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A COMPARISON OF THE PHILOSOPHIES OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AS THEY RELATE TO THE STUDENT SERVICES OFFERED AT SELECTED MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES

Cornelius Patterson, Jr., Ed. D.
Western Michigan University, 1974

The purpose of this study was to: (1) identify the philosophies of student personnel administration held by chief student personnel administrators, (2) identify the service functions included in the student personnel divisions, and (3) determine what kind of relationships exist between the student personnel divisions and the institutions studied.

A questionnaire was developed and mailed to chief student personnel administrators in selected Midwestern universities. Since this was a descriptive study, the entire population of chief personnel administrators at member universities of the Mid-American Athletic Conference was surveyed. The findings were based upon the ten administrators' responses to the questionnaire and questions asked in a structured interview.

Descriptive analysis of the data produced the following findings: (1) the chief student personnel administrators functioned under two philosophies of student personnel administration; (2) seven of the ten chief student personnel administrators functioned under the traditional student personnel point of view philosophy and three of the
administrators functioned under the newer student development philosophy; (3) chief student personnel administrators who adhered to the traditional philosophy received their professional training in student personnel or some area of education and those administrators who adhered to the student development philosophy received their training in disciplines other than education; (4) there were no differences between the kind of student services offered in student personnel divisions that operated under the traditional philosophy and those that operated under the student development philosophy; (5) the relationships between the student personnel divisions and the institutions were identified as "good" on the basis of the variables studied; (6) faculty support of the student personnel programs was identified as a key factor in perceived effectiveness by the chief student personnel administrators.

The conclusions were based upon frequencies and percentages of responses to the interview questions, questionnaire items, and information provided through a review of the literature of student personnel.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Rationale for the Study

The student unrest of the 1960's that pervaded the college and university campuses created quite a philosophical dilemma for members of the student personnel profession. The conflicts between the students and the administration placed the student personnel administrators in the middle. Sheldon (1968) pointed out that the chief student personnel administrators were often split between the position of student advocate on the one hand and student adversary as a member of the administrative team on the other hand. Pepinsky and Correll (1966) clarified the dilemma when they stated:

Personnel people, as agents delegated by the institution to perform institutional functions, must administer and control in order to do their jobs efficiently—indeed, in order to survive in the institution. They must, on the other hand be benign and ever attuned to the needs of individual students in order to meet the demands of their own self images, as well as those of the students, the institution, and society alike. How to resolve this dilemma (p. 232)?

Some of the chief student personnel administrators resolved the dilemma by leaving the profession. Those that remained during...
the period of student unrest were too busy handling the major and minor crises of the day to spend much time looking at their philosophy of student personnel administration. However, once the smoke had cleared the student personnel administrators found themselves facing problems and issues related to the creation and initiation of programs and services as well as to their effective organization and administration (Shaffer, 1973).

It became evident to student personnel administrators that some of their past methods of operation were not acceptable for present and future effective student personnel administration. One of the basic tenets of past student personnel administration, "in loco parentis," had been successfully challenged by students in the courts. The relationship between the students and the institution has changed as a result. Leslie (1973) indicated that the older, contractual, "in loco parentis" model articulated and defended a half century ago has been changed to something approximating a full citizenship model implied in recent court cases. Therefore, "in loco parentis" has been eroded as a concept to justify programs and policies in student personnel.

In the recent literature of student personnel, there had been articles indicating interest in the philosophical basis of student personnel work (Crookston, 1972; O'Banion and Thurston, 1972; Rickard, 1972; Sandeen, 1971). The writers seemed to be
focusing on two identifiable trends involving the administration of
student personnel work. The first trend is the "student personnel
point of view," examples of which can be found in the writings of
Wrenn (1951), Mueller (1961), and Williamson (1961). This par-
ticular approach to student personnel work is based on the follow-
ing three assumptions about students: (1) individual differences
among students are anticipated (2) the student is conceived of and
treated as a functioning whole person; and (3) teaching, counseling,
activities, and other organized educational efforts start from where
the student is and not where the institution would prefer the student
to be in development. It is apparent that these assumptions have
not been implemented as they were originally conceived. Along
with the "student personnel point of view" came the development
of a series of service functions such as counseling, testing, place-
ment, health, student activities, and financial aids. These services
are often remedial or controlling in nature and they generally
operate independently of one another. The purposes and intent of
the services were the determination of student personnel adminis-
trators; faculty and students had little or no input into the organi-
zizing, staffing or evaluation.

The second and more recent trend is generally referred to
as student development. The "student development approach" to
student personnel work involves the entire campus in facilitating
the behavioral development of the student. The individual student is assessed to find out where he is in terms of his goals. Emphasis is placed on the meaningful involvement of the student in the educational activities affecting him. The concepts of student development are not so basically different from those of the student personnel point of view, except that student development emphasizes intensive involvement of both student and faculty in cooperative efforts. This emphasis requires new thinking and new attitudes about what is being done and how to do it.

Student development is viewed as a preventative, proactive, collaborative role with the staff moving outward, rather than the service station role where the staff sits and waits for the customers to come to them. The two approaches are not only separated by the nature of the duties but also by an attitude about why and how the work is done. This difference is not so much concept as practice (Chandler, 1973).

Although there has been a great deal written about the positive and negative aspects of the student personnel point of view and the student development approach to student personnel work, there has not been any research done to determine the extent to which the two concepts are being used by chief student personnel administrators. This information would be of great value to educators who have the responsibility of preparing students to work in student personnel.
It would also provide information which could be useful to chief student personnel administrators as they evaluate their programs. The present study was designed to provide this needed information.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to identify and compare the philosophies of student personnel administration held by chief student personnel administrators and the service functions used to implement those philosophies at selected Midwestern universities. This study was designed to provide information about student personnel service functions and the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators who were responsible for them.

The problem led to several areas of concern for this study:

1. To develop interview questions to assist in determining the philosophies and goals held by the chief student personnel administrators.

2. To develop a questionnaire to assist in determining the service functions found in student personnel divisions.

3. To determine the relationship between administrative philosophy and the service functions offered.

4. To determine the kinds of relationships that exist between the student personnel divisions and the
institutions studied.

An important aspect of the study was the identification of the philosophies held by the chief student personnel administrators and then the determination as to whether the philosophies identified were either the student personnel point of view or the student development approach to student personnel work. Since every chief student personnel administrator uses some kind of student personnel philosophy, it was necessary to develop some criteria to distinguish between the different philosophies. In order to identify the various philosophies of student personnel administration, a review of the student personnel literature was conducted. Books, current journal articles, and research studies were reviewed in an effort to identify the characteristics which distinguished the different student personnel philosophies.

Identification of the service functions and determination of the relationship that existed between the student personnel divisions and the institutions were also important aspects of the study. It was of particular interest to this study to find out if the student personnel divisions under different philosophies offered different service functions. Hurst and Ivey (1973) and many other writers in the literature of student personnel have indicated that the student personnel area is seen as irrelevant by various sectors of the university community. Therefore, the relationship between student
personnel divisions and the institutions studied were looked at to see how student personnel was viewed by members of the university community, specifically, the administrative colleagues of the chief student personnel administrators. The variables used to make this determination were budget and influence in institutional decision making. Budget was selected as a variable because one can get an indication of where the programs of a particular division stand in relation to the institutional priorities by the amount of budget they are allocated. Decision making is an integral part of university administration. Often times the opportunity to have inputs into key decisions is a matter of influence and some administrators have more than others.

This study asked three basic questions. The first question dealt with the identification of the student personnel philosophies held by the chief student personnel administrators. The second question sought the identification of the service functions offered by the various student personnel divisions. The third question focused on the relationship that existed between student personnel and the institutions studied. Because of the type of information sought and the format of the data generated, the study was developed around objectives rather than hypotheses. The objectives and their subparts will be stated below.
Objectives

The investigation was developed around the following three objectives and their component subparts:

I. To identify the philosophies held by chief student personnel administrators for their divisions at the institutions studied.

   A. What kinds of relationships exist between the educational background and the philosophies of the student personnel administrators?

   B. What were the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators whose divisions experienced programatic cuts?

   C. Is there a difference in professional affiliation between those chief student personnel administrators who had the same philosophies of student personnel administration and those who had different philosophies of student personnel administration?

II. To identify the service functions included in the student personnel divisions at the institutions studied.

   A. Is there a difference between the types of service functions included in student personnel divisions that operated under the same philosophy and those
functions that are included in the divisions that
operated under different philosophies?

B. Is there a difference in the range of budgetary
allocations between those student personnel divi-
sions that operated under the same philosophy
and those divisions that operated under different
philosophies?

III. To determine what kind of relationships exist between
the student personnel divisions and the institutions
studied based on the variables of budget and adminis-
trative influence in decision making.
A. Did student personnel divisions that had the highest
percentages of budget allocations also have the
same philosophy?

B. Is there a difference in perception of influence on
institutional decision making between chief student
personnel administrators who had the same
philosophy and those who had different philosophies?

Limitations

Caution in interpreting the results of this study should
be based on three potential weaknesses. First, the chief student
personnel administrators comprising the study population were
limited to those administrators in the Mid-American Athletic Con-
ference. This may mean that the study population may not be
representative of the total population of chief student personnel
administrators in the United States. It may be that since many of
the administrators have met, they may have influenced one another's
philosophy. Second, the findings of this investigation are based on
self report by the chief student personnel administrators. It may
mean that the administrators may have reported what they felt
should be rather than what actually exists with regard to their
student personnel divisions. Third, data for this study were
generated via a field survey and there was no experimental manip-
ulation of the variables investigated. Therefore, it is not possible
to make cause and effect inferences from these data.

Definition of Terms

For the sake of clarity, some of the terms and concepts
used in this investigation are defined in the following manner:

Student personnel.--The U. S. Department of Health, Edu-
cation and Welfare defines the term as follows:

The college or university programs which assists
students, individually and in groups, to take full
advantage of the opportunities offered in the aca-
demic community. Emphasis is placed upon the
student--his needs and aspirations, his intellectual,
personal, psychological, social, and physical
growth--so that he may achieve his own goals and

The term "student personnel" is used to describe an administrative group and is often used interchangeably with other terms such as "student affairs," "student services," "student personnel divisions," and "student development programs."

Student personnel point of view. -- This term refers to a statement made by the American Council on Education about the nature of student personnel work. It is based on the assumptions about students which state that (1) individual differences among students are anticipated; (2) the student is conceived of and treated as a functioning whole person; and (3) teaching, counseling activities, and other organized educational efforts start from where the student is and not where the institution would prefer the student to be in development.

Since this statement has long been considered a part of the basic framework of student personnel work, in this study it is referred to as the "traditional approach" or philosophy to student personnel work. It is viewed as being remedial, reactive, and directive with the staff waiting for the students to come to them for help.

Student development approach. -- This term refers to a
philosophy of student personnel work that emphasizes positive 
changes in student attitudes and behaviors rather than the efficient 
functioning of services. The entire campus environment is used 
and manipulated to facilitate the student's behavioral development. 
It is viewed as preventative, proactive, and collaborative with the 
staff moving out to seek out the students.

Chief student personnel administrator. --This term refers to 
the administrator who is responsible for the operation of the student 
personnel division and reports directly to the president or executive 
officer of the institution. This administrator usually has the title 
of vice president for student affairs or student services. In one 
instance he had the title of dean of students.

Philosophy. --In the context of this study the term refers to 
a basic theory and set of values concerning student personnel admin-
istration.

Service function. --The term as it is used in the context of 
this study describes the student personnel services offered in the 
student service division. This includes services such as counseling, 
placement, health service, housing and financial aid.

Relationship. --In this study the term "relationship" is used to 
describe the manner in which things are connected or associated with 
one another. One of the objectives is to determine the "relationship" 
between the student personnel divisions and the institutions. The
purpose of this objective is to find out how student personnel compares with other divisions on the basis of the variables studied. There was an attempt to determine the "relationship" or connection between the educational background and the philosophies of the administrators.

**Programatic cuts.**--This term refers to reductions in scope and/or number of student personnel programs offered at a particular institution.

**Perceived.**--This term is defined as the act of knowing, becoming aware of, or identifying by means of the senses or the mind. The study attempted to determine the administrators' perception of their influence in institutional decision making.

**Organization of the Study**

The intent of Chapter I has been to present an overview of the study through a rationale for the study, statement of the problem, definition of terms and a presentation of the organization of the dissertation. Chapter II contains a report of the Review of the Literature in the area of student personnel administration. Within this report may be found statements of previous studies and articles dealing with the philosophy and backgrounds of chief student personnel administrators. Chapter III, Research Design and Procedures, is a discussion of the procedures utilized, objectives and questions
explored, sources of data, methods of data collection, instrumentation, and the methods of analyzing the data. Chapter IV contains a report of the findings, and Chapter V gives a review of the study, a summary of the findings and implications and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Purposes of Review

The review of the literature for this study needed a focus on student personnel administration in higher education. There were three purposes for the review of the literature of student personnel administration in higher education:

1. To assist in the development of the instruments needed to carry out the study.
2. To review the historical development of student personnel services in higher education.
3. To identify literature related to the objectives of the study.

The materials presented were discussed under the following sections: Historical development of student personnel services in higher education, philosophy and goals of student personnel administration, background of chief student personnel administrators, institutional relationship of student personnel services, and the structure and organization of student personnel services.

15
Historical Development of Student Personnel Services in Higher Education

The origins of student services in colleges and universities are somewhat difficult to separate from the cultural background of which they are a part. In one form or another student services have always been an important part of higher education. The combination of classical and Christian emphasis in the Oxford-Cambridge tradition largely influenced American colleges in the pre-Civil War period (Ayers, 1966). For the most part, higher education was private and the institutions took the responsibility for the students' intellectual growth, as well as for their moral, spiritual, and social development. During this period in higher education student personnel work was based on a paternalistic concern for assuring the religious commitment of the students entrusted to the care of the institutions (Mueller, 1961).

A new concept, the Land Grant College legislation, was implemented in America in 1892. This concept was largely responsible for secularizing higher education in particular and the nation in general. The Land Grant College legislation opened the doors of higher education to a broader spectrum of students by focusing on more practical and vocational ends than in the past. This legislative act is the basis of government involvement in higher education today (Leonard, 1956).
The twentieth century brought about many new ideas and philosophies about the nature of man and his inter-relationships with his fellow man and with his environment. Writers such as Sigmund Freud, William James, and John Dewey were the focus of attention. The influence of the philosophies, the impact of the new social sciences, the acceptance of the general education movement, larger and more diverse enrollments and the elective system combined to transform the ideas and attitudes of the leaders of higher education. The attitudinal change resulted in a broader concern for the total development of the student (Ayers, 1966).

The emerging student personnel movement was influenced by Frank Parsons' initiation of the vocational guidance movement in 1908. The beginning of a new breed, the student personnel administrators, was marked by the early appearance of deans of men and deans of women (Lloyd-Jones, 1954).

After World War I, the rise of tests and measurements joined with the widespread interest in progressive education and child development in the 1920's and the 1930's to give rise to a diversified approach within the student personnel movement. Although the leaders in student personnel work were united in their push to individualize education, they were divided on the various ways to accomplish it (Barry, 1957). Lloyd-Jones (1954) indicated that in the 1940's the new emphasis on individual counseling and on
research in the area of group interaction intensified the meaning and scope of student guidance. After World War II, extensive Federal involvement in higher education and growing enrollments led to more complex and varied provisions of student services in all types of institutions. Out of this proliferation of new ideas, new institutions, and new perceptions of life came the new form of specialized activity in American higher education which is now classified as student personnel work.

Willey (1949) indicated that only in the recent past had this educational activity been identified as a separate teaching and administrative function within the community of higher education. With the development of official titles, statements of purpose, organization of professional associations and the publication of books, articles, and journals, the student personnel movement has been gradually recognized as a profession. Definitions of the scope of student services and the necessary qualifications of its administrators are still being refined. It has been realized, however, that more than general insight, good intentions and sympathy are necessary for effectively administering the varied and complex programs of student services. Before student personnel can make its needed contribution to higher education, it must develop sound philosophical approaches to the achievement of its goals.
Philosophy and Goals of Student Personnel Administration

The philosophy and goals of student personnel programs are developed from and supportive of the institution's philosophy and goals. Shaffer (1970) pointed out that those subsystems which cannot show their specific contributions to the goal achievement of the overall institution will not be able to justify continued support. He indicated student personnel must clarify its contributions to the educational environment and to the effective functioning of the institution as a whole. A first step in clarifying contributions is stating student personnel philosophy and goals as they relate to the institution's philosophy and goals.

A study by Craig (1962) indicated that institutions of higher education supported two contrasting views of the philosophy and goals of higher education. One view was that college is an intellectual, physical, emotional, and spiritual experience in both a personal and social sense. The second view was that college is intellectual in character, wholly and completely. Contrasting views such as the above impeded the systematic development of philosophy and goals of student personnel administration throughout higher education. The philosophy and goals of student personnel administration at particular institutions often reflect the personality, traditions, historical developments, and the general characteristics
of the institution. Because of these local idiosyncrasies, it was not possible to identify a systematic philosophical pattern of development (Wrenn, 1951).

Gildseth and Parker (1971) found that student personnel objectives were often ambiguous and difficult to translate into behavioral criteria necessary for evaluation. Without the ability to state clearly what they were doing or to evaluate what they were doing, many student personnel workers found themselves "putting out fires" rather than developing sound programs.

A study by Pitts (1969) concluded that pragmatism was the most appropriate philosophical basis for student personnel work because it offered a decision-making process suitable for the typical dynamic situations often encountered in student personnel work. Student personnel administrators usually were too busy handling the major and minor crises of the day to spend much time looking into the future or to evaluate what they were attempting to do.

Various writers (Braungart and Braungart, 1972; Foster and Long, 1970; Sampson and Korn, 1970) have identified rigidity, lack of sensitivity, inadequate feedback, and cumbersome institutional response mechanisms as some of the factors that contributed to much of the student unrest of the 1960's. The violence and unrest were often seen as failure on the part of student personnel workers.

Some of the qualities upheld by most student personnel programs
caused institutions to respond to student unrest in a rigid and
defensive manner. However, many institutional policies and pro-
cedures were in direct conflict with their verbalized goals and state-
ments of desired outcomes.

Shaffer (1973) indicated that because of a lack of clear goals
and objectives, student personnel was not as effective as it might
have been during the past decade in helping colleges and universities
respond more creatively to student unrest and other tensions. He
stated:

    Much of this failure must be attributed to the
lack of awareness by student personnel workers of
advances in understanding and conceptualizing the
nature of organizational development in applying
current knowledge of complex organizations to opera-
tional behavior and in adapting the systems approach
to student personnel work. By viewing itself in such
a limiting role as "student services," it is often
viewed, at worst, as an expensive luxury with an
insatiable appetite for funds and staff, and at best,
as a difficult-to-evaluate function which needs to
clarify its roles, inputs, processes and results.

    In most institutional settings budget restrictions,
new evaluative procedures, and cost benefit analyses
prohibit the continued addition of staff members with
narrow perceptions of their roles and limited estimates
of their value. However, by perceiving the entire organi-
zation as a client and by vigorously reallocating expendi-
tures of energy to contribute maximally to institu-
tional goal achievement, the worth of student personnel
functions will be visible, their contributions and
achievements recognized, and their role in organi-
zational effectiveness enhanced (P. 391).

Following the unrest of the 1960's, higher education received
a great deal of criticism from various groups (Mortimer, 1972). The criticism was focused on the way in which higher education was being managed. Millett (1972) indicated that legislators were demanding more effective management of the resources allocated to higher education. The legislative concern for effective management has led to a great deal of discussion about evaluation and accountability in higher education in general and student personnel in particular (Fisher, 1972; Harvey, 1972; Laudicina, 1972; Robinson, 1970). Robinson said:

There seem to be at least two general factors which should provide sufficient motivation to encourage rigorous program evaluation. First the ever-increasing expenditures of higher education necessitates that economics be effected. Programs that do not contribute significantly toward meeting institutional objectives will be curtailed. And they should be. At the same time, however, programs which do make substantial contributions towards meeting institutional objectives, but have not been made clear what the contributions are, might also suffer . . . the student personnel administrator, can best state his case when it becomes necessary to recommend increased budget, enlargement of staff or program modification; if the student personnel program is throughly understood (p. 155).

Many educators felt that they had found a system in management-by-objectives (MBO) that would allow them to manage higher education in an accountable manner (Harvey, 1972; Lahti, 1972; McAninch, 1972). Harvey pointed out that MBO is used by two-thirds of the corporations in business and industry. Odiorne
(1971) described MBO as a system under which the manager and subordinate sit down at the beginning of each period and talk until agreement upon job goals are achieved. The subordinate is given wide latitude in choice of method. At the end of the period, the actual results are jointly reviewed against agreed upon goals, and an assessment of the degree of success is made. Then the process is begun again. Although some educators feel that one cannot effectively apply business and industrial systems to higher education, MBO has created significant interest as demonstrated by a conference held at The Catholic University of America in Washington D.C., in November of 1972. Its purpose was to inform educators about the applicability of MBO in higher education. Many institutions, particularly community colleges, have already begun to move in this direction.

In an article entitled, "Administration by Objectives in Student Personnel Programs," Harvey (1972) described the ABO system as used at William Rainey Harper Community College in Illinois. He listed ten advantages of using the system and five disadvantages of using the system. The advantages cited were:

1. Communication is improved.
2. Evaluation is stressed.
3. The importance of the student is re-emphasized.
4. Institutional objectives are clarified.
5. Focus is on the relevant.
6. Accountability is established.
7. Merit pay can be objectified.
8. Focus is on planning.
9. Supervision is lessened; control expanded.
10. Staff morale is improved.

The disadvantages cited were:

1. Quantification is difficult.
2. ABO doesn't measure methods.
3. ABO takes time.
4. Arbitrary decisions must be made (deadlines, quantities, acceptable limits, etc.)
5. ABO can become paper shuffling.

In their study of institutions of higher education, Rourke and Brooks (1966) pointed out some of the reasons for resistance to application of business management techniques. They found that opposition to the new form of management was rooted in certain basic beliefs regarding both the administration and the educational processes that have long been prevalent in colleges and universities. These beliefs are that educational outputs cannot be measured, and that any attempt to do so is ludicrous if not actually subversive of the purposes for which academic institutions exist; and that there is an inherent conflict between administrative efficiency and academic effectiveness.

Vande Guchte (1973) in a study of the use of MBO in community colleges found that staff members in student personnel units which fully used MBO perceived their units as more effective than staff members of units that did not use MBO.

As student personnel workers began to evaluate their pro-
grams, they began to question some of the assumptions held by the profession. Schellin (1969), after examining the "student personnel point of view," indicated that several myths existed within the framework of the student personnel point of view. The myths were:

1. Teachers at the beginning of the century were not interested in their students.
2. Student personnel workers entered the colleges to fill the gap between faculty and students.
3. The student personnel point of view was held only by student personnel workers.
4. All student personnel workers who held the student personnel point of view were good student personnel workers.

Schellin pointed out that student personnel work was created by teachers deeply involved with their students and the progressive educator had made his contribution to student personnel work by instituting and developing the student personnel point of view.

Williamson (1961) stated in his book, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities that, "The fundamental purpose of personnel workers and personnel programs is not to perform a service per se but to use a service to help students develop into full maturity (p. 52)." The idea that the role of the personnel
worker is mainly to provide services and administer discipline has come under a great deal of criticism in the current student personnel literature.

Many of the personnel workers writing in the professional journals felt that the area of student personnel is facing critical times and its survival is at stake. According to Hecklinger (1972), the title of dean of students should be done away with. It was his belief that students should be treated the same as any other member of the college or university community. Most of the old custodial functions such as curfews and dress and social regulations are on the way out. This leaves discipline, which still is important, but which is not basically a student issue. It is a campus issue. Distinctions should not be made by categories within the campus community, but by function. Hecklinger proposes that in addition to eliminating the title of dean of students, any other title that applies only to particular groups should be discontinued. The dean could then become the coordinator of non-instructional services, for example.

Various writers indicated that if student personnel is to meet the demands of a complex and changing university scene, radical new approaches need to be considered. The writers have suggested that student personnel should abandon the traditional student personnel point of view for the human development point of view. The
human development point of view holds that the student personnel worker will be most effective as a colleague of the students sharing in a learning experience. He would spend his time teaching human relations skills instead of administering programs. The student personnel profession would disappear as it is now known (Hurst, 1971).

Cross (1972) pointed out that student personnel administration is changing more rapidly than any other aspect of college and university organization. Therefore, if student personnel administration is to survive as a creditable function, its priorities must be changed. She stated:

In the past, and especially in the very recent past, student personnel administrations have been charged more with the responsibility of helping students adjust to colleges than they have with helping colleges adjust to students' diverse needs. The unspoken assumption is that students can be changed but institutions cannot. Student personnel administrators have had plenty of opportunity to interpret the requirements of institutions to students, individually and collectively; they have not had much chance to interpret the educational needs of students to faculty or vice presidents for academic affairs (p. 49).

Of the writers proposing philosophical changes for student personnel, the proponents of student development have received the most attention in the professional journals. O'Banion and Thurston (1972) described student development as a student personnel program that is focused on positive changes in student behavior rather
than the efficient functioning of services. The organizational changes suggested by the student development proponents are not limited to the student personnel area, but they encompass the entire institution (Crookston, 1972; Hedlund, 1971; Morrill, 1968; O'Banion and Thurston, 1972).

O'Banion stated that: "The most appropriate organizational structure would be decentralized, with responsibility and authority shared throughout the college. A climate of participative administration set by the president should permeate the institution (p. 206)."

A variety of student development models have been proposed. Hurst (1973) reported that a particular university did attempt a basic organizational restructuring for the creation of an office of student development. An effort was made to combine the resources on campus that could most efficiently modify aspects of the environment with those best prepared to help students learn to efficiently utilize that environment. The endeavor failed because the staff had not been properly prepared for the change; they did not receive help in making adjustments to the changes.

To avoid the situation described above, Chandler (1973) developed a transitional model. This model was designed to move a student personnel program from the traditional approach to the student development approach in stages. By making the change a gradual process, less resistance would occur throughout the
institution. The first stage would organize student personnel into three components. The components would be the managerial unit, the student development unit, and the judicial control unit. The transitional model is one way to enable student personnel administrators to initiate a student development program on campuses where complete change to the student development concept would be difficult to achieve.

Crookston (1972), in pointing out the differences between student development and the traditional student personnel philosophy, stated:

The principal differences between the student development idea and the old student personnel philosophy rest in (1) doing away with the term student personnel, which has always been a descriptive anomaly, and (2) asserting that student development is not merely complementary or supplementary to the instructional program, it is a central teaching function of the college. According to the student developmental theory, the entire academic community is a learning environment in which teaching can take place, whether it produces academic credit or not; hence, the teacher of student development teaches in multiple situations, including the classroom (p. 3).

Crookston suggested that the bureaucratic structures that exist in institutions today are not receptive to, nor compatible with, student development. Therefore, it is not enough to modify the existing organizational structures. The organizational structures need to be replaced.
All of the student personnel workers have not enthusiastically embraced the student development concept. In his presidential address to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators' Conference in Philadelphia, John Blackburn (1973) stated the following:

To me the term "student development" has lost its potential impact without even having a fair trial. The weakness of the concept, I believe, is that it lacks a theoretical construct that will clearly distinguish it from past practice and operations. The underlying construct which appears to have permeated all aspects of student personnel work is what I will designate as the "counseling syndrome" with its emphasis upon the "whole student," but the whole student has to interact with a host of counselors--placement counselors, psychological counselors, academic counselors, vocational counselors, residence hall counselors, and many others.

This army of counselors, all committed to the "whole student," succeeded in dividing up the students by parts. More seriously, however, the training and practice of student personnel ignored the fact that one of the critical aspects of individual personnel development is the presence, or absence, of a healthy community. We seemed to assume that if we worked with individual students who sought or were perceived as needing assistance, and if we helped these individuals, that was about all that was necessary. This approach assumed that the aggregate of students wasn't really a responsibility for the student personnel worker and was beyond his purview, except where he could influence individuals who, in turn, might have an impact on the community.

To put it more bluntly, student personnel work, like the rest of higher education, has an obsession with the individual and his personal development, and this obsession has put a perimeter on student affairs that has prohibited student personnel administrators
from having a dramatic impact upon the campus. It has also resulted in the staff being responders to the initiative of others and particularly the student rather than being change makers or initiators of campus societal programs.

There are many places where we can put the blame for the feeling of alienation in our society, but, in my judgement, the "counseling syndrome" is high on a list for causing alienation in the campus community. We are so busy dealing with the problems which students have as a result of the absence of community that we overlook many of their problems—a decommunitized society.

Student development, good mental health, and individual personal development are not ends. They should be by-products of what we do on the college campuses. Before we can provide these by-products we must develop campus communities, and if we have healthy, vibrant, intellectual communities, students will learn, will develop, and will hopefully, carry community development skills out into the larger society...

If the current literature is any indication of what the future model for student personnel will be, student development will play a significant role in determining strategies for student personnel administration. At many institutions, it will be a matter of how much, how soon.

Background of Chief Student Personnel Administrators

In an article entitled, "The Collision Course of Higher Education," David Riesman (1969) stated: "An extraordinary thing about higher education, and this always astonished businessmen,
is that there is no career line for the top job. A group of students at the Harvard Business School once asked me how to get into administration work in higher education, and I said you can't do it by training for it—-you have to do it by training to do something else and then be unlucky (p. 368)." In a humorous way Riesman has identified a fact that is still true for many positions in higher education. Until recently the lack of formal training was true for student personnel administrators. Student personnel administrators have existed longer than professional training programs and they have traditionally come from a variety of educational backgrounds.

The results of a study by Ayers (1966) indicated that the masters degree was the typical degree held by chief student personnel administrators in both public and private institutions. Of equal significance, however, was the fact that more than one-third of the chief student personnel administrators had earned doctorates.

The study also revealed that half of the chief student personnel administrators (50%) had obtained their preparation in education. Table 2.1 summarizes the data obtained on the preparation of chief student personnel administrators.

Ayers reported that the vast majority of the chief student personnel administrators were promoted from within their own institutions. Nearly seventy percent of the sample were persons with previous experience in higher education. More than one-
fourth had moved from faculty positions. This source ranked second only to other student personnel work as a background.

### TABLE 2.1. -- Preparation of 621 chief student personnel administrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Student Personnel</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table reproduced from study by Ayers

Slightly more than one-third had previous experience in student personnel work and a majority of them were in administrative positions. Nearly one-fifth of the administrators came from other kinds of administrative responsibilities in higher education. In selecting student personnel administrators, those responsible looked for demonstrated administrative skills in many cases, rather than previous professional preparation or experience.

Grant and Foy (1972) found that the growth and increasing availability of training programs in counseling and student personnel administration resulted in an increasing number (41%) of administrators having educational backgrounds in their professional...
fields.

Sherburne's (1968) study concluded that a majority of student personnel administrators in most senior positions at institutions in the Western Conference (Big Ten) entered their positions from a previous position outside of student personnel. He found that the fastest route to the top positions in student personnel in the Big Ten was not through upward promotion from within the student personnel division but from outside. With the exception of females, the higher an administrator advanced in student personnel in the Big Ten, the longer one tended to remain in higher positions.

Writers raised some very basic questions about what direction and emphasis professional student personnel training should have (Blackburn, 1969; Kauffman, 1971; McDaniel, 1972; Rhatigan, 1968).

McDaniel pointed out that trainers of student personnel workers have generally ignored basic principles of organizational behavior which should serve to guide the development of graduate programs. Professors of education have not placed any particular emphasis on those general administrative and leadership skills that are required for organizational effectiveness. They seem to have ignored the fact that a student personnel worker is part of an administrative structure and that the future success of the administrator will be largely a function of his ability to contribute to the
effectiveness of the organization.

Kauffman did a study to determine the purposes of student personnel programs as identified by educators directing graduate programs in student personnel work as compared with those identified by administrators directing student personnel programs on campuses. He found that the educators identified broad issues affecting higher education such as humanizing the institution and freedom and privacy for students. The administrators identified purposes such as innovation and change, implementation of goals and policies of the institution, and student development.

Ferrari (1972) found that the current supply of student personnel workers is greater than the demand. The problem could possibly be eliminated and prevented in the future if a closer relationship developed between educators and administrators. Kauffman (1971) indicated that the lack of agreement on the purpose of student personnel work by trainers and practitioners of student personnel work will have to be resolved if student personnel is to survive in the future.

Institutional Relationship of Student Personnel Services

For the purpose of the present study the institutional relationship of student personnel services was examined using the vari-
ables of decision-making inputs, budgetary allocations, and image as perceived by other members of the institutional community. A number of writers suggested ways in which student personnel services can develop effective relationships with the rest of the institutional community. Hodinko (1973) stated:

To increase their involvement in, and impact on, the nature of curricular programs, student personnel staff must achieve voting membership on major campus decision-making bodies. It is unusual among universities, in particular, to find the chief student personnel administrator or any of his staff participating as voting members on the institution's senate or its standing committees. Thereby an important campus constituency is denied a direct say in institutional-wide matters. The student personnel staff can be a rich campus resource with regard to what students want and realistically require. Too frequently, curriculum, scheduling, and other academic decisions are based solely on faculty desires and for administrative considerations.

Faculty tend to view the person in student personnel work with negative perceptions. In a recent study by Mozee, 39 highly significant differences were found between the role conceptions held by two-year college counselors in 16 study institutions and the role expectations held for them by their faculties. More than a few instructors referred to student personnel counselors as "evaluators of faculty," "mollycoddlers of wrong doers," or "non-doers" (p. 55-56).

Dutton (1973) in a speech before the Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in Philadelphia, made the point that greater emphasis must be placed on the planning function. The student personnel administrators must be more actively involved in setting institutional goals,
policies, and priorities; allocating resources; and developing educational environments. These are the functions that really count, because educational purpose, structure, and programs are determined through the exercise of these functions. To be excluded from top-level decision making reduces considerably the role the student personnel administrator can play in creating educational settings that are responsive to student needs. The primary measure of power and authority is the degree of involvement in the decision-making process.

The results of a study done by Perry (1966) indicated that student personnel administrators were important to the management team of an institution only as they possessed and demonstrated effective administrative performance. Furthermore, he found student personnel administrators to be on the periphery of central decision making, and they are evaluated more on their ability to supervise effectively than on meeting students and assisting with their problems. They were found to be significantly different from vice presidents for business affairs and are called upon in policy-making decisions only when directly affected.

Robinson and McKee (1965) conducted a study to determine the percentage of expenditures that went to the student services area. The largest percentages of general educational expenditures went for instruction, physical plant maintenance, general adminis-
tation, libraries, and student service administration, in that order. They found that in both public and private institutions, expenditures for student services accounted for less than five percent of all general educational expenditures.

According to Freeman (1972), individuals in education, unlike individuals in business and industry, have not been concerned about public relations with consumers. Student personnel workers should be more concerned about how their departments are perceived by the people they serve. A quality control program to aid departments in evaluating their relationship with their constituencies was proposed. It was suggested that feedback from the program could be used as part of an in-service training plan.

Coe (1973) pointed out that collective bargaining has become a reality for many institutions of higher education. The role student personnel workers decide to play in collective bargaining will have a significant impact on the image of student personnel in higher education. Coe indicated that the advent of faculty unions will change the relationship that exists between student personnel and faculty and student personnel and students. He suggests that student personnel workers become actively involved in planning strategies now to make sure student personnel will have significant inputs. Lack of preparation may result in student personnel workers being caught between faculty, students, and administrators. If student
personnel allows itself to get trapped in that position, unnecessary pressure would be added to an already strained institutional relationship.

Structure and Organization of Student Personnel Services

Pressures from outside of education have forced administrators to become noticeably concerned about organizational effectiveness. Each administrator has to make certain that his division is contributing toward the achievement of institutional goals. Student personnel has some unique problems in this area (Lewis, 1973). The pattern in which student services developed is unique to each institution. The characteristics of the student services program on a particular campus is much more likely to be the influence of some strong personality in the life of that campus than it is on any ordered reflection of what is known of students' needs or the art of administration. A single dominant person can control such a program for decades. Frequently such dominance is exercised in the direction of the institution's welfare rather than the students' needs (Wrenn, 1970).

The unique character of student personnel work determines the distinctive nature of its administrative structure and organization. Student personnel work consists basically of a series of
interrelated technical services performed by a professionally trained staff and members of the faculty. Williamson (1961) indicated at least three different types of administrative structures of services grouped according to the type of function performed. He found no universal type of structure that would fit each and every type of function and service within an institution. Comparisons indicated that diversity as well as commonality characterize student services on large and small campuses.

The diversity aspect, to a great extent, is the result of the unique histories of development at various institutions. There emerged basically three types of administrative structures. The first type was the centralized structure in which the head is the chief administrative officer responsible directly to a board of trustees, and with each member of the staff responsible to him. Then there was the structure with the partially centralized functions and control in which a larger measure of independence or autonomy of technical functioning is delegated according to professional competence and the tasks performed. The third type of structure consisted of decentralized administrative control of different services, representing an even greater extension of delegated responsibility and authority of functioning (Brumbaugh, 1952).

Williamson (1961) indicated that W. H. Cowley was one of the first in the field of student personnel to identify the trend toward
centralized administration that is the dominant pattern of structure and organization found in institutions today. As institutions began to grow in size and complexity, the move toward centralization increased. Student personnel leaders observed that the differences between men and women students regarding needed personnel services, though substantial and real, were not such as to justify parallel and separate organizations any longer. Thus came the trend toward the elimination of the positions of dean of men and dean of women in many large institutions.

According to Berg (1972), generally the organizational plan for four-year institutions of higher education separates the cognitive from the affective areas. Under the immediate supervision of the president of the institution, a vice president for academic affairs and a vice president for student affairs, respectively, head the divisions. The faculty relate directly to the academic vice president; and the student personnel staff, to the student affairs vice president. This particular arrangement permits the two staffs to operate in isolation, with the faculty teaching as though the affective needs of the students should be satisfied elsewhere within the institution, if at all. Students cannot divide their lives into cognitive and affective segments; they respond to their campus environment as a whole person.

In discussing the development of specific student personnel
services, Horn (1962) stated the following:

Financial aid, once handled in the admissions office, has become such a large operation, with scholarships and loans amounting in some universities to more than a million dollars annually, that a separate office is now common. Placement once handled hit or miss by individual professors or deans, is now a highly organized activity which properly belongs in a coordinated student personnel set up. Other activities include the testing and counseling service, sometimes handled by one office, sometimes separated; the office of foreign student advisor; the health services; extracurricular activities; intercollegiate athletics, generally administered separately from the rest of the activity program; and the student union. Various combinations of these positions occur, depending on the size, complexity, tradition, and personalities involved in the particular institution (p. 65).

Ayers (1962), in a study of the organization and administration of institutions in higher education, raised the issue of the placement of student personnel service functions. The question raised was: Should admissions be assigned to the academic or student services area? Those who advocate the academic area stress that admissions of students is primarily a determination of eligibility in terms of the individual's academic competence. On the other hand, an equally valid argument can be made that the business of admissions involves more than just academic competence and is, therefore, a counseling task. Similar arguments were made for and against the placement of most of the other services in one area or the other. The decision is left to those
whose responsibility it is to make sure that the structure used contributes effectively to the successful achievement of the institution's goals.

Shaffer (1959) pointed out that size and complexity presents unusual problems to institutions. No one organizational pattern can be applied to all institutions because local needs arise out of the traditions, general characteristics, and personalities of the particular institution involved.

Summary

The writers of the literature and research examined in this chapter focused on the philosophy and goals of student personnel administration, the background of chief student personnel administrators, the institutional relationship of student personnel service, and the structure and organization of student personnel services. Although there have been many studies on student personnel administration, most seem to have one or more of the following shortcomings: (1) They were conducted prior to or during the student unrest of the 1960's which triggered many changes in student personnel. (2) They rarely discussed the chief student personnel administrator. (3) They seldom discussed the philosophy of student personnel administration. The present study attempted to identify the trends in student personnel administration.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Review of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to identify and compare the philosophies of student personnel administration held by chief student personnel administrators and the service functions used to implement those philosophies at selected Midwestern universities. This investigation was designed to provide information about student personnel service functions and the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators who were responsible for the administration of those service functions. This chapter will discuss the procedures used to carry out the study: the development of the instruments, the population studied, and the data collection and analysis procedures.

Instrumentation

Development of the questionnaire and interview questions

The questionnaire and interview questions were designed to assist in carrying out the investigation of the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators and service functions
included in their student personnel divisions. Since the search
to find instruments to meet the particular needs of this study was
fruitless, new instruments were developed. A review of the litera-
ture was useful in the development of the instruments and a study
by Ayers, Russell and Tripp (1966) was particularly helpful since
it was designed to provide a complete picture of the status and
organization of the administration of student personnel in colleges
and universities. The final questionnaire (Appendix C), entitled,
"Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire," contained
questions in three basic categories. They were: (1) the back-
ground of the chief student personnel administrators, which related
to objective one; (2) the service functions, which related to objective
two; and (3) budget allocations and decision making, which related
to objective three. A description of the instruments follows.

Questions pertaining to the background of the chief student person-
nel administrators which was related to objective one. (Num-
bers refer to item number in questionnaire)

1. Please indicate your educational background beyond
high school (indicate institution, dates attended, degree earned and
major).

2. List, in chronological order, the most recent professional
positions you have held (no more than five) and the institution; indi-
cate most recent and the year each position was held (also title,
employer and dates).

3. How long have you been employed by this institution (in years)?

4. How long have you been in your present position (in years)?

Questions pertaining to budgetary allocations and decision making which was related to objective three.

5. As the chief student personnel administrator, to whom do you report? President ________ Other (list) ________________

6. Do you see yourself primarily as: (check one) ____ an administrator ____ a student development specialist ____ both an administrator and a student development specialist

7. What percentage of the total general and educational purposes fund (general fund) budget goes to student services programs? _____ less than 3% _____ 3-5% _____ 5-7% _____ 7-9%

_____ 9-11% _____ 11% or more

8. Are you and other student personnel administrators at your institution involved in top level policy and decision making groups? _____ always _____ often _____ some _____ rarely _____ never

9. When the university plans major shifts in goals and purposes, are student personnel administrators involved? _____ always _____ often _____ some _____ rarely _____ never
10. Are students involved in the governance of the university?

__yes  __no  If yes, how are they involved________________________

11. Does your institution have a student service committee or council that makes policy for the student services division?

__yes  __no

12. If yes, are students voting members of the group?

__yes  __no

13. The application of the doctrine of "in loco parentis" has declined as an approach to student personnel work. What impact has this decline had on institutional responsibility for the total growth and development of students? Has it increased? decreased? or remained the same? Explain ______________________________

Instructions for the section pertaining to student service functions and objective two.

The following instructions and two examples preceded the third section of the questionnaire.

Listed below are functions traditionally known as student personnel services. Circle YES if the function is found in the student personnel division of your institution. If the function is NOT found in the student personnel division, circle NO and indicate where it is located and who is responsible for it. If the function is not found in your institution, write DOES NOT EXIST.
in the space provided for location.

The interview questions (Appendix D) were developed with three purposes in mind. The first purpose was to obtain needed information that was not obtained through the use of the questionnaire. For example, the information pertaining to the administrators' philosophies was obtained by this method. The second purpose was to structure the interview. The intent was to structure the interview in such a manner that the questions and responses would have the flow of a natural conversation as much as possible and still get the desired information. A third purpose was to spot check some of the information obtained through the use of the questionnaire. By using this particular approach, the interview would serve as a reliability check for the questionnaire.

The face validity of the items included in the questionnaire and the interview questions was evaluated by thirteen different individuals with a variety of backgrounds. Those individuals consulted included five doctoral students in counseling and personnel, a university budget officer, a vice president for student services, a director of institutional research, an associate dean of students, an assistant to the vice president for academic affairs, two professors of student personnel administration and an educational research specialist. Their comments and suggestions as well as those of
the dissertation committee members provided valuable assistance in improving the clarity of the individual items. In the development of both instruments, every attempt was made to provide items in a format with the greatest amount of clarity and the lowest level of abstraction, in an attempt to reduce any possibilities of the respondents trying to "read in" hidden meanings to these items. The items selected were in no way intended to support or reject any particular hypotheses, since this investigation did not have any, but merely to collect information in a confidential, straightforward manner.

Population for the Study

Since this was a descriptive study, and according to Good (1966), descriptive-survey studies are accurate only for the time and sample represented, and that many experiments should be repeated under the same or different conditions for purposes of verification, this study used an entire population rather than a randomly selected sample. The population selected consisted of the ten chief student personnel administrators at the member universities of the Mid-American Athletic Conference (MAC). The all male group ranged in age from thirty three to fifty two years of age. Six of the ten chief student personnel administrators had the title vice president for student affairs and the remainder had
the titles vice president for student services, vice president for academic services, vice provost for academic affairs, and dean of students.

All ten of the administrators agreed to cooperate and participate in the study. Questionnaires were mailed to the group and they responded with a 100% return. These administrators also participated in a structured interview.

The universities of the MAC are located in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio (See Appendix E). These state institutions are found in a variety of settings, which include rural, urban and rural-urban. The members of the MAC are comparable in size, ranging from 12,000 to 22,000 full-time students, and complexity of programs offered. A majority of the universities were teachers' colleges before developing into universities. The MAC is unique in that it is organized solely on the basis of athletics and the member institutions make no attempt to utilize the organization for any kind of academic programming.

Data Collection Procedures

To obtain the cooperation of the chief student personnel administrators, the Vice President for Student Services at Western Michigan University sent to each a letter of introduction (See Appendix A) asking for cooperation and participation in the
study. The letter also indicated that the administrators would be receiving a telephone call from the investigator to set up a date for an interview. The calls were made and the dates for the interviews were confirmed. The confirmation calls were particularly important because of the location of the institutions and the amount of travel involved. A cover letter (See Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the study, along with a Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire (See Appendix C), was sent to each chief student personnel administrator. A stamped return envelope accompanied each questionnaire to encourage prompt return. Within a two-week period all but one of the questionnaires were returned. The final questionnaire was returned within another week following a telephone call and the mailing of a second copy of the questionnaire.

The interviews were scheduled so that approximately five hours were spent on each campus. To make certain that all of the administrators were responding to the same questions, a list of interview questions was developed and used. Permission was asked and granted to record the interview session to insure that the administrators' responses were reported accurately. The interviews varied in length from one and one-half to three hours. Most of the administrators spoke very candidly about their programs and philosophies. Generally the interviews ended with a tour of the student personnel areas and in several instances, a complete
campus tour was given. To the extent that time permitted, the investigator talked to as many staff, faculty, and students as possible. The conversations were a means of getting a "feel" for the universities. Many of the administrators supplied supplemental materials such as a student personnel organizational chart and an undergraduate catalogue. The interviews were conducted over a period of two and one-half weeks.

Data Analysis Procedures

This study investigated and compared the philosophies of student personnel administration held by chief student personnel administrators and the student service functions used to implement them in selected Mid-western universities. Because of the nature of the study, the size of the population, and the type of information sought, the study was organized around several objectives and their component subparts.

The objectives and their component subparts follow.

Objective I. --To identify the philosophies held by chief student personnel administrators for their divisions at the institutions studied.

A. What kinds of relationships exist between the educational backgrounds and the philosophies of the student personnel administrators?
B. What were the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators whose divisions experienced programatic cuts?

C. Is there a difference in the professional affiliation between those chief student personnel administrators who had the same philosophies of student personnel administration and those who had different philosophies of student personnel administration?

Objective II. --To identify the service functions included in student personnel divisions at the institutions studied.

A. Is there a difference between the types of service functions included in student personnel divisions that operated under the same philosophy and those functions that are included in divisions that operated under different philosophies?

B. Is there a difference in the range of budgetary allocations between those student personnel divisions that operated under the same philosophy and those divisions that operated under different philosophies?

Objective III. --To determine what kind of relationships exist between the student personnel divisions and the institutions studied based on the variables of budget and administrative influence in decision making.
A. Did student personnel divisions that had the highest percentages of budget allocations also have the same philosophy?

B. Is there a difference in perception of influence on institutional decision making between chief student personnel administrators who had the same philosophy and those who had different philosophies?

In analyzing the data pertaining to objective one, the following steps were taken:

1. The literature of student personnel was reviewed to determine the philosophies of student personnel administration. The literature review indicated the existence of two philosophical trends in student personnel administration: The traditional "student personnel point of view" and the "student development approach" to student personnel administration. Crookston (1972) developed criteria with which the two philosophies could be identified. The criteria listed below was used to identify and categorize the philosophies of the student personnel administrators on the basis of their response to the instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Personnel Point of View (Traditional)</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) service oriented</td>
<td>a) change oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) authoritarian</td>
<td>b) egalitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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c) reactive
d) passive
e) remedial
f) corrective
g) cooperative
h) status oriented

c) proactive
d) encountering
e) developmental
f) preventative
g) collaborative
h) competency oriented

2. Data pertaining to subpart one of objective one were analyzed by comparing the administrators' educational backgrounds with their philosophies and an attempt was made to identify the observed relationships.

3. Data pertaining to subpart two of objective one were analyzed by identifying those programs that experienced programatic cuts and then comparing the philosophies of the administrators whose programs experienced cuts with the philosophies of those administrators whose programs had no cuts.

4. Data pertaining to subpart three of objective one were analyzed identifying the philosophies and the professional affiliations of the administrators and then attempting to identify any relationships between philosophy and professional affiliation.

Data pertaining to the remaining objectives and their component subparts were analyzed in the same way as those described above.

There was an attempt in each case to identify relationships or trends
involving the particular variables in each objective or its component subpart.

Summary

The design and procedures employed in this study have been discussed in this chapter. The population selection, instrumentation, and analysis of the data have also been discussed. The data gathered as well as the analyses were descriptive in nature. The next chapter will give a review of the study, a summary of the findings and conclusions, and make recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter are presented the results of the data collected through the use of the Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire (Appendix C) and a structured interview (Appendix D). The data are presented as they relate to the objectives stated in Chapter III. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section is concerned with a review of the problem as it relates to the objectives. The second section provides the analysis of the data.

Review of the Problem

The specific purpose of this study was to investigate and compare the philosophies of student personnel programs and the service functions used to implement them at selected mid-western universities. This study was designed to provide information about the extent to which various philosophies of student personnel administration were being used. It was also designed to provide information about the service functions as they relate to the philosophies identified.

The study was organized around the following three
objectives and their component subparts.

I. To identify the philosophies and goals held by chief student personnel administrators for their divisions at the institutions studied.

   A. What relationships exist between the educational background and the philosophies of student personnel administrators?

   B. What were the philosophies and goals of the chief student personnel administrators whose divisions experienced programatic cuts?

   C. Is there a difference in professional affiliations between those chief student personnel administrators who had the same philosophies of student personnel administration and those that had different philosophies of student personnel administration?

II. To identify the service functions included in the student personnel divisions at the institutions studied.

   A. Is there a difference between the types of service functions included in student personnel divisions that operated under the same philosophy and those functions that are included in the divisions that operated under a different philosophy?

   B. Is there a difference in the range of budgetary allocations between those student personnel divisions that
operated under different philosophies?

III. To determine what kind of relationships exist between
the student personnel divisions and the institutions studied based on
the variables of budget and administrative influence in decision
making.

A. Did student personnel divisions that had the highest
percentages of budget allocations also have the same
philosophy?

B. Is there a difference in perception of influence on
institutional decision making between chief student personnel
administrators who had the same philosophies and those that
had different philosophies?

Findings Related to the Objectives

In this section, the data are presented using descriptive
analyses according to the order of the objectives stated above.
Following are the findings relative to the three objectives.

Objective I. To identify the philosophies and goals
held by chief student personnel admin-
istrators for their divisions at the
institutions studied.

The philosophies and goals of the student personnel divisions
studied were ascertained through the use of a structured interview
and printed materials supplied by the chief student personnel
administrators. The philosophies and goals of the administrators fell into two categories, the student development approach and the traditional "student personnel point of view" approach to student personnel work. Of the ten student personnel divisions studied, seven operated under the traditional approach and three operated under the student development approach. Table 4.1 identifies which divisions used the traditional approach and which divisions used the student development approach.

**TABLE 4.1.--Educational background and philosophy of chief student personnel administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Date of Degree</th>
<th>Major(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Higher education and business administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Speech pathology and psycho-acoustics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Higher education and sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Counseling psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Clinical psychology and measurement and evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparing the educational backgrounds and philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators, several differences and similarities were identified. Table 4.1 shows that only four of the ten chief student personnel administrators earned their highest degree in the area of education. All of the administrators had the doctorate as their highest degree except one, who earned a master's degree. The chief student personnel administrators who were proponents of the student development approach all earned their doctorates in areas other than education. The four administrators who earned their doctorates in educations were proponents of the traditional approach. It is interesting to note that all of the administrators except one was in favor of or "saw some merit in" the student development approach, yet only three out of ten actually used this method of operation. None of the administrators professionally trained in student personnel work or in higher education in general used the student development approach.

The information shown in Table 4.2 indicates that the professional backgrounds of the proponents of the student development approach differ from those of the administrators who were proponents of the traditional approach. Two of the three student development administrators had been a part of a teaching faculty at one time in their careers in higher education. Only one of the seven traditional administrators had previous experience in student personnel work.
while five of the seven traditional administrators had previous experience in student personnel work. In the areas of top level administration, two of the traditional administrators had previous experience, while only one of the student development administrators had comparable experiences.

**TABLE 4.2.**—Comparison of philosophy, professional background and length of service of chief student personnel administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Professional Background</th>
<th>Years at Institution</th>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Alumni relations; assistant to president</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Dean of men; vice president</td>
<td>3-1/2</td>
<td>3-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>High school principal; dean of students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>Assistant provost; assistant dean of faculties</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Dean of students; dean of student life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Assistant dean business; associate dean business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>Post doctoral fellow; professor-chemistry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Dean of students; executive dean student affairs</td>
<td>14-1/2</td>
<td>5-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>Director of counseling center; director of student development</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the ten administrators were considered as one group, the average number of years they had worked at their institutions
was 11.1 years. The student development administrators had been with their institutions on the average one year longer than the total group. The traditional administrators had been at their institutions on the average one year less than the total group. However, when the number of years each group had been in their position was compared, the reverse was true. On the average the traditional administrators had been in their positions longer. The average number of years in their present position for the total group was three and one half years. The student development administrators, as a group, had been in their present positions two and one half years while the traditionalists had been in their present positions an average of four years.

Many of the student personnel divisions represented in this study experienced cuts in their budgets as a result of "tight finances" at their institutions. However, only two divisions indicated that they had to cut out programs as a result of finances. Both of these divisions operated under the traditional approach to student personnel work. Two of the student development divisions indicated that they had dropped several programs but it was indicated that the cuts were due to reorganization and redefinition of functions rather than lack of funds.

There was no noticeable difference in the professional affiliation between the student development administrators and the
traditional administrators. All of the chief student personnel admin-
istrators held memberships in the National Association of Student
Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and participated in the national
conferences. All but one of the administrators indicated that they
also affiliated with the American Personnel and Guidance Associa-
tion (APGA). When asked about forming a student personnel
organization on the basis of membership in the Mid-American
Athletic Conference, all of the administrators responded in favor
of the idea. Several voiced a concern about the problem of trans-
portation in light of the energy crisis. Since some of the universities
are separated by great distances, some of the members would have
trouble making some of the meetings.

Objective II. To identify the service functions included
in the student personnel divisions at the
institutions studied.

The chief student personnel administrators were asked to
indicate, from a list, those service functions that were included in
their student personnel divisions. They were asked to indicate
which administrator was responsible for the listed service function
if it was not a part of the student personnel division.

Admissions

In only four of the ten institutions studied, undergraduate
admissions was a part of the student personnel division. Those institutions that had undergraduate admissions in a division other than student personnel often had this service function reporting to the chief academic officer, an executive vice president or an administrator comparable to a vice president for institutional services. Table 4.3 shows the various patterns of administrative responsibility for undergraduate admissions.

**TABLE 4.3.**--Comparison of the location of administrative responsibility for undergraduate admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Chief Student Personnel Administrator</th>
<th>Chief Academic Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>V.P. for institutional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>V.P. for student affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>V.P. for academic services*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Executive V.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Academic V.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>V.P. for student affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>V.P. for student affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At institution D, the vice president for administrative services is the chief student personnel administrator.
With the exception of one institution, graduate admissions was handled through the academic divisions of all of the institutions studied. In many cases the graduate admissions operation was not as centralized as the undergraduate admissions. This situation often exists because the graduate admissions process had to articulate with such a variety of programs and requirements.

Registration and records

Registration and records were often combined into one office, under one administrator, called the registrar, who usually reports to the chief academic administrator. In seven of the ten institutions studied, both registration and records reported to the chief academic administrator. In two of the institutions studied, records and registration reported to the chief student personnel administrator.

Counseling

Psychological counseling was one of four service functions found in the student personnel divisions of all of the institutions studied. Eight of the institutions offer psychiatric counseling. In two of the eight institutions, psychiatric counseling was offered through the health center. At one university, psychiatric counseling reported to the chief student personnel administrator and at the other, it reported to the chief finance administrator. Two
institutions did not have psychiatric counseling available for their students. The students in those universities were referred to community and private agencies for assistance.

Academic advising

During the interviews, several administrators indicated that their institutions were either studying, or had just recently completed, a study of their academic advising system. In all but two of the institutions, academic advising was the administrative responsibility of the chief academic officer. The advising system at one institution was split with the freshmen program in the student personnel division and the upper level students' program in the academic division.

Testing and career planning

Testing and career planning were located in the student personnel area of responsibility in most institutions. However, in three instances this was not the case. At two of the institutions, the testing program was part of the academic division and, therefore, reported to the provost. In the other institution, career planning was handled throughout the university by several divisions. The function in this instance was not centralized, each area made its appropriate contribution to the total program.
Financial aid

A financial aid office generally involved the areas of student loans, grants, scholarships, work-study and part-time employment. Because a financial aid office often handled in excess of a million dollars annually, depending on the size of the institution, it was not surprising to find this office reporting to the institution's chief financial officer. However, in the institutions studied this was not the case. In eight of the ten institutions, financial aid was considered a student service and was, therefore, part of the student personnel division. In the other two institutions, a financial aid officer reported to the vice president for finance in one institution and to the secretary to the board of trustees in the other. In the latter institution, the secretary to the board of trustees was equivalent to a vice president.

Housing

The housing area was typically divided into two administrative units, housing programs and financial management. A survey of the institutions revealed a variety of organizational structures for the housing area. In five of the institutions, the program aspect of housing reported to the chief financial administrator. The entire housing area, both programs and finances, reported to the chief
student personnel administrator in four of the institutions. The remaining universities had both housing programs and finance reporting to the chief financial administrator of the institution.

**Student activities**

Student activities was one of the service functions found in the student personnel division of each of the universities studied. This service function seemed to be one of the basic functions of most of the student personnel programs. Both traditional and student development administrators considered the student activities program to be an important vehicle for implementing the goals and objectives of the divisions.

In a majority of the institutions, the cultural activities were handled in part by an all university committee that worked closely with the student activity program. At several universities, there was a student concert committee that handled the concerts that were particularly student oriented or student sponsored. The fine arts areas generally sponsored cultural events for the entire university community also.

**Placement**

In many of the institutions studied, the chief student personnel administrators indicated that they were either in the process of
studying the effectiveness of their placement programs or in the process of restructuring their present programs to gain greater effectiveness. In all but two of the institutions, both graduate and undergraduate placement programs reported to the chief student personnel administrator. The other two had graduate and undergraduate placement reporting to the chief academic administrator.

**Student newspaper, yearbook and campus radio station**

At only two of the institutions studied was it reported that the student newspaper, yearbook and the campus radio station were part of the student personnel division. Tables 4.4 and 4.5 indicate that in most of the institutions the newspaper and yearbook generally

**TABLE 4.4. --Comparison of student personnel administrative responsibility for the student newspaper, yearbook and campus radio station**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Student Newspaper</th>
<th>Yearbook</th>
<th>Campus Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response from the institution*
TABLE 4.5.--Administrators responsible for the student newspaper, yearbook and campus radio station at the universities studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Student Newspaper</th>
<th>Yearbook</th>
<th>Campus Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>V. P.* for student services</td>
<td>V. P. for student services</td>
<td>V. P. for student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for government relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>V. P. for academic services</td>
<td>V. P. for academic services</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>Academic V. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>NG**</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>Academic V. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
<td>V. P. for student affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Academic V. P.</td>
<td>Academic V. P.</td>
<td>Academic V. P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vice president **No response from the institution

were a responsibility of the chief student personnel administrator

while the campus radio generally was the responsibility of the chief
academic administrator. In one institution the chief academic admin-
istrator was responsible for all three operations.

Health service and student judiciaries

Health services was part of the student personnel division in
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all of the institutions except one. This particular service function is generally considered another one of the basic functions of a student personnel program, as are counseling, student activities, and student judiciaries. Student judiciaries were also a part of all of the student personnel divisions at the various institutions.

**Minority programs**

Minority programs are relatively new when compared to other service functions found in the student personnel division. At the institutions studied, five of the minority programs reported to the chief student personnel administrator and five reported to the chief academic administrator. The administrators interviewed indicated that the more educationally oriented minority programs reported to the chief academic administrators. Those programs reporting to the chief academic administrator tended to be more widely accepted and respected by the faculty and other members of the university community.

**Bookstore, food service and student union**

The bookstore, food service and the student union are generally part of what are called auxiliary services. That is, they are self supporting operations. Although these service functions are closely related to student personnel programs in most of the
institutions, they reported to the chief financial officer. In only four institutions did either of the functions report to the chief student personnel administrator. Most institutional operations that are self supporting report to the chief financial administrator.

Orientation

In eight of the ten institutions studied, orientation was a part of the student personnel division. The two institutions that varied from this pattern had orientation as a part of admissions. Admissions reported to the chief academic administrator in one case and was responsible to an administrative assistant to the chief academic administrator in the other institution. Several chief student personnel administrators indicated that although they had the major responsibility for orientation, they shared the programing with other areas.

Summary

The survey of the functions included in the student personnel division revealed that there were only four service functions common to all student personnel divisions. Table 4.6 pointed out the four service functions common to all of the divisions were career planning, psychological counseling, student activities, and student judiciaries. In comparing all of the services offered, the student
TABLE 4.6.—Comparison of philosophies of student personnel administration and the service functions offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Service Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*no response from institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Undergraduate Placement</th>
<th>Graduate Placement</th>
<th>Student Newspaper</th>
<th>Yearbook</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
<th>Student Judiciaries</th>
<th>Bookstore</th>
<th>Minority Programs</th>
<th>Student Union</th>
<th>Food Service</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*no response from institution
development divisions offered sixty-nine percent of the services listed while the traditional divisions offered fifty-nine percent of the services listed. It is interesting to note in Table 4.5 that both of the two divisions that included academic advising were traditional divisions. Academic advising is a service function that lends itself particularly well to the student development approach to student personnel work, yet none of the student development divisions included academic advising. Student development divisions are generally viewed as being more academically oriented than the traditional divisions.

The administrators were asked to indicate what percentage of the general fund budget went to the student personnel divisions. Their responses showed that the percentages ranged from less than three percent to a high of eleven percent. Table 4.7 showed that half of the student personnel budgets were within the range of three percent to seven percent. Two of the budgets were below three percent and three were in the range from seven percent to eleven percent or more. There were two divisions with the student development approach that were in the three to five percent range. The student personnel division with the highest percentage also operated with the student development approach. The university's library system was included in that division, which may help explain such a high budget figure. The range of divisions with the traditional
TABLE 4.7. --Comparison of philosophy and percentage of general fund budget allocated to student services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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approach went from less than three percent to a nine to eleven percent range. Robinson (1965) stated that in both public and private institutions, expenditures for student services accounted for more than five percent of all general fund expenditures. Therefore, of the ten student personnel divisions studied, half were above the national average for percentage of general fund budget allocated to student services.

Objective III: To determine what kind of relationships exist between the student personnel divisions and the institutions studied based on the variables of budget and administrative influence in decision making.

Two indices of how a particular program was viewed by the university administration and the university community in general were the amount of budget the program had and the extent to which the administrator who administered the program had in influencing institutional decision and policy making. Those programs that effectively contribute to the institution achieving one of its high priority goals will get the funds it needs to operate, particularly with the advent of the systems approach to budgeting.

In comparing the percentages of general fund budget allocated with the two philosophies of student personnel administration identified, Table 4.7 indicated that only one student development
division was included in the top five. Four of the top five were traditional divisions. However, one student personnel division had a particularly high percentage. As mentioned previously, the high percentage could possibly be attributed to the inclusion of the university's library services in that division, which was not true for the other divisions. Taken as two separate groups, the student development divisions had a higher average percentage (7%) than the traditional divisions (6.5%). In comparing these results to a national average, both groups are higher than the national average identified by Robinson (1965).

To determine how the chief student personnel administrators perceived their involvement in institutional decision making, they were asked to respond to two questions. The first question asked to what extent are student personnel administrators involved in top level policy and decision making groups? The second question asked: Are student personnel administrators involved in major shifts of the goals and purposes of the institutions? The administrators' response patterns for both questions were the same. Five administrators indicated that they were always involved in top level policy and decision making groups and five indicated that they were often involved. Of the five in the group that answered "always" to the question, two were proponents of the student development approach. Of the five in the group that answered "often" to the
question, four were proponents of the traditional approach. Therefore, there was no identifiable trend as to the perceived involvement in institutional decision making by student personnel administrators with different philosophies.

Summary

An analysis of the findings generated by the Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire and a structured interview was conducted. The responses of the chief student personnel administrators were presented in order of the stated objectives of the study and some of the data were presented in tabular form.

The majority of the chief student personnel administrators were proponents of the traditional approach to student personnel work as opposed to the student development approach. There were no differences identified between the type of service functions offered in the traditional student personnel divisions and the student development oriented student personnel divisions. The institutional relationships of the student personnel divisions studied were also discussed.

This chapter presented the results of the investigation and provided a picture of specific aspects of student personnel administration in the ten institutions studied. Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Review of the Study

The primary objective of this investigation was to determine the philosophies of student personnel administration in the ten universities of the MAC. The study was designed to achieve three objectives: (1) to identify the philosophies held by chief student personnel administrators for their divisions in the institutions studied, (2) to identify the service functions included in the student personnel divisions at the institutions studied, and (3) to determine what kind of relationships exist between the student personnel divisions and the institutions studied.

To achieve the objectives, the Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire and a set of questions for a structured interview were developed. The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare the philosophies of student personnel administration and the service functions used to achieve the objectives of the student personnel divisions. The design of the study, therefore, was not an attempt to prove or disprove a hypothesis, nor to support or discourage a particular philosophy of student personnel administration.
administration. Instead, this investigation simply gathered data about the philosophy of student personnel administration used by chief student personnel administrators in selected institutions, with the hope of shedding some light on the question as to the extent to which particular philosophies were being used.

The population surveyed consisted of the member institutions of the Mid-American Athletic Conference. The chief student personnel administrator at each university completed a Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire. A structured interview was also conducted with each chief student personnel administrator. The results generated were organized and analyzed on the basis of the objectives which follow in the next section.

Summary of Findings

In order to carry out the specific purpose of the study, three objectives and their component subparts were formulated and investigated. The three objectives and the related findings follow.

Objective I. To determine the philosophies held by chief student personnel administrators for their divisions at the institutions studied.

The student personnel administrative philosophy of the ten chief student personnel administrators was identified. Seven of the administrators used the traditional student personnel approach
to student personnel work while three used the student development approach. It is interesting to note that the three student development proponents had just completed some major organizational changes in their division. With one exception, the administrators surveyed indicated that they were generally in favor of the student development concepts presented in the student personnel literature. Although there had been a great deal written about student development, only a few writers (Chandler, 1973; Hurst, 1973; O'Brien and Thurston, 1972) have presented operational models to implement the student development concepts. Therefore, the findings related to objective one support the trends discussed in the literature review of Chapter II. Student personnel administrators were discussing student development more than they were implementing it as an approach to student personnel work.

What relationships exist between chief student personnel administrators' educational backgrounds and their philosophies of student personnel administration. The doctorate was the typical degree held by the chief student personnel administrators. This finding does not agree with the finding in a study conducted by Ayers (1966). His study indicated that the master's degree was the typical degree for the chief student personnel administrator. One of the more significant findings of this study was that all of the administrators who were proponents of the student development approach
earned their doctorates in some field other than education, while all of the administrators who earned their doctorates in education were proponents of the traditional approach to student personnel work. These particular findings were in agreement with research findings cited in Chapter II (Blackburn, 1969; Kauffman, 1971; McDaniel, 1972; Rhatigan, 1968). It might be hypothesized that the traditionalists were practicing what they had learned from their professors and/or their previous experiences in student personnel work.

Sherburne (1968) reported findings which revealed that most senior administrators enter present positions from the ranks of faculty or non-student personnel administrative ranks. The findings of the present study did support those results. Seven of the ten administrators had previous student personnel experience.

Was there a difference in professional affiliation between those chief student personnel administrators who differed in philosophies and those who had the same philosophies. --There was no noticeable difference in professional affiliation between those administrators that had the same philosophies and those who had different philosophies. Nearly all of the administrators held membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA). Two of the administrators had previously
held national offices in NASPA and were currently active in the organization. Several were active members in several other professional organizations in higher education.

What were the philosophies of the chief student personnel administrators whose student personnel divisions experienced programatic cuts. --Many of the student personnel divisions represented in this study had cuts in their budgets because of a reduction in institutional budgets. However, only two of the student personnel divisions had program cuts. Both of these divisions were under the direction of a chief student personnel administrator who was a proponent of the traditional approach to student personnel work. In only one of the two divisions was the program cut attributed specifically to budget. The faculty in that particular institution told the administration they would not allow any cuts in the academic area until all possible cuts have been made in the student personnel area first. The second student personnel division experienced the cut as a result of some "administrative problems." There was not any research in the literature to support or contradict this particular finding. One might hypothesize, on the basis of this finding and other background data about the institutions involved, that student personnel divisions that were organizationally weak were likely to be cut in times of "tight finances."
Objective II. To identify the service functions included in the student personnel divisions at the institutions studied.

The service functions identified for student personnel divisions studied are found in Table 4.6 which give a composite comparison of the service functions and the philosophies were compared with the service functions offered, no particular trend or pattern could be identified. These findings support the results cited by Shaffer (1959) and Williamson (1961). It was interesting to note that there were four service functions common to all student personnel divisions studied. The functions were psychological counseling, career planning, student activities, and student judiciaries. Health service came close to being in that group also. There was one institution studied in which health service was not a part of the student personnel division. The development of these services parallels the historical development of the student services area. Student service programs started out with these basic programs in one form or another (Ayers 1966). The four service functions along with the health program are often considered the basic core of a student personnel program.

Objective III. To determine what kind of relationships exist between the student personnel divisions and administrative influence in decision making.

The relationships between the student personnel divisions and
the institutions were determined on the basis of data related to two variables, the percentage of general fund budget that was allocated to student personnel divisions and the chief student personnel administrators' perceived influence in institutional decision making. When the ten student personnel divisions and their institutional relationships were studied as a group, no particular pattern or trend emerged. Data related to the budgetary variable indicated that half of the institutions' percentages of general fund budget allocations were within the range of three to seven percent. These particular findings generally support the findings of Robinson and McKee (1965). They found that in both public and private institutions, the national average for expenditures for student services accounted for less than five percent of all general fund expenditures. One division had a percentage of more than 11, which was the highest for the entire group. The high percentage for this particular student development division could be attributed to types of services offered. The university's library services was a part of that division, along with the regular student personnel service functions.

Data related to the chief student personnel administrators' perceived influence in institutional decision making indicated that they felt they had significant influence in institutional decision making. Half of the administrators indicated they were always included in top level decision and policy making groups. The other half indicated
that they were often included in top level decision and policy making groups. These findings did not agree with the results of a study by Perry (1966). His study revealed that the chief student personnel administrators were on the periphery of central decision making, and they were called upon in policy making decisions only when they were directly affected, which was different from the chief finance officer. In comparing the findings of the present study with the findings of Perry's study, the reader should keep in mind that the results of this study are based on self report and Perry's was not.

Most of the chief student personnel administrators indicated that they had a strong desire to gain the acceptance of the faculty. With faculty support they felt they would have sufficient impact to implement and carry out the programs the administrators felt were necessary to achieve their goals and objectives.

Implications

The presentation of the results of this investigation attempted to provide the reader with the descriptive results of the survey. Probably different readers will be more interested in the items that deal with their particular concerns. This section will provide the reader with the implications which are of particular concern to the investigator.
The results of the findings related to objective one indicated that a majority of the student personnel administrators were not using student development in their divisions although they were generally in favor of the concept. Leaders and prominent members of the student personnel profession have endorsed student development as the approach to student personnel work that will make student personnel more organizationally effective and adaptable to the future needs of students. Yet, in the group studied only those administrators who received their formal training in areas other than student personnel or education used the student development approach. Those administrators who continue to use the traditional approach may be overlooking a vehicle that could make their programs more effective.

The findings related to objective two indicated that regardless of the philosophy used by the chief administrator, the divisions included the same service functions. This would imply that it is not as critical what services a division offers as it is how the services offered are used to accomplish the goals and objectives of the division. If the student personnel division isolates itself from the academic division it may find itself fighting a losing battle against the academic division in the competition for scarce dollars. Student personnel will have to become more oriented to and supportive of the academic programs of the institution; after all, the educational
endeavor is organized around the academic division.

The findings related to objective three indicated a majority of the divisions had an adequate institutional relationship. However, most of the administrators, and particularly the traditionalists, were concerned about gaining the acceptance of the faculty. The student development administrators tended to be less concerned than the traditionalist about this matter. This tendency coincides with the view that student development is more academically oriented than the traditional student personnel point of view as it has been implemented in the past. Therefore, if the traditionalist would like to ease his concern about his relationship with the academic divisions, he will have to take a closer look at student development or some other approach that will facilitate better relations between student personnel and academic divisions.

Chief student personnel administrators will have to insure that their divisions do more than provide services. To beorganizationally effective, student personnel will have to assist the institutions in preparing students to work and live in a world of change. The administrators will have to develop and use approaches and philosophies that will facilitate student personnel in continuing to be a significant force in higher education.

The educators who will be preparing student personnel workers of the future will have to develop a closer relationship with the
administrators who are running the programs. The administrators should be able to rely on the educators for competently trained professionals who can make significant contributions to the profession.

Recommendations for Further Study

The chief student personnel administrators in this study consisted of an entire population. The institutions represented were comparable in size, enrollment, purpose and complexity of programs. This study should be replicated using a randomly selected sample of all of the chief student personnel administrators in the United States as a population. Such a study might yield some results that would make the findings of the present study more meaningful.

Since student development has the attention of the profession, it may be worthwhile to design a study that would assess the effectiveness of student personnel programs that use the student development approach as compared with those that use the traditional approach. This would be particularly appropriate at a time when many institutions are concerned about accountability and the effectiveness of programs.

Another issue which warrants further study is that of the professional training of student personnel workers. A research design could be developed to assess the extent to which professional educators and administrators agree or disagree as to what type of
training student personnel workers should have and are receiving.

The suggestions mentioned above have by no means exhausted the possibilities for further study. Since different people bring different perspectives to a situation, this study will affect each reader differently. My hope is that each reader finds something in this study that makes him want to ask more questions and set about to find the answers.
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APPENDIX A

Letter of Introduction
Dear

Mr. Cornelius Patterson, a doctoral student in Counseling and Personnel at Western Michigan University, has been working on a graduate internship in my office.

Cornelius will be doing his doctoral dissertation on a comparison of the organizational structures of the Student Services Divisions in the various Mid-American Conference Universities. Studies of this kind would seem to me to be of significant interest to the profession, particularly those of us who are working in the MAC.

As part of his dissertation research he would like to visit with you for approximately two or three hours to interview you on both the formal and informal organizational structure of your office. I would deem it a personal favor if you would grant him this time.

In order to accomplish this with minimum disruption to your schedule, Cornelius will be calling you on November 2 to set up an interview date and time.

Knowing you are undoubtedly besieged with requests to complete survey forms and answer questionnaires, I want to personally assure you this is a very sincere young man, doing excellent work here at the University. Your cooperation in helping him research his dissertation topic will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Thomas Coyne
Vice President
Student Services

TC/pw
APPENDIX B

Cover Letter for Questionnaire
Dear

As a graduate intern in the office of the Vice President for Student Services at Western Michigan University and as a doctoral candidate in student personnel administration, I am conducting a study to determine the administrative and organizational structure of student personnel services in institutions of the Mid-American Conference. The central purpose of the study is to provide a descriptive and comparative analysis of the administrative and organizational structure of student personnel services at institutions in the M.A.C.

The need for the study has become very evident. Concerns brought on by declining enrollment and "accountability" have forced many institutions to evaluate their goals and objectives in light of these concerns. This study will attempt to describe how student services are organized administratively to achieve their particular goals and objectives.

Since the population being surveyed is limited to the Mid-American Conference, it is imperative that your response be accurate and complete. Your involvement in completing the questionnaire and participating in the interview discussed in our telephone conversation is essential to the completion of this project. If it is possible for you to return the questionnaire within ten (10) days, I would be most grateful. I can be reached at either my home telephone, 616-382-5742, or through the Budget Office at Western Michigan University, 616-383-1654, if you would like to talk to me.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Cornelius Patterson, Jr.
616 Lynn Avenue, #108
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Enclosure: Questionnaire
Return Envelope

lap:CAP
APPENDIX C

Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire
Student Personnel Administrative Questionnaire

This questionnaire asks for information about the organization and administration of the student personnel services program at your university.

All questionnaires will be kept in strict confidence. No one other than the researcher will have access to individual answers. You will receive summary information about the study.

Please fill in these blanks:

Name _____________________ Title _____________________

University _____________________

PLEASE ANSWER THE ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO ME.

THANK YOU.

1. Please indicate your educational background beyond high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Dates attended</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. List, in chronological order, the most recent professional positions you have held (no more than five) and the institution; indicate most recent first and the year each position was held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How long have you been employed by this institution? (in years)___
4. How long have you been in your present position? (in years) ______

5. As the chief student personnel administrator, to whom do you report?
   President_____ Other (list) ________________________________

6. Do you see yourself primarily as: (check one) ___ an administrator
   ___ a student development specialist    ___ both an administrator
   and a student development specialist

7. What percentage of the total general and educational purposes fund (general fund) budget goes to student services programs?
   ___ less than 3%   ___ 3%-5%   ___ 5%-7%   ___ 7%-9%
   ___ 9%-11%   ___ 11% or more

8. Are you and other student personnel administrators at your institution involved in top level policy and decision making groups?
   ___ Always   ___ Often   ___ Some   ___ Rarely   ___ Never

9. When the University plans major shifts in goals and purposes, are the student personnel administrators involved?
   ___ Always   ___ Often   ___ Some   ___ Rarely   ___ Never

10. Are students involved in the governance of the University?
    Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how are they involved? _______________

11. Does your institution have a student services committee or council that makes policy for the student services division?
    ___ Yes     ___ No

12. If yes, are students voting members of this group? Yes___ No___

13. The application of the doctrine of "in loco parentis" has declined as an approach to student personnel work. What impact has this decline had on institutional responsibility for the total growth and
development of students? Has it increased? decreased? or remained the same? Explain.

Listed below are functions traditionally known as student personnel services. Circle YES if the function is found in the student personnel division of your institution. If the function is NOT found in the student personnel division, circle NO and indicate where it is located and who is responsible for it. If the function is not found in your institution, write DOES NOT EXIST in the space provided for location.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Health Service YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intramural Sports YES NO</td>
<td>Phys. Ed. Dept.; Academic V. P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (list) YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>records YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological YES NO</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Available (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yearbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERCOLLEGE ATHLETICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT JUDICIARIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINORITY PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY AND SECURITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT UNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALUMNI RELATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRAMURAL SPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOOKSTORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAYCARE CENTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCHING BAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORENSICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

Interview Questions
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Could you briefly describe the philosophy and goals for student affairs at this university?

2. To the best of your knowledge, how long has the present student personnel administrative structure been in existence?

3. On what basis was this structure organized? (individual strengths, personalities, rapid growth, presidential preference, etc.)

4. What kind of organization structure existed prior to the present one?

5. What kind of organizational structure do you presently have?

6. Would you classify the present structure as centralized or decentralized?

7. Do you see this institution moving toward more or less centralization in the area of student personnel services in the future?

8. There is a great deal of discussion about student development in the professional literature. In describing a desirable model for student development, O'Brien and Thurston indicate that the program would be focused on positive changes in student behavior rather than on the efficient functioning of services. To what extent are personnel workers of this institution involved in this approach to student personnel work?

9. What changes do you see ahead for the area of student personnel work?

10. Do you anticipate any changes in the basic administrative structure and/or philosophies of student personnel services as it now exists?

11. In which of the professional organizations related to the area of student personnel services do you hold memberships?

12. If an organization was formed that would allow the chief student personnel administrators of the Mid-American Conference to get together on a regular basis to discuss common problems and concerns, do you feel such an organization would benefit you and/or your institution? Would you participate?

13. What is the university's current enrollment?
APPENDIX E

Locations and Dates of Entry for Universities of the MAC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>Muncie, Indiana</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>Bowling Green, Ohio</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, Michigan</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Ypsilanti, Michigan</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>Kent, Ohio</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>Oxford, Ohio</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>DeKalb, Illinois</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Athens, Ohio</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>Kalamazoo, Michigan</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Geographical Location of the MAC Universities