


12-1978

A Survey of the Work-Study Programs in the State Universities of Kentucky

Glen Knight

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Performance Management Commons](#), and the [Training and Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Knight, Glen, "A Survey of the Work-Study Programs in the State Universities of Kentucky" (1978). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 1778.

<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1778>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

A SURVEY OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY

A Project
Presented to
the Faculty of the
Department of Educational Leadership
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Educational Specialist Degree

by
Glen M. Knight
December 1978

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research or scholarly purposes.

reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed

Glen Michael Knight

Date

15 November 1978

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

A SURVEY OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY

D. Mitchell
Director of Project

Carl W. Kusch

A. Schmacke

Approved *16 October 1978*
Date

Elmer Gray
Dean of the Graduate College

Approved *November 6, 1978*
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. DeWayne W. Mitchell for the assistance and understanding he provided as chairman of my committee, and to Dr. Stephen B. Schnacke and Dr. Carl W. Kreisler for their patience and guidance as members of the committee. I offer a special thanks to Ms. Mona Logsdon for her invaluable assistance in the development of the questionnaire that was used in the study.

This study is dedicated to my parents for their understanding, loyalty, and encouragement throughout all my endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Rationale	1
Objectives of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	9
Delimitations of the Study	10
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	23
Design of Questionnaire	23
Description of Category I	24
Description of Category II	32
Description of Category III	33
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	37
Organization and Administration	37
Evaluation Procedures	48
Professional Preparation	49
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	54
Summary of the Findings	54
Conclusions	58
Recommendations	59
Suggestions for Further Research	61
APPENDIX A. A SURVEY OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY	63
APPENDIX B. THE COVER SHEET THAT EXPLAINED THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	70

APPENDIX C. INSTRUCTIONS	Page 72
APPENDIX D. THE EIGHT STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY	73
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Pay Scale Range for Student Workers at the Eight State Universities of Kentucky	40
2	Number of Students Participating in the Student Work Programs Offered by the Eight State Universities	43
3	Areas of Professional Preparation Respondents Felt Would be Beneficial for Financial Aid Officers	52

A SURVEY OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY

Glen M. Knight

December 1978

76 pages

Directed by: DeWayne W. Mitchell, Stephen B. Schnacke, and
Carl W. Kreisler

Department of Educational Leadership Western Kentucky University

This study was undertaken to determine the status of the work-study programs in the eight state universities of Kentucky. A review of the literature indicated that little research had been conducted in the area of work-study administration, and thus this study was performed to increase the knowledge in this area. A questionnaire was developed to survey the work-study programs at the eight universities concerning the following three areas: organization and administration, evaluation procedures, and professional preparation. A high degree of centralization was indicated at all of the universities in regard to their student work programs, and administrative policy was generally consistent among the eight universities. The most used procedure to evaluate student workers was to interview the work supervisors, this method was used by four of the eight institutions. The other methods of evaluation included rating scales, self-rating scales, and evaluation forms. The need for professional preparation for financial aid workers at the graduate level was endorsed by all of the universities. The results of the study suggested

the five following recommendations for the institutions involved: (1) the development of a job classification scale for student workers; (2) the granting of academic credit for labor assignments requiring specialized skills; (3) the development of a supervisors handbook; (4) student evaluations of the work programs; and (5) courses that relate to financial aid be added to the graduate programs in higher education.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses upon the status of the student work programs in the eight state universities of Kentucky. Chapter I is designed to present the background and rationale of the study and to serve as an introduction to the study. The objectives of the study, definitions of terms that are used throughout the study, and delimitations of the study are presented in this chapter.

Background and Rationale

The working student in America's colleges and universities is one of higher education's fastest growing concerns. A United States Census Bureau survey (1975a) indicated that 40 percent of the undergraduate students in four-year colleges and universities in 1973 were working to pay education costs while going to school. The survey reported on the increased reliance on student earnings for meeting college costs. Data from the 1960 and 1970 censuses were analyzed to determine the percentage of students depending on their own earning power to meet college expenses. The data showed that over the ten year period the percentage of full time undergraduate students meeting college costs by student earnings had increased from 29 percent of the

student population in 1960 to 40 percent of the student population in 1970. Female college students who depended on student earnings to defray college costs rose from 16 percent in 1960 to 31 percent in 1970. For male college students, the increase was from 27 percent in 1960 to 46 percent in 1970.

The working student is also gaining increasing attention from the federal government. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized the establishment of the College Work-Study Program, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 appropriated \$40 million to be spent on the program. The appropriation for the College Work-Study Program in Fiscal Year 1976 was \$420 million, and in Fiscal Year 1982 the authorized appropriation is \$720 million.

Cooperative Education is another student work program that receives federal funds. The Cooperative Education Program was authorized by Part D, Title IV of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (Bobowski, 1975). In Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 1 percent of the sum appropriated for the College Work-Study Program was allocated to Cooperative Education, totaling \$1.54 million and \$1.6 million respectively. In Fiscal Year 1972 Congress authorized independent funding for Cooperative Education and the program was allocated \$1.7 million.

The attention and financial support of the federal government in regard to student work has also increased the number of institutions of higher learning participating in the

College Work-Study and Cooperative Education Programs. During Fiscal Year 1970, Adams and Stephens (1970a) reported that approximately 1,400 colleges and universities participated in the Work-Study Program. During Fiscal Year 1976 over 3,200 institutions participated in the program, employing approximately 973,000 students. Porter (1975) reported that in Fiscal Year 1964 there were 110 colleges and junior colleges offering cooperative programs. By Fiscal Year 1975 that number had increased to approximately 900 colleges and community colleges that either had an operational program or were planning one. Porter estimated that over 200,000 students were involved in these programs.

A third student work program, not federally funded, is the Institutional Employment Program. This program is mainly funded by the participating colleges and universities from monies appropriated by their state legislatures. The state legislatures usually do not earmark funds specifically for the Institutional Employment Programs, and most universities and colleges administer this program from that part of their budget that covers the hiring of faculty, staff, and student workers.

Another source of support for Institutional Employment Programs is that of private funding. Private funding usually comes through grants from foundations and agencies to support research. The support of Institutional Employment Programs from foundations and agencies is especially common when student labor and wages are involved.

With the growth of student work programs, and of student financial aid services in general, the financial aid officers have become administrators of key importance in higher education. Prior to the inception of the College Work-Study Program, the Educational Opportunity Grant, and the National Defense Loan Program, there was little need for a centralized financial aid office under the direction of a full time administrator. The limited loans, scholarships, and student work opportunities that were available were easily administered by the various departments within the institution.

The present importance of an efficiently run student financial aid office, under the competent direction of a full time administrator, is no longer questioned. With federal appropriations now allocated to student financial aid in the billions of dollars, and the millions of dollars more that state and private funding account for, the financial aid office represents a major source of financial support for its institution. As important as the financial aid office is to its institution, it is of even more importance to its students. The student work programs, as well as the other forms of financial aid, allow many capable and deserving students to attend institutions of higher education. An improperly administered financial aid office would certainly be detrimental to its parent institution, and many students with serious financial need would be forced to terminate their educations at the secondary level.

The importance of properly trained personnel to work as financial aid administrators is a major concern for the field of educational administration and supervision. The student financial aid officer must not only be thoroughly versed in the federally funded programs of student work, grants, and loans, but must also keep abreast of the various state and institutional financial aid programs. In addition, detailed records must be maintained by the financial aid office for audit purposes in regard to federal, state, and institutional funds. The responsibility of maintaining student work records, developing instruments for evaluating both the work programs and the student workers, doing research to improve the financial aid programs, and the general administration of the financial aid office, all fall under the jurisdiction of the financial aid officer.

Casazza (1975) stated that the majority of financial aid officers learn by on-the-job training, and thus the need for professional training and development for administrators in financial aid is critical.

In response for this need for professional training, Moore (1971) suggested courses for the training of financial aid officers, and Delaney et al (1974) developed a Master's Degree program in Financial Aid Administration.

The importance of research in the field of financial aid, and especially in the area of student work programs, is vital to its professional growth and continued relevance. Keene (1975) noted that most of the research concerning

student work programs is done by scholars who are only incidentally concerned with the programs. Keene states that the primary interests of such scholars lie only in their own specialized disciplines. Keene feels that it is the professional responsibility of the student employment officer to use his research competence in relation to work and the college student. Adams and Stephens (1970b) believe that one of the urgent necessities of the student work programs is to obtain personnel who have had training and experience to conduct research projects in the area. They stated that it appears difficult to find personnel with this preparation because of the relatively little attention that has been paid to the area of financial aid research over the past twenty years.

Objectives of the Study

The present study is designed to determine the status of the student work programs in the eight state universities of Kentucky. The research reviewed the questionnaires that were sent to the financial aid offices of the eight state universities to collect information on the following three areas:

1. The organization and administration of the student work programs;
2. Evaluation procedures that have been developed to measure the effectiveness of the programs and the student workers; and
3. The professional preparation and work experience of the financial aid officers.

The success of any student work program is mainly dependent upon the organizational and administrative procedures that direct it. The importance of this area is reflected in that thirty-three of the forty-five questions on the survey instrument pertained to organization and administration. The organization and administration of the work-study programs will depend in some degree upon the programs that are offered at a given institution. Thus the survey will determine how many of the state universities offer the following programs: College Work-Study, Cooperative Education, Institutional Employment, Off-Campus Work-Study, Off-Campus Non-Work-Study, and Referral Services. The study will also determine how many students took part in the student work programs, and the percentage increase or decrease of student participation in the programs of College Work-Study, Institutional Employment, and Cooperative Education.

The methods used to determine student worker wages and/or compensation will be researched. Information will be collected on questions dealing with minimum wage, methods to determine student worker pay increases, and noncash awards as partial compensation. The use of job classification scales in relation to student wages will also be considered. Questions dealing with the centralization of the work office, support of the student work programs by the administration and staff of the university, publicity of the work programs,

and academic credit for participating in the work programs will be researched.

Evaluation is a necessity for any program that is going to remain productive and useful. This is especially true for programs that are still developing and in need of constant input to determine their relativity. The survey will thus view the types of instruments used by the state universities in evaluating their programs and student workers. Included in this section are questions concerning the use and development of supervisor handbooks, and whether student workers are afforded the opportunity to evaluate the work programs.

Financial aid has developed into a complex and highly significant position in the area of educational administration. The professional preparation of financial aid officers is a major concern of higher education, and the present study presented questions to the financial aid officers concerning academic preparation and professional work experience. Questions regarding the financial aid officers own professional preparation and work experience are reviewed, and their opinions concerning these areas are included. The aid officers are also asked to report on duties they perform outside the area of financial aid, how they view their positions, and their membership in professional organizations related to financial aid.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are used for the purposes of this study:

1. College Work-Study Program is a federally supported student work program for students who need employment to defray college costs. To be eligible, a student must be enrolled on a full-time basis and be listed in good academic standing. Students may work fifteen hours per week during academic terms and forty hours per week during vacation periods.

2. Cooperative Education Program is an educational program in which students alternate between college studies and full-time work experience. The work experience is usually in a business or industry related to their academic major.

3. Institutional Employment Program is a student work program under the jurisdiction of the college or university. The students are employed by the institution and are paid from the budget of the school. Most institutions use the same guidelines for their Institutional Employment Program as those established for Work-Study except for the federal regulations regarding financial need.

4. Financial Aid is any and all forms of financial assistance to assist college students in defraying educational costs. The assistance may include work, loans, grants, scholarships, awards, and fellowships.

5. Evaluation Instrument is a form designed to rate work performances and related characteristics of student workers. Also forms that allow student employees to rate the work programs in terms of effectiveness and relativity.

6. Job Classification Scale is a scale designed to describe the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications needed for jobs in the various student work programs.

7. Supervisors Handbook is a financial aid office publication designed to aid supervisors of student workers in carrying out their responsibilities. Most handbooks cover the objectives of student work, requirements for each program, pay procedures, hours per week the student may work, and other related topics.

Delimitations of the Study

The following are delimitations of the study which should be considered when the results of the study are reported:

1. No generalization of the findings of this study to other than the eight state universities is attempted.
2. The population was limited to the eight state universities of Kentucky.
3. The weaknesses inherent in questionnaire surveys delimit this study. These weaknesses include bias due to questionnaire-design and question-wording.

Summary

This chapter presented the background and rationale of the study, the objectives that the study hopes to accomplish, definition of terms used in the study, and those delimitations of the study that were felt should be taken into consideration when using the study. Chapter II will present the survey of the literature concerning the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature related to this study. A search of the literature has shown that little research has been conducted regarding the organization and administration of student work programs, procedures to evaluate the programs, and the professional preparation of financial aid administrators.

Adams and Stephens (1970c) traced the history of student work programs from the founding of Harvard College in 1636 to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 that established the College Work-Study Program. To fund the first student work program at Harvard, the administration increased the tuition and fees of the wealthier students to pay students of limited means to perform custodial work for the college. The authors noted that early student employment was primarily oriented to providing work to enable students to earn a portion of their expenses, but little effort was made to relate the work experience to academic study. In an effort to make the work experience more meaningful for students, Professor Herman Schneider established the first Cooperative Education Program at the University of Cincinnati in 1906. Professor Schneider's goal was to provide a

work experience program that blended practical experience with classroom theory.

In 1935 the National Youth Administration Student Work Program (NYA) was initiated to provide financial assistance for high school and college students. The NYA was the first financial assistance program sponsored by the federal government, and like the present College Work-Study Program, was administered by the individual institution with guidelines supplied by the federal government. The NYA was discontinued in 1943, a result of enrollment declines due to America's involvement in World War II.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established the College Work-Study Program and represented the federal government's support for student employment. Additional federal aid for student labor was provided for in 1968 with the authorization of the Cooperative Education Program. Initially the Cooperative Education Program was funded out of appropriations marked for the College Work-Study Program, but Congress authorized independent funding starting in Fiscal Year 1972.

Adams (1976) proposed the creation of a comprehensive work education program. The program's philosophy would be based upon the assumption that all students need to work and that work should be considered as a significant experience in the totality of education. The comprehensive program would be institutionally administered and funded by the federal government providing one dollar for every two

dollars that the institution expends. The program would consider any full-time student, graduate or undergraduate, eligible for employment consideration regardless of the student's financial status. The present work-study program limits off-campus employment to public or private nonprofit organizations, but the comprehensive program would permit profit making organizations to participate. The off-campus employer would provide two dollars to match each dollar supplied in federal funds, thus providing the program a financial foundation based on the partnership between institutions of post-secondary education, business and industry, and the federal government.

Dawson (1975) discussed the importance of cooperative education in respect to those fields of study that fall under the classification of liberal arts. The author stated that a major deficiency in the career preparation of liberal arts students is their lack of work experience. Dawson proposed that cooperative education in the liberal arts programs would serve a dual purpose. Firstly, it would allow students to gain direction and preparation in career planning, an area in which liberal arts students need more guidance. Secondly, this experience would give direction for whatever further education is desired. Cooperative education often develops motivation for graduate work for it allows students to focus on a particular area of interest. However, Dawson added that few liberal arts colleges have well developed programs in cooperative education. Dawson

attributed this to the greater difficulty in securing placements for liberal arts students and the resistance on the part of liberal arts faculties to breaking the established pattern in liberal arts education.

Adams and Stephens (1972) discussed the necessity of developing a student job classification system. The authors considered such topics as job description, job title, job definition, and job classification. A very extensive job classification system was presented that included pre-professional jobs, clerical jobs, service jobs, pre-skilled and semi-skilled jobs, and temporary jobs. The importance of vocational counseling, supervision, and the relationship of the work program to academic programs were also discussed.

Ramsay (1974a) outlined the objectives of student supervision and discussed the importance of helping the students to understand the meaning of their work assignments. The objectives of student supervisors are to fulfill the obligations of the department to which the supervisor is responsible and to aid in the development of the student worker. Ramsay claimed both objectives to be equally important and warned against emphasizing one over the other. It is the commitment to both service and student development that work-study gains its vitality and real potential. The responsibility of meeting standards in their work assignments is the setting for the development of student workers. The supervisor can enhance the development of student workers by letting the student get into the "why's" of things.

The learning experience will go beyond the actual assignment if the labor supervisor helps the student to understand how and why to do things, rather than just carrying out the instructions of the program.

Counts (1975) surveyed colleges and universities in nine southern states regarding pay policies for student workers. Counts found that 65 percent of those institutions reporting a graduated pay scale, used a student job classification system as the basis for establishing rates of pay. Job seniority, financial need, merit, funds available, and supervisor's request were also reported as standards for determining student pay. Of those institutions reporting no graduated student pay scales, 32 percent claimed they lacked the funds necessary to initiate such a system. Simplicity of administration followed with 21 percent, and 11 percent of the institutions reported that differences in rate of pay would be discriminatory.

Mason and Haines (1972) discussed the importance of publicity in promoting a cooperative education program to the business community. The authors gave suggestions concerning the use of the press, radio, television, and other forms of communication in promoting a cooperative program. The importance of utilizing informal situations in spreading interest in the program was stressed. Mason and Haines believed that the alert administrator may find that community group meetings, parties, and even sports events provide many

opportunities to inform business and community leaders of his institution's cooperative program.

Ramsay (1974b) listed three characteristics in which student workers differ from other workers. The first characteristic is the student's perception of time. Student workers are short-term, and thus think of their labor assignments in terms of months or semesters. Whereas supervisors may be content with long range objectives, students are impatient to reach goals within their limited labor span. A second characteristic of student workers that Ramsay found is their need for impact. This desire for impact is a highly motivating force, and replaces the long-term rewards found in normal employment -- advancement, retirement plans, and other benefits not applicable to student labor. The student's need for purpose can be provided by immediate recognition of achievement by the supervisor. When it is not possible to provide immediate recognition, the supervisor can reinforce the student by showing how a particular idea or plan fits in with long range objectives. A third characteristic of student workers is their relative freedom from experience. Most students have a fresh approach to their labor assignments, and are not constrained by having learned what they can not do. They are free from professionalism and vested interests in the organization, and this allows them to be used in some ways that other employees could not.

Pasework and Sawyer (1968) investigated interest change associated with student work experience. The

Pasework and Sawyer study was conducted to determine whether an intensified summer work-study program in a mental health setting would result in a change of interest patterns as measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Lewey Modification of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. The results of the study indicated that by the time an individual has reached the college level, interest patterns are quite solidified and that work experience does not produce a change in measured interests.

Keeney (1975) emphasized the value of full-time work assignments in preference to part-time or concurrent assignments. A full-time assignment allows the student to encounter three phases of adjustment that normally need to be resolved if the work experience is to be meaningful. The first phase Keeney labeled the "honeymoon period" and it occurs because of the excitement and interest in a new experience. The second phase is the disillusionment period that is associated with the realization that the student will not be able to accomplish all that was expected. In the final phase the student is usually able to critically evaluate the experience objectively in terms of value gained and effort expended. If the assignment is terminated during the first phase the student may be overly romantic and unrealistic with respect to the job assignment. If the assignment is terminated during the second phase the student may be excessively negative about the experience. Keeney stated that the learning value of the experience is enhanced if the

assignment not continue until it is simply repetitive and the learning has so diminished that it does not justify the investment of time.

Friedman, et al. (1971) found that the most important determinant in student job satisfaction is job preference. The study showed that 69 percent of the students surveyed in jobs they preferred (compared to other jobs) were vary satisfied even when they felt their pay was too low and the hours of work were not to their liking. However, among students who would have preferred holding a different job, only 35 percent were satisfied. The authors also found that certain attitudes which students may hold about work in general may also be reflected in their level of job satisfaction. In general, those students who felt work should be avoided, those who thought their grade point would have been better if they had not had to work, and those who felt that other students looked down on those who had to work their way through college all tended to have somewhat lower levels of job satisfaction.

The Berea College labor department (1975b) conducted a survey of Berea alumni to determine their feelings concerning the student labor program. Of the more than twelve thousand questionnaires issued, more than five percent were completed and returned. It was found that 84 percent of the respondents considered the labor program worthwhile. In addition, 71 percent considered their work experience of "great value," and more than 50 percent felt that their work

experience had definitely, or partly, helped them in obtaining jobs after graduation. In ranking various aspects of the program for continued emphases, providing an educational experience ranked second only to financial aid.

Hinko (1971) surveyed financial aid officers in sixty-six community junior colleges. The study revealed that 95 percent of the aid officers held advanced degrees at the masters level or beyond. Of those aid officers holding advanced degrees, 75 percent earned their master's degrees in the area of guidance and counseling. The next highest area of concentration was in school administration in which 11 percent held master's degrees. The financial aid officers were asked if they had duties other than the administration of the aid program. The following percentage responses were recorded: 94 percent had duties in areas other than the administration of the aid program; 23 percent had duties in one additional area; 35 percent in two areas; 16 percent in three areas; and 26 percent in four or more areas. The areas of additional responsibilities and the percentage of financial aid officers taking part in these areas were recorded as follows: placement services - 66 percent; counseling services - 65 percent; admissions - 50 percent; student activities - 39 percent; housing - 8 percent; records - 6 percent; and teaching - 3 percent.

In a study by Puryear (1974) financial aid officers of two and four year institutions were questioned in regard to job satisfaction. Responses indicated that 85 percent of

the two-year college aid officers found financial aid work satisfying to some degree. However, less than half - 45 percent - of the aid officers in junior colleges would be willing to spend a lifetime in the profession. When questioned if they (the financial aid officers) would have chosen another profession if they had it to do over again, 84 percent of the two-year aid officers said they would have chosen their same profession. Four-year college financial aid directors made responses within five percent of the two-year college aid officers to questions concerning job satisfaction.

Although not intended as an integral part of this study, several references were reviewed concerning the academic performances of students involved in student work programs in higher education. Studies by Barnes and Keene (1974), Hay and Lindsay (1969), Meritt (1970), Dickinson and Newbegin (1959), and the Office of the Dean of Labor at Berea College, Berea, Kentucky (1974c) found no significant differences in academic achievement between students who do and do not work part-time while carrying a full-time academic schedule. Although not statistically significant, the study by Dickinson and Newbegin noted a trend toward better relative academic performance under increased outside work load. In general, these studies showed that student academic performance was not influenced by part-time work.

SUMMARY

A review of the literature concerning student work programs makes evident the need for more research into the areas of organization and administration, evaluation procedures, and professional preparation. The majority of the data relates to the affect that working has on the academic performances of employed students.

The studies concerning the affect employment has on the academic performance of the student worker have generally shown that a working student performs academically as well as the student that does not work.

The literature universally portrays the student worker as being characteristically different from other workers. Student workers, because of their limited labor span, are mainly motivated by job interest and personal impact. Since their labor span is so limited, the rewards of normal employment -- such as advancement -- are not applicable to student workers. Student workers set short range goals and are impatient with obstacles that require postponed results.

A number of books and articles have been written describing the steps involved in initiating student work programs, but few studies have been designed to evaluate the effectiveness or scope of existing programs. Chapter III will present the methodological outline for the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter presents a methodological outline for the study. The development of the data collection instrument is described. Distribution of the instrument and the treatment of the data are also explained.

Design of Questionnaire

The development of a field instrument was necessitated by the scarcity of information pertaining to the specific topics of the present study (See Appendix A). The instrument was a forty-five item questionnaire designed to survey the work-study programs in the state universities of Kentucky. The questionnaire was divided into the categories of Organization and Administration, Evaluation Procedures, and Professional Preparation. The categories of the questionnaire represented the three stated objectives of the study.

Field Test of Questionnaire

The questionnaire underwent four revisions before the final design was approved. The first draft was critically reviewed by a staff assistant in charge of the work-study programs at Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky. A number of suggestions were incorporated into the

instrument. The second draft contained fifty-five questions which were further consolidated and revised upon recommendations of professionals in the area of student personnel services. The third draft was further refined and shortened when a preliminary field test was given the instrument at a nearby community college. Since community colleges were not included in the survey, the field test was not considered detrimental to the collected data. The fourth and final draft of the survey contained forty-five questions.

Distribution of Questionnaire

Duplicated copies of the questionnaire were sent to the eight state universities of Kentucky (See Appendix D). The copies were sent in care of the student financial aid officer in charge of the work-study programs. Enclosed with the questionnaires were cover sheets that explained the purpose of the study (See Appendix B), and instruction sheets that explained how to complete the questionnaire (See Appendix C). A 100 percent return of the copies was achieved within two weeks of the initial mailing.

Description of Category I

The first section of the questionnaire was entitled Organization and Administration and contained thirty-three questions. The section sought information concerning the following nine areas: (1) centralization of work programs, (2) student pay policies, (3) participation in work programs,

(4) programs in work-study offered, (5) publicity of programs, (6) institutional and community support, (7) student work and academic credit, (8) personal philosophy of respondents, and (9) participation fluctuations in the work programs for a three year period.

Centralization of Work Programs

Centralization infers the presence of an administrative unit charged with the responsibility of coordinating the institution's student work programs. A centralized student work program would be headed by one office that would direct all programs concerned with student employment regardless of sponsoring agent. A decentralized program would have two or more administrative units sharing the leadership responsibility for the various programs. Centralization was considered important in determining the organizational and administrative make up of the institution's student work programs. The area of centralization concerned the first six questions on the survey.

Student Pay Policies

The manner in which the institutions determined student wages and/or equivalent forms of compensation was the next topic under the category of Organization and Administration. The utilization of job classification scales to rate jobs according to their difficulty or training required for the purpose of determining student pay was investigated. The

range of student pay was researched by asking for the minimum and maximum hourly wage paid by the institution to its student workers. The offering of noncash awards to student workers as partial compensation was a possible institutional option, and thus was included in this section. Student pay policy was regarded as a means for the institution to reward its student workers on the basis of individual merit, and not just a perfunctory compensation for services rendered. The area of student pay policy included questions seven through twelve on the survey.

Participation in Work Programs

Questions thirteen and fourteen respectively inquired into the number of students who participated in the institution's programs of College Work-Study and Institutional Employment. The participation level in these programs, when compared to the total enrollment of the institution, would indicate the percentage of the total student body involved in the programs.

Question fifteen was included in this section to determine if students who qualified for College Work-Study were given preference over Institutional Employment Students in regard to job placement. This was a question concerning administrative policy to find if the federally sponsored Work-Study Program would take precedence over the university sponsored Institutional Employment Program.

Programs in Work-Study Offered

The second and third areas under the category of Organization and Administration dealt mainly with the programs of College Work-Study and Institutional Employment. The fourth area surveyed other programs in work-study offered by the institutions. The Cooperative Education, Off-Campus Work-Study, and Commonwealth Work-Study Programs are off-campus programs and depend upon agencies and businesses in the community for support.

Cooperative Education offers students the opportunity to alternate between their academic studies and full-time work experience. This is usually accomplished by alternating semesters or trimesters designated for either work or study. The work is customarily in the student's major field of study, and the student receives credit for the experience that is gained from the employment. Unlike the programs classified as work-study, the financial status of the student is not considered when determining eligibility for the Cooperative Education Program. Although Cooperative Education is considered an educational program, it was included in the survey because it has characteristics that are similar to those financial aid programs classified as work-study. Work-Study programs and Cooperative Education give the students a realistic perspective into the world of work, and allows them to earn money while working for their academic degrees. Questions sixteen through eighteen on the survey were concerned with Cooperative Education.

The Off-Campus Work-Study Program offers the student the opportunity to work for a non-profit public agency part time (fifteen hours) during the academic year, and full time (forty hours) during the summer. The program is federally funded through, and is administered by, the College Work-Study Program. The institution pays 80 percent of the wages earned by the student and the agency pays the remaining 20 percent. It is the responsibility of the agency to determine the work schedules for the students, and to prepare periodic work evaluations on the students.

The Commonwealth Work-Study Program is a program for student employment with non-profit public agencies during the summer. The placements are made by the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority and funded by the student's institution (80 percent) and the Bureau of Manpower Services (20 percent).

An Off-Campus Non-Work-Study Employment Program or referral service would include possible positions for student employment that would not come under the auspices of the institution's financial aid office. These services would allow agencies interested in hiring students to send notices to the institution's financial aid office concerning job openings and needed qualifications. The hiring agency would have full authority in negotiating with the student on all contractual arrangements concerning pay and hours worked.

The programs of Cooperative Education, Off-Campus Work-Study, Commonwealth Work-Study, and referral services were covered by questions nineteen through twenty-two on the questionnaire. Questions in this area related to the existence of the above mentioned programs, and the participation of students and agencies in the programs.

Publicity of Programs

Publicity of the student work study programs was the area of concern of questions twenty-three, twenty-five, and twenty-six. The publicity of the programs was considered an important element in their being a success. The off-campus programs require the support of the business community, and this support will be enhanced by informing these prospective employers of the intrinsic values to be found in student labor. An imaginative publicity campaign showing the benefits that the students, the employers, and the community will gain by participating in these programs should be a priority of the financial aid office.

Adequate publicity is needed also to direct student attention to the programs and thus give the financial aid office the opportunity to explain the programs in detail. A nebulous knowledge of the programs, as a result of inadequate publicity, could result in many students turning to other means of financial aid.

Faculty and staff understanding of the work programs is instrumental in acquiring acceptance and support. Unless

they understand the growth potential that work-study offers the student, they may favor a less time consuming form of financial aid. Publicity emphasizing the values that work-study can offer students will aid in its acceptance by the academic community.

Institutional and Community Support

Questions twenty-four, twenty-seven, and twenty-eight were concerned with the support the various work-study programs had received. The support of the local business community in respect to the Off-Campus Work-Study and Cooperative Education Programs was the area of concern of question twenty-four. Questions twenty-seven and twenty-eight, respectively, dealt with the support the institution's administration and faculty had given the Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs, and in what areas this support might be improved.

Student Work and Academic Credit

The granting of academic credit to students who participate in work-study assignments requiring specific skills would accentuate the relationship that exists between higher education and the world of work. The requirement of specific skills is necessary in order to maintain the integrity of academic achievement and to more closely resemble the technological society that the student will enter after graduation. The granting of academic credit for programs in work-study was the subject of question twenty-nine.

Personal Philosophy of Respondents

Questions thirty and thirty-one on the survey dealt with the personal beliefs of the respondents concerning two philosophical questions that workers in student financial aid may have to answer as the field continues to grow. Question thirty was concerned with the relevancy of the student work programs in modern higher education. The continued growth of federally funded grant and loan programs for education may lead educators to question whether the experience gained by participating in student work programs alone justifies their continued existence. Question thirty-one concerned students who qualified to participate in one of the work programs but refused to do so. Should students who refuse to participate in student work programs be eligible for other forms of financial aid? These are two philosophical issues that may determine the direction of student financial aid in the future.

Participation Fluctuations

Question thirty-two dealt with percentage fluctuations in student participation over a three year span in the programs of College Work-Study, Institutional Employment, and Cooperative Education. Percentage fluctuations over a three year period was thought to be a means to determine a trend in student participation, and thus be useful in predicting future participation in the programs.

Question thirty-three inquired into the contributory factors that the respondents felt were responsible for the participation fluctuations indicated in question thirty-two.

Description of Category II

The evaluation of student workers was considered a determining factor in the development of the individual student and the programs of work-study in general. One benefit that students gain from being evaluated is that they can better understand those areas in their jobs in which they have strengths and weaknesses. A second benefit students could gain would be merit pay increases based on their evaluations. Pay increases based on performance evaluations would reward student workers monetarily for meeting standards of excellence.

Performance evaluations that are placed in the permanent records of student workers could be of benefit to them when they seek full-time employment after graduation. A good record in a student work program would indicate qualities that would be valued by prospective employers, and could be the influencing factor if two or more applicants were equally qualified.

Evaluations of student workers benefit the institution by making the evaluating supervisors aware of the responsibilities they have in the student's training and progress. In helping the student worker achieve the standards to be met, the supervisor is also developing an

employee that is valuable to the institution. A second benefit that student performance evaluations may render to the institution lies in the area of work-study programming. Evaluations of student workers would indicate the skills needed to perform certain jobs, and would help in relating the work programs to the academic majors of the students. Questions thirty-four through thirty-seven in the survey dealt with the area of evaluation procedures.

Description of Category III

The growth of student financial aid into a multibillion dollar a year program has stressed the importance for professional training in the field. The increasing complexity and specialization associated with the programs of financial aid has made the practice of on-the-job training an unsatisfactory method for adequately preparing workers in the area. Graduate schools with programs in college personnel work could offer basic courses in financial aid, and advance courses for those students who are preparing to specialize in the area.

Professional work experience in financial aid should be encouraged before an individual assumes the responsibilities of directing one of the aid programs. An internship period in the financial aid office would allow the individual to gain knowledge of the programs offered and a clearer perspective of how they complement each other. This

internship period could be accomplished by working in the financial aid office as part of the individual's graduate program.

The field of financial aid is relatively new to the administrative area of higher education, and thus research in the field is in its basic stages. This research needs to be accessible to the workers in financial aid in order for them to incorporate useful information into their programs. Membership in professional organizations related to financial aid would provide a means for both transmitting and receiving research findings by means of conventions and journals.

Question thirty-eight inquired into the number of years and months the respondents had held their positions. Since the field of student financial aid is one of the more recent services to be offered in higher education, many new workers in educational administration find it to be more readily accessible than the more established areas. This condition leads to a high attrition rate among financial aid personnel as opportunities in the more established areas become available to them. The loss of trained professionals to other administrative areas is a problem besetting financial aid, and will persist until financial aid gains professional status equal to that of the older administrative services.

Question thirty-nine requested the respondents to list their academic degrees, the areas of concentration, and the institution(s) from which their degree(s) were conferred.

The area of concentration was considered to be especially significant in determining the relevancy of the respondents' academic training to their positions.

Question forty dealt with the previous professional work experience of the respondents. As in the area of professional training, the previous work experience of the respondents was considered important in determining its relevancy to their positions.

Question forty-one concerned the professional preparation the respondents felt was needed to be a financial aid officer. A list of academic courses was included that could be checked if training in that area was considered important, and a space was provided where additional courses could be added.

Question forty-two sought to determine if the respondents performed any duties outside the area of financial aid. The types of additional duties performed, if any, were considered to be important in defining the respondent's area of responsibility.

Question forty-three dealt with how the respondents viewed their positions - that of being mainly personnel placement or financial aid. If the respondents viewed their positions as mainly being that of personnel placement, they probably did little counseling in the other areas of financial aid. In those cases where the respondents considered their positions as being financial aid, they probably counseled students in all aspects of the financial aid program.

Question forty-four concerned the professional organizations related to financial aid to which the respondents belonged. Membership in professional organizations was considered essential in that they provide a means for the workers to keep abreast of new developments in the field.

Question forty-five, the final question in the survey, was provided to allow the respondents to add any additional comments which they felt would contribute to the study.

Data Analysis

The limited population of the study prohibited the use of statistical analysis in the interpretation of the data. The data were presented by summaries and tables that recorded the responses of the eight financial aid officers to each question.

Summary

This chapter has been a report of the methods and procedures which were employed in the study. The population of the study was described. The development of the instrument to survey the population was reported, and a summary of the method for data analysis was provided. The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the results of the study in summaries depicting the responses from the eight state universities of Kentucky. The data were collected from a questionnaire that was sent to the financial aid departments of the eight universities. The purpose of this study, as stated in Chapter I, was to gather information on the following three areas:

1. The organization and administration of the student work programs;
2. Evaluation procedures that have been developed to measure the effectiveness of the programs and the student workers; and
3. The professional preparation and work experience of the financial aid officers.

The data were arranged according to subject areas:

Organization and Administration, Evaluation Procedures, and Professional Preparation.

Organization and Administration

The official title of the office from which the student work programs were administered was the subject of question one. All of the offices had titles that included either the phrase "financial aid" or "financial assistance." The titles of the offices indicated that the student work programs

were centralized under one authority at seven of the eight universities. One university indicated a degree of decentralization by having its College Work-Study Program under the Office of Student Financial Aid and its other work programs under the Office of Placement.

The title of the person who headed the student work programs was the subject of question two. The titles of the officers indicated that the programs were headed by officers other than the directors of the student labor offices. This was true in all of the universities concerning the College Work-Study Program, but one university had the Director of Placement in charge of the other student work programs.

The title of the immediate supervisor of the person who headed the student work programs was sought by question three. Seven of the eight universities had the head of their work programs under the supervision of the director of the Financial Aid Office. One university had the head of the work programs under the supervision of the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs.

Question four sought to determine if the departments hired their own student workers, or if the students were assigned by the work office. At four universities the Office of Student Financial Aid assigned all student workers to labor positions. At three universities the Financial Aid Offices and departments combined to assign student workers. At one university the departments were charged with the responsibility of hiring their own student workers.

Questions five and six dealt with any differences in policy or procedure in the administration of the programs of College Work-Study and Institutional Employment. Three universities had the same program policy concerning their Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs. Five universities did have differences in their program policy, and these differences are cited in the paragraph below.

The Institutional Employment Program at one university was directed by the Placement Office and on a referral basis only. The other four universities indicating differences in their program policies referred to the federal regulations pertaining to College Work-Study and financial need. Institutional Employment is not based on financial need, but on the needs of the university.

Question fifteen sought to determine if Work-Study Students were given preference over Institutional Employment Students in regard to job placement. Work-Study Students were given preference over Institutional Employment Students at four universities in regard to labor assignments. The other four universities did not give Work-Study Students preference in job assignments.

The use of job classification scales by the universities to rate jobs in the student work programs according to their difficulty was the subject of question seven. All eight state universities reported that no job classification scales were used to rate jobs in the student work programs.

Questions eight and ten dealt with the pay scale range for student workers at the universities. Four universities paid their student workers the minimum hourly wage as set by congress as their minimum wage. The other four universities paid their student workers a sub-minimum hourly wage. The highest maximum hourly wage was \$3.50 and the lowest maximum wage was \$2.05 at the universities. The average maximum wage at the eight state universities was \$2.71 an hour for student workers (See Table 1).

TABLE 1
PAY SCALE RANGE FOR STUDENT WORKERS AT THE
EIGHT STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY

University	Minimum Hourly Wage	Sub-Minimum Hourly Wage	Maximum Hourly Wage
A		X	\$2.50
B	X		\$3.00
C	X		\$3.50*
D	X		\$2.30
E		X	\$2.30
F		X	\$2.05
G		X	\$3.50
H	X		\$2.50

* Law clerks for federal government under the College Work-Study Program.

Question nine was asked to determine what methods were used by the universities to determine pay increases for individual student workers. One university used recommendations from department heads as the basis for wage increases. The length of service in the work programs was the standard another university employed in granting wage increases to student workers. One university paid all student workers uniformly except in the food service area where a higher wage was paid to returning workers. One university reported that the minimum wage was paid to all student workers. Two universities reported that all student workers were paid the same hourly rate, and two universities reported that no procedures were used concerning the matter.

The percentage of student workers at the universities who received noncash awards as partial compensation, and the types of awards offered, were the respective subjects of questions eleven and twelve. Two universities did issue noncash awards to student workers as partial labor compensation. Both universities granted tuition, or any portion thereof, as the partial compensation offered. One of the universities that granted partial compensation reported the percentage of student workers receiving noncash awards ranged from 1 percent to 5 percent, and the other university set the percentage at 1 percent. The remaining six universities did not issue noncash awards to student workers.

Questions thirteen, fourteen, eighteen, nineteen, and twenty-two dealt with the number of students who participated

in the various student work programs offered by the eight universities. The mean/median number of students who participated in the College Work-Study Program was 890.7 and 850 respectively. The mean/median number of students who participated in the Cooperative Education Program was 55.1 and 172 respectively. The mean/median number of students who participated in the Institutional Employment Program was 577.8 and 425 respectively. The mean/median number of students who participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program during the academic year was 113 and 65.5 respectively. The mean/median number of students who participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program during the summer term was 91 and 78.5 respectively. The mean/median number of students who participated in the Commonwealth Work-Study Program was 52 and 33.5 respectively (See Table 2).

Questions sixteen and seventeen were concerned respectively with the existence of/or planned Cooperative Education Programs at the eight universities. Four of the eight universities sponsored a Cooperative Education Program. Three universities did not sponsor a Cooperative Education Program. The remaining university did not sponsor a Cooperative Education Program, but planned to initiate a program in the future.

Question twenty-one sought to determine if Off-Campus Non-Work-Study Employment Programs or referral services were offered at the universities. The Off-Campus Non-Work-Study Employment Program was offered at three of the eight

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDENT WORK
PROGRAMS OFFERED BY THE EIGHT STATE UNIVERSITIES

University	College Work-Study	Co-Op Educ.	Inst. Employ.	Off-Campus (Academic)	Off-Campus (Summer)	Commonwealth Work-Study
A	1,000	NA	1,500	96	112	130
B	1,400	100	1,100	457	200	92
C	462	250		35	35	35
D	600	NA	10	0	0	20
E	1,430	27	135	144	144	74
F	700	0	725	30	45	25
G	1,314	244	425	3	0	32
H	220	NA	150	29	10	4

universities. Referral services were provided at four of the eight universities, but were not sponsored at the other four institutions.

The number of off-campus agencies each university had to employ work-study students was the subject of question twenty. The range was from a low of zero to a high of forty-three. The average number of contractual arrangements with off-campus agencies to employ work-study students each university had was ten.

The methods used by the universities to publicize the off-campus student work programs to prospective employers in the business community was the subject of question twenty-three. The most common method employed was to mail brochures to the local businesses, a method used by six of the eight institutions. The mass media was utilized by two universities by notices in the local newspapers, and by one university that used the radio to publicize its programs.

The methods employed by the universities to publicize the work programs to their students came under question twenty-five. Six universities used their college catalogs as a means to inform their students of the work programs that were available. The college newspaper and notices were employed by five of the universities, and four universities used the student handbook in publicizing the student work programs.

Question twenty-six was asked to determine the methods used by the eight universities to publicize their work

programs to their staffs and faculties. Memos sent to the departments was the most employed method with six universities reporting this procedure. The next most employed method was faculty and staff meetings with four universities reporting this system.

The perceived community support of the off-campus student work programs was the topic of question twenty-four. Seven universities responded that the community supported their College Work-Study Programs, and the eighth university reported that the question was not applicable. Four universities responded that the community supported their Cooperative Education Programs, and three universities reported that the question was not applicable. One university did not respond to the question of Cooperative Education and community support.

Question twenty-seven dealt with the perceived administrative and faculty support of the College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs. Five of the universities reported that their College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs received support from the administration and faculty. One university reported that the College Work-Study Program was fully supported, but that the Institutional Employment Program was not fully supported. Two universities responded that neither the College Work-Study nor the Institutional Employment Programs received adequate support from their institution's administrations and faculties.

Question twenty-eight was asked to determine in what areas could cooperation and assistance from administration and faculty be improved in respect to the programs of College Work-Study and Institutional Employment. One university wanted increased emphasis on the part of department heads to assist in preventing overearnings. A second university reported that there could be more cooperation on the part of the departments in the listing of jobs available with the Office of Financial Aid. A third university stated that the Financial Aid Office needed more staff to provide more adequate services. A fourth university wanted better organized work plans from the departments and more emphasis placed on remitting time cards on time. A fifth university believed there needs to be more awareness of the regulations governing the work programs on the part of the administration and faculty. Three universities listed no areas in which cooperation and assistance could be improved.

The awarding of academic credit for participating in the work programs was the subject of question twenty-nine. No university awarded academic credit to students who participated in their On-Campus College Work-Study Programs. One university did award academic credit to students who participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program. No university awarded academic credit for participation in the Institutional Employment Programs. In those five universities that offered Cooperative Education, four universities awarded academic credit and one did not.

In question thirty, the respondents were asked if they believed that the educational experience gained by participation in the work programs alone justified their continued existence. Seven respondents felt that the educational experience gained by participating in the work programs did justify their continued existence. One respondent felt that the educational experience did not alone justify their continued existence.

In question thirty-one, the respondents were asked if they felt students should be eligible for other forms of financial aid if they refused to participate in the student work programs. Six respondents felt students should be eligible for other forms of financial aid if they refuse to participate in the work programs. Two respondents felt students should not be eligible for other forms of financial aid if they refuse to participate in the work programs.

The percentage participation fluctuations for a three year period in the programs of College Work-Study, Institutional Employment, and Cooperative Education was the subject of question thirty-two. The highest percentage increase for College Work-Study was 95 percent, with the mean/median for those universities reporting being 29.5 percent and 17.5 percent respectively. The College Work-Study Program did not decrease in percentage participation at any of the universities, and one university reported no change in participation. The highest percentage increase in participation for Institutional Employment was 17 percent, with the mean/median for

those universities reporting being 10.5 percent and 10 percent respectively. Three universities reported no change in percentage participation, and one university reported that the percentage participation in its Institutional Employment Program decreased by 1 percent. The only percentage participation change in the Cooperative Education Program was an increase of 244 percent at one institution. The other universities reported no change in percentage participation in the area of Cooperative Education.

Question thirty-three dealt with the factors that were responsible for the participatory fluctuations in the work-study programs. One university stated that the Commonwealth Work-Study Program had increased awareness of the other student employment programs offered by the institution. Two universities reported that increased enrollment and increased funding of the programs accounted for their growth. One university stated that the main contributory factor to the growth of its College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs was the appointing of a student work supervisor to direct the programs.

Evaluation Procedures

The type of instrument used to evaluate student workers was the subject of question thirty-four. Interviews with the student's supervisor was the evaluation instrument used at four of the universities. Two universities used a checklist of traits as their evaluating instrument. Rating

scales, self-rating scales, and evaluation forms were used at three of the universities as their evaluating instruments, and one university did not use an evaluating instrument.

Question thirty-five dealt with the number of times the evaluating instrument was implemented during the academic year. Five universities evaluated their student workers twice a year. Two universities evaluated their student workers once a year. One university did not respond to the question.

Question thirty-six was asked to determine if a supervisors handbook had been developed that gave specific instructions in the use of the evaluating instruments. One university had developed a supervisors handbook and one university did not respond to the question. The remaining six universities had not developed a supervisors handbook for the use of student evaluations.

Question thirty-seven sought to determine if student workers were given the opportunity to evaluate the work programs. Two universities provided their student workers with the opportunity to evaluate the work programs, the other six universities did not.

Professional Preparation

In question thirty-eight the respondents were asked how long they had held their position. The average length of service for the respondents at their positions was 7.08

years, with eleven being the most years served and one year and six months being the least years served.

In question thirty-nine the respondents were asked to list their academic degree(s), academic major(s), and degree granting institution(s). Five of the respondents held the Master of Arts Degree, two the Bachelor of Arts Degree, and one did not hold an academic degree. The highest degrees held in an academic major by the respondents were in the following areas: guidance and counseling; education; business administration; business education; and history. The degree granting institutions included: Western Kentucky University; Eastern Kentucky University; University of Kentucky; Tennessee State University; Morehead State University; and Murray State University.

The professional work experiences of the respondents was the area of concern of question forty. The prior work experiences of the respondents included: guidance counselors; teachers; administrators; auditors; accountant; postal clerk; principals; assistant superintendent of a county school system; director of pupil personnel; secretary and accounts clerk in financial aid office; draft board representative; real estate salesperson; and tax specialist with the Internal Revenue Service.

In question forty-one the respondents were asked if they felt there was a need for professional preparation in the area of financial aid. If they felt a need existed, a list of areas was provided for them to select as possible

academic courses. One area selected by all of the respondents was Introduction to Federal Aid Programs. The next most selected area was Student Personnel Services with six of the eight respondents feeling this was an important subject. Career Guidance was the third most selected area with four votes, and Business Law and Utilization of Community Resources received three votes apiece (See Table 3).

In question forty-two the respondents were asked if they had any duties outside of the area of financial aid. Seven of the respondents performed no additional duties outside of the area of financial aid. One respondent had the additional duty as an assistant professor in the Department of History.

In question forty-three the respondents were asked if they viewed their positions as being mainly personnel placement or financial aid. No respondent viewed his/her position as being mainly personnel placement. Three respondents viewed their positions as being mainly financial aid. Four respondents viewed their positions as being both personnel placement and financial aid. One respondent did not reply to the question.

The professional organizations of which the respondents were members was the area of concern of question forty-four. Seven respondents belonged to the Kentucky Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (KASFAA). Seven respondents belonged to the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (SASFAA). Three respondents

TABLE 3

AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION RESPONDENTS FELT
WOULD BE BENEFICIAL FOR FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS

University	Career Guidance	Bus. Law	Educ. Stat.	Student Personnel Services	Federal Aid Programs	Community Resources
A	X	X	X	X	X	X
B				X	X	X
C	X	X		X	X	
D					X	
E		X		X	X	X
F	X			X	X	
G	X				X	
H				X	X	

belonged to the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). One respondent belonged to the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). One respondent was a member of the Kentucky Student Personnel Association (KSPA).

The final question in the survey, question forty-five, was provided to allow the respondents to add any additional comments which they felt would contribute to the study. One respondent wrote that students who worked obtained an enriched education and would be better prepared to meet the challenges of their future occupational choices. A second respondent felt that the certification of financial aid officers was imperative for the continued growth of the profession.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the study. Each question on the survey was considered separately and the data was arranged according to subject areas. The eight state universities of Kentucky composed the population of the study. The conclusions of the study will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the findings for the study and the conclusions based on the findings. Recommendations are presented that the concerned institutions may wish to consider for possible inclusion in their work-study programs. Areas for future investigation are recommended at the conclusion of Chapter V.

Summary of the Findings

A high degree of centralization was indicated at seven of the eight universities in regard to their student work programs. The programs were administered from one centralized office and were headed by persons associated with that office. The assignment of student workers to positions and the general administrative policies of the universities also were indicative of centralization. One university had a more decentralized format by having two offices involved in administering the work programs, but in general still retained centralized programming. The College Work-Study Program at this university was directed by the Office of Student Financial Aid, while the other work programs were under the Office of Placement. The programs were headed by persons from

both offices, and the departments were charged with the responsibility of hiring their own student workers.

Policy concerning student worker compensation was consistent among the eight universities, with only the hourly wage paid to students showing moderate discrepancies. No university used job classification scales to determine wage increases for their student workers, and only two of the eight institutions had standard procedures that could be utilized for this purpose. Two universities granted a percentage of the total tuition as partial compensation for student labor, the remaining six universities did not offer any form of partial compensation.

All eight of the universities offered the College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs. Four of the universities sponsored the Cooperative Education Program, and a fifth planned to initiate the program. Three of the eight institutions sponsored the Off-Campus Non-Work-Study Employment Program, and four universities provided placement referral services for their students.

The universities generally utilized the same methods to publicize their student labor programs to their students, faculties, and the local business community. Six of the eight universities ran notices in their college catalogs to inform the students of their programs. The college newspaper and campus bulletin boards were employed by five of the universities, and four universities used the student handbook to publicize the work programs. The most common method utilized

by the universities to inform their faculties of the work programs was to send memos to the various departments. This procedure was used by six of the institutions. Faculty and staff meetings were employed by four of the universities to transmit knowledge of their work programs. In publicizing the work programs to the business community, the method utilized by six of the universities was to mail brochures to the local businesses. The mass media was utilized by two universities by having notices appear in the local newspapers, and by using radio stations to publicize their student work programs.

Community support for the programs of Cooperative Education and Off-Campus Work-Study was perceived as being adequate by all of the institutions that sponsored these programs. Administrative and faculty support of the College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs was perceived as being adequate by five of the universities. One university reported that the College Work-Study Program was fully supported, but that the Institutional Employment Program was not. Two universities responded that neither program received adequate support from their administrations and faculties.

Four of the five universities that listed areas in which cooperation and assistance from institutional administration and faculty might be improved in regard to the work programs wanted the departments to give more attention to the regulations governing work-study. One institution stated that their financial aid office needed a larger staff

in order to provide more adequate services. Three universities listed no areas in which cooperation and assistance could be improved.

Academic credit was not awarded to students who participated in the On-Campus College Work-Study Programs at any of the eight universities. One university did award academic credit to students who participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program. None of the institutions awarded credit for participation in the Institutional Employment Program. In those five universities that offered Cooperative Education, four universities awarded academic credit and one did not.

The most used procedure to evaluate student workers was to interview the work supervisors, this method was used by four of the eight institutions. The other methods employed by the other four universities included rating scales, self-rating scales, and evaluation forms. Five universities reported that they evaluated their student workers twice a year, and the other two universities that responded evaluated their students once a year. One university had developed a supervisors handbook that gave guidelines in the use of the evaluating instruments, the other seven universities had not developed a formalized procedure as such. Two of the universities provided their students with the opportunity to evaluate the work programs, the remaining six institutions did not follow this procedure.

All of the respondents felt there was a need for professional preparation in the area of administering financial

aid in student work programming. The one area that was unanimously selected as being essential in the academic training of financial aid workers was a course entitled Introduction to Federal Aid Programs. The next most selected course title was Student Personnel Services with six of the eight respondents feeling this was an important subject for workers in financial aid.

All of the respondents viewed their positions as being financial aid, and only one respondent had an additional duty outside of the area of financial aid. All belonged to either a national or state professional organization related to financial aid, and two belonged to professional organizations that related to other areas of student personnel work.

Conclusions

The student work programs at the eight state universities of Kentucky were consistently similar in all aspects of the study. A basic reason for this similarity in regard to the organization and administration of the programs was the federal regulations that the universities must adhere to in sponsoring the College Work-Study and Cooperative Education Programs. Both programs are federally funded, and the administrative procedures that are to be maintained made a centralized work office a necessity in order to run the programs efficiently. In the areas of student pay, methods used to publicize the work programs, and student worker evaluations the institutions were not as uniform in

procedure. In these areas the federal regulations set minimal standards or left it to the discretion of the respective institution to develop local procedures.

Based on the responses of the workers in the field, it is concluded that professional training at the graduate level is becoming a decided prerequisite for those who plan to enter the area of student financial aid. The complexity and growth of student financial aid has made on-the-job training of personnel an unacceptable substitute for academic training. Membership in professional organizations dealing with financial aid has also become important to the professionals in the field if they are to keep abreast of new trends and research in their area.

Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest five areas in which the institutions involved may wish to consider in the future planning of their work-study programs. These areas are emphasized for they fall under the auspices of the individual institution and thus more accessible to change than those governed by federal regulations.

The development of job classification scales would afford student workers the opportunity to progress in their labor assignments as they gain in experience and knowledge. The various campus jobs could be listed under classification levels that would be indicative of the training and knowledge needed to perform them. As mastery at one level was achieved,

the student would advance to the next classification level that would offer new responsibilities and more difficult tasks. An added incentive for the student to progress in the labor program, would be to have a higher hourly rate of pay for each succeeding level.

The granting of academic credit for labor assignments that require specialized skills and/or knowledge would make student labor a more meaningful experience for the achieving student. If the labor assignment required knowledge that was needed in the student's major area of study, the assignment could be listed as a laboratory credit in the student's academic record. The granting of academic credit for specialized labor assignments, would also add credibility to the labor programs in the eyes of the academic community, an area that five of the eight universities said needed improvement.

The development of a supervisors handbook that describes the student labor programs in terms of regulations, and in the use of student evaluation forms, should be seriously considered by the institutions. Six of the eight universities stated in their responses that departmental cooperation in regard to student labor regulations was a area that needed improvement. A handbook that described pay schedules, time card procedures, the maximum and minimum hours a student may work a week, and other administrative details would help the supervisors to better understand their responsibilities. The handbook should also contain a section that

explains the use of the forms that are used to evaluate student workers. Since these forms are placed in the student's permanent file, great care should be taken in their preparation, and guidelines should be strictly adhered to.

Student evaluations of the labor programs would be invaluable in determining their worth to the students. The evaluation forms should allow the students to express their feelings concerning job relevancy, supervisor effectiveness, hourly wage, work schedules, and other related concerns. The welfare of the student is the only reason the work-study programs exist, and thus the student's evaluation of the programs should take precedence in program planning.

The respondents unanimously agreed that academic training in the area of financial aid was a necessity. A number of academic courses were suggested that could be offered in the curriculums of graduate schools that offered advanced degrees in the area of student personnel work. It is thus suggested that the graduate schools of the eight concerned universities ask the workers in the field of financial aid for recommendations regarding courses that could be added to their student personnel work programs.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study has revealed the need for possible additional research in the following areas:

1. The awarding of academic credit to students who participate in the College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs.

2. The effect of the work experience in college upon the student's full-time employment after graduation.

3. The financial benefit of student work programs for their respective institutions.

4. The areas of student financial aid to be emphasized for those graduate programs emphasizing student personnel services.

Summary

This chapter has presented the summary and conclusions of the study on the student work-study programs in the eight state universities of Kentucky. Recommendations were suggested for the institutions involved in the study to consider. The study was concluded with suggestions for further research.

APPENDIX A

A SURVEY OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY

NAME _____ UNIVERSITY _____
TITLE _____ TOTAL ENROLLMENT _____

I. Organization and Administration

1. What is the official title of the office from which the student work programs are administered?

2. What is the title of the person who heads the student work programs at your university?

3. What is the title of his/her immediate supervisor?

4. Do the various departments hire their own student workers, or are the students assigned by the work office?
Hire Own _____ Assigned _____ Combination _____
5. Is there a difference in policy or procedure in the administration of the College Work-Study Program and the Institutional Student Employment Program?
Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX A--Continued

6. If the answer to Question 5 was Yes, please list the major differences.

7. Is a job classification scale used to rate jobs in the College Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs according to their difficulty or training required?
(If Yes, please specify)

Yes _____ No _____ Difficulty _____ Training _____

8. Is the minimum hourly wage as set by congress (or a sub-minimum wage) used by the university as its base pay scale for student workers?

Minimum _____ Sub-Minimum _____ Other (Please

specify) _____

9. What methods are used by the university to determine pay increases for individual student workers?

Job Classification Scale _____ Student Labor Evaluations _____
Length of service on a particular job _____
Length of service in work program _____ Other (Please specify) _____

10. At present, what is the highest rate of pay earned by student workers at your university?

_____ Per Hour

11. Does the university offer noncash awards to student workers as partial compensation for their labor? If so, approximately what percentage of the student workers receive such compensation?

Yes _____ No _____ %

12. If the answer to Question 11 was Yes, what type of compensation is offered? (Please check)

Tuition or any portion thereof _____
Books or supplies which are not normally furnished _____
Reduced fees or charges _____
Other (Please specify) _____

APPENDIX A--Continued

13. For those students who qualified for the federally funded College Work-Study Program at your university, how many were assigned to jobs last academic year?
_____ Students
14. How many students who qualified for the Institutional Employment Program at your university last academic year were assigned to jobs?
_____ Students
15. Are Work-Study Students given preference over Institutional Employment Students in regard to job placement?
Yes _____ No _____
16. Does the university sponsor a Cooperative Education Program with local business and industry?
Yes _____ No _____
17. If a Cooperative Education Program is not in operation at the university, are there plans to initiate one?
Yes _____ No _____
18. How many students participated in the Cooperative Education Program last academic year?
_____ Students
19. How many students participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program last academic year? _____ Students. How many students participated in the Off-Campus Work-Study Program last summer? _____ Students.
20. How many off-campus agencies currently have a contract to employ Work-Study Students?
_____ Agencies
21. Does the university sponsor an Off-Campus Non-Work-Study Employment Program or Referral Service? (Please check)
Non-Work Study _____ Referral _____ Neither _____
22. How many students from your university participated in the Commonwealth Work-Study Program last summer?
_____ Students

APPENDIX A--Continued

23. What means are used to publicize the various off-campus student work programs to prospective employers in the business community?
- Television _____ Radio _____
 Newspapers _____ Chamber of Commerce _____
 Brochures or College Publications _____ Other (Please specify) _____
24. Have the Off-Campus Work-Study and Cooperative Education Programs received substantial support from the business sector of your community? (Please check Yes or No)
- Off-Campus Work-Study: Yes _____ No _____ Co-Op Education: Yes _____ No _____
25. What methods are used to publicize the work programs to the students? (Please check)
- School Newspaper _____ College Catalog _____
 Student Handbook _____ Notices & Fliers _____
 Other (Please specify) _____
26. How are the work programs publicized to the staff and faculty? (Please check)
- Faculty and Staff Meetings _____ Supervisors Handbook _____
 Memos sent to Departments _____ Other (Please specify) _____
27. Do you believe that the administration and faculty have fully supported the Work-Study and Institutional Employment Programs at your university?
- Yes _____ No _____
28. In what areas could cooperation and assistance from administration and faculty be improved in respect to the programs listed in Question 27? (Please specify)
- _____
- _____
- _____
29. Is academic credit ever given for participating in the various work programs? Please answer Yes or No for each program below.
- College Work-Study _____ Cooperative Education _____
 Institutional Student Employment _____

APPENDIX A--Continued

30. Do you believe that the educational experience gained by participating in the work programs alone justifies their continued existence?
Yes _____ No _____
31. Do you feel students should be eligible for other forms of financial aid - such as grants and loans - if they are qualified to participate in one of the work programs but refuse to?
Yes _____ No _____
32. Has student participation in the work programs at your university increased or decreased over the past three years? Please indicate to the nearest percent the Increase or Decrease for each program listed below.
- College Work-Study: Increased _____ %
Decreased _____ %
No Change _____
- Institutional Employment: Increased _____ %
Decreased _____ %
No Change _____
- Cooperative Education: Increased _____ %
Decreased _____ %
No Change _____
33. Are the above changes in participation related only to increases or decreases in the total enrollment of the university? If not, please list those factors that have also been contributory. (Please specify program(s))
- _____
- _____
- _____

II. Evaluation Procedures

34. What type of instrument is used to evaluate student workers? (Please check)
- Checklist of Traits _____ Self Rating Scale _____
Rating Scales _____ Interviews with Supervisors _____
Other (Please specify) _____

APPENDIX A--Continued

35. How many times is this instrument implemented during the academic year? (Please check)

Once _____ Twice _____ Other (Please specify) _____

36. Has a Supervisors Handbook been developed that gives specific guidelines in the use of the evaluating instrument(s)? If so, would you please forward one to me at the following address: Michael Knight, 1277 Clay St., Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101.

Yes _____ No _____

37. Are student workers at your university given the opportunity to evaluate the work programs?

Yes _____ No _____

III. Professional Preparation

38. How long have you held your present position?

_____ Years _____ Months

39. Please complete the following:

Degree(s)	Major(s)	Institution
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

40. What professional work experience did you have before your present position? (Please list)

APPENDIX A--Continued

41. Do you feel there is a need for professional preparation to be a financial aid officer? If so, what areas do you feel would be the most helpful? (Please check)

Yes _____ No _____

Career Guidance _____ Student Personnel Services _____
 Business Law _____ Introduction to Federal Aid Programs _____
 Educational Statistics _____ Utilization of Community Resources _____
 Other (Please specify) _____

42. Do you perform any duties outside of the area of financial aid? If so, please list these duties.

Yes _____ No _____

43. Do you view your position as being mainly one of personnel placement or financial aid? (Please check)

Personnel Placement _____ Financial Aid _____ Both _____

44. List professional organizations related to your job of which you are a member.
-
-

45. Please feel free to add any comments which you feel would contribute to this study.
-
-
-

Thank you for your assistance in this study. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope or to me at the following address: Michael Knight, 1277 Clay Street, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101.

APPENDIX B

THE COVER SHEET THAT EXPLAINED THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

I am a graduate student working toward a Specialist in Education Degree in the area of Educational Administration and Supervision. Enclosed you will find a questionnaire that I developed to survey the work-study programs in the state universities of Kentucky. The information for this survey will be provided by financial aid officers in the state universities who complete a copy of the questionnaire. The three areas included in this instrument are: organization and administration; evaluation procedures; and professional preparation.

Apart from the fact that this study is serving as a part of my graduate work at Western Kentucky University, the results of the study will serve at least three meaningful purposes: (1) graduate programs in the area of educational administration will be provided with much needed information to better prepare students who are planning to enter the area of financial aid; (2) individuals considering a career in student financial aid will be given a clearer perspective of this particular area; and (3) the financial aid officers of the state universities will be provided with information that may enable them to render more effective service to their students.

The results of this study will describe the present status of the work-study programs in the state universities, and will not make any attempt to evaluate the programs. The results will not include the names of individuals, and institutions will not be specifically identified.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. Since this survey only includes the eight state universities, it is imperative that you

APPENDIX B--Continued

return your questionnaire. In appreciation of your participation in this study, I will send you a summary of the results. I hope you will find the results to be of some benefit to you.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Knight
Ed.S. Candidate
Western Kentucky University

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS

Please give each question careful consideration and then make your answers clear and concise. Feel free to use the response termed "other" when you have a professional opinion that can not be expressed by merely checking an answer. Some of the most helpful and unique ideas will probably result from the written answers which you volunteer.

You will probably find that it will take about 25 minutes to complete this questionnaire. I have attempted to cover the topic thoroughly and, at the same time, to minimize the amount of time which will be required of you to participate in the study.

APPENDIX D

THE EIGHT STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KENTUCKY
THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY

UNIVERSITY	LOCATION
EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	RICHMOND, KENTUCKY
KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY	FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY
MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY	MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY
MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY	MURRAY, KENTUCKY
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	HIGHLAND HEIGHTS, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY	LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY
WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Frank C. "A Comprehensive Work Education Program." Paper presented at the National Convention on Work and the College Student, Columbus, Ohio, September, 1976.
- Adams, Frank C. and Stephens, Clarence W. College and University Student Work Programs (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), 39. a
- _____. College and University Student Work Programs (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), 156. b
- _____. College and University Student Work Programs (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), 118-132. c
- _____. A Student Job Classification Plan for Colleges and Universities (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972).
- Barnes, John B. and Keene, Roland. "A Comparison of the Initial Academic Achievement of Freshman Award Winners Who Work and Those Who Do Not Work," Journal of Student Financial Aid, 4 (November, 1974), 25-29.
- "Berea Labor," Berea Alumnus, (March-April, 1975), 3. b
- Bobowski, Rita C. "OE's Cooperative Education Program," American Education, 11 (January-February, 1975), 38.
- Casazza, Clarence. "Professional Development of Program Administrators." In Work and the College Student, Edited by Roland Keene; Frank C. Adams; and John E. King. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1976), 102.
- "A Comparison of Academic and Labor Performances of Berea College Students," A Report prepared by the Office of the Dean of Labor, Berea College, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky (1974), c
- Counts, Perry. "Pay Policies for Student Workers," The Journal of Student Financial Aid, 2 (May, 1975), 5-9.
- Dawson, Dudley J. "The Co-Op Angle," Journal of College Placement, 35 (Summer, 1975), 51-56.

- Delaney, Francis H; Hylander, Gary L; Karp, Ruth; and Lange, Richard J. "A Taxonomy of Objectives for the Training of Financial Aid Administrators," The Journal of Student Financial Aid, 4 (November, 1974), 5-12.
- Dickinson, Carl and Newbegin, Betty. "Can Work and College Mix?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (December, 1959), 314-317.
- Friedman, Nathalie. The Federal College Work-Study Program: A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1971, Final Report. (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 080 082, 1971).
- Hay, John E. and Lindsay, Carl A. "The Working Student: How does He Achieve?" Journal of College Student Personnel, 10 (March, 1969), 109-114.
- Hinko, Paul M. "Financial Aid Officers and Institutional Programs," Junior College Journal, 41 (April, 1971), 20-23.
- Keene, Roland. "Research: Program, Policy, Profession," In Work and the College Student, Edited by Roland Keene; Frank C. Adams; and John E. King. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1976), 131.
- Keeney, William. "Cooperative Education in the Liberal Arts," Liberal Education, 61 (December, 1975), 427-438.
- Mason, Ralph E. and Haines, Peter G. Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum, 2nd ed. (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1972), 177-181.
- Meritt, Ray. "Academic Performance of Work-Study Students," Journal of College Student Personnel, 11 (May, 1970), 173-176
- Moore, Shirley B. "Suggested Courses for the Preparation of Financial Aid Administrators," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 12 (March, 1971), 143-146.
- Pasework, R. A. and Sawyer, R. N. "Changes in Interests Associated with an Undergraduate Summer Work-Study Program in Mental Health," The Journal of Educational Research, 62 (October, 1968), 58-59.
- "Paying for an Education, Student Reliance on Own Earning Power," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (July, 1975), 3. a

Porter, Ralph C. "A History of Cooperative Education Including Graduate Cooperative Programs," In Work and the College Student, Edited by Roland Keene; Frank C. Adams; and John E. King. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1976), 102.

Puryear, James B. "Two-Year College Financial Aid Officers," Journal of College Student Personnel, 15 (January, 1974), 12-16

Ramsay, William R. "The Unique Aspects of Student Supervision," Paper presented at the Work-Study Development Project, Berea, Kentucky, 1974. 22-26. a

_____. "The Unique Aspects of Student Supervision," Paper presented at the Work-Study Development Project, Berea, Kentucky, 1974. 27-29. b