of the role of the chief student affairs officer. While some inferences about purpose could be made, no clear picture emerged of presidents' attitudes. Terenzini's study suggested that presidents were

most supportive of the student personnel perspective, but his conclusions are somewhat suspect because of problems associated with his use of Q-Sort methodology.

Chapter III - METHODOLOGY

Sample

The population to be surveyed was defined as the chief
executive officer (president), chief academic officer (aca-
demic vice president), and chief finance or business officer
(business vice president) at four-year colleges and univer-
sities located in the western United States. The population
was further defined to exclude administrators at institu-
tions whose enrollments were less than 300 students. Also
excluded were certain professional schools, such as seminar-
ies and medical schools. For this study the western states
included:

Alaska	Nevada
Arizona	New Mexico
California	Oregon
Colorado	Utah
Hawaii	Washington
Idaho	Wyoming
Montana	

The total number of institutions in the population was 178.
Thus the population itself totaled 534 administrators.

Since the population could be completely identified and
was relatively small, systematic sampling was employed to
draw the sample. A random list of the population, strati-
fied by state, was constructed and every other institution

selected (the first institution was selected randomly). This provided a sample of more than adequate size and allowed proportional stratification of the sample by state, type of institution (public or private), and size of institution. Systematic sampling also ensured randomization (Sax, 1978). At each institution selected, the president, academic vice president, and finance/business vice president were surveyed. This produced a total sample of 267 individuals.

Development of the Instrument

A review of the literature failed to identify a questionnaire entirely appropriate to the purposes of this study. As noted in Chapter II, there have been very few studies which have touched on the purpose of student services. Terenzini's (1973) survey, while closest in intent to this project, used the Q-Sort method; his instrument had some serious disadvantages, and Q methodology in general has been criticized for its structure and for the length of time needed for a respondent to complete a Q-Sort questionnaire (Mowrer, 1953; Wittenborn, 1961). Fitzgerald's (1962) Student Personnel Services Questionnaire, which has been replicated several times since its development, was intended to measure faculty perceptions of specific student services functions. It was not designed as a measure of attitude. Moreover, it lacked a systematic differentiation of the major perspectives. Modifications of the instrument by

subsequent researchers (Pinsky and Marks, 1980) did not result in any significant changes that would permit use of the instrument for this study. The Assumptions and Beliefs Questionnaire developed by Dutton et al., (1970), was designed to measure beliefs of campus administrators and others about the role and functions of the chief student affairs officer. A significant portion of the instrument was devoted to management concerns. It, too, was not intended to measure attitudes, though they could possibly be inferred from an analysis of the responses to the belief statements. Since radical modification would have been necessary to make the instrument appropriate to this project, no benefits could be gained by adopting it.

Thus it was concluded that a new instrument would have to be developed in order to adequately answer the research questions. Some elements of the Terenzini, Fitzgerald and Dutton instruments would be incorporated into the questionnaire design, but it could not be considered as a modified replication of any of the three.

The initial conception of the instrument suggested it should be designed to provide an index measurement (see Dawes, 1972) rather than an actual scale. The attitude object -- the purpose of student services -- was relatively narrow and applicable only to certain populations. This would make it difficult to validate with reference to an external criterion, since there would be no existing independent measures. A second factor mitigating against a

scale is that the research questions actually posed three attitude objects: in effect, each of the three major perspectives identified in Chapter I would have to be measured. While this could be done with a single instrument to produce a scale, it would likely require a complex design subject to considerable systematic error. Finally, it was anticipated that the attitudes indicated in the responses to the instrument would be strongly influenced by the administrators' beliefs (that is, there would be a strong cognitive influence), given the nature of the attitude objects. Including a cognitive element in a scale would be difficult, and would increase the potential for serious errors in measurement.

An index measurement, on the other hand, appeared to better fit the research questions. It would allow more flexibility in developing an index that could accurately describe the attitudes, would not be absolutely dependent on an external criterion, and could be used to make predictions about the specified population from which the sample was drawn. Moreover, it would allow the development of a single instrument that could simultaneously measure attitude towards all three perspectives. The cost for this flexibility would be an inability to predict attitudes outside of the defined population (for example, attitudes of chief student affairs officers or attitudes of presidents and vice presidents outside of the western states). Additionally, according to Dawes (1972), there would be a partial loss of certainty regarding the findings.

Most of the remaining considerations regarding the means of measurement, format, and administration of the instrument were dictated to a considerable extent by the assumed characteristics of the sample: 1) the individuals had heavy work schedules; 2) they would be recipients of many surveys and questionnaires; and 3) they would be well-educated.

These assumptions led to the conclusion that the instrument would have to be verbal, eliciting self-reports from the respondents. Other methods of measurement, including observation of behavior, reaction to stimuli, or physiological reactions, appeared to be inappropriate given the nature of the attitude objects and the characteristics of the individuals comprising the sample. Additionally, the instrument would have to be short, containing only the attitude questions. It was anticipated that the individuals to be surveyed would be less likely to respond to a lengthy instrument.[2] Demographic information would be obtained from other sources (principally the Higher Education Directory, 1983). Finally, the purpose of the instrument would remain undisguised; no attempt would be made to hide the intent of the research.

Unfortunately, the guidelines would have the effect of

---

[2]The Dutton, et al., (1970) study recorded a usable response rate of 58% from presidents. Terenzini (1973) only managed to obtain responses from 21% of the presidents in his sample.

weakening the instrument, resulting in a partial loss of certainty concerning the measurements. To offset this weakness, it was expected that there would be a more than adequate response rate from the sample, thereby overcoming problems regarding representation of the population.

Based on the considerations discussed to this point, it was decided that the instrument would have to be in the form of a survey. Each of the three possible survey methods -- face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, and mailed questionnaires -- presented certain advantages and disadvantages. Face-to-face interviews were discarded for reasons of high cost and because of the risk that respondents might bias the survey by offering answers supportive of the current philosophy of their campus student affairs division. Research has shown that such a risk is significantly higher in face-to-face interviews than in other forms of surveys (Hyman, 1955; Phillips and Clancy, 1972). Other considerations suggested that telephone interviews also would not be an appropriate method. The initial development of questions indicated that they would be complex and relatively lengthy. Studies of the effectiveness of telephone interviews have found that simplicity of question language and content is essential for a telephone survey (Dillman, 1978). Additionally, the cost of conducting a telephone survey was found to be exceedingly high. It was estimated that long-distance charges alone would average $8.75 per interview.

In contrast to face-to-face or telephone interviews, a

mail survey offered a number of advantages. Dillman's
(1978) work in survey construction has shown that mail
surveys tend to be more effective under conditions that
approximate the conditions of this research project. These
include complete identification of the population, locating
respondents, homogeneous samples, length of questionnaire,
avoidance of social desirability bias, avoidance of inter-
viewer distortion, and relatively low cost. For these
reasons, it was decided to use a printed questionnaire which
would be mailed to selected respondents.

The initial questionnaire was composed of thirty-three
questions divided into two parts. Part I contained three
statements, each a description of a possible primary purpose
of student services according to one of the three major
perspectives. For each statement the respondent was asked
to indicate on a five-point Likert scale whether he or she
agreed or disagreed with the statement (1 = strongly dis-
agree; 5 = strongly agree). Part II consisted of thirty
statements describing specific student services functions.
These statements covered ten functional areas:

Admissions	Health Services
Counseling	Housing
Discipline	Orientation
Financial Aid	Placement
General Services[3]	Student Activities

Three statements were assigned to each functional area.

---

[3]This category was changed to "Academic Support" as a
result of pre-testing.

Each of the three was then used to describe a function from one of the major perspectives. The resulting thirty statements were randomly ordered. For each statement the respondent was asked to indicate on a five-point Likert scale how important he or she considered that function (1 = very unimportant; 5 = very important). Each of the thirty-three statements was drawn directly from the literature as representative of one of the three perspectives. Generally the statements were paraphrased to conform to the format of the instrument. (See Appendix A for documentation of each statement.)

The questionnaire was constructed according to the survey design principles described by Dillman (1978), resulting in a ten-page survey instrument containing the questions and instructions. A cover letter further explaining the purpose of the project and requesting the respondent's cooperation accompanied the instrument (see Appendix B).

Pretesting

Dillman (1978) recommended three specific pre-tests, designed to test the questions and also to evaluate the effectiveness of the questionnaire. His recommendations were incorporated with some modifications into a pretest plan which required three groups of respondents. The tests were run consecutively. Revisions to the questionnaire were made at each stage before the next test was begun.

Panel of Experts Test. Eight chief student affairs officers were selected for the first test, representing a mix of geographic locations, types of institutions, and size of institutions. Each was sent a copy of the questionnaire. An accompanying cover letter explained the intended purpose of the survey, asked the expert to complete the questionnaire, and asked him or her to also complete a separate evaluation sheet containing specific questions about the instrument. The role of the panel was thus to determine whether the questionnaire would accomplish the objectives of the research project.

The first pretest was conducted in June, 1982. The evaluations of the panel of experts resulted in a number of changes in the wording of certain statements, and a change in the format of the questionnaire. The most serious problem uncovered was the use of Likert scales to measure responses. A number of respondents were confused by the presentation of the three statements in Part I. Consequently they tended to mark all three items as "important" or "very important." The lack of variance which resulted diminished the validity of the questions. The same results occured in Part II. Respondents believed they were not being asked to place a relative value on specific functions, and so instead simply indicated the possible importance of each function. Nearly all were considered "important," and thus there was no systematic variance in the responses.

As a result of the first pretest, it was decided to

measure responses using an ordinal scale rather than the Likert scale in order to ensure systematic variance. Since the instrument was intended to produce an index rather than a scale, the loss of interval measurement which the Likert scale would have provided was not considered critical. An ordinal scale, on the other hand, would give some benefits. The response from the pre-test strongly suggested that the probable responses would not fall into a normal distribution. Ordinal measurement would allow use of non-parametric statistics, which are unaffected by the possible lack of a normal distribution.

The change in scale from interval to ordinal required a minor adjustment to Part I of the questionnaire and a more significant change to Part II. Part I was revised to present the three different perspectives for ranking by the respondent, based on how essential he or she believed the perspectives were to the purpose of higher education (1 = most essential). Part II, in its revised version, departed from the random presentation of functional statements; instead, the statements were grouped according to functional area (three statements for each area), with each statement representing one of the three major perspectives. A number of statements were reworded to more clearly reflect the underlying rationale of the function. Additionally, some statements were revised so that all three statements in a group described as nearly as possible the same type of function. In this revised format, the respondent would be

asked to rank each group of three statements in order of how essential he or she felt they were to the purpose of the functional area.

Respondent Evaluation Test. A small sample of six individuals was drawn from the target population. They were told that a survey was to be done regarding student services in higher education and they were being asked to help pretest it. An appointment was made with each respondent. They were given a questionnaire and a cover letter and were asked to complete the questionnaire in the presence of the researcher. This test provided two crucial pieces of information. The first was verbal feedback, as the respondent commented on the instrument while filling it out. The second was non-verbal feedback observed by the researcher. This included hesitations, erasures, skipping through questions, and other behavior that indicated a problem with the instrument.

Comments from respondents who participated in the second pretest indicated that the length, format, and appearance of the instrument were successful in motivating the respondent to complete it. The shortness of the questionnaire and the lack of demographic questions were generally appreciated. The groups of statements were ranked with little hesitation by most respondents. In some cases, respondents remarked that a number of the statements did not describe programs or services which actually existed at their campuses. In each instance when this occured, a ques-

tion by the researcher revealed that the respondent had not remembered the questionnaire instructions, which stated that the services may or may not exist. Nonetheless, this pointed out the need to make the instructions clearer. They were subsequently revised to provide additional emphasis regarding the hypothetical nature of the statements.

Statistical Analysis Test. A small sample (N = 45) was drawn from the target population. In a rehearsal of the actual survey, each respondent was sent a copy of the questionnaire and cover letter. The responses were used to test the statistical tools that would be applied to the survey, and to make initial tests for reliability.

Administration of the test produced replies from 38 (84.4%) of the respondents. Three questionnaires were not usable, leaving a net return rate of 77.8%. Reliability was checked using a test called alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which is based on the KR_{20} formula for internal consistency developed by Kuder and Richardson (1937). The alpha test produced a low coefficient of r = .38. The lack of consistency was traced to two areas of the instrument. Respondents were not perceiving a clear difference between the administrative and student personnel perspectives contained in Part I. Secondly, respondents were apparently interpreting four of the student personnel statements in Part II as representing an administrative perspective.

Based on the analysis of the pre-test, the instrument was again revised. The administrative and student personnel

statements in Part I were restated to make them more clearly mutually exclusive. Additionally, a number of statements in Part II were rewritten to more clearly reflect appropriate perspectives.

Because of the substantial revisions, it was decided to repeat the pre-test prior to implementing the actual survey, as a final check on the instrument. A small sample (N = 15) was drawn, and the instrument administered using the same procedures as before. Analysis of the results from this test, when corrected for the small sample size, indicated that the revisions had improved the reliability of the instrument.

The Survey

The final version of the instrument (see Appendix C) was given to the 267 administrators who composed the sample. Based on the successful return rate of the third pretest, the procedures recommended by Dillman (1978) were again employed. Each respondent was mailed a copy of the questionnaire, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research, and a postage-paid return envelope. One week after the initial mailing a follow-up letter was sent to all respondents, thanking those who had already returned their questionnaires and reminding those who had not. Three weeks after the first mailing a letter and replacement questionnaire were sent to those who had not responded. Seven weeks after the first mailing another letter and question-

naire, sent by certified mail, were sent to those who had not responded. Responses from completed questionnaires were matched with the appropriate demographic information, coded, and entered into a computerized data bank.

A total of 226 questionnaires, 84.6% of the sample, were returned. Of these, 19 were not usable -- either because they were not properly completed or because someone other than the intended respondent filled out the question- naire. This left 207 usable questionnaires, or 77.5% of the sample. Chi square tests for goodness of fit determined that the collected sample was representative of the popula- tion for all strata (type of administrator, type of insti- tution, size of institution) and was also representative for each state contained in the population.

Reliability

An estimate of the reliability of the measurements was made based on the consideration that the instrument was essentially homogeneous; that is, it was measuring the same attitude in approximately equal fashion through all items. Since homogeneity is a reflection of internal consistency (Guilford and Fruchter, 1978), it followed that the appro- priate test of reliability would be one which measured consistency.

Shortly after completion of the third pretest, it was discovered that alpha tends to underestimate reliability where ordinal measurement is used. For this reason a dif-

ferent test was substituted. A reliability coefficient was obtained from the sum of the 207 sets of ranks by first finding the average rank-difference correlation. Guilford and Fruchter (1978) have shown that a reliability estimate of consistency can be derived by the formula:

$$\underline{r} = \frac{kx}{1+(k-1)x}$$

where $\underline{r}$ = reliability coefficient
               $\overline{k}$ = number of respondents
               x = average rank-difference correlation

This test gave a value of $\underline{r}$ = .73, indicating an estimate of a high correlation of the average ranks for the three given purposes of student services with the averages in a comparable set.

Validity

A definitive measurement of the instrument's validity, in the form of a correlation coefficient, will require an eventual retest or replication of the research with a separate, comparable population. As noted in Chapter II, there apparently does not exist an independent measure of the same attitude objects which concern this study. The lack of an external criterion precludes testing for either criterion-related or construct validity.

Although a single quantitative measure cannot be obtained, there several qualitative indications that the instrument is measuring the attitude objects. Bohrnstedt (1970) has pointed out that content validity in attitude

measurement is enhanced when a number of procedures are carefully followed. First, he contends, the concept which forms the attitude object must be precisely defined and should have a solid foundation in the literature. Second, the concept should be stratified into its major components. Finally, the instrument should contain several items for each stratum, so that all dimensions of meaning of the strata are contained in the subsequent measurement.

These criteria were met in the instrument. The attitude object -- the purpose of student services -- was defined in Chapter I. Its component parts, which were represented by the three perspectives, formed the strata. Each was also carefully defined and tied to the literature. The differing shades of meaning that might be attached to the perspectives were covered by the thirty-three statements contained in the instrument. Moreover, each of the statements was directly related to the literature. (Documentation of the statements is contained in Appendix A.)

Statistical Procedures

The collected responses were first tallied to determine for each of the eleven sets of rankings the proportion of respondents who indicated the highest rank for each of the three perspectives. The tallies were stratified by:

a) type of administrator (president, academic vice president, business vice president);

b) size of institution (I - less than 1500 students,

II - 1500 to 4999 students, III - 5000 to 9999 students, IV - 10,000 or more students);

c) type of institution (public or private).

A single-variable chi square test was employed to make an initial determination as to whether the three statements in each question were equally likely to be chosen. The null hypothesis stated that each of the three statements in each set would be equally preferred. Rejection of the null case (at the .05 level) would indicate that a preference existed for one of the statements.

A two-variable chi square test of independence was employed to determine whether differences in preference existed between levels in each stratified group (type of administrator, size of institution, type of institution). The null hypothesis stated that the defined variable would have no effect on preference. Rejection of the null case (at the .05 level) would indicate that a relationship existed between the variable and preference. In such a case, Cramer's V was used to measure the strength of the relationship.[4]

An important aspect of the research was to determine the level of congruency (i.e., the association) among the rankings given by the administrators. To accomplish this,

---

[4]Cramer's V is a version of the Phi Coefficient. While not often used in social science research, it has been judged by Welkowitz, et al., (1976) as a superior index, in part because the resulting coefficient always varies between 0 and 1 regardless of the number of levels in each variable.

the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (denoted by the symbol $\underline{W}$) was used (Kendall, 1970).

$\underline{W}$ is a statistic specifically designed for ordinal data; it measures the extent of association among several sets of rankings of any number of objects. The measure is derived from the sums of ranks for each object. In effect, it represents an index of the variance of the actual agreement from the maximum possible agreement, and may take a value of from 0 (complete disagreement) to 1 (perfect agreement).

An observed value of $\underline{W}$ may be tested for significance. Where the number of sets of rankings is large, the following formula (Guilford and Fruchter, 1978) provides a statistic which is distributed approximately as chi square:

$$\text{Chi Square} = k(r-1)W$$

where k = the number of sets of rankings and r = the number of objects being ranked. The statistic can be used to test the null hypothesis that the k sets of rankings are unrelated. Rejection of the null hypothesis (i.e., a significant value of $\underline{W}$) permits an inference to be made that the same standard or criterion is being applied in the k sets of rankings of the r objects.

The use of $\underline{W}$ also allowed an extra check on the respondents' indicated preferences for one of the three perspectives. Kendall (1970, pp. 100-102) suggested that the best estimate of the true ranking of the objects being tested is

to rank according to the sums of ranks assigned to each object. This procedure is reliable whenever a significant value for W̲ is produced. The estimates were applied as necessary to clarify the "true attitude" of respondents toward the objects.

In this research the objects were of course the three perspectives. The k variable was applied in two ways. First, the W̲ of the entire sample and of each stratified respondent group was calculated for each group of three statements. For example, to determine the association among all presidents toward a preferred perspective of financial aid services, the ranks assigned by presidents to that section of the instrument were summed and W̲ was then computed. The large number of rankings involved (depending on which stratum was being measured, the value of k varied from 25 to 207) increased the precision of the coefficient, providing significant W̲'s even when the absolute value was small.

In order to obtain a measure of overall congruence, independent of any one group of statements, a second test was applied to each individual in the sample. The eleven groups of statements in the instrument were assumed to represent eleven sets of rankings of the three perspectives. The resulting value of W̲ for each case represented the index of congruence each individual possessed in his or her preference for one of the perspectives. The null hypothesis was tested for each W̲ at the .05 level of confidence. Mean W̲'s

were calculated for each stratum, using Fisher $\underline{Z}$ Coefficient transformations (Guilford and Fruchter, 1978).

The resulting statistics allowed inferences to be made concerning respondent preference for one of the three perspectives. Differences in preference by varying strata were also determined, and indications were obtained of which functional areas were most closely linked to particular preferences.

Chapter IV - FINDINGS

Purpose of Student Affairs

In order to determine the administrators' general attitude toward student affairs, the initial group of statements in the instrument presented three general declarations of purpose, intended to encompass all aspects of student services. These were:

> a. (administrative perspective) "The principal purpose of student affairs is to support the mission of the institution by administering services and regulations pertaining to student life, thereby contributing to the maintenance of an orderly academic community."

> b. (student personnel perspective) "The principal purpose of student affairs is to provide and coordinate support services and extracurricular programs which respond to the needs of students, thereby contributing to their physical, social, emotional, and intellectual growth and assisting them to become successful members of the campus community and society."

> c. (student development perspective) "The principal purpose of student affairs is to create a campus environment, both in and out of the classroom, in which human development concepts are applied by faculty and administrators promoting the total development of the student."

Each statement was designed to reflect concepts which were central to the perspective. The administrative statement thus focused on support of the institution and the "administration" of necessary services. The student personnel statement described a concern for the "whole student" and stressed social growth and adaption. The student development statement emphasized its concern for the campus "en-

vironment," the integration of the curriculum and extra-curriculum, and the application of theories grounded in humanistic psychology.

Preference. Table 1 shows the percentage of administrators who assigned the highest rank to each perspective, including percentages for each stratum within the sample.

Table 1. Reponse to Question 1,
"Purpose of Student Affairs":
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Chi Square
All Administrators	207	19.32	54.11	26.57	41.826**
Presidents	60	16.67	56.67	26.67	15.600**
Academic VP	72	20.83	45.83	33.33	6.750*
Business VP	75	20.00	60.00	20.00	24.000**
Institution[+] Size I	70	14.29	50.00	35.71	13.574**
Size II	56	19.64	53.57	26.79	10.748**
Size III	25	16.00	68.00	16.00	13.033**
Size IV	56	26.79	53.57	19.64	10.966**
Public	103	24.27	55.34	20.39	22.682**
Private	104	14.42	52.88	32.69	23.094**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

The distribution of responses indicated that slightly more than half of the administrators (54.11%) considered the student personnel perspective to represent the most essential purpose of student services. A significant chi square statistic (x^2 [2] = 41.826, significant at the .01 level) confirmed the preference. When the three groups of strata (type of administrator, size of institution, type of institution) were broken out, the resulting distributions generally paralleled the distribution of the total sample. Significant chi square statistics were found for each stratified group, supporting the contention that a definite preference existed among all groups.

Chi square tests for independence failed to reject the null case. There were no significant differences within the three stratified groups and thus no relationship appeared to exist between preference and administrator characteristics. There was a visible (though statistically nonsignificant) difference for academic vice presidents, who showed a plurality (45.38%) but not a majority preference for the student personnel outlook. The distribution for this group of administrators was broader than those for presidents and business vice presidents. This was reflected in a chi square statistic of x^2 (2) = 6.750 which, while significant at the .05 level, was relatively close to the critical value of 5.991.

Congruence. The tabulation of sums of ranks and co-efficients of concordance (Table 2) for the statement group

supported the findings based on first ranks.

The total sample obtained a $\underline{W}$ of .179, significant at the .01 level, but suggesting only a slight level of con-

---

Table 2. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 1, "Purpose of Student Affairs"

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	485	316	441	.179**
Presidents	60	149	89	122	.251**
Academic VP	72	166	114	152	.140**
Business VP	75	170	113	167	.183**
Institution[+] Size I	70	171	110	139	.190**
Size II	56	129	87	120	.156**
Size III	25	60	34	56	.314**
Size IV	56	125	85	126	.174**
Public	103	236	155	227	.186**
Private	104	249	161	214	.181**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

---

gruence. $\underline{W}$'s for stratified groups were generally similar, and all showed significance at the .01 level. Administra-

tors of Size III institutions showed the strongest association ($\underline{W}$ = .314), reflecting the relatively large proportion (68%) who assigned first ranks to the student personnel statement. A slightly stronger association was also observed for presidents, who obtained a coefficient of .251.

The sums of ranks generally corroborated the percentages in Table 1. The only exception of some size concerned public institution administrators. The proportion of first ranks from Table 1 indicated the administrative and student development statements would be ranked second and third, respectively (24.27% and 20.39%). An estimate based on sums of ranks would reverse this order, ranking the student development statement slightly ahead of the administrative statement.

Summary. Responses to the first group of statements gave some evidence of a moderate preference for the student personnel perspective by all types of administrators. The degree of preference was tempered by low (but significant) levels of congruence. Administrators of Size III institutions showed the strongest level of association and the largest proportion favoring the student personnel outlook. Since this first group of statements covered student affairs in a broad sense, analysis of subsequent, more program-specific statement groups would allow a determination as to how consistently the preference would be held.

Financial Aid

The statements contained in the second group focused on

a reason for coordinating financial assistance to students. The three perspectives were:

       a.   (administrative) "Enrollment levels are increased by providing a wide variety of financial aid programs."

       b.   (student personnel) "Needy and worthy students are assisted in obtaining financial support."

       c.   (student development) "Students develop a sense of maturity and purpose by applying for and managing financial support from scholarships, loans, or grants."

The administrative statement contended that the purpose of financial aid programs was to support the institution by increasing enrollment. The student personnel statement reflected a concern for helping "needy" students. The student development statement suggested that development of individual maturity (a sense of financial responsibility) was of greatest importance. Table 3 shows the responses from the sample.

Preference. A strong preference for the student personnel outlook was evident, as 80.19% of all administrators gave this perspective the highest rank. Of those administrators who ranked one of the other perspectives highest, the number was divided approximately equally between the administrative and student development perspectives.

Stratified groups also showed a strong preference for the second perspective. In all cases a chi square test signified that the three statements were not equally likely to be chosen. Nonetheless, there were some significant differences. Chi square tests for independence resulted in a

Table 3. Response to Question 2,
"Financial Aid"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	---Perspective---			Chi Square
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	8.70	80.19	11.11	204.725**
Presidents	60	8.33	80.00	11.67	58.900**
Academic VP	72	6.94	83.33	9.72	81.084**
Business VP	75	10.67	77.33	12.00	65.360**
Institution[+] Size I	70	17.14	67.14	15.71	36.033**
Size II	56	7.14	80.36	12.50	55.955**
Size III	25	8.00	88.00	4.00	32.411**
Size IV	56	0	92.86	7.14	91.381**
Public	103	2.91	88.35	8.74	140.829**
Private	104	14.42	72.12	13.46	70.379**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

significant value for the "size of institution" stratum, with x^2 (6) = 16.943, significant at the .01 level. Application of Cramer's $\underline{V}$ (for strength of relationship) produced a coefficient of .29, suggesting a moderate relationship. Further investigation by chi square tests of paired comparisons revealed the only significant difference was between

administrators of Size I and Size IV institutions (X^2 [2] = 14.136, significant at the .01 level). Cramer's $\underline{V}$ for this pair was $\underline{V}$ = .33, again a moderate relationship. Size IV administrators as a group showed a stronger preference for the student personnel outlook; almost 93% of them ranked it highest, as compared to approximately 67% of the Size I administrators. Moreover, none of the Size IV administrators chose the administrative perspective, whereas 12 of the Size I administrators (17%) did so.

A significant difference (X^2 [2] = 10.625, significant at the .01 level) was also obtained for the public/private institution stratum. Cramer's $\underline{V}$ produced a coefficient of .23. The observed difference was very similar to that found between administrators of the smallest and largest institutions. The significant difference between administrators of public and private institutions appeared to be in large part a reflection of the difference related to institution size. Administrators of Size IV institutions represented 49% of the public institution sub-group but only 6% of the private institution sub-group. Size I administrators, on the other hand, amounted to but 14% of the public institution administrators, but represented 54% of the private institution sub-group.

Congruence. Table 4 shows that as a whole administrators displayed a moderate level of congruence ($\underline{W}$ = .490) regarding the financial aid statements. Coefficients for the stratified groups ranged from .321 for administrators of

Size I institutions to .691 for administrators of Size IV

institutions. The range between these two groups supported

Table 4. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance (W):
Question 2, "Financial Aid"

Respondent Group	N	---Sum of Ranks---			W
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	478	250	515	.490**
Presidents	60	140	73	148	.505**
Academic VP	72	166	85	181	.514**
Business VP	75	172	92	186	.457**
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	155	95	170	.321**
Size II	56	128	67	141	.498**
Size III	25	57	28	65	.606**
Size IV	56	138	60	139	.691**
Public	103	250	115	254	.610**
Private	104	228	135	261	.433**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

the difference found earlier by chi square tests for inde-

pendence.

The sums of ranks were of course supportive of the

general preference for the student personnel statement, but were not supportive of the ranking of the remaining two perspectives. With two exceptions, the stratified groups recorded a slightly larger proportion of first ranks to the student development perspective than they did to the administrative. The sums of ranks, however, indicated that the administrative statement was ranked slightly higher by all groups. For example, although public institution administrators showed first rank proportions of 0% and 7.14% for the administrative and student development statements (Table 3), the sums of ranks (Table 4) for the two were 250 and 254.

Summary. Administrator responses to the financial aid statements showed a strong preference and moderate congruence towards the student personnel perspective. While significant differences occurred between administrators of small and large institutions and between administrators of public and private institutions, they were indicators of relative degrees of support for the student personnel perspective rather than outright differences of opinion on the most essential purpose.

Counseling

The statement group covering counseling services focused on types of student concerns that could be met by a counseling center and the desired outcome of such services. The three statements were:

a. (administrative) "Counselors help students to adjust to the campus and academic environment."

b. (student personnel) "Counselors assist students in thinking through their personal and vocational problems."

c. (student development) "Counselors' efforts are aimed at expanding human awareness and experience and maximizing human potentials for each student."

The administrative statement denoted this perspective's primary concern with institutional support. Its aim is to encourage "adjustment" to the college environment. The student personnel statement was more concerned with helping students out of their "problems"; the allusion to vocational counseling reflected the traditional importance of that activity in the student personnel movement. The student development statement avoided any mention of things that might be external to the student; the use of the phrases "human awareness" and "human potential" was intended to clearly tie the underlying perspective to its foundations in humanistic psychology. The responses to the counseling statement group are presented in Table 5.

Preference. Unlike the previous statement groups, there was virtually no concensus on a most essential purpose for counseling services. In all cases except one, respondents' primary ranks were distributed approximately equally among all three statements. The single exception was the 56 administrators of Size II institutions, exactly half of whom indicated a preference for the student development perspective. This was the only group for which a significant chi

square (X^2 [2] = 7.106, significant at the .05 level) was obtained. The differing response of administrators of Size

---

Table 5. Response to Question 3,
"Counseling"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Chi Square
All Administrators	207	28.50	31.88	39.61	4.029
Presidents	60	23.33	31.67	45.00	4.300
Academic VP	72	30.56	27.78	41.67	2.334
Business VP	75	30.67	36.00	33.33	0.320
Institution[+] Size I	70	25.71	32.86	41.43	2.601
Size II	56	23.21	26.79	50.00	7.106*
Size III	25	40.00	36.00	24.00	1.039
Size IV	56	32.14	33.93	33.93	0.054
Public	103	31.07	32.04	36.89	0.602
Private	104	25.96	31.73	42.31	4.288

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

II colleges was not sufficient to raise a significant statistic for the test of relationship between institutional size and preference.

Congruence. The lack of preference evidenced by the tallies of first ranks also brought about a negligible level of congruence among the administrators (Table 6). The $\underline{W}$ for the whole sample was a non-significant .016.

Table 6. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 3, "Counseling"

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	424	384	434	.016
Presidents	60	129	108	123	.033
Academic VP	72	146	139	147	.004
Business VP	75	149	137	164	.033
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	149	128	143	.024
Size II	56	120	113	103	.023
Size III	25	43	46	61	.149*
Size IV	56	112	97	127	.072
Public	103	203	203	225	.030
Private	104	221	194	209	.017

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

Coefficients for the stratified groups also tended to

be non-significant, with one exception. The W for admin-
istrators of Size III institutions was .149, significant at
the .05 level, and suggesting a slight degree of associa-
tion. An estimate from the sums of ranks would thus indi-
cate the administrative statement to be most essential,
followed in order by the student personnel and student
development statements. This would indicate that of the
fifteen administrators in this group who did not rank the
administrative statement first, a slight majority gave their
second ranks to it over one of the other statements.

An opposite situation emerged for administrators of
Size II institutions. The tally of highest ranks here
(Table 5) showed a 50% preference for the student develop-
ment view, with a significant chi square value to support
the preference. The level of congruence, however, was very
low (W = .023), insufficient to establish a degree of
association. This would indicate that while half of the
group ranked this statement highest, a nearly equal propor-
tion ranked it lowest, thereby canceling any potential
degree of concurrence.

Summary. There was no identifiable trend from the
responses to this statement group. Proportions of first
ranks were statistically equal, except for administrators of
Size II institutions. Levels of congruence were non-sig-
nificant, except for administrators of Size III institu-
tions. Although the distributions did not allow rejection
of the null case, it was interesting to note that most of

the stratified groups had their largest proportion of first ranks favoring the student development perspective, while the various sums of ranks for the administrators tended to favor the student personnel outlook. Given such contradictions, and the absence of significant preferences, one could conclude that the administrators held no strong feelings regarding campus counseling services, or that all three perspectives were considered of relatively equal importance.

Admissions

The three statements which composed this group were not so much concerned with the admissions process as they were with the possible relationship of an admissions program with its institution. The statements were:

> a. (administrative) "Adequate enrollment levels are attained by using sophisticated marketing techniques."

> b. (student personnel) "Institutional objectives and opportunities are interpreted to prospective students and their parents."

> c. (student development) "The admissions office considers each prospective student's needs and personality, creating an enrollment of new students representing varying ability levels and interests."

The administrative statement, with its emphasis on "adequate enrollment," evoked a strong sense of institutional support. The student development statement, to the contrary, implied a program possessing considerable autonomy from the institution. The primary concern of the administrative view was to reach enrollment level goals, while the student de-

velopment approach was concerned first of all with "each prospective student's needs and personality . . ." The student personnel statement in this instance represented a compromise between the other two perspectives, as it reflected both a concern for individual students and a degree of institutional support. For this statement group, the student personnel statement was a direct quote from "The Student Personnel Point of View," (American Council on Education, 1937). Table 7 presents the responses to the statement group.

Preference. As a whole, administrators recorded a preference for the student personnel outlook; just over 51% ranked this statement highest. In this instance the student development statement represented a clear second, with almost 35% of the administrators giving it the highest rank. The "split" between those administrators who ranked the student personnel perspective highest and those who did not was very close -- approximately 51% - 49%. Thus even with the confirmation of the preference by a significant chi square (X^2 [2] = 43.159, significant at the .01 level), there was not the margin associated with the student personnel outlook that was evident with the financial aid statement.

Distributions for the various strata showed no significant differences within each group. All levels indicated a preference for the student personnel perspective, confirmed by significant chi square statistics for preference. Exam-

Table 7. Response to Question 4,
"Admissions"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective---			Chi Square
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	14.01	51.21	34.78	43.159**
Presidents	60	8.33	50.00	41.67	17.500**
Academic VP	72	13.89	48.61	37.50	13.584**
Business VP	75	18.67	54.67	26.67	16.080**
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	18.57	45.71	35.71	7.916*
Size II	56	12.50	46.43	41.07	11.177**
Size III	25	8.00	60.00	32.00	9.805**
Size IV	56	12.50	58.93	28.57	19.040**
Public	103	12.62	59.22	28.16	34.800**
Private	104	15.38	43.27	41.35	15.133**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

ination of the strata provided additional evidence that the preference was relatively weak. Five groups (presidents, academic vice presidents, administrators of Size I and Size II institutions, and administrators of private institutions) had distributions which gave a plurality, but not a major- ity, of highest ranks to the student personnel viewpoint

(50%, 58.61%, 45.71% 46.43% and 43.27%, respectively). The response of private institution administrators was particularly ambivalent, with almost as many individuals ranking highest the student development statement as did the student personnel statement (43 and 45, respectively).

Congruence. The overall degree of concurrence for the "admissions" statement group was small, with a calculated value of .203 for W (Table 8). Coefficients for the stratified groups were equally modest. The lowest congruence levels were among business vice presidents (W = .151), administrators of small institutions (W = .118), and private institution administrators (W = .165). Other groups indicated somewhat greater levels of association.

The sums of ranks in Table 8 paralleled very closely the proportions of highest ranks noted in Table 7. The relatively large sums found in the "Student Personnel" column are responsible for the presence of low, but significant, values for W since they reflect the presence of a fairly large proportion of second and third ranks.

Summary. The administrators generally shared a preference for the student personnel outlook in admissions, but obviously did not hold strong feelings about their preference. The level of congruence, while significant, was rather small; it may have been an indication that the administrators did not perceive much difference between the student personnel and student development statements. A concensus was more apparent regarding the administrative

Table 8. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 4, "Admissions"

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	---Sum of Ranks--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
All Administrators	207	511	325	406	.203**
Presidents	60	155	92	113	.286**
Academic VP	72	181	115	136	.219**
Business VP	75	175	118	157	.151**
Institution[+] Size I	70	165	117	138	.118**
Size II	56	143	90	103	.243**
Size III	25	62	36	52	.275**
Size IV	56	141	82	113	.278**
Public	103	256	152	210	.256**
Private	104	255	173	196	.165**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

statement; the respondents were consistent in their belief that a marketing approach to admissions activities was of least importance.

Student Health

The types of activities which would fall under the

function of student health services were such that a single
activity could not be found from which all three perspec-
tives could be illustrated. Thus for this group the three
statements describe three separate activities or programs:

>   a. (administrative) "Health insurance is
> made available to students, enabling them to use
> off-campus (community) health care facilities."
>
>   b. (student personnel) "Programs in pre-
> ventive medicine and personal hygiene are coor-
> dinated by the health center."
>
>   c. (student development) "The health center
> staff recommends institutional changes designed to
> create an environment more conducive to physical
> and mental health."

The administrative statement reflected a sense of minimal
activity, a characteristic described in the introductory
chapter. It implied an "administrative" service (provision
of insurance) as opposed to employment of health care pro-
fessionals on campus for students. The student personnel
statement suggested forms of medical counseling, stressing
preventive concerns. The student development statement
suggested a situation where student health staff interact
with the institution on behalf of the students. This state-
ment was also intended to illustrate the importance which
the student development outlook attaches to theories of
environmental impact and person-environment interaction.
The responses for this statement group are given in Table 9.

Preference. Eighty-six of the administrators ranked
the student personnel statement highest, a plurality of
41.55%. A significant chi square statistic (X^2 [2] =
13.246, significant at the .01 level) confirmed the respond-

Table 9. Response to Question 5,
"Student Health"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

| Respondent Group | N | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi Square |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	36.71	41.55	21.74	13.246**
Presidents	60	33.33	46.67	20.00	6.400*
Academic VP	72	40.28	31.94	27.78	1.751
Business VP	75	36.00	46.67	17.33	9.920**
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	45.71	31.43	22.86	5.601
Size II	56	41.07	39.29	19.64	4.749
Size III	25	28.00	52.00	20.00	4.039
Size IV	56	25.00	51.79	23.21	8.784*
Public	103	33.01	47.57	19.42	12.254**
Private	104	40.38	35.58	24.04	4.404

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

ents' preference, though once again the confirmation should be treated cautiously. In this instance the administrative viewpoint was found to be of second highest importance; less support for the student development perspective was found in this case than had been observed heretofore.

Distributions for the stratified groups also showed less agreement than had been found earlier. The distributions of presidents, business vice presidents, and administrators of Size III, Size IV, and public institutions paralleled that of the overall response. Within the subgroups there were no significant differences. There was an interesting pattern, however, regarding the non-significant distributions. In each case where a non-significant chi square statistic was found for a distribution, a plurality existed for the administrative statement. The single exception to this was the distribution for administrators of Size II institutions, where 52% ranked the student personnel viewpoint highest. In this case the lack of a significant chi square statistic appeared to be due to the relatively low value for N (N = 25).

Congruence. The coefficient for all administrators was a very low .050 (Table 10). Although statistically significant, it can only be interpreted as a minute degree of concurrence.

Coefficients for stratified groups showed the same weakness observed for the whole sample. In three instances, values for $\underline{W}$ were found to be non-significant: academic vice presidents recorded a $\underline{W}$ of .014; administrators of Size I and Size II institutions recorded $\underline{W}$'s of .010 and .052, respectively. Even where coefficients were judged to be significant, the levels of association were slight.

Table 10. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance (W):
Question 5, "Student Health"

Respondent		---Sum of Ranks---			
Group	N	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	W
All Administrators	207	429	362	451	.050**
Presidents	60	132	101	127	.077**
Academic VP	72	149	134	149	.014
Business VP	75	148	127	175	.103**
Institution[+] Size I	70	136	136	148	.010
Size II	56	115	98	123	.052
Size III	25	54	40	56	.122*
Size IV	56	124	88	124	.138**
Public	103	215	172	231	.088**
Private	104	214	190	220	.023*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

For those administrator groups with significant coefficients, the associated sums of ranks generally paralleled the distributions noted in Table 9. One exception was observed. The distribution of highest ranks accorded by private institution administrators (Table 9) showed no preference for a particular perspective, based on a non-

significant value for chi square. It was observed that a plurality of 40.38% ranked the administrative statement highest. However, an estimate of rank order based on sums of ranks, enabled by a significant $\underline{W}$ of .023, suggested that a slight preference actually rested with the student personnel statement.

In a similar manner, an estimate for administrators of Size III institutions based on sums of ranks would also confirm the student personnel statement as having the highest rank, despite the lack of a significant finding in the distribution of first ranks recorded in Table 9.

Summary. While the response of the sample indicated a preference for the student personnel perspective, it appeared that there was considerable ambivalence. One could not claim either a substantial preference or more than a very slight degree of congruence based on this group of statements. A negative argument could be made to the effect that programs intended to effect institutional change in this sphere were generally considered least essential.

Student Activities

The statements for this group all described outcomes of activities programs, each reflecting the purpose contained in one of the three perspectives. The statements were:

    a. (administrative) "Extracurricular activities are made available which channel the students' energies into appropriate and constructive outlets."

b. (student personnel) "A variety of social, recreational, and group activities are encouraged and supervised in order to promote lifetime interests and skills."

c. (student development) "Student activities are designed to create opportunities which enhance the development of personality and growth in morals and values among students."

Each statement centered on one of the major characteristics of its perspective. The administrative statement, with its emphasis on channeling excess energy in a satisfactory (and non-destructive) direction, implied concern for the orderly life of the campus community. The student personnel statement illustrated an interest in social development. The student development statement reflected an emphasis on individual growth outside of the social realm. The responses to these statements are presented in Table 11.

Preference. A plurality of the administrators showed a preference for the student development perspective in this statement group. The observed preference was confirmed by a significant value for chi square (X^2 [2] = 24.377, significant at the .01 level). While there was not a majority preference, only 40 of the administrators (19.32%) ranked the administrative outlook highest. Thus the trend of the distribution suggested a belief that activities were valued more for their educational value than for simply allowing students to "let off steam."

No significant differences were found among the stratified groups. The distribution of each stratum level generally paralleled that of the administrators as a whole. A

Table 11. Response to Question 6,
"Student Activities"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

| Respondent Group | N | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi Square |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	19.32	33.33	47.34	24.377**
Presidents	60	20.00	31.67	48.33	7.300*
Academic VP	72	12.50	40.28	47.22	14.584**
Business VP	75	25.33	28.00	46.67	6.080*
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	21.43	31.43	47.14	7.058*
Size II	56	16.07	33.93	50.00	9.678**
Size III	25	16.00	40.00	44.00	3.345
Size IV	56	21.43	32.14	46.43	5.401
Public	103	22.33	37.86	39.81	5.670
Private	104	16.35	28.85	54.81	24.017**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

break-out of distributions revealed that not all groups could be said to show a definite preference. Non-significant chi square statistics were found for administrators of Size III and Size IV institutions, and for administrators of public institutions. The latter group was of particular interest, since its distribution appeared to contrast with

that of the private institution administrators, who showed a significant preference for the student development outlook. Nonetheless, the chi square test for independence did not permit a conclusion that these two groups were substantially different.

Congruence. The obtained coefficients of concordance for the whole sample and for stratified groups again showed only slight levels of association, though within their limits all were significant (Table 12).

Administrators of Size III institutions recorded the highest degree of congruence, with $\underline{W}$ = .206. Compared to other levels within the institutional size stratum, the Size III group appeared to be the only one possessing more than a minimal association. The closeness of the sums of ranks for the student personnel and student development statements, (45 and 42, respectively), illustrated the relative equality of the two statements.

The difference between public and private institution administrators, initially observed in their distributions of highest ranks, was more evident in Table 12. Coefficients for both groups (.084 and .133) were significant at the .01 level, but the $\underline{W}$ value for private institution administrators was visibly higher. Moreover, the sums of ranks for the two groups indicated that the public institution group ranked the student personnel statement highest, whereas the student development statement was considered by private institution administrators to be most essential.

Table 12. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance (W):
Question 6, "Student Activities"

Respondent Group	N	---Sum of Ranks--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	W
All Administrators	207	489	385	368	.100**
Presidents	60	143	113	104	.116**
Academic VP	72	178	128	126	.167**
Business VP	75	168	144	138	.045*
Institution[+] Size I	70	163	132	125	.083**
Size II	56	131	103	102	.086**
Size III	25	63	45	42	.206**
Size IV	56	132	105	99	.099**
Public	103	240	184	194	.084**
Private	104	249	201	174	.133**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999
enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV=
10,000 and higher enrollment.

Summary. Findings for the "student activities" state-
ment group indicated that while administrators preferred an
educational purpose for this function, they shared little
agreement as to the nature of that purpose. In general, a
slight preference towards the student development perspec-
tive was noted, though there was some evidence that public

institution administrators leaned more towards the student personnel outlook. Coefficients of concordance were uniformly low, suggesting at best only slight degrees of congruence.

Student Conduct

The statements in this group all touched on the disciplinary hearing -- the process of dealing with unacceptable behavior by a student. Each statement suggested a primary emphasis in keeping with the perspective it illustrated:

> a. (administrative) "Disciplinary procedures are clearly defined, emphasizing adequate safeguards for due process and student rights and responsibilities."

> b. (student personnel) "Student disciplinary hearings are intended as educational functions designed to modify personal behavior patterns."

> c. (student development) "Self-discipline is enhanced by having students control the disciplinary process at the hearing or tribunal level."

The administrative statement reflected a concern for the legal issues involved in judging student conduct. Nothing in the statement precluded the possibility that the hearing could be educational or student-run, but nonethless this perspective would consider such matters to be of secondary importance. The student personnel statement exhibited more concern for behavioral change. Its emphasis was on the educative possibilities of the disciplinary process. The student development statement took the educational concept one step further, emphasizing self-discipline and peer control of disciplinary hearings. The responses to

these statements are given in Table 13.

Preference. The administrators indicated a substantial

preference for the administrative perspective, as just over

Table 13. Response to Question 7,
"Student Conduct"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Chi Square
All Administrators	207	75.85	15.46	8.70	169.768**
Presidents	60	73.33	21.67	5.00	45.700**
Academic VP	72	80.56	8.33	11.11	72.334**
Business VP	75	73.33	17.33	9.33	54.720**
Institution[+] Size I	70	70.00	17.14	12.86	42.549**
Size II	56	80.36	10.71	8.93	55.740**
Size III	25	76.00	20.00	4.00	20.647**
Size IV	56	78.57	16.07	5.36	53.519**
Public	103	76.70	16.50	6.80	88.629**
Private	104	75.00	14.42	10.58	81.473**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

75% ranked its statement highest. The single-variable chi

square test produced an extremely large calculated value, as

X^2 (2) = 169.768, significant at the .01 level. The proportions of first rankings given to the other two statements were close enough to each other (15.46% and 8.7%) to suggest that both were considered relatively inconsequential in relation to the administrative statement.

The distributions for each of the strata closely paralleled the overall distribution. There were no significant differences between groups, and the proportions favoring the administrative viewpoint, ranging from 70.00% to 80.56%, were more than sufficient in each case to generate a significant chi square statistic.

Congruence. The large proportions favoring the administrative statement were matched by relatively high coefficients of concordance (Table 14).

As a whole, administrators showed a moderate level of association in their rankings (W = .368). Among stratified groups, academic vice presidents indicated the highest degree of agreement, with W = .445. Administrators of Size IV institutions also had a relatively high index of congruence (W = .404). Sums of ranks for all groups corroborated the initial findings recorded in Table 13, with only a few negligible differences.

Summary. The administrators' responses to this group of statements made it very clear that the issues of student rights and due process inherited from the 1960's have continued to exert a strong influence on attitudes towards the disciplinary process. The questions of educational benefit

Table 14. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 7, "Student Conduct"

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	---Sum of Ranks--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
All Administrators	207	269	484	489	.368**
Presidents	60	78	131	151	.395**
Academic VP	72	90	182	160	.445**
Business VP	75	101	171	178	.322**
Institution[+] Size I	70	94	164	162	.324**
Size II	56	72	132	132	.383**
Size III	25	32	58	60	.390**
Size IV	56	71	130	135	.404**
Public	103	133	244	241	.377**
Private	104	136	240	248	.361**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

and personal development suggested by the student personnel and student development perspectives were, by comparison, perceived as being of considerably less importance. The degree of congruence found for the student conduct issue was uniformly high among all groups, indicating a substantial community of judgement.

Student Housing

The statements in this group all considered why an institution would want to provide campus housing. For the sake of clarity, only single student residence hall housing was mentioned. The statements were:

    a. (administrative) "Dormitories provide students with an economical place in which to live."

    b. (student personnel) "Residence Halls contribute positively to education in group living and social growth."

    c. (student development) "Student housing facilities provide integrated living-learning centers, joining academic with out-of-class experiences."

The administrative statement reflected a minimal approach. The word "dormitory" (a place to sleep) was intentionally used to reinforce the notion of meeting an extremely basic student need. The student personnel statement focused on social needs which "residence halls" (as opposed to dormitories) can fulfill. In this perspective housing exhibits a function which is educational, though extracurricular. The student development statement also evoked an educational function, but unlike the previous statement it explicitly advocated the integration of the curricular and extracurricular. Again, a particular phrase, "living-learning centers," was intentionally used to reinforce the concept. Responses to this statement group appear in Table 15.

Preference. The distribution showed just over 47% of the administrators favored the student development perspec-

Table 15. Response to Question 8,
"Student Housing"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective--- Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Chi Square
All Administrators	207	14.49	38.16	47.34	35.681**
Presidents	60	11.67	46.67	41.67	12.900**
Academic VP	72	11.11	41.67	47.22	16.334**
Business VP	75	20.00	28.00	52.00	12.480**
Institution[+] Size I	70	18.57	42.86	38.57	7.058*
Size II	56	12.50	33.93	53.57	14.177**
Size III	25	4.00	52.00	44.00	9.574**
Size IV	56	16.07	30.36	53.57	12.276**
Public	103	16.50	32.04	51.46	18.953**
Private	104	12.50	44.23	43.27	20.326**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

tive in this statement group. The number of responses for the student personnel outlook was fairly close, as about 38% ranked it first. By contrast, the administrative statement fared poorly; only 30 (14.49%) of the administrators considered it to be most essential. Despite the relatively close proportions for the student development and student

personnel perspectives, the total distribution produced a chi square statistic of X^2 (2) = 35.681, significant at the .01 level.

Sub-distributions for the stratified groups produced results that were not always parallel to the overall distribution. All distributions gave significant chi square statistics, indicating in all cases that the three perspectives were not likely to be equally preferred. However, four sub-groups registered pluralities or majorities in favor of the student personnel statement rather than the student development outlook. Nonetheless, chi square tests for independence failed to reveal any significant differences within each group. The only pattern consistently found among all groups was the low proportion of first ranks assigned to the administrative perspective.

Congruence. Coefficients presented in Table 16 showed that as a whole administrators demonstrated a relatively slight (W = .220), but significant, degree of concordance.

Congruence levels among the stratified groups appeared to be fairly close to each other. Business vice presidents (W = .157) and administrators of Size I institutions (W = .169) showed comparatively low levels of association, while administrators of Size III institutions (W = .347) possessed the highest level. The coefficients of the remaining groups ranged from .193 to .293, again suggesting somewhat small levels of association.

Table 16. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 8, "Student Housing"

Respondent Group	$\underline{N}$	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
All Administrators	207	526	354	362	.220**
Presidents	60	153	96	111	.243**
Academic VP	72	189	121	122	.293**
Business VP	75	184	137	129	.157**
Institution[+] Size I	70	173	120	127	.169**
Size II	56	144	99	93	.248**
Size III	25	66	37	47	.347**
Size IV	56	143	98	95	.231**
Public	103	258	184	176	.193**
Private	104	268	170	186	.256**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

Examination of the sums of ranks confirmed one observation of the first rank tallies, specifically that the student personnel and student development statements tended to be scored quite close to each other. The sums of ranks for all administrators, however, created a discrepancy. The initial tallies (Table 15) indicated that as a whole, admin-

istrators preferred, albeit weakly, the student development perspective. Nonetheless, the sums of ranks from Table 16 suggested that the preference was more towards the student personnel outlook -- again, only by a slim margin. The sum for the student personnel statement was 354; for the student development statement it was 362, a difference of just 8. A nearly identical situation occurred for academic vice presidents. Although a plurality of 47.22% assigned highest ranks to the student development statement, the sums of ranks showed a reversal in favor of the student personnel statement.

Summary. The data suggested that administrators primarily agreed on the educational nature of student housing. Residence halls were obviously considered to be more than simply a place to sleep. On the question of the nature of the educational function, however, there was no concensus. Administrators favoring an educational purpose were about equally divided as to whether the function should be essentially extra-curricular or closely integrated with the formal curriculum.

Academic Support

This functional area permitted three statements whose underlying assumptions were clearly separate from each other. As was the case with the student health group, no single activity could be found from which all three perspectives could be illustrated. Thus each statement described a different

activity, though all three were concerned with support or enhancement of the teaching function:

      a. (administrative) "The university maintains a record of the student's academic achievement."

      b. (student personnel) "Remedial and tutorial services are provided in the areas of writing, reading, math, and study habits to assist each student to overcome academic deficiencies."

      c. (student development) "Courses are offered for credit in the field of human relations, including such topics as values assessment, personal and group decision-making, and human sexuality."

The administrative statement described in a brief sentence the function of the registrar's office. It implied a minimal approach to the function by not referring to any other activity other than the traditional work of recording grades. The student personnel statement exhibited an extracurricular, counseling-related activity, characteristic of the student personnel point of view. Finally, the student development statement illustrated two ideas frequently found in its literature: 1) an emphasis on human development topics; and 2) a direct participation in the teaching function. The adminstrators' reponses to these statements appear in Table 17.

Preference. The response from all administrators showed a substantial majority (60.39%) preferred the student personnel statement. A chi square statistic of X^2 (2) = 74.696, significant at the .01 level, confirmed the preference. The smallest number of first ranks was shown by the student development statement (12.56%), suggesting that the

Table 17. Response to Question 9,
"Academic Support"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

Respondent Group	N	---Perspective---			Chi Square
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	27.05	60.39	12.56	74.696**
Presidents	60	35.00	51.67	13.33	13.300**
Academic VP	72	25.00	62.50	12.50	29.250**
Business VP	75	22.67	65.33	12.00	35.840**
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	27.14	57.14	15.71	19.231**
Size II	56	28.57	53.57	17.86	11.284**
Size III	25	28.00	60.00	12.00	8.652*
Size IV	56	25.00	71.43	3.57	41.190**
Public	103	22.33	71.84	5.83	72.959**
Private	104	31.73	49.04	19.23	13.979**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

idea of credit courses on human development topics was not considered to be of importance. The traditional registrar's function fared better, with 27.05%, but was not considered as essential as academic remediation and tutoring.

The same pattern of distribution was found for all stratified groups. Significant chi square statistics were

obtained for each distribution. Chi square tests for independence uncovered a significant relationship between preference and type of institution. The distributions for public institution administrators (22.33%, 71.84%, 5.83%) and private institution administrators (31.73%, 49.04%, 19.23%) produced X^2 (2) = 13.552, which was significant at the .01 level. Cramer's $\underline{V}$ gave a coefficient of .26, indicating a moderate relationship. The distributions showed public institution administrators had a more substantial preference for the student personnel statement than did administrators from private institutions.

Congruence. The coefficient of concordance for all administrators (Table 18) was .222, very similar to that obtained for the previous group of statements, and again suggesting a small but significant degree of congruence. The lowest (.118) and highest (.359) coefficients belonged to administrators of private and public institutions, respectively, and helped to confirm the difference between these two groups which was noted earlier.

The sums of ranks for this statement group paralleled the first-rank distributions found in Table 17 quite closely. No variances were found which might provide additional insights.

Summary. Responses to the "academic support" statement group showed a fairly strong preference for the student personnel perspective. The level of congruence, however, was small in relation to the first-rank preferences. This

Table 18. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\overline{W}$):
Question 9, "Academic Support"

| Respondent Group | N | ---Sum of Ranks--- | | | W |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	444	305	493	.222**
Presidents	60	122	95	143	.161**
Academic VP	72	156	104	172	.244**
Business VP	75	166	106	178	.265**
Institution[+] Size I	70	150	107	163	.164**
Size II	56	124	86	126	.162**
Size III	25	52	36	62	.275**
Size IV	56	118	76	142	.356**
Public	103	225	137	256	.359**
Private	104	219	168	237	.118**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999
enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV=
10,000 and higher enrollment.

may have been due to the administrative statement, which represented a traditional and highly essential function. All administrator groups considered the student development statement, with its emphasis on the teaching of human development topics, to be least essential.

Student Orientation

The statements for this group focused on the desired outcome of a new student orientation program. The statements were similar to those used for the student activities statement group in their particular emphases. As a result each statement suggested a very different kind of program:

   a.   (administrative)   "New   students   are informed   about   campus   rules   and   regulations, academic   programs,   and   extracurricular   opportunities."

   b.   (student personnel)   "Orientation activities assist new students to discover their educational abilities and objectives, and to adjust socially to the campus community."

   c.   (student   development)   "Orientation programs for new students emphasize the uniqueness of students and enhance positive feelings about chances for success."

The administrative statement denoted a program of information which would result in students becoming familiar with the institution -- its customs, rules, and opportunities. The student personnel statement was more concerned that students understood their potential for making use of the institution and that they accomplished a successful social adjustment. The student development statement shared this concern, but focused more on ego development of the individual rather than social development. Responses to these statements are presented in Table 19.

Preference. The overall distribution showed a slight majority (52.66%) of the administrators preferred the student personnel statement. The remainder split their highest

Table 19. Response to Question 10,
"Student Orientation"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

| Respondent Group | N | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi Square |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	24.64	52.66	22.71	34.899**
Presidents	60	23.33	50.00	26.67	7.600*
Academic VP	72	20.83	58.33	20.83	20.250**
Business VP	75	29.33	49.33	21.33	9.360**
Institution[+] Size I	70	24.29	42.86	32.86	3.629
Size II	56	14.29	69.64	16.07	33.245**
Size III	25	24.00	56.00	20.00	5.653
Size IV	56	35.71	46.43	17.86	7.147*
Public	103	31.07	53.40	15.53	22.390**
Private	104	18.27	51.92	29.81	18.247**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

ranks about equally between the administrative and student development perspectives (24.64% and 22.71%, respectively). A significant chi square statistic confirmed the unequal distribution (X^2 [2] = 34.899, significant at the .01 level).

Distributions for the sub-groups followed the same pattern found for the total distribution. In most cases a significant chi square value accompanied the distributions. In two instances -- for administrators of Size I and Size III institutions -- non-significant statistics were found.

Chi square tests for independence uncovered a significant relationship between preference and type of institution. Although administrators of public and private institutions appeared to show similar preferences (53.4% of the public institution administrators and 51.92% of the private institution administrators ranked the student personnel statement as most essential), the resulting value for chi square was X^2 (2) = 8.105, significant at the .05 level. Cramer's $\underline{V}$ produced a coefficient of .20, indicating a slight relationship. A closer examination of the distributions revealed that while the percentages favoring the student personnel outlook were similar, the remaining proportions for the other two perspectives were virtually opposite. The number of public institution administrators favoring the administrative and student development statements was 32 and 16, respectively (31.07% and 15.53%); for private institution administrators, the numbers were reversed -- 19 and 31 (18.27% and 29.81%). Thus the relationship between preference and type of institution was somewhat nebulous. One could conclude only that to a slight degree administrators of public institutions were more inclined to an administrative viewpoint than were administrators of

private institutions.

Analysis also showed a relationship between preference and size of institution. The calculated value for chi square was X^2 (6) = 14.966, significant at the .05 level. Cramer's V gave a coefficient of .19, again indicating a slight relationship. Further tests (Table 20) on paired comparisons revealed significant differences between administrators of Size I and II institutions, and between administrators of Size II and IV. In both cases Cramer's V indicated a slight-to-moderate relationship. The differences

Table 20. Chi Square Tests for Independence
Based on Size of Institution

Levels	Chi Square	Cramer's V
Size I and II	9.088**	.27
Size I and III	1.721	--
Size I and IV	4.153	--
Size II and III	1.592	--
Size II and IV	7.794*	.26
Size III and IV	1.101	--

*Significant at the .05 level for 2df.
**Significant at the .02 level for 2df.

appeared due to the substantial majority (nearly 70%) of highest ranks given by Size II administrators to the student personnel statement. In contrast, administrators of Size I and IV institutions showed only a plurality for the perspec-

tive. Their distributions were visibly broader.

Congruence. Only a slight degree of association was evident, as the total sample obtained a coefficient of only .121 (Table 21). This was due in part to the fact that only

Table 21. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 10, "Student Orientation"

| Respondent Group | $\underline{N}$ | ---Sum of Ranks--- | | | $\underline{W}$ |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	456	331	455	.121**
Presidents	60	137	96	127	.127**
Academic VP	72	158	112	162	.149**
Business VP	75	161	123	166	.098**
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	157	117	146	.087*
Size II	56	134	79	123	.270**
Size III	25	53	41	56	.101
Size IV	56	112	94	130	.103*
Public	103	214	165	239	.135**
Private	104	242	166	216	.138**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

a small majority ranked the student personnel statement

highest. Moreover, the equality of the second and third ranked statements, confirmed by sums of ranks totaling 455 and 456, would also have the effect of lowering the value of $\underline{W}$.

Coefficients for the stratified groups showed the same slight levels found for the entire sample. Only administrators of Size II institutions obtained a degree of congruence ($\underline{W}$ = .270) of visibly greater strength than the others. A non-significant value for $\underline{W}$ was found for administrators of Size III institutions, indicating no degree of association. This reinforced the non-significant chi square test mentioned previously, even though a majority of 56% ranked one statement (student personnel) highest.

Although the distribution of first ranks for administrators of Size I institutions (Table 19) suggested no preference when tested by chi square, the coefficient and associated sum of ranks for this group allowed a cautious inference that the group shared a preference for the student personnel statement. In all other cases, the sums of ranks confirmed the preferences found from Table 19, including the lack of preference for Size III administrators.

Summary. The findings for this statement group suggested that for the most part administrators held a moderate preference for the student personnel outlook. Curiously, administrators from the smallest colleges (Size I) and from medium institutions (Size III) exhibited a more ambivalent stance than the overall sample, but those from institutions

in-between, (Size II), showed a much more substantial preference and degree of congruence.

Placement

The statements in this final group considered different kinds of assistance which a placement/career planning department might offer. In order to preserve the distinctive characteristics of each perspective, three separate activities were described:

> a. (administrative) "Placement files, containing information about the students' academic, job, and extracurricular background and letters of recommendation, are made available to potential employers."

> b. (student personnel) "Students are counseled with regard to the development of their educational plans in relation to their vocational goals."

> c. (student development) "Career educators assist students to clarify values and life plans by helping them to gain self-insight and to acquire problem-solving and decision-making skills."

The administrative statement described the collection and dissemination of placement files. This has been one of the most traditional activities in college placement and, until the mid-1970's, was considered one of the most important. The student personnel statement described an activity -- vocational counseling -- that has long been identified with the personnel movement. The student development statement focused on humanistic concerns (values clarification), again emphasizing the notion of student services professionals in the role of educators. Responses to these

statements appear in Table 22.

Preference. The administrators showed a weak pref-
erence for the student personnel statement. A plurality of

Table 22. Response to Question 11,
"Student Placement"
Percentage of Highest Ranks Assigned

| Respondent Group | N | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi Square |
		Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
All Administrators	207	24.64	43.00	32.37	10.551**
Presidents	60	25.00	43.33	31.67	3.100
Academic VP	72	27.78	40.28	31.94	1.751
Business VP	75	21.33	45.33	33.33	6.480*
Institution[+]					
Size I	70	32.86	35.71	31.43	0.201
Size II	56	17.86	42.86	39.29	6.142*
Size III	25	24.00	52.00	24.00	3.807
Size IV	56	21.43	48.21	30.36	6.384*
Public	103	25.24	47.57	27.18	9.457**
Private	104	24.04	38.46	37.50	4.057

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999
enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV=
10,000 and higher enrollment.

43% ranked it highest. While the distribution was suffi-
cient to generate a significant chi square statistic, the

calculated value of X^2 (2) = 10.551, (significant at the .01 level), was rather low given the high value of N (N = 207). Thus while the statistic allowed an inference to be made concerning preference for one of the statements, caution was nonetheless indicated.

Distributions for the stratified groups gave further evidence for the weakness of the preference. While the distributions for the most part paralleled the overall distribution, they were supported by significant values for chi square in just four instances: the distributions for business vice presidents, administrators of Size II and Size IV institutions, and administrators of public institutions. For all other levels, there was not sufficient evidence to infer that a preference existed. The observed differences within groups notwithstanding, there were no substantial differences between levels based on chi square tests for independence.

Congruence. As noted in Table 23, the administrators as a whole demonstrated a significant but rather slight degree of concurrence, obtaining a coefficient of .107. This provided a further indication that whatever preference existed was tenuous.

The minute level of congruence associated with the whole sample was further reflected in the coefficients for the stratified groups. Although all were statistically significant, the values of W (ranging from .050 to .177) denoted only very slight agreement.

Table 23. Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$):
Question 11, "Student Placement"

Respondent		---Sum of Ranks---			
Group	$\underline{N}$	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
All Administrators	207	473	340	429	.107**
Presidents	60	135	99	126	.098**
Academic VP	72	164	124	144	.077**
Business VP	75	174	117	159	.155**
Institution[+] Size I	70	151	122	147	.050*
Size II	56	138	92	106	.177**
Size III	25	58	39	53	.155*
Size IV	56	126	87	123	.150**
Public	103	228	166	224	.113**
Private	104	245	174	205	.117**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999
enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV=
10,000 and higher enrollment.

The sums of ranks related to the significant $\underline{W}$'s al-
lowed inferences which were not available from analysis of
first rank tallies. In particular, sums of ranks for pres-
idents, academic vice presidents, administrators of Size I
and Size III institutions, and private institution adminis-
trators all indicated that these groups ranked the student

personnel statement first, followed by the student development statement and then the administrative statement.

Summary. The responses to this statement group followed a pattern very similar to that found for the "Student Orientation" statements. Administrators showed a consistent preference for the student personnel outlook, but this preference was associated with a rather low level of congruence. The sums of ranks and distributions of first ranks together showed that the other two perspectives -- administrative and student development -- each had a sizable number of proponents, enough to prevent all but the most minimal degree of concordance.

Overall Congruence

The findings so far indicated a general attitude in favor of the student personnel perspective. It was also evident that the strength of the attitude appeared to vary, from miniscule to moderate, depending on the function involved. Moreover, in some instances the student personnel outlook was rejected in favor of either the student development or administrative perspectives.

The final step was to obtain a comprehensive measurement of congruence, along with an estimate of true attitude, encompassing all areas of student services covered by the instrument. Following the procedures outlined in Chapter III (p. 43), W was calculated for each respondent, using the eleven sets of rankings of the three perspectives contained

in the instrument. For k = 11 and r = 3 the critical value

of W̲ at the .05 level of confidence was .273 in each in-

stance. Table 24 shows the mean W̲ for the sample and for

Table 24. Mean Coefficient of Concordance for Stratified Groups and Proportion of Significant Coefficients

Respondent Group	N̲	Mean W	Individuals with Proportion	Sig. W̲ Mean
All Administrators	207	.280*	53.6%	.455**
President	60	.285*	60.0%	.410*
Academic VP	72	.260	41.7%	.495**
Business VP	75	.300*	60.0%	.465**
Institution[+]				
Size I	70	.295*	55.7%	.450**
Size II	56	.240	41.1%	.485**
Size III	25	.215	52.0%	.357*
Size IV	56	.330*	64.3%	.465**
Public	103	.275*	54.4%	.455**
Private	104	.287*	52.9%	.452**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

---

each stratified group, as well as the proportion of sig-

nificant individual coefficients found.

The mean coefficient for all administrators was .280, significant at the .05 level. 111 members from the total sample obtained significant $\underline{W}$'s. Thus a somewhat small level of congruence was found for the sample, though slightly more than half (53.6%) were observed to have a more substantial degree (mean of .455).

Among the stratified groups the largest proportions of significant scores occurred among presidents (60%), business vice presidents (60%), and administrators of large (Size IV) institutions (64.3%). These administrators appeared more likely to apply a common standard of judgement to the various student services functions. In all three cases, the group means were statistically significant. The means for administrators of small (Size I) colleges and of both public and private institutions were also significant, though the proportions were smaller (55.7%, 54.4%, and 52.9%, respectively).

Academic vice presidents obtained a low mean of $\underline{W}$ = .260, which was non-significant. Thus as a group they failed to show a common standard. Interestingly, the mean $\underline{W}$ for the 41.7% who did have significant coefficients was .495, highest among all groups. Administrators of Size II and III institutions also showed a low level of congruence, with means of .240 and .215, respectively. Size II administrators paralleled academic vice presidents in both the proportion of significant $\underline{W}$'s and the mean $\underline{W}$ for that proportion. Size III administrators, despite having a larger

proportion of significant scores (52%), possessed the weakest mean for that proportion, with $\underline{W}$ = .357 (significant at the .05 level). These three groups therefore did not appear to show communities of judgement, although within each there were a number of significant individual indexes.

For the 53.6% of the sample whose coefficients were significant, it was possible to estimate their true attitudes, following Kendall's suggestion (1970, p. 101) that the sums of ranks provided the best estimate of true ranks when $\underline{W}$ is significant. Table 25 shows for each perspective the number and proportion of the sample for whom a true attitude was found.

Among the stratified groups, administrators of Size III institutions showed the most concensus. 48% held an attitude most favorable to the student personnel perspective -- exactly equal to the 48% who showed no significant level of congruence. A relatively strong preference was exhibited by presidents (41.7%) and administrators of Size IV institutions (42.9%). Administrators of public institutions also showed a substantial preference (39.8%) for the student personnel outlook, though it was overshadowed by the 45.6% whose scores indicated no significant level of congruence.

Not all groups demonstrated a dominant student personnel attitude. Approximately equal proportions in favor of student personnel and student development were found for academic vice presidents (20.8% and 16.7%, respectively), administrators of Size I institutions (24.3% and 21.4%),

Table 25. "True Attitude" of
Administrators Obtaining a
Significant Coefficient of Concordance

Respondent Group	N	Admin n	%	- - - Perspective - - - StuPer n	%	StuDev n	%
All Administrators	207	15	7.2	65	31.4	31	15.0
Presidents	60	2	3.3	25	41.7	9	15.0
Academic VP	72	3	4.2	15	20.8	12	16.7
Business VP	75	10	13.3	25	33.3	10	13.3
Institution[+] Size I	70	7	10.0	17	24.3	15	21.4
Size II	56	2	3.6	12	21.4	9	16.1
Size III	25	0	0.0	12	48.0	1	4.0
Size IV	56	6	10.7	24	42.9	6	10.7
Public	103	7	6.8	41	39.8	8	7.8
Private	104	8	7.7	24	23.1	23	22.1

[+]Size I=up to 1,499 enrollment; Size II=1,500 to 4,999 enrollment; Size III=5,000 to 9,999 enrollment; Size IV= 10,000 and higher enrollment.

administrators of Size II institutions (21.4% and 16.1%), and private institution administrators (23.1% and 22.1%). The equalities exhibited by small college administrators appeared to be influenced by the large number of administrators of private institutions with relatively small enrollments.

CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS

Research Questions

From the findings reported in Chapter IV, some answers can now be offered to the research questions posed earlier.

1. "Of the three historical rationales for the existence of student services -- the administrative, student personnel, and student development points of view -- which is most likely to coincide with the attitudes of campus administrators regarding the proper purpose of specific student services functions?"

Administrative perspective. This outlook found substantial support in only one area: student conduct. Just over 75% of the respondents ranked the perspective highest in this area. In six of the ten functions, (financial aid, counseling, admissions, student activities, housing, and placement), it was ranked last. The actual proportion of first ranks in these areas ranged from 8.7% to 28.5%. Finally, in three of the functional areas (health, academic support, and orientation), the administrative perspective was ranked in the middle, with proportions ranging from 24.64% to 36.71%.

The key to understanding administrators' responses to the administrative perspective is the term "essential." When an administrative statement reflected a student services function which was unequivocally essential to the

well-being of the institution and its students, a larger proportion of administrators tended to assign the highest rank to that statement. This was especially obvious in the area of student conduct. Here the administrative statement dealt with the basic issue of student rights and due process, whereas the remaining perspectives were more concerned with the educational potential in the disciplinary process. The responses implied that while such potentials might be desirable -- and even important -- they were less essential.

In the three functions where the administrative perspective was ranked second overall, elements supporting essentiality could also be discerned. The student health statement, which accounted for almost 37% of the first ranks, dealt with the provision of medical insurance for students. Given the cost of medical treatment and the lack of comprehensive medical facilities on many campuses, the necessity of an insurance program would have been evident to many administrators.

The institutional recording of grades also would be essential, and this was the activity expressed in the academic support statement group. Although this statement was considered less essential than that expressed in the student personnel perspective, it still earned a clear second place in the ranking, with 27% of the administrators considering it most essential.

Finally, in the orientation statement group, the administrative statement was concerned with the dissemination

of basic information regarding the structure, regulations, and programs of the institution. Again the notion of an essential service was evident; a little more than 24% of the respondents ranked this perspective highest.

Conversely, in those functional areas where the administrative perspective fared least well, the idea of essentiality was usually lacking. For example, the administrative statement in both the financial aid and admissions groups was concerned with stimulating enrollment. While this might be an important function in the case of a struggling private college beset by severe enrollment losses, it lacked an element of absolute necessity. The administrative statements in student activities, housing, and placement were similar. Each described a function which, while it could easily be seen as a basic component of the functional area, nonetheless was not the essential component.

Student development perspective. This perspective did not receive majority support in any of the ten functional areas. For student activities and housing, however, it did gain a plurality of first ranks, with a proportion of 47.34% in both cases. It also received a plurality of 39.61% in the counseling statement group, although the lack of a significant chi square statistic prevented any conclusions about preference. Additional support -- to a limited degree -- was found in the areas of admissions and placement, where the student development perspective held substantial minority proportions of 34.78% and 32.37%, respectively.

The responses reflected a great deal of ambiguity. Administrators tended to show support for the concept of integration of the teaching function with student affairs in their ranking of the housing statements. However, in the area of academic support there was scant support for the same principle. Similarly, the concept of basing programs on human development theory appeared to be considered acceptable in some functions (student activities, admissions, and counseling), but not in others (financial aid, student conduct, and orientation).

This lack of consistency suggested that while there may have existed a group of administrators whose attitudes generally favored the student development perspective, a larger proportion was more program-specific in its attitude; that is, they held different values for different student services functions. The question was not necessarily whether a particular student services function was preferred because it coincided with a favorable attitude towards the student development perspective. Instead, it seemed to be more a matter of whether the perspective coincided with an idea about the value (or purpose) of a given function.

Thus many administrators could appreciate the value of a human development-based program in a functional area where it appeared appropriate, and where other possible rationales were not critical. This could be true in student activities, where simply "channeling energies" might be construed as an inadequate use of facilities and resources. The same

idea could be applied in the area of student housing. On the other hand, certain functions -- such as financial aid or student conduct -- would be considered as much more basic. The application of student development theories in such areas might be interesting, even useful. But other considerations would be deemed more critical to the function, and the rationales supporting these considerations would thus appear more essential.

Student personnel perspective. This outlook found widespread support among the respondents. It accounted for a majority of first ranks in the areas of financial aid (80.19%), admissions (51.21%), academic support (60.39%), and orientation (52.66%). It earned pluralities in the areas of health (41.55%) and placement (43.00%). Finally, it showed substantial minority support in counseling (31.88%), student activities (33.33%), and housing (38.16%).

The activities used to describe the student personnel outlook in each of the statement groups reflected some concepts central to the perspective: they were non-curricular, and they emphasized a "helping" role for student services personnel. These characteristics appeared to most coincide with administrator attitudes. The only major exception was in student conduct, where the legal concern for due process overrode all other considerations. In the two areas (student activities and housing) where the student personnel outlook deferred to the student development perspective, it would appear that the activities cited were not

seen as critical. Nonetheless, the fact that the student personnel perspective received the highest proportion of first ranks in six of the ten functional areas -- and the second highest in the remaining four -- would indicate it enjoyed a wide degree of support.

Administrator attitudes thus indicated for a majority of the functions an approval of the helping role -- the student personnel outlook. They saw as most essential those activities which: gave direct support to students, were pragmatic in their goals, and which remained in the traditional extracurriculum.

2. "What are the attitudes of campus administrators regarding the proper purpose of student services as a whole?"

This question was presented directly to the administrators in the questionnaire's first statement group in the context of a general purpose for a student affairs division. As noted in Chapter IV, a majority of the administrators (54.11%) favored the student personnel perspective. Another 26.57% identified the student development perspective as most essential, with the remainder (19.32%) preferring the administrative outlook. That administrators' attitudes tended to favor the student personnel perspective could also be inferred from the answer to the first research question, since the perspective was ranked highest for six of the ten functional areas.

These findings would suggest that the student personnel

outlook carries some unique characteristics which tend to strike administrators as crucial factors in the operation of student services. These might be categorized in terms of: 1) how the perspective balances institutional interests and student needs; and 2) what the perspective suggests as a proper relationship between a student affairs division and its institution.

Of the three perspectives, the student personnel outlook would seem to be closest to seeking a true balance between the institution's needs and the needs of its students. As defined in the questionnaire, the student personnel perspective expressed a commitment to help in students' personal growth and to respond to their needs. This appears to set the perspective apart from the administrative outlook, which requires a complete alignment of the division with institutional interests. It must be pointed out, however, that there is nothing in the administrative perspective which necessarily precludes a commitment to student growth. If the institutional mission includes an obligation to contribute to students' social, emotional, and physical development as well as their intellectual learning, then the administrative perspective can (and in practice certainly does) assume such characteristics so as to make it similar to the student personnel point of view. The difference between the two is that the student personnel outlook assumes that at times student needs and institutional needs will not coincide, and that in such cases the student af-

fairs division may not necessarily align itself with the institution. Within the context of the administrative perspective, the issue is normally not in doubt: the purpose of the division is to support the institution. The student personnel outlook, on the other hand, implies that under some circumstances the division will act as an advocate for the students, representing and arguing their interests to the institution.

In a mirror-like fashion, the same difference is true with regard to the student development outlook. This perspective shares with the student personnel outlook a commitment to the growth of the student in all ways, intellectual and non-intellectual. But where student personnel also works to help the student to adjust to the institution, student development instead focuses on adjusting the institution in support of the "total development" of the student. In a sense, it is related to the administrative perspective in this regard. Both perspectives assume the necessity for a complete convergence of institutional and student interests and needs. The student personnel perspective, on the other hand, operates from the premise that institutional and student interests will not always coincide. This leads to the matter of the second characteristic: the proper relationship between the student affairs division and its institution.

The administrators' responses suggested that, in general, they preferred a student services organization whose

programs were supportive of the academic mission of the institution and were also extracurricular. They tended not to see student services as simply a set of administrative responsibilities. At the same time, they were not inclined to accept a student services role in the formal curriculum.

The consistent rejection of the administrative perspective provided ample evidence that most administrators did not wish to see a minimal role for student affairs. On the contrary, there appeared to be broad acceptance of the idea that most student services programs are in essence educational. The statement group which covered student housing is a clear example. Here only a little more than 14% of the administrators considered as most essential the idea that shelter is the main reason for providing housing. Instead, just over 85% indicated that providing an educational environment was more important.

But while the administrators favored an educational role for student services, they also appeared to see that role take place in the extracurriculum. This was an important distinguishing element in the first statement group. The student development statement spoke of a role within the classroom as well as without, while the student personnel statement specifically emphasized the extracurricular. Moreover, in the academic support statement group, where the notion of student affairs staff working as teaching faculty was specifically addressed, only about 12.5% of the administrators considered such a role as most important.

Thus it would seem that the administrators' attitudes were, for the most part, inclined towards the view that a student services division should stand as a link between the institution and its students. Such a division would be supportive of the institutional mission and work to help students adjust to the task of membership in an academic community. At times, however, it would be expected that student services would take an advocate's role in support of its students. The programs of the student services division would generally be educational -- supporting the academic function -- and would focus on the extracurriculum, leaving the curriculum reserved to the faculty.

3. "Are campus administrators consistent in their views regarding the purpose of student services?"

It has been shown that administrators tended to prefer the student personnel perspective. However, in a few cases the administrators considered the student personnel outlook to be of lesser importance than one of the other two per-spectives; and, in some instances, their support for the student personnel outlook was not substantially greater than for one of the others.

The question of congruence of attitude was addressed in Chapter IV (pp. 96ff.). When Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to provide an index measurement, it was found that the administrators held varying degrees of con-gruence, but that on the average the degree was somewhat low (a mean W of .280). The mean W for those administrators

whose coefficients were statistically significant (see Table 24) was considerably higher at $\underline{W}$ = .455. Even this higher mean, however, was not indicative of a high degree of congruence. This was an extremely interesting finding because it implied a major limitation or qualification to the answers given to the first two research questions.

To demonstrate this, it is necessary to review what the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance is intended to describe. As noted in Chapter III, $\underline{W}$ is based on the sums of ranks. It may take a value of from 0 to 1.0. A value of 1.0 would be expected if an administrator ranked the three perspectives in the exact same order for each of the eleven statement groups. If he or she were to consistently rank one perspective first for all eleven groups, but variously rank the other two perspectives either second and third or third and second, one would expect to see a coefficient of approximately $\underline{W}$ = .750. If the value for $\underline{W}$ falls below .750, it can only mean a varying lack of consistent first ranks for one of the perspectives. The lower the coefficient, the more variability must exist in the assignment of ranks, including first ranks.

The obtained data thus strongly implied only a small degree of congruence. An administrator (or group of administrators) might say he or she supports one of the three perspectives. In practice, it would have to be expected that such support would vary in intensity -- and in some cases would actually be nonexistent. An administrator whose

attitude generally coincided with the student personnel outlook may actually prefer a student development approach for certain programs, or an administrative stance in others. The preferences exhibited by most administrators tended to be program-specific; that is, their attitudes were influenced as much by the type of program being offered as by the underlying purpose which shaped the program. The only element which was consistently held was the idea that programs should be educational and supportive of the academic mission. For a majority of the administrators who participated in the survey, this element was most represented in the student personnel perspective. But whenever a differing perspective was perceived to better represent the educational support element, administrators were not reluctant to abandon their general attitudes in favor of another for a specific objective.

4. "Are there significant differences in the attitudes of different types of campus administrators?"

No significant differences were found between the three types of administrators surveyed. Their rankings of the perspectives tended to be similar, with occasional minor differences that remained statistically nonsignificant. Of the eleven statement groups presented, there was noticeable disagreement in just three. Academic vice presidents showed no preference for the any of the statements in the student health group, while presidents and business vice presidents expressed a preference for the student personnel perspec-

tive. For student housing, presidents supported the student personnel outlook while business vice presidents preferred the student development perspective. Academic vice presidents expressed a weak preference for student development, with some indication of almost equal support for student personnel. Finally, in the area of placement, business vice presidents were supportive of the student personnel perspective while presidents and academic vice presidents showed no significant preference.

Analysis of individual congruence indicated significant (though moderate) degrees of consistency in attitude for presidents and business vice presidents, though not for academic vice presidents. Based on estimates of true attitude (pp. 98-99), it appeared that presidents held the strongest degree of congruence.

The lack of substantial differences in attitude between the types of administrators was somewhat unexpected. At the time the project was conceived, it was thought that presidents would tend to take a fairly strong student personnel view; academic vice presidents were expected to be very program-specific, concerned more with faculty prerogatives than with a consistent perspective; and business vice presidents were expected to prefer the administrative perspective. The findings indicated that these assumptions were only partially correct.

Presidents indeed tended to prefer the student personnel outlook, and their attitude was more consistent. How-

ever, in absolute terms the level of congruence was moderate at best, and their responses were often program-specific.

Academic vice presidents generally appeared closest to the initial assumptions. More so than presidents or business vice presidents, they tended to draw a line between academic functions and extracurricular functions. In effect, they preferred that student services remain on its own side of the line. While they tended towards the student personnel outlook, their degree of consistency was apt to be low. It should be noted, however, that for those academic vice presidents whose individual Coefficients of Concordance were statistically significant (Table 24), their mean coefficient was $\underline{W}$ = .495 -- highest among all sub-groups in the sample. This would suggest a greater variance in strength of attitude among these administrators than might be found among the other types.

The response of business vice presidents was most surprising. Rather than agreeing with the administrative view, as had been expected, they showed considerable support for an educational role for student services in general -- and for most of the specific functional areas detailed in the questionnaire. Along with the presidents, they showed a significant degree of congruence.

5. "Are there significant differences with respect to the type of institution?"

Five statistically significant differences were found that were related to relative degrees of strength of atti-

tude. These suggested that administrators of large (10,000 or higher enrollment) public universities were more likely to have attitudes favoring the student personnel outlook. They were also more likely to show a higher degree of congruence towards the perspective.

Because of the larger proportion of large institutions under public control rather than private, public institution administrators in general showed a stronger level of support for the student personnel perspective. Administrators of private institutions, while for the most part supportive of the student personnel outlook, had a slight tendency to "slip" towards the student development perspective. This was particularly true for administrators of small colleges under private control.

Thus the major difference found from the study was not simply between large and small, nor public and private. Instead, it was a combination of strata: large, public universities and small, private colleges. Administrators of both were mainly supportive of the student personnel point of view, but the former were more likely to be firm in their attitude while the latter had tendencies to a position somewhere between student personnel and student development. Nonetheless, it should be remembered that neither group consistently held the same attitude at approximately the same level of congruence throughout the functional areas covered in the questionnaire.

Implications

In 1973 Terenzini surveyed presidents of colleges and universities and concluded that they were not yet ready to accept a student development rationale as the major purpose underlying student services. Ten years later, it would appear that there has been only a little movement towards acceptance of student development -- and that primarily by administrators of small, private colleges. Administrators continue to favor what Terenzini spoke of as the "traditional" role for student affairs (Terenzini, 1973, pp. 34-35).

This role, however, is not of one kind. The administrators described in this study showed a definite inclination to "pick and choose." While most generally adhered to the student personnel approach, they were able to identify some administrative functions and some student development functions as equally essential. Their lack of congruence does not make for exciting statistical findings. It does suggest that they prefer a student services organization which works to fill the gaps between administrators, faculty, and students. Such an organization would of necessity have to be elastic. It would handle perfunctory administrative tasks, provide useful extracurricular opportunities, create sound developmental tasks, interpret the institution to the students, and serve as a student advocate to the institution. There may be considerable wisdom in the collective outlook of college and university administrators: they appear to be saying that flexibility is the most es-

sential characteristic of student services.

There is nothing new in such a perspective. Members of the student services profession itself have pointed out the folly of creating a single model to define what student services should do. Penn et al., (1975, p. 223), noted that even if a satisfactory developmental theory were found, "the need would still exist for someone to attend to the basic functions in which student personnel workers are presently engaged." And Rhatigan (1975, p. 58) demonstrated equal insight when he said there was no one correct perspective; the strength of the profession came "from the campus up, not from theory down." The attitudes of most of the administrators who made up the sample in this study coincide to a great extent with such statements. They do not wish to see a single model prevailing, whether it advocate the "total development" of the student or the provision of a minimum level of administrative services.

Student services professionals cannot afford to ignore the attitudes and opinions of other campus administrators. Certainly there is a need to continue research involving concepts of student development and applications of developmental theory, but it would seem to be just as important to listen to the voices of the rest of the campus community. Student affairs divisions need to continually evaluate and -- if necessary -- adapt their role and functions in light of the institutional mission, refining traditional tasks and explicating new ones. To do this, they need to

maintain a productive dialogue with administrators, faculty, and students.

Suggestions for Further Research

In Chapter III it was shown that there has been little research concerning administrator attitudes towards student services. Faculty perceptions have been the object of many studies, particularly with the numerous replications of Fitzgerald's (1962) work. But even here there was little attempt to gain an understanding of what purpose faculty ascribed to student services.

Thus it would seem that additional efforts should be made to determine both administrator and faculty attitudes towards the purpose of student services and the role of student services professionals. It is not enough to continue the internal debate; the profession needs to ask what the other segments of the campus community want student services to contribute to the institution and to higher education.

This study used a new instrument and a statistic (Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance) that has rarely been used in student affairs research. As with any new method, its validity remains somewhat limited until additional studies have been performed. The findings of this study can only be applied to administrators of institutions in the western states. Replications covering other geographic regions or particular types of institutions or administrators would

thus be of interest. It might also be of value to use the instrument to explore faculty attitudes.

Finally, this study focused on a measure of relative support to discern attitudes. While it was possible to conclude that there existed a general attitude favoring the student personnel point of view, the methodology employed precluded any assessment of the absolute value of the perspective. An unanswered question that needs to be asked of administrators and faculty is: how essential is the student services contribution to higher education?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W. Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), A handbook of social psychology. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

American Council on Education Studies. The student personnel point of view. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1937.

American Psychological Association. Standards for educational and psychological tests and manuals. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1966.

Arbuckle, D. S. Student personnel services in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Arquist, C. & Farragher, J. An interview with Robert B. Young. The Vermont Connection, 1982, 3, 16-20.

Astmann, S. K. Faculty perceptions of the student personnel staff: implications for survival. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1975, 38, 65-70.

Bandura, A., Blanchard, E. B., & Ritter, B. Relative efficacy of desensitization and modeling approaches for inducing behavioral, affective, and attitudinal changes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 173-199.

Barton, Jr., D. W. If the customers don't buy, the institution will die. National Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal, 1973, 17, 9-12.

Bess, J. L. More than room and board: linking residence and classroom. In J. Katz (Ed.) Services for Students. New Directions for Higher Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973.

Blackburn, J. L. Perceived purposes of student personnel programs by chief student personnel officers as a function of academic preparation and experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1969.

Bloland, P. Student personnel training for the chief student affairs officer: essential or unnecessary? NASPA Journal, 1979, 17, 57-62.

Bohrnstedt, G. W. Reliability and validity assessment in attitude measurement. In G. F. Summers (Ed.), Attitude measurement. Chicago: Rand McNalley & Company, 1970.

Bowman, A. E. The financial aid counselor -- a true educator. In R. Keene, F. C. Adams, & J. E. King (Eds.), Money, marbles, or chalk: student financial support in higher education. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Brown, R. D. Student development in tomorrow's higher education - a return to the academy. Student Personnel Series No. 16. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1972.

Brunson, M. A. Residence halls as centers of learning. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1963, 27, 32-36.

Campbell, D. T. Social attitude and other acquired behavioral dispositions. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: a study of science (Vol. 6). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Campbell, D. T. & Fiske, D. W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

Carr, L. & Roberts, S. O. Correlates of civil-rights participation. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 67, 259-267.

Chein, I. Behavior theory and the behavior of attitudes: some critical comments. Psychological Review, 1948, 55, 175-188.

Cook, S. W. & Selltiz, C. A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 36-55.

Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA). Student development services in higher education. July 14, 1972. (Mimeographed)

Dawes, R. M. Fundamentals of attitude measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Dillman, D. A. Mail and telephone surveys: the total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Dutton, T. B., Appleton, J. R., & Birch, E. E. Assumptions and beliefs of selected members of the academic community. NASPA Division of Research and Publications, 1970. (Monograph)

Fishbein, M. An investigation of the relationships between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. Human Relations, 1963, 16, 233-240.

Fishbein, M. A consideration of beliefs, attitudes, and their relationships. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Fishbein, M. Attitude theory and measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Fitzgerald, L. E. Faculty perceptions of student personnel functions. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1962, 3, 169-179.

Gross, S. J. A critique of practices in the administration of financial aid. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 78-85.

Guilford, J. P. & Fruchter, B. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1978.

Hodgkinson, H. L. How deans of students are seen by others -- and why. NASPA Journal, 1970, 8, 49-54.

Hyman, H. H. Survey design and analysis. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Johnson, W. M. Faculty perceptions of student personnel services (Doctoral dissertation, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 29, 2526A.

Jones, J. K. Students' perceptions of student personnel services at the University of Mississippi (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 1458A.

Jones, K. K. Status and use of codes and regulations on campus. Journal of the American College Health Association, 1974, 22, 302-307.

Kamm, R. B. An inventory of student reaction to student personnel services. Educational and Psycholgoical Measurements, 1950, 10, 537-544.

Kendall, M. G. Rank correlation methods (4th ed.). London: Griffin, 1970.

Kroeker, L. L. & Carver, G. H. A developmental paradigm for discipline. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1968, 31, 111-115.

Kuder, G. F. & Richardson, M. W. The theory of the estimation of test reliability. Psychometrika, 1937, 2, 135-138.

Laudicina, R. A. Student affairs. In E. Rausch (Ed.), Management in institutions of higher learning. Toronto: D. C. Heath and Co., 1980.

McIver, C. R. A study of administrators', faculty, and students' perceptions of student personnel services at the University of Oklahoma (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 2672A. (University Microfilm No. 76-24, 387)

Miller, J. M. The development of an environmental health and safety program in a comprehensive health program for the campus community. Journal of the American College Health Association, 1972, 20, 183-185.

Miller, T. K. & Prince, J. S. The future of student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Mowrer, O. H. Q technique: description, history, and critique. In O. H. Mowrer (Ed.), Psychotherapy: therapy and research. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1953.

Moyer, G. F. A study of student and faculty perceptions of student personnel services at Memphis State University (Doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 7065A.

Mueller, K. H. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Osgood, C. E., Tannenbaum, P. H., & Suci, G. J. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Packwood, W. T. (Ed.). College student personnel services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1977.

Parker, C. A. Student development: what does it mean? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15, 248-256.

Penn, J. R., Manspeaker, J., & Millette, B. J. The model merry-go-round. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12, 222-225.

Penney, J. F. Student personnel work: a profession still-born. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 47, 958-961.

Phillips, D. C. & Clancy, K. J. Some effects of social desirability in survey studies. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 77, 921-940.

Pinsky, S. & Marks, D. Perceptions of student personnel services at a major land grant university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980, 21, 99-104.

Plato, K. The shift to student development: an analysis of the patterns of change. NASPA Journal, 1978, 15, 32-36.

Rankin, G. E. Graduating seniors' perceptions of student personnel services at Colorado State College (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27, 2406A.

Rhatigan, J. J. Student services vs. student development: is there a difference? Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1975, 38, 51-59.

Rosenburg, M. J. A structural theory of attitude dynamics. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 319-340.

Sax, G. Foundations of educational research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

Scott, W. A. Structure of natural cognitions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 261-278.

Shuman, I. G. Resident faculty, faculty administrators and student personnel administrators perceptions of a program of student personnel services (Doctoral dissertation, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 6140A.

Smith, D. G. The next step beyond student development -- becoming partners within our institutions. NASPA Journal, 1982, 19, 53-62.

Snider, P. A. A student comes to us. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1970, 33, 138-141.

St. Antoine, T. J. The administrative tribunal. In G. W. Holmes (Ed.), Law and discipline on campus. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1971.

Strang, R. Problems and procedures of student activities. In C. G. Wrenn (Ed.), Student personnel work in college. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Summers, G. F. Attitude measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1970.

Terenzini, P. T. The goals of student personnel work: views from the top. NASPA Journal, 1973, 11, 31-35.

Thurstone, L. L. The measurement of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1931, 26, 249-269.

Tilley, D. C. Student services and the politics of survival. In J. Katz (Ed.), Services for students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Tilley, D. C. The student affairs dean and the president: trends in higher education. ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse and NASPA, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 459)

Troescher, C. M. A descriptive study of the perceptions held by students, faculty, and student personnel administrators of the student personnel services at Rock Valley College (Doctoral dissertation, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 1385A.

Useem, R. H. A sociologist views learning in college residence halls. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1966, 29, 116-122.

Welkowitz, J., Ewen, R., & Cohen, J. Introductory statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Williamson, E. G. Student personnel work in colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Williamson, E. G., et. al. The student personnel point of view. American Council on Education Studies, Series VI (Student Personnel Work Number 13). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949.

Wittenborn, J. R. Contributions and current status of Q methodology. Psychological Bulletin, 1961, 58, 132-142.

Wolf, J. Marketing Admissions. College Board Review, 1973, 89, 2-4;23-24.

Young, D. P. Due process standards and guidelines for student discipline in higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 101-106.

Zajone, R. B. Structure of the cognitive field. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954.

Zajone, R. B. The process of cognitive tuning in communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 159-164.

Zimmerman, E. E. Student perceptions of student personnel services at Michigan State (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963). Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, 261.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Documentation of Questionnaire Statements

Each statement in the instrument was based on one or more sources from the literature. Most statements were paraphrased, though some were direct quotations. There were three major sources for the statements:

> T. K. Miller and J. S. Prince, The future of student affairs (1977).
>
> W. T. Packwood (Ed.), College student personnel services (1977).
>
> E. G. Williamson, et al., The student personnel point of view (1949).

All three works represented efforts to comprehensively define or describe the field of student services. In addition to these, other more specific sources were occasionally used when necessary. Brief citations are given below; complete citations are contained in the Bibliography.

Statement Group: Purpose of Student Affairs

Administrative	COSPA (1972).
Student Personnel	Williamson, et al. (1949).
Student Development	Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: Financial Aid

Administrative	Packwood (1977); Gross (1966).
Student Personnel	Williamson (1949).
Student Development	Packwood (1977); Bowman (1975).

Statement Group: Counseling

Administrative	Packwood (1977).
Student Personnel	Williamson (1949).
Student Development	Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: <u>Admissions</u>

    Administrative   Barton, Jr. (1973).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: <u>Student Health</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Jones (1974); Miller (1972).

Statement Group: <u>Student Activities</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977); Strang (1951);
                          Mueller (1961).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: <u>Student Conduct</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977); Young (1971).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Kroeker & Carver (1968);
                          St. Antoine (1971).

Statement Group: <u>Student Housing</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977); Useem (1966).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Bess (1973); Brunson (1963);
                          Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: <u>Academic Support</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977); Williamson
                          (1949).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Brown (1972).

Statement Group: <u>Student Orientation</u>

    Administrative   Packwood (1977); Snider (1970).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Miller & Prince (1977).

Statement Group: <u>Student Placement</u>

    Administrative   Arbuckle (1953); Packwood
                          (1977).
    Student Personnel   Williamson (1949).
    Student Development   Miller & Prince (1977).

APPENDIX B

<u>Sample Cover Letters</u>

April 6, 1983

Dr. John J. Doe, President
Aurora State University
Aurora, Borealis 99911

Dear Dr. Doe:

The current financial climate in higher education has caused all of us to pay closer attention to cost efficiency, accountability, and evaluation. Student affairs programs have been affected by these concerns as much as other campus divisions, resulting in a continuing dialogue within the student personnel profession about the roles and purposes of student services. For the most part this has been an internal discussion -- but it is evident that the views of leading campus administrators outside of student affairs also should be heard.

Aurora State University is one of a number of colleges and universities in the western states in which executive administrators are being asked to offer their opinions on the purpose of student personnel work in higher education. So that the results will truely reflect your thinking, it is important that you personally complete the questionnaire.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only, so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Neither your name nor the name of your institution will be placed on the questionnaire or mentioned in the study report.

This research project is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. J. Roger Penn, Acting Dean for Student Services, Oregon State University. If you have any questions, please feel free to write or call me (907-474-7317) or Dr. Penn (503-754-3661).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Stephen E. Roth, Coordinator
Academic Support Services
Office of Student Affairs

encl.

April 13, 1983

Dr. John J. Doe, President
Aurora State University
Aurora, Borealis 99911

Dear Dr. Doe:

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about the purpose of student services in higher education was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of campus executive administrators in the western states.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because the questionnaire has been sent to only a small, selected group of college and university administrators it is extremely important that your response be included in the study if the results are to accurately reflect executive level opinion.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me now, collect (907) 474-7317 and I will get a replacement in the mail to you today.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Stephen E. Roth, Coordinator
Academic Support Services
Office of Student Affairs

SR:jd

April 27, 1983

Dr. John J. Doe, President
Aurora State University
Aurora, Borealis 99911

Dear Dr. Doe:

About three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion on the purpose of student services in higher education. As of today we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

This study was undertaken because of the belief that the opinions of executive-level administrators should be considered in the dialogue currently taking place within the student personnel profession regarding its purpose and professional identity.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. You are part of a small sample restricted to campus executive officers only. In order for the results of the project to be truly representative of the thinking of executive administrators it is essential that each person in the sample return his or her questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stephen E. Roth, Coordinator
Academic Support Services
Office of Student Affairs

SR:jd

May 20, 1983

Dr. John J. Doe, President
Aurora State University
Aurora, Borealis 99911

Dear Dr. Doe:

I am writing to you about our study of executive administrators' attitudes regarding the purpose of student services in higher education. We have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

Understandably, you have a busy schedule -- and you probably see more requests for information cross your desk than you care to answer. But, whether we will be able to accurately describe how college and university presidents and vice-presidents personally perceive the role of student affairs depends upon you and others who have not yet responded. It is very possible that you may have a different opinion than those who have already returned their questionnaire.

This is the first study of this particular type that has ever been done. The results are of special importance to the student affairs profession; we need to know how executive officers outside of student services see our role. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe administrators' viewpoints.

It is for this reason that I am sending this by certified mail to ensure delivery. In case our other correspondence did not reach you, or was misplaced, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. May I urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible.

Your contribution to the success of this project will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stephen E. Roth, Coordinator
Academic Support Services
Office of Student Affairs

encl.

APPENDIX C

<u>Questionnaire</u>

THE PURPOSE OF STUDENT SERVICES:

A SURVEY OF EXECUTIVE LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS

Division of Student Affairs
University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

(FRONT COVER)

Part I.   Directions: Below are three statements which reflect different perspectives about the primary purpose of student affairs in colleges and universities.   Read all three statements carefully, and then RANK them in order of how essential you personally believe they are to the central purpose of your institution.   (1 = MOST ESSENTIAL)

Rank___   a. The principal purpose of student affairs is to create a campus environment, both in and out of the classroom, in which human development concepts are applied by faculty and administrators promoting the total development of the student.

Rank___   b. The principal purpose of student affairs is to support the mission of the institution by administering services and regulations pertaining to student life, thereby contributing to the maintenance of an orderly academic community.

Rank___   c. The principal purpose of student affairs is to provide and coordinate support services and extracurricular programs which respond to the needs of students, thereby contributing to their physical, social, emotional, and intellectual growth and assisting them to become successful members of the campus community and society.

Part II. Directions: On the following pages are groups of statements describing specific student services functions in each of ten general areas. Each group is composed of three statements. For each group, read the three statements carefully, and then RANK them in order of how essential you believe they are to the functional area identified (1 = MOST ESSENTIAL). The ranks you assign should indicate how you personally feel about the services described, whether or not they are actually offered at your institution.

Financial Aid

Rank___   a. Needy and worthy students are assisted in obtaining financial support.

Rank___   b. Students develop a sense of maturity and purpose by applying for and managing financial support from scholarships, loans, or grants.

Rank___   c. Enrollment levels are increased by providing a wide variety of financial aid programs.

Counseling

Rank___   a. Counselors help students to adjust to the campus and academic environment.

Rank___   b. Counselors assist students in thinking through their personal and vocational problems.

Rank___   c. Counselors' efforts are aimed at expanding human awareness and experience and maximizing human potentials for each student.

Admissions

Rank___   a. The admissions office considers each prospective student's needs and personality, creating an enrollment of new students representing varying ability levels and interests.

Rank___   b. Adequate enrollment levels are attained by using sophisticated marketing techniques.

Rank___   c. Institutional objectives and opportunities are interpreted to prospective students and their parents.

Student Health

Rank___   a. Health insurance is made available to students, enabling them to use off-campus (community) health care facilities.

Rank___   b. The health center staff recommends institutional changes designed to create an environment more conducive to physical and mental health.

Rank___   c. Programs in preventive medicine and personal hygiene are coordinated by the health center.

Student Activities

Rank___   a. A variety of social, recreational, and group activities are encouraged and supervised in order to promote life-time interests and skills.

Rank___   b. Extracurricular activities are made available which channel the students' energies into appropriate and con-structive outlets.

Rank___   c. Student activities are designed to create opportunities which enhance the development of personality and growth in morals and values among students.

Student Conduct

Rank___   a. Disciplinary procedures are clearly defined, emphasiz-ing adequate safeguards for due process and student rights and responsibilities.

Rank___   b. Self-discipline is enhanced by having students control the disciplinary process at the hearing or tribunal level.

Rank___   c. Student disciplinary hearings are intended as educa-tional functions designed to modify personal behavior patterns.

Student Housing

Rank___   a. Residence halls contribute positively to education in group living and social growth.

Rank___   b. Dormitories provide students with an economical place in which to live.

Rank___   c. Student housing facilities provide integrated living-learning centers, joining academic with out-of-class experiences.

Academic Support

Rank___   a. Remedial and tutorial services are provided in the areas of writing, reading, math, and study habits to assist each student to overcome academic deficiencies.

Rank___   b. Courses are offered for credit in the field of human relations, including such topics as values assessment, personal and group decision-making, and human sexuality.

Rank___   c. The university maintains a record of the student's academic achievement.

Student Orientation

Rank___   a. Orientation programs for new students emphasize the uniqueness of students and enhance positive feelings about chances for success.

Rank___   b. New students are informed about campus rules and regulations, academic programs, and extracurricular opportunities.

Rank___   c. Orientation activities assist new students to discover their educational abilities and objectives, and to adjust socially to the campus community.

Student Placement

Rank___   a. Placement files, containing information about the students' academic, job, and extracurricular background and letters of recommendation, are made available to potential employers.

Rank___   b. Students are counseled with regard to the development of their educational plans in relation to their vocational goals.

Rank___   c. Career educators assist students to clarify values and life plans by helping them to gain self-insight and to acquire problem-solving and decision-making skills.

Is there anything else you would like to mention regarding the purpose and functions of student affairs? If so, please use this space for that purpose. Also, any comments you may wish to make about this survey will be appreciated, either here or in a separate letter.

YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS RESEARCH PROJECT IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

(BACK COVER)

APPENDIX D

Tables 26-35, Percentage of Highest Ranks

Assigned by Stratified Groups

Table 26.   Percentage of All Administrators
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=207)

| Statement | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi |
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Square
Purpose of Student Affairs	19.32	54.11	26.57	41.826**
Financial Aid	8.7	80.19	11.11	204.725**
Counseling	28.5	31.88	39.61	4.029
Admissions	14.01	51.21	34.78	43.159**
Health	36.71	41.55	21.74	13.246**
Activities	19.32	33.33	47.34	24.377**
Conduct	75.85	15.46	8.7	169.768**
Housing	14.49	38.16	47.34	35.681**
Academic Support	27.05	60.39	12.56	74.696**
Orientation	24.64	52.66	22.71	34.899**
Placement	24.64	43.00	32.37	10.551**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 27. Percentage of <u>Presidents</u>
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=60)

Statement Group	---Perspective---			Chi Square
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	16.67	56.67	26.67	15.600**
Financial Aid	8.33	80.00	11.67	58.900**
Counseling	23.33	31.67	45.00	4.300
Admissions	8.33	50.00	41.67	17.500**
Health	33.33	46.67	20.00	6.400*
Activities	20.00	31.67	48.33	7.300*
Conduct	73.33	21.67	5.00	45.700**
Housing	11.67	46.67	41.67	12.900**
Academic Support	35.00	41.67	13.33	13.300**
Orientation	23.33	50.00	26.67	7.600*
Placement	25.00	43.33	31.67	3.100

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 28. Percentage of Academic Vice Presidents
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=72)

| Statement Group | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi |
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Square
Purpose of Student Affairs	20.83	45.83	33.33	6.750*
Financial Aid	6.94	83.33	9.72	81.084**
Counseling	30.56	27.78	41.67	2.334
Admissions	13.89	48.61	37.50	13.584**
Health	40.28	31.94	27.78	1.751
Activities	12.50	40.28	47.22	14.584**
Conduct	80.56	8.33	11.11	72.334**
Housing	11.11	41.67	47.22	16.334**
Academic Support	25.00	62.50	12.50	29.250**
Orientation	20.83	58.33	20.83	20.250**
Placement	27.78	40.28	31.94	1.751

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 29. Percentage of <u>Business Vice Presidents</u>
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=75)

Statement Group	---Perspective---			Chi Square
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	20.00	60.00	20.00	24.000**
Financial Aid	10.67	77.33	12.00	65.360**
Counseling	30.67	36.00	33.33	.320
Admissions	18.67	54.67	26.67	16.080**
Health	36.00	46.67	17.33	9.920**
Activities	25.33	28.00	46.67	6.080*
Conduct	73.33	17.33	9.33	54.720**
Housing	20.00	28.00	52.00	12.480**
Academic Support	22.67	65.33	12.00	35.840**
Orientation	29.33	49.33	21.33	9.360**
Placement	21.33	45.33	33.33	6.480*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 30. Percentage of Administrators
of <u>Size I Institutions</u> (up to 1,499 enrollment)
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=70)

Statement Group	---Perspective---			Chi Square
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	14.29	50.00	35.71	13.574**
Financial Aid	17.14	67.14	15.71	36.033**
Counseling	25.71	32.86	41.43	2.601
Admissions	18.57	45.71	35.71	7.916*
Health	45.71	31.43	22.86	5.601
Activities	21.43	31.43	47.14	7.058*
Conduct	70.00	17.14	12.86	42.549**
Housing	18.57	42.86	38.57	7.058*
Academic Support	27.14	57.14	15.71	19.231**
Orientation	24.29	42.86	32.86	3.629
Placement	32.86	35.71	31.43	.201

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 31. Percentage of Administrators
of <u>Size II Institutions</u> (1,500 to 4,999 enrollment)
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=56)

Statement Group	---Perspective---			Chi Square
	<u>Admin</u>	<u>StuPer</u>	<u>StuDev</u>	
Purpose of Student Affairs	19.64	53.57	26.79	10.748**
Financial Aid	7.14	80.36	12.50	55.955**
Counseling	23.21	26.79	50.00	7.106*
Admissions	12.50	46.43	41.07	11.177**
Health	41.07	39.29	19.64	4.749
Activities	16.07	33.93	50.00	9.678**
Conduct	80.36	10.71	8.93	55.740**
Housing	12.50	33.93	53.57	14.177**
Academic Support	28.57	53.57	17.86	11.284**
Orientation	14.29	69.64	16.07	33.245**
Placement	17.86	42.86	39.29	6.142*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 32. Percentage of Administrators
of Size III Institutions (5,000 to 9,999 enrollment)
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=25)

Statement Group	---Perspective---			Chi Square
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	16.00	68.00	16.00	13.033**
Financial Aid	8.00	88.00	4.00	32.411**
Counseling	40.00	36.00	24.00	1.039
Admissions	8.00	60.00	32.00	9.805**
Health	28.00	52.00	20.00	4.039
Activities	16.00	40.00	44.00	3.345
Conduct	76.00	20.00	4.00	20.647**
Housing	4.00	52.00	44.00	9.574**
Academic Support	28.00	60.00	12.00	8.652*
Orientation	24.00	56.00	20.00	5.653
Placement	24.00	52.00	24.00	3.807

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 33. Percentage of Administrators
of <u>Size IV Institutions</u> (10,000 and higher enrollment)
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=56)

Statement	---Perspective---			Chi
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Square
Purpose of Student Affairs	26.79	53.57	19.64	10.966**
Financial Aid	0	92.86	7.14	91.381**
Counseling	32.14	33.93	33.93	.054
Admissions	12.50	58.93	28.57	19.040**
Health	25.00	51.79	23.21	8.784*
Activities	21.43	32.14	46.43	5.401
Conduct	78.57	16.07	5.36	53.519**
Housing	16.07	30.36	53.57	12.276**
Academic Support	25.00	71.43	3.57	41.190**
Orientation	35.71	46.43	17.86	7.147*
Placement	21.43	48.21	30.36	6.384*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 34. Percentage of Administrators
of <u>Public Institutions</u>
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=103)

Statement	---Perspective---			Chi
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Square
Purpose of Student Affairs	24.27	55.34	20.39	22.682**
Financial Aid	2.91	88.35	8.74	140.829**
Counseling	31.07	32.04	36.89	.602
Admissions	12.62	59.22	28.16	34.800**
Health	33.01	47.57	19.42	12.254**
Activities	22.33	37.86	39.81	5.670
Conduct	76.70	16.50	6.80	88.629**
Housing	16.50	32.04	51.46	18.953**
Academic Support	22.33	71.84	5.83	72.959**
Orientation	31.07	53.40	15.53	22.390**
Placement	25.24	47.57	27.18	9.457**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 35. Percentage of Administrators
of Private Institutions
Assigning Highest Rank to Each Perspective
(N=104)

| Statement | ---Perspective--- | | | Chi |
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	Square
Purpose of Student Affairs	14.42	52.88	32.69	23.094**
Financial Aid	14.42	72.12	13.46	70.397**
Counseling	25.96	31.73	42.31	4.288
Admissions	15.38	43.27	41.35	15.133**
Health	40.38	35.58	24.04	4.404
Activities	16.35	28.85	54.81	24.017**
Conduct	75.00	14.42	10.58	81.473**
Housing	12.50	44.23	43.27	20.326**
Academic Support	31.73	49.04	19.23	13.979**
Orientation	18.27	51.92	29.81	18.247**
Placement	24.04	38.46	37.50	4.057

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

APPENDIX E

Tables 36-45, Sums of Ranks and
Coefficients of Concordance by Stratified Groups

Table 36. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of <u>All Administrators</u>
(N = 207)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
Purpose of Student Affairs	485	316	441	.179**
Financial Aid	478	250	515	.490**
Counseling	424	384	434	.016
Admissions	511	325	406	.203**
Health	429	362	451	.050**
Activities	489	385	368	.100**
Conduct	269	484	489	.368**
Housing	526	354	362	.220**
Academic Support	444	305	493	.222**
Orientation	456	331	455	.121**
Placement	473	340	429	.107**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 37. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of <u>Presidents</u>
(<u>N</u> = 60)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
	<u>Admin</u>	<u>StuPer</u>	<u>StuDev</u>	
Purpose of Student Affairs	149	89	122	.251**
Financial Aid	140	73	148	.505**
Counseling	129	108	123	.033
Admissions	155	92	113	.286**
Health	132	101	127	.077*
Activities	143	113	104	.116**
Conduct	78	131	151	.395**
Housing	153	96	111	.243**
Academic Support	122	95	143	.161**
Orientation	137	96	127	.127**
Placement	135	99	126	.098**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 38. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of <u>Academic Vice Presidents</u>
$(N = 72)$

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	166	114	152	.140**
Financial Aid	166	85	181	.514**
Counseling	146	139	147	.004
Admissions	181	115	136	.219**
Health	149	134	149	.014
Activities	178	128	126	.167**
Conduct	90	182	160	.445**
Housing	189	121	122	.293**
Academic Support	156	104	172	.244**
Orientation	158	112	162	.149**
Placement	162	124	144	.077*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 39. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of <u>Business Vice Presidents</u>
(N = 75)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	170	113	167	.183**
Financial Aid	172	92	186	.457**
Counseling	149	137	164	.033
Admissions	175	118	157	.151**
Health	148	127	175	.103**
Activities	168	144	138	.045*
Conduct	101	171	178	.322**
Housing	184	137	129	.157**
Academic Support	166	106	178	.265**
Orientation	161	123	166	.098**
Placement	174	117	159	.155**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 40. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of Administrators of <u>Size I Institutions</u>
(up to 1,499 enrollment)
(N = 70)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
	<u>Admin</u>	<u>StuPer</u>	<u>StuDev</u>	
Purpose of Student Affairs	171	110	139	.190**
Financial Aid	155	95	170	.321**
Counseling	149	128	143	.024
Admissions	165	117	138	.118**
Health	136	136	148	.010
Activities	163	132	125	.083*
Conduct	94	164	162	.324**
Housing	173	120	127	.169**
Academic Support	150	107	163	.164**
Orientation	157	117	146	.087*
Placement	151	122	147	.050*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 41. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of Administrators of <u>Size II Institutions</u>
(1,500 to 4,999 enrollment)
(N = 56)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
Purpose of Student Affairs	129	87	120	.156**
Financial Aid	128	67	141	.498**
Counseling	120	113	103	.023
Admissions	143	90	103	.243**
Health	115	98	123	.052
Activities	131	103	102	.086*
Conduct	72	132	132	.383**
Housing	144	99	93	.248**
Academic Support	124	86	126	.162**
Orientation	134	79	123	.270**
Placement	138	92	106	.177**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 42. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of Administrators of <u>Size III Institutions</u>
(5,000 to 9,999 enrollment)
(N = 25)

Statement Group	---Sum of Ranks---			$\underline{W}$
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	60	34	56	.314**
Financial Aid	57	28	65	.606**
Counseling	43	46	61	.149*
Admissions	62	36	52	.275**
Health	54	40	56	.122*
Activities	63	45	42	.206**
Conduct	32	58	60	.390**
Housing	66	37	47	.347**
Academic Support	52	36	62	.275**
Orientation	53	41	56	.101
Placement	58	39	53	.155*

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 43. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance (W)
of Administrators of Size IV Institutions
(10,000 and higher enrollment)
(N = 56)

| Statement Group | ---Sum of Ranks--- | | | W |
	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	
Purpose of Student Affairs	125	85	126	.174**
Financial Aid	138	60	139	.691**
Counseling	112	97	127	.072*
Admissions	141	82	113	.278**
Health	124	88	124	.138**
Activities	132	105	99	.099**
Conduct	71	130	135	.404**
Housing	143	98	95	.231**
Academic Support	118	76	142	.356**
Orientation	112	94	130	.103**
Placement	126	87	123	.150**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 44. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of Administrators of <u>Public Institutions</u>
(N = 103)

Statement	---Sum of Ranks---			
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
Purpose of Student Affairs	236	155	227	.186**
Financial Aid	250	115	254	.610**
Counseling	203	203	225	.030*
Admissions	256	152	210	.256**
Health	215	172	231	.088**
Activities	240	184	194	.084**
Conduct	133	244	241	.377**
Housing	258	184	176	.193**
Academic Support	225	137	256	.359**
Orientation	214	165	239	.135**
Placement	228	166	224	.113**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 45. Sums of Ranks
and Coefficients of Concordance ($\underline{W}$)
of Administrators of <u>Private Institutions</u>
(N = $\overline{104}$)

Statement	---Sum of Ranks---			
Group	Admin	StuPer	StuDev	$\underline{W}$
Purpose of Student Affairs	249	161	214	.181**
Financial Aid	228	135	261	.433**
Counseling	221	194	209	.017
Admissions	255	173	196	.165**
Health	214	190	220	.023*
Activities	249	201	174	.133**
Conduct	136	240	248	.361**
Housing	268	170	186	.256**
Academic Support	219	168	237	.118**
Orientation	242	166	216	.138**
Placement	245	174	205	.117**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.