


6-1973

# A Comparative Study of the Home Environment, College Environment, & Personal, Emotional, & Academic Characteristics of the Dropout & Persistent Student at Western Kentucky University

Casimir Kowalski  
*Western Kentucky University*

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Kowalski, Casimir, "A Comparative Study of the Home Environment, College Environment, & Personal, Emotional, & Academic Characteristics of the Dropout & Persistent Student at Western Kentucky University" (1973). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 2513.  
<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2513>

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](mailto:topscholar@wku.edu).

Kowalski,

Casimir J.

1973

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE HOME ENVIRONMENT,  
COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT, AND PERSONAL, EMOTIONAL,  
AND ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DROPOUT AND  
PERSISTENT STUDENT AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

A Project

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the

Educational Specialist Degree

by

Casimir J. Kowalski

June, 1973

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE HOME ENVIRONMENT,  
COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT, AND PERSONAL, EMOTIONAL,  
AND ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DROPOUT AND  
PERSISTENT STUDENT AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Emmett D. Burken  
Director of Thesis

M. Eugene Harryman  
Stephen B. Shackle

Approved 6/19/73  
Date

Elmer Gray  
Dean of the Graduate College

Approved 11-18-74  
Date

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose and Rationale . . . . .	4
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Definition of Terms . . . . .	5
Limitations of Study . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Selection of College . . . . .	8
Characteristics of Persistent Students . . . . .	10
Characteristics of College Dropouts . . . . .	12
Home Environment . . . . .	13
College Environment . . . . .	14
Individual Characteristics . . . . .	16
Comparison of the Characteristics of High School and College Dropouts . . . . .	20
Summary . . . . .	21
III. METHODS . . . . .	22
Overview . . . . .	22
Pilot Study . . . . .	23
Design of Questionnaire . . . . .	25
Validity & Reliability . . . . .	26
Sampling . . . . .	27
Sampling Non-Respondents . . . . .	29
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	31
Descriptive Data:	
Home Environment . . . . .	31
College Environment . . . . .	35
Personal, Emotional Characteristics . . . . .	39
Academic Characteristics . . . . .	43
Significant Chi-Squares . . . . .	45
Summary . . . . .	52

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	53
Summary of Background and Procedures . . . . .	53
Methods . . . . .	54
Summary of Findings . . . . .	56
Significant Items . . . . .	57
Non-Significant Items . . . . .	57
Conclusions . . . . .	58
Recommendations . . . . .	59
 APPENDIXES:	
A. Questionnaires and Cover Letters Used in Study with Dropouts and Persisters . . . . .	61
B. First Follow-up: Post Card Mailed to Non- Respondents . . . . .	66
C. Tables Showing Comparison of Respondents with a Follow-up Sample of Non-Respondents . . . . .	68
D. Cover Letter Used in Follow-up of Non-Respondents	77
 REFERENCES . . . . .	 78
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 82

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>	
1	Distribution of the 1972 Spring Semester of Western Kentucky University Student Population: Dropout and Persistent Students	28
2	Dropout and Persistent Students Included in Respondent and Non-Respondent Categories	29
3	Distribution of a Sample of Dropouts and Persisters: Age, Class, and Sex	32
4	Frequency (f) Counts, Percentages (%), Chi-Squares (X), and Probability (p) Scores for Dropouts and Persisters: For Home Environment	34
5	Specific Reasons Expressed by Dropouts for Not Returning to Western Kentucky University	36
6	Comparison of the Satisfaction of Living Conditions: Dropouts and Persisters	37
7	Comparison of the Need to Talk with and Evaluation of the Attitude of the Advisors and Faculty Members by Dropouts and Persisters	38
8	Comparison of the Evaluations of the Student Personnel Services by the Dropout and Persistent Students	40
9	A Comparison of Personal Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persistent Students: Frequencies, Percentages, Chi-Squares, and Probabilities	41
10	The Influence of Personal Characteristics while in School Between Dropouts and Persisters	42
11	Comparison of Personal-Emotional Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Frequencies, Percentages, and Chi-Squares	44
12	A Comparison of Academic Characteristics Between Dropout and Persistent Students	46

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
13 Comparison of the Home Environmental Factors Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square	45
14 Comparison of Personal Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square	47
15 Comparison of Personal and Emotional Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Squares	49
16 Comparison of Academic Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square	50
17 Comparison of Personal-Medical Reasons which Influenced Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square	50
18 Evaluation of the Attitude of Advisor and Comparison Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square	51
19-28 Comparisons of Frequencies and Percentages Between Respondents and Sample of Non-Respondents	69-76



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to extend sincere and grateful acknowledgment to all of the individuals who helped to make this study possible.

A very special note of thanks and appreciation is extended to the members of my committee: Dr. Emmett D. Burkeen, chairman; Dr. M. Eugene Harryman; and Dr. Stephen B. Schnacke. The author also wishes to express his appreciation to Mr. Joseph P. Cangemi, Dr. John H. Hillison, and Dr. Wallace K. Nave who were particularly helpful in the early structuring and encouraging of this project. A note of thanks is also deserved for Dr. Jerry Wilder whose invaluable assistance was helpful on many occasions.

Appreciation is also given to Mrs. Maxine Stokes, Miss Teresa O'Shea, and my wife Luba who contributed many hours of typing to this project.

Finally, the author expresses his deepest appreciation to his parents and his wife. Without their assistance, encouragement, love, and expressed confidence in the author, this research project may have never been completed. It is to my loving wife Luba and my mom and dad that this research project is dedicated.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The school dropout problem is a national concern at all levels of education. Since the founding of Harvard, the first institution of higher education in the United States, educators have been confronted with the dilemma of students withdrawing from college, either voluntarily or involuntarily because of influence and motivation from the administration.

Furthermore, the school dropout problem is not a new phenomenon. Schreiber (1968), felt that as an institution, the dropout problem is probably just one day, or several hours, younger than the schools themselves. A paper entitled "The Early Withdrawal of Pupils from School: Its Causes and Its Remedies" was presented to the annual convention of the National Association as early as 1872.

The college dropout problem is an international problem. In Costa Rica each student is interviewed by a social worker before withdrawing from school. As a result, Costa Rica has devoted a major research emphasis to the college dropout phenomena. In Great Britain only the best students are admitted into colleges, and 75% of these receive government aid. Still 20% fail to graduate. The cost of this failure to the British economy is about 20 million dollars a year (\$1,200 per student per year).

Historically, considerations regarding the college dropout were largely viewed from the standpoint of ignorance and the personal

loss experienced by the dropout. Today, however, the problems related to the college dropout have become a loss to the university, loss of talent to society, and, worst of all, personal failure with which the dropout is forced to live.

Approximately 80% of all high school seniors in the United States hope to continue their post secondary education. About 66% of our graduating high school population enroll in some institution of higher education. Approximately 50% of high school seniors set their goal for a college degree. In reality, not nearly all those who aspire to a college degree end up earning one (Withey, 1971).

A review of the literature indicates the average retention for the nation's colleges and universities, out of 100 entering students, is as follows: approximately 40 complete a bachelor's degree within four years, another 20 graduate in succeeding years, and approximately 40 fail to graduate at all. Specifically, the research by Laird (1969) and Pervin (1966) support these findings.

President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965 expressed concern when he stated that 60% of the 10th grade students from poverty neighborhoods of our 15 largest cities drop out before finishing high school. The cost of this withdrawal runs high both for youth and the nation (Hornbostel, 1969).

Data at the national level indicate a variety of reasons why students drop out of college (Laird, 1969; Marshall & George, 1971;

Rose, 1966). Some students leave for academic, personal, environmental, financial, or medical reasons. Seldom do students withdraw for a single reason.

Also, each college and university should be considered as a unique entity. The factors leading to students dropping out may well be unique to any given institution. Western Kentucky University is concerned about the dropout problem amongst its students. A recent study completed by the Office of Academic Affairs (Sutton, 1973) dealt with new freshmen initially registering as full-time students at Western Kentucky University during the 1967 fall semester. The study focused on the number of students who persisted or dropped out. During the fall-1967, spring-1968 (freshman) semesters, 34% of the freshmen dropped out. During the fall-1968, spring-1969 semesters (sophomore year), an additional 17% of this sample student population withdrew. By the end of the fall-1969, spring-1970 semesters (junior year), an additional 6% withdrew. In the fall-1970, spring-1971 semesters (senior year), another 1% dropped out. Approximately another 1% of the sample dropped out during the fifth year (fall-1971, spring-1972). Overall, a total of 58% of students from the sample withdrew from Western Kentucky University. Approximately 2% are currently enrolled in the sixth year (fall-1972, spring-1973) semesters and pursuing a degree. Thirty-seven percent of the students from the sample graduated at various times within the five-year period of the study. Also, after

five years, approximately 1% of the students from the sample received an Associate degree (2-year program) or a Certificate (1-year program).

#### Purpose and Rationale

It appeared that little additional information regarding the withdrawal factors at Western Kentucky University was available. The study by Sutton (1973) was one of few regarding the dropout problem. Thus, it appears that other studies concerned with the dropout problem at Western Kentucky University are needed.

Assuming that the atmosphere at Western Kentucky University is different to some degree from other universities, and further assuming that the students at Western Kentucky University are a unique group, then additional information may be needed about the specific characteristics associated with students withdrawing from Western Kentucky University. As previously stated, little additional information was found regarding dropouts. Therefore, the present study attempted to contribute information relevant to the understanding of the variety of factors associated with the attrition of students from Western Kentucky University. Specifically, the present study examined the following: the home environment, college environment, and the student's personal, emotional, and academic characteristics.

The information from this study may well be utilized to strengthen and improve existing programs or to create new programs

to assist students with problems which may influence their decision regarding withdrawal from Western Kentucky University.

### Statement of the Problem

The specific focus of this study was to examine the differences between the home environment, college environment, and the personal-emotional and academic characteristics of the dropout and persistent students at Western Kentucky University.

Within the design of this study three separate clusters of factors were examined. These factors were as follows:

1. The home environment as expressed by family size, income, parental pressures, size of community and high school graduating class has an influence on persistency.
2. The college environment as expressed by the student's relationship with other students, his advisor, faculty members, and the personnel services has an influence on persistency.
3. The individual's emotional, personality, and academic characteristics as expressed by his feelings of happiness-unhappiness, encouraged-discouraged, healthy-unhealthy, good study habits-poor study habits, self-confidence-lacking self-confidence, adequate ability-inadequate ability, etc., have an influence on persistency.

### Definition of Terms

Dropout Student--a former student who enrolled and officially withdrew during the 1972 spring semester from Western Kentucky University.

Persistent Student--a student who was enrolled during the 1972 spring semester at Western Kentucky University and there was no official evidence of his being withdrawn from Western Kentucky University.

Official Withdrawal--students listed as having completed and submitted a necessary withdrawal form at the Office of the Registrar before the last day beginning the final exams.

Home Environment--factors related to the students which included the number of brothers and sisters in the family, family income, parental pressures and/or encouragements, parental status (living or deceased), population of home community, and the size of the high school graduating class.

College Environment--factors related to the student while in school which may include the relationship with other students, rapport with advisors and other faculty members, and interaction with various student personnel services within the university.

Personal, Emotional, and Academic Characteristics--factors related to personal, health, and home problems; feelings of happiness; discouragement; lack of self-confidence; feeling timid or shy; resentment of authority; lack of responsibility; church attendance; disinterest in school; class attendance; study habits; participation in class discussions; getting along with other students; and lack of skills in basic school subjects.

### Limitations of Study

This study is limited by the fact that the sample is based only on the 1972 spring semester dropouts from Western Kentucky University. This is a biased sample as far as future classes and semesters are concerned.

A possible limitation is that the Pilot Study was made only on the 1971 fall semester dropouts from Western Kentucky University. It is possible that the questionnaire might have been slightly different if fall and spring semester students were used.

Another possible limitation is that the study only involved Western Kentucky University students and may not be reflective of other institutions.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The problem of the college dropout has long been of interest to researchers. Numerous studies have been conducted to determine the reasons why students withdraw from college before graduation. Apparently, many of the reasons for departure from college prior to earning a degree have been broken down into the following three factors: home influences and background, college environmental influences, and the student's personal, emotional, and academic characteristics.

The individual student brings certain skills with him from his various environments. In order for the student to be successful in the college environment, he must have the prerequisite skills to fulfill the requirements of that environment (Starr, Betz, & Menne, 1972). If he has the appropriate skills, the environment becomes a source of reward to him. If he lacks the skills, the college environment then becomes a source of great dissatisfaction; and the probability of withdrawal from it increases.

#### Selection of College

Numerous variables have been found to be related to an individual's college choice and attendance. Primary among these variables are ability, parent's socioeconomic level, high school achievement, self-concept, sex, and place of residence (Bailey, 1966; George & Marshall, 1971).

George (1971), in a report of the National Merit Scholarship finalists, found that a student's selection of a college or university is related to a number of personal and cultural factors. He further reported that choice of an undergraduate institution may be the result of a complex set of factors (including student's goals, abilities, and personality) mingled with parental values, education, financial level, and the parents' idea of the best college or university. In a study of 754 high school seniors he found that the most vital factors influencing college choice were the quality of the institution and the matching of the university curriculum with the individual's needs. In addition, he discovered both socioeconomic status and geographic location were of major importance on choice of college. He also stated that commuter students were found to desire continued dependence on family, while resident students preferred independence.

Meyerson (1966) reported that students sort themselves to some extent according to their images of themselves and of the colleges to which they apply. To some degree the institutions mate student characteristics to institutional characteristics, particularly at the prestigious private schools. But to a large extent, selections are made by accidents of propinquity, pocketbook, and propaganda. Meyerson further stated that students rarely have clear ideas about their options and alternatives.

Kirkpatrick (1971) stated that millions of young men and women have enrolled in institutions of higher education for reasons other than

just the desire for academic learning. He explained that the huge enrollments in colleges and universities are largely due to pressures of diverse nature, such as social pressures, parental and peer group pressures, the hope for military deferment, and the fear that only a college diploma will serve as a key to a successful job in industry.

#### Characteristics of Persistent Students

A serious attempt to delineate outstanding characteristics of the American college graduate was made by the National Opinion Research Center (Vener, 1965). A survey of 35,000 graduating students yielded the following data:

The model graduates of June, 1961, were more likely to be men than women, were in their early twenties, came from families where they were neither the youngest nor the oldest, nor the only child, were unmarried, and were white, native-born Americans from cities of over 100,000. They were members of the middle and upper middle class whose fathers and mothers had at least graduated from high school and whose income was over \$7,500. Their fathers were managers or professionals. The graduates had at least a part-time job during their final year of college and were still members of the Protestant religion in which they had been raised.

They had warm and positive feelings toward their schools and professors, planned to continue their education in graduate school (at least eventually), planned to be some kind of professional (if one counts education from elementary to university as a profession), did not particularly like businessmen, had at least a "B" average, thought of themselves as being in the top one-fourth of their class, and found intellectual and service values the most important things they would look for in their job. While they were in school, they had lived in a dormitory or in off-campus housing and were within four hours driving time from their family.

They thought of themselves as conventional, religious, and politically liberal and were inclined to describe themselves as cooperative, ambitious, happy, fun-loving, easy-going, idealistic, athletic, and cautious.

Rose & Elton (1966) investigated factors related to persistence and withdrawal of entering freshmen at the University of Kentucky. Those who withdrew, but remained in good academic standing, were more maladjusted, more hostile, and less interested in academic affairs than were persisters. Persisters tended to be more submissive to authority and conventional than were those that withdrew. Suczek & Alfert (1966) found that persistent students were more programmatically oriented than withdrawals, while withdrawals demonstrated a greater need for independence.

Rossman & Kirk (1970) found voluntary withdrawals were better oriented intellectually and had higher ability scores than persisters at the University of California. Marks (1967) reported college persisters were overly concerned with satisfying parental expectations. They seemed to suffer anxiety and guilt at the prospect of displeasing their parents. Lehmann (1965) suggested that persistence in college was primarily dependent on an individual's intellectual ability. He added, however, that affective factors, such as attitude, interest, and motivation should not be overlooked.

Turner (1970) found a succinct difference between students who persist and those who drop out:

Persisters were more selective in choosing their colleges and saw more reasons for attending. They studied harder and were less prone to allow social life to interfere with their studies. They tended to be more

intellectual, self-reliant, and open-minded before entering college.

He found that no great significance could be attached to differences in ability or socioeconomic status between the dropout and persistent student. His findings strongly suggested that persisters entered college with the necessary predispositions.

#### Characteristics of College Dropouts

Knoell (1966), in a critical review of studies on the college dropout, found attrition was but one aspect of the more general phenomenon of persistence or withdrawal from college. Other variables of significant importance were the institution which the student attends and the system of higher education of which that institution is a part. According to Knoell, dropping out of college may be viewed as one of the results of the interaction between the student, the institution, and the student's interpersonal variables. The major factors associated with attrition are biological, social, academic, motivational, health, and financial. It was reported that academic ability and achievement are unrelated to attrition, since as many good students as poor ones withdraw from college and since academic difficulties account for only 33% of dropouts. Knoell further explained attrition in the following:

Academic factors, high school preparation and performance in college; motivation, including both lack of it and changes or conflict in it; and finances emerge most clearly from the literature as important determiners of attrition, illness, and injury account for a small but reliable portion of attrition. However, evidence concerning the roles of social factors (such as socioeconomic variables and hometown location and size) and personal-social adjustment is still inconclusive.

### Home Environment

A number of studies suggested that parental influence on children, either directly or indirectly, affects persistence as much as any other single factor. Ridlon (1966) reported parents frequently impose psychological pressures on their children by their own images and attitudes toward college.

Turner (1970) stated that parents' social status exerts an important influence on the educational plans of their children. Parents' occupational status has also been found to exert an influence upon college-going behavior. Bailey (1966) found that the parents of 62.7% of the students who entered college were white collar workers, while the parents of only 27% of those who entered were farm workers. Goetsch (1966) found that when comparing students from different socioeconomic levels, only 20% of the lower income families had children who attended college while 90% of the superior students from high income backgrounds attended institutions of high education. He concluded that income and/or low socioeconomic status are highly related in determining the possibilities of whether one will attend college.

Parents of dropouts had histories of serious disappointments in their careers, scholastic interruption, mental disorders, and other discontinuous experiences, such as divorce, desertion, and death (Levenson, Stockhamer, & Feiner, 1967). Parents of persisters in general had fewer of these types of background experiences. Rose &

Elton (1971) concluded from their study that college dropouts reflect a population of adolescents with diffused (uncertain) identity.

### College Environment

The college environment imposes varied and different social and intellectual challenges upon its students. As an individual moves along Havighurst's ladder of developmental tasks, he is faced with unique challenges and conflicts. According to Pervin (1966), almost all students are exposed to stress upon entering college. Especially in these recent years, where additional stress and tension have been inherited due to greater pressures and competition for admission into college, fierce competition for grades and graduate school placement, and increasing competition for good jobs upon graduation.

Cope (1971) researched the environmental press (stress) approach and its effect on students and found data which suggested that there are major presses within the environment of colleges and universities that confront students. The two major presses were social and academic; a third may be religious. Since students experience difficulties in meeting with any of these presses, whether separately or with a number of them simultaneously, they may be encouraged to drop out.

Thistlethwaite (1959) stated that the college environment is a vital factor determining the student's motivation to pursue higher intellectual development. He further suggested that there are apparent differences in the student's cultures and faculty press which motivate

achievement. Also, factors in the natural sciences seem to differ from those which motivate success in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Pace (1958) considered the concept that cultures in higher education may be viewed as a system of complex environmental press, practices, and policies which may be related to a similar complex of personal needs.

Sievert (1972) found attrition rates at two-year colleges were somewhat higher than at four-year institutions. He reported that 61.6% of the students entering a two-year college failed to receive a degree. Sievert attributed this cause primarily to the lower level of motivation and poorer academic preparation of students entering the two-year colleges. According to Landrith (1971), at least half of the students entering junior colleges withdrew prior to completing their two-year studies. He postulated the key to the problem was related to the faculty of the specific institution. Landrith further stated that both junior college and four-year college faculty fail to understand and empathize with what the student is trying to accomplish in his first and second years of college.

In general, lack of commitment to educational objectives characterize withdrawals. Pervin & Rubin (1967) found discrepancies between the perception of self and the college environment increased the probability of withdrawing from school.



### Individual Characteristics

Turner (1970) stated withdrawal was due to a number of reasons related to personal characteristics of the student, as well as a mismatch between the student and the institution's environmental factors. Turner found the potential dropout displayed certain identifiable characteristics, such as disinterest and non-involvement in college affairs, doubtful vocational goals, rigidity in attitudes, intolerance toward conformity, inadequate adjustment, unrealistic image of college life, unsatisfactory attendance, high level anxiety, fear of change, and social introversion. Vener (1965) stated that scholastic ability, socioeconomic status, and previous high school experience played a vital role in influencing one's future in higher education. Vener's study found 61% of the students at the top quartile of academic ability expressed plans to attend college, while only 24% at the bottom quartile showed similar desires.

Ridlon (1966) stated the college dropout rate has increased at the very time when we are told our high schools are sending the best of their class to college. He feels the answer for students' ineffectiveness lies in two areas: reading skills and personal attitudes (self-consciousness, fear, anxiety, selfishness, aggressiveness, timidity, and lethargy). Ridlon's findings have also been supported in a comprehensive review of the literature completed by Cangemi & Coan (1973).

Savicki (1970), in researching the effects of various factors on withdrawal and achievement of college students, reported that students who withdraw from college for various reasons were psychologically different from those students who continued in college.

Reik (1966) explained the problem of many college dropouts from a clinical perspective. He expressed dropping out in terms of age old conflict of what is expected from the individual by society and what the individual expects in return from life and society. Reik also stated that generally society and parents alike view a student withdrawing from college as failure or a waste of talent. Levenson (1966), from a somewhat different perspective, described withdrawal from college or a university as a psycho-social manifestation of the individual's identity crisis and may be looked at as a way of resolving the crisis and searching for a more meaningful life. He added, such behavior creates a great deal of stress and threat to the dropout's parents, peers, and teachers since his behavior reflects on their lives.

Saranoff (1965), researching the failing college students, reported a number of highly complex and significant phenomenon of underachievement. He summarized a rather typical case of a failing student in the following manner:

...an immature, tensional, and inert person lacking in mature motivation for college work and appreciation of educational values, and without constructively worked out vocational goals. Moreover, he was plagued by intense feelings of inadequacy as a consequence of unresolved sibling rivalry with an older brother. His emotional liabilities were increased by anxiety over his makeup and tended to recoil from the challenge of a university curriculum. Thus, in spite of superior intellectual endowment, his study habits were very insufficient. He fell behind early in the semester, and when confronted with the fact that he was failing, tended to become more negligent in meeting assignments. In this regard, his participation in the marching band was an added impetus toward failure since it was a drain on his time and energy, especially

during the first and for him the most crucial half of the semester. Finally, poor interpersonal relations with his roommate made it more difficult for him to study in his room with any real effectiveness.

Hannah (1971) found college dropouts were more complex, more impulsive, more anxious, less altruistic, less personally integrated, and less willing to exert an effort to make a good impression on either peers or their instructors. Kooker & Bellamy (1969) concluded that graduation as opposed to non-graduation was related to students' anticipated major, anticipated grades, ability estimation, campus organizational membership, vocational goals, attitudes toward coming to college, and educational level of both parents.

Kramer & Kramer (1968) found a significant difference in library usage between dropouts and persisters among college freshmen. There were considerably fewer dropouts amongst those students who frequented the library during their freshman year. Rigidity in thought and action were found to be among the contributing factors leading to college withdrawal in a study by Gibson, Higgins, & Mitchell (1967). Rose & Elton (1966) observed that anxiety, hostility, maladjustment, non-conformity, low interest in literature, dislike for abstract thought, and diverse values were significantly related to leaving college. Nicholi (1967), Harvard University, determined psychiatric consultation was four times as frequent among Harvard dropout students as among the student population in general. According to Nicholi, depression seemed to play a significant role in a student's decision to leave the academic environment.

Landis (1954) tabulated the problems related to college withdrawal mentioned by 238 students in their autobiographies. He concluded that it is possible to predict fairly closely the specific problems that will be disturbing freshmen students on college campus now as well as in the future. Specific problems included the following:

- inferiority complex
- daydreaming
- compensating for inferiority feelings
- disillusionment in changing from the small local group to the larger group
- sex problems
- feelings of insecurity
- undesirable traits of temperament
- introversion
- religious problems
- death in family
- personal fear
- emancipating myself from home
- disillusionment with friends and adults
- financial difficulties
- family problems

Another more detailed list of symptoms and causes associated with dropping out of college has been developed by Cangemi & Coan (1973). It has been said often that the high school dropout is uniquely a product of his environment. Various writers and researchers concerned with the school dropout problem have suggested a number of symptoms and causes connected with youngsters leaving school.

According to Kowalski & Cangemi (1973) the following characteristics are symptoms suggesting potential withdrawal from high school. It appears also that college dropouts have many of the same characteristics as do high school dropouts (Cangemi & Coan, 1973). The following list

based upon the research by Kowalski & Cangemi and also the preceding review of the literature demonstrates some of the common characteristics shared by the high school and the college dropouts.

<u>Characteristics of High School Dropouts</u>	<u>Characteristics of College Dropouts</u>
low reading ability	poor self-concept
low socioeconomic status	low native ability
low scholastic aptitude	financial difficulties
dislikes school	lacking motivation for college
low IQ	parents former school dropouts
parents formerly dropouts	dislike of college environment
pregnancy	peer-relationship problems
frequent absence and tardiness	lack of parental encouragement
retention	inadequate high school preparation
broken home	greater feeling of inferiority
alienation	poor study habits
avoiding participation in extracurricular activities	unwise curricula choice
pupil-teacher relationship	personal difficulties
consistent failure to achieve in regular school work	enrolled for social rather than academic reasons
frequent changes of schools	faculty introduction in beginning college orientation
record of delinquency	division and discord in family life
desire to find employment	
lack of self-confidence	
feelings of insecurity	
poor social adjustment	
emotional maladjustment	
poor work habits	
resentful, defiant	
sex problems	

It appears that withdrawal from college has multiple causation and in general reflects a symptom of difficulties the student is experiencing (Cangemi & Coan, 1973). Attending to the causal factors could in all probability limit the number of college dropouts in the future.

In summary, many factors have been related to success and failure in college. Some are concerned with preparation for the collegiate experience. From research, a variety of factors have been identified which differentiate persisters from non-persisters. The college dropouts frequently suffer from poor motivation, inadequate work habits, and immaturity in attitudes and perceptions. They have low level status and achievement drives, lack self-initiative, are poor decision makers, are disorganized, and lack intellectual independence. They are procrastinators when faced with academic responsibilities and are often unable to identify with or to become involved in college life and related campus activities.

It seems quite evident that the college dropout is one of America's major educational problems. Much concern has been expressed about it. Institutions of higher education need to continue to explore ways of not only keeping students in college until they complete their degrees, but also of giving them a useful and a meaningful education. Without modification in this direction, the problem will become more cancerous.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

As previously identified, college students drop out or persist in college for a variety of reasons. Very little data were found to be available about the Western Kentucky University dropout students. General information about dropout and persistent students could have been obtained by interviewing faculty members, student personnel service workers, and by reviewing existing research and literature. However, such information would have been general and would not have generated an adequate body of specific data. Thus, a need existed to obtain additional in-depth information regarding characteristics of the dropout students at Western Kentucky University.

It was believed that the most accurate data could be obtained by directly asking students at Western Kentucky University about information pertaining to personal background and experiences which could be associated with students dropping out or persisting at Western Kentucky University. Therefore, a survey form of research was selected which allowed for the personal expression by the dropout and persistent students of responses to a variety of items regarding their home environment, college environment, personal, emotional, and academic factors.

#### Overview

The general procedure in this study involved selecting two random samples of Western Kentucky University students. One sample

was composed of dropouts, and the other sample consisted of students who persisted in their education. Further, the design called for the development of two questionnaires which allowed the students to respond to selected items related to the problems of college attendance. Questionnaires were mailed to a sample of dropouts and to a sample of persistent students. This information was compiled into statistical data which when analyzed allowed for comparisons between dropouts and persisters on selected factors.

The names and addresses of the dropout students were randomly selected from a 22-page list of students who officially withdrew from Western Kentucky University during the 1972 spring semester. The names of the persistent students were obtained from a computer print-out provided by the Office of the Registrar. From this list, the random sample of persistent students was selected.

After the samples were selected, questionnaires were mailed to students in both samples. Data were tabulated and analyzed utilizing a variety of statistical procedures.

#### Pilot Study

The original questionnaire was developed using the following procedure. The first draft of the questionnaire came as a result of course work in Education 558S, "Counseling Theory and Practice," which was taken by the researcher in the spring of 1972 at Western Kentucky University. Based upon the review of the literature, a variety of items relating to dropping out and persisting were written.



The initial version of the questionnaire was checked and evaluated by a number of graduate students in an Educational Research class and Counselor Education class and was also critiqued by a number of faculty members from Western Kentucky University. It was found that students could complete the questionnaire within a 15-minute period. Based upon the evaluation and comments of the graduate students and faculty members, the initial questionnaire was somewhat revised. The revision included rephrasing and restructuring of certain items. This revised version was used in the Pilot Study.

On April 14, 1972, the pilot questionnaire was mailed to 200 randomly selected dropouts from the 1971 fall semester.

Sixty-seven questionnaires (33.5%) were returned from the field trial. No attempt was made for a follow-up on the field trial, since the main purpose was to field test the initial questionnaire. Based on review of the limited information gathered by the pilot questionnaire, the researcher concluded that certain additional changes were necessary. Examples of such changes were the deletion of "yes" or "no" responses and the adaptation of a three-point Likert-type scale (i. e., 1 = seldom or never, 2 = sometimes, and 3 = frequently or most of the time). In analyzing the feedback from the field study, it became evident that additional data were needed. Therefore, several additional questions were incorporated pertaining to the individual's personal characteristics and home environment, such as the population of the home community and size of the high school graduating class.

After incorporating the above mentioned changes in the field tested questionnaire, faculty members in the Departments of Educational Research, Counselor Education, and Psychology were consulted. Their input was utilized in achieving the construction of the final questionnaire.

#### Design of Final Questionnaire

The final version of the questionnaire consisted of two separate forms. One form was utilized with the dropout students and the other form was utilized with the persistent students. Both forms were identical in the questions and items asked with exception of items numbered 31-32 which were omitted from the form used with the persistent students. These two items pertained to specific reasons for not returning to Western Kentucky University after the fall semester and only related to dropout students. Throughout the questionnaire and enclosed cover letter, dropout students were referred to as former students. The questionnaire contained eight items which were related to the home environment, fourteen items that related to the college environment for the persistent students and sixteen for the dropouts, and twenty-three items related to personal, emotional, and academic characteristics.

The questionnaires were printed on colored paper, pink to persisters and yellow to dropouts. The questionnaire was printed on one sheet of letter size paper and printed on both sides.

A follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed after a period of elapsed time. Two weeks later, a post card was mailed to further remind the non-respondents.

After the attempted follow-ups, a cutoff date was established. The cutoff date was two weeks after the last follow-up mailing.

Of the 80 dropouts surveyed, 46 responded by completing and returning the questionnaire. Of the 182 persistent students surveyed, 142 responded.

#### Questionnaire Validity and Reliability

Inherently, the questionnaire possesses face validity. Face validity addresses itself to the issue of questionnaire appearance. Each item in the questionnaire dealt with some aspect of the student's persistence in college or his failure to continue in college. No attempt was made to disguise items. Therefore, the questionnaire contains face validity.

Furthermore, nothing in the content of the questionnaire suggested offensive, threatening, or incriminating self-disclosure by the respondents. Therefore, the researcher assumed the respondents would not purposely have reasons to falsify their responses. A cover letter which was enclosed with the questionnaire explained the purpose of the study, explained that respondents need not identify themselves, assured the student that all information would be confidential, and stated that the individual information would be compiled into group data which hopefully could be used to help students at Western Kentucky University. The material in the cover letter further established a basis for assuming that subjects would respond honestly and accurately.

The questionnaire also possessed content validity. Content validity addresses itself to the issue of comprehensiveness. Because the questionnaire was designed as a result of the review of literature and attempted to collect data on several factors related to dropping out or persisting, it was assumed that the questionnaire was sufficiently comprehensive.

A degree of reliability was established consulting with faculty members in construction of the field study questionnaire as well as with the construction of the final questionnaire. The questionnaire was field tested with several groups of students at Western Kentucky University. A field study surveyed dropout students from Western Kentucky University utilizing the field questionnaire. The information from the field study was analyzed and from this analysis it appeared that the questionnaire items were concise, clear, and not vague, thereby enhancing the degree to which students would consistently respond.

### Sampling

As a result of numerous methodological considerations including size of the dropout and persistent population, a randomly selected sample of dropout and persistent students rather than the entire student population of dropouts and persisters was used.

The target population in the study consisted of 276 students who officially withdrew from Western Kentucky University during the 1972 spring semester and 8,780 students at Western Kentucky University who registered and completed the 1972 spring semester.

The sample consisted of 80 students randomly selected from the population of dropouts and 182 students randomly selected from the population of persistent students. This information is summarized in Table 1.

The information (names, addresses, and status) about the students was received from the Office of the Registrar and Office of Undergraduate Advisement at Western Kentucky University.

TABLE 1

Distribution of the 1972 Spring Semester of Western Kentucky University Student Population: Dropout and Persistent Students

	No. in Target Population	No. in Sample	Percent
Dropouts	276	80	29.00%
Persisters	8,780	182	2.72%

On November 27, 1972, the appropriate questionnaire, cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the 182 persistent students and 80 dropout students. A copy of each questionnaire and cover letter used in the study are located in Appendix A.

On January 22, 1972, approximately two months after the questionnaires were mailed, a post card was mailed to each of the non-respondents requesting them to complete their questionnaire. The reminder was mailed to all subjects, both dropout and persistent students, except those that returned the questionnaire and included their name. The names of the non-respondents were easily identified because

to this date, all but two of the respondents included their names on the returned questionnaires. In the event any of the non-respondents had already completed and mailed their questionnaire, they were asked to disregard the reminder. A copy of the post card mailed to the non-respondents is located in Appendix B.

#### Sampling of Non-Respondents

In an attempt to check whether the non-responding dropouts and persisting students differed from the respondents, a follow-up was made. Five students were randomly selected from each group of non-respondents. Comparison of this follow up is located in Appendix C.

A combination of questionnaire and a telephone call were used to follow up the sample of the ten non-respondents. A specially designed cover letter dated March 2, 1973, was developed. The letter appealed to the students and stated the importance of their cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire. A copy of the cover letter is located in Appendix D.

As a result of the follow-up of the non-respondents, questionnaires were received from all five persistent students and four of the dropouts. The fifth dropout of the non-respondent replied by a letter but did not complete the questionnaire.

-----  
Insert Table 2 here  
-----

TABLE 2

Dropout and Persistent Students Included in Respondent and Non-Respondent Categories

	No. in Sample	Respondents No.	%	Non-Respond. No.	Sample of Non-Respond.	No. Respond.
Dropouts	80	46	57.5	34	5	4
Persisters	182	142	78.0	40	5	5

The data from the returned questionnaires were analyzed at the Western Kentucky University Computer Center and Area of Research and Computer Services. The Computer Center was utilized in transferring the data from the questionnaires to punched IBM cards. The Computer Center utilized Western's Program R001 to provide a single column distribution of frequency counts for both groups. Western's Program R014 was utilized by the Area of Research and Computer Services to provide a printout listing frequency distributions and percentages. Program R014 is a generalized cross classification program. Its function is to classify two or more variables, presenting contingency tables and associated statistics. Chi-squares were also completed for the various characteristics. The same program was also used to interpret significant chi-square values for factors identified at .10 level of significance.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter IV presents the findings of data relevant to the statements of the problem. Specific attention was given to the differences between the home environment, college environment, and the personal, emotional, and academic characteristics of the dropout and persistent students at Western Kentucky University.

The first part of the chapter presents descriptive data comparing dropout and persistent students. The second part deals with items in which the inferential statistic chi-square was utilized. Within each part interpretations and explanations were provided for each section of the data presented.

#### Descriptive Data

##### Home Environment

Table 3 presents a distribution of frequencies and percentages of dropouts and persisters by age, class, and sex. Analysis indicated the dropouts were older than persisters. The mean age for dropouts was 23.15 and for persisters, 20.66. To minimize the effect of extreme scores, the median was used as a measure of central tendency. It was found the two groups were quite close together. Dropouts had a median age of 20.5 years and persisters 21 years. For the dropout students, 43.5% were classified as freshmen when they dropped out, 24% sophomores, 24% juniors, and 8.7% seniors. Among persisters 8.5% were



freshmen, 32.4% sophomores, 31.7% juniors, and 26.8% seniors. These data demonstrate over two-thirds of the students dropped out before they reached their junior year. Among the dropout students, 37% were males and 63% females, while among the persistent students 39.4% were males and 60.6% females. Although there were more females in both groups, the ratio of males to females between the dropout and persistent students was approximately the same.

TABLE 3

Distribution of a Sample of Dropouts and Persisters:  
Age, Class, and Sex

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142	
	f	%	f	%
Age: years				
18	1	2.2	12	8.5
19	12	26.0	37	26.0
20	10	21.7	40	28.2
21	5	10.9	27	19.0
22	5	10.9	11	7.8
23	4	8.7	4	2.8
24	0	0	2	1.4
25	1	2.2	2	1.4
26	2	4.3	2	1.4
27	4	8.7	2	1.4
30	0	0	1	0.7
31	0	0	1	0.7
32	1	2.2	0	0
46	1	2.2	0	0
49	1	2.2	1	0.7
Mean Age	23.15		20.66	
Median Age	20.50		21.00	
Class: freshman	20	43.5	12	8.5
sophomore	11	24.0	46	32.4
junior	11	24.0	45	31.7
senior	4	8.7	38	26.8
Sex: males	17	37.0	56	39.4
females	29	63.0	86	60.6

Percentages are rounded off to nearest tenth of percent

Table 4 also presents data relevant to home environment. The analysis of the data indicated that for home environmental factors only, one item was found to differentiate the dropouts from the persistent students. That factor was the size of the high school graduating class. A greater percentage of dropouts tended to come from high schools with a smaller graduating class than persisters. Little difference was found between the number of brothers and sisters in the family of the dropout and persistent students. The researcher concluded, based on chi-square, family size had little influence whether students drop out or persist. With regard to parental status, 89.1% of the parents of the dropouts were living and 8.7% deceased. For the persistent students, 95.8% of their parents were living and 4.2% were deceased. Among both groups the father was the deceased parent, and in one case of a persistent student, both the father and the mother were deceased.

The data also showed that a majority (80.4%) of dropouts were unmarried while in school. Also a majority (81.7%) of persisters were unmarried. Among persisters 39.4% came from home communities of over 20,000 population and 31% came from communities of under 2,500 population. Among dropouts, 34.8% came from communities of over 20,000 population; and 23.9% came from communities of under 2,500 population.

For the item "did some family condition or circumstance have influence upon your leaving school" - influential family condition (financial problems, illness and death, complaining parents, divorces

TABLE 4

Frequency (f) Counts, Percentages (%), Chi-Squares ( $X^2$ ), and Probability (p) Scores for Dropouts and Persisters: For Home Environment

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
No. Brothers & Sisters:					
0	3	6.5	11	7.8	$X^2=1.6378$
1	10	21.7	40	28.2	p =0.5551758
2	11	23.9	40	28.2	
3 or more	22	47.8	51	46.0	
Marital Status:					
married	9	19.6	26	18.3	$X^2=0.0008$
unmarried	37	80.4	116	81.7	p =0.9761856
Parental Status:					
living	41	89.1	136	95.8	$X^2=0.6914$
deceased	4	8.7	6	4.2	p =0.5890993
Which Parent Deceased:					
mother	0	0	0	0	$X^2=0.0463$
father	4	8.7	5	3.5	p =0.9778038
both	0	0	1	0.7	
Size of High School Graduating Class:					
50 or less students	7	15.2	9	6.3	$X^2=5.0562$
51-150 students	12	26.1	56	39.4	p =0.0782996*
151 or more "	27	58.7	77	54.2	
Population of Home Community:					
under 2,500	11	23.9	44	31.0	$X^2=3.4129$
2,500 - 8,000	6	13.0	21	14.8	p =0.3326647
8,000 -20,000	12	26.1	21	14.8	
20,000 - over	16	34.8	56	39.4	
Influential Family Condition:					
yes	18	39.1	38	26.8	$X^2=0.0409$
no	28	60.9	68	47.9	p =0.83414

\* p < .10 but > .05

and personal problems), 39.1% of the dropouts responded "yes," while 60.9% responded "no." For the persistent students the item "did some family condition or circumstance have an impact on you while you were attending school," 26.8% responded "yes" and 47.9% responded "no."

#### College Environment

Table 5, Table 6, Table 7, and Table 8 contain data relevant to the college environment and its influence on dropouts and persistent students.

Data in Table 5 indicated that 15.2% of the dropouts did not return to Western Kentucky University because of transfer to another college closer to home. Of the remaining, 76% of the dropouts did not pursue any further college experience during the semester immediately following their withdrawal. When asked directly the reason for transferring or leaving Western Kentucky University, none of the dropouts indicated they left because a particular program was not offered by the University. However, 4.3% indicated they failed to return because it was less expensive at another institution, 15.2% stated they wished to be closer to home, and 58.7% indicated a variety of reasons which were classified as "other."

TABLE 5

Specific Reasons Expressed by Dropouts for Not Returning to  
Western Kentucky University

Items	Dropouts N=46	
	f	%
Transferred to Another College:		
yes	7	15.2
no	35	76.0
Transferred or Left Because:		
program not offered at WKU	0	0
less expensive elsewhere	2	4.3
closer to home	7	15.2
other ...	27	58.7

Students in both groups were requested to identify their place of residence while a student. Among the dropouts 47.8% indicated that they lived on campus, 47.8% lived off campus, and two students omitted the item. Thus, little difference was observed between the groups with regard to place of residence.

The students were further asked to indicate their satisfaction with their selected place of residence. Among the dropouts 71.7% indicated satisfaction, while 23.9% indicated dissatisfaction. For persisters 79.6% indicated satisfaction while 16.2% indicated dissatisfaction. Data showed that a greater percent of dropouts than persisters expressed dissatisfaction and a greater percent of persisters than dropouts indicated satisfaction. Data relevant to the preceding items have been placed in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Comparison of the Satisfaction of Living Condition: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
Place of Residence:					
On Campus	22	47.8	76	53.5	$\chi^2=0.3460$
Off Campus	22	47.8	60	42.3	$p = 0.5637670$
Satisfaction With Living Condition:					
Satisfied	33	71.7	113	79.6	$\chi^2=0.3525$
Dissatisfied	11	23.9	23	16.2	$p = 0.5600711$

Table 7 presents the results of an analysis of responses to questions related to college environment. The data presented compares the need and evaluation of the rapport with an advisor and faculty member. Dropouts (39.1%) indicated a lesser need than did persisters (25.4%) to talk with advisors. In evaluating the attitude, 21.1% more persisters than dropouts found the attitude of their advisors as "concerned." More dropouts than persisters (32.6% versus 19.7%) felt no need to talk with any faculty members, and 14.3% more persisters than dropouts found the faculty members "concerned" about them. The findings indicate a greater percent of persistent students tended to perceive the need for a closer relationship with their advisors and faculty members than did dropouts.

-----  
 Insert Table 7 here  
 -----

TABLE 7

Comparison of the Need to Talk With and Evaluation of the Attitude of the Advisors and Faculty Members by Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
Need to Talk With Advisor:					
yes	28	60.9	101	71.1	$X^2=2.1520$
no	18	39.1	36	25.4	$p =0.1386784$
Evaluate Attitude of Advisor:					
unconcerned=1	6	13.0	8	5.6	$X^2=6.2455$
slightly concerned =2	10	21.7	30	21.1	$p =0.0430791^{**}$
concerned =3	11	23.9	64	45.0	
Need to Talk With Faculty Member:					
yes	31	67.4	110	77.5	$X^2=2.2761$
no	15	32.6	28	19.7	$p =0.1275924$
Evaluate Attitude of Faculty Member:					
=1	5	10.9	9	6.3	$X^2=2.0598$
=2	7	15.2	21	14.8	$p =0.3585687$
=3	19	41.3	79	55.6	

\*\*  $p < .05$  but  $> .01$

Table 8 indicates both dropouts and persistent students were consistent in their evaluation of the student personnel services. Students were able to respond with from "below average," "average," and "above average." The Counseling Center, Health Services, and Financial Aid Office were most often rated "below average" by persisters, while the Financial Aid Office, the Office of Undergraduate Advisement, and the Registrar's Office were rated lowest by the dropouts. Interestingly, 17.4% more dropouts than persisters found the Counseling Center "average" and

"above average," while 16% more persisters than dropouts found the Office of Undergraduate Advisement "average" and "above average."

-----  
Insert Table 8 here  
-----

### Personal Characteristics

Information in Table 9 indicated dropouts had more health problems than did persisters. Specifically, dropouts and persisters stated as having health problems "sometimes" in an almost even comparison. However, 15.2% of the dropouts expressed having health problems "frequently or most of the time" versus only 1.4% for persisters.

Dropouts were more inclined to have home problems. Among 13% of the dropouts versus 2.8% of the persisters stated having experienced home problems "frequently or most of the time."

Church attendance was more frequent among persisters. By 32.6% of the dropouts it was indicated that they attended church "about half the time" or "almost every Sunday," while 51.4% of the persisters expressed attending church "about half the time" or "almost every Sunday."

-----  
Insert Table 9 here  
-----



TABLE 8

Comparison of the Evaluations of the Student Personnel Services by the Dropout and Persistent Students

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
<b>Counseling Center:</b>					
below average =1	2	4.4	10	7.0	$X^2=0.9493$ $p =0.6282104$
average =2	15	32.6	26	18.3	
above average =3	5	10.9	11	7.8	
<b>Health Services:</b>					
=1	6	13.0	25	17.6	$X^2=0.1021$ $p =0.9501480$
=2	13	28.3	46	32.4	
=3	6	13.0	21	14.8	
<b>Financial Aid:</b>					
=1	6	13.0	22	15.5	$X^2=0.3643$ $p =0.8348823$
=2	11	23.9	30	21.1	
=3	7	15.2	18	12.7	
<b>Reading Lab:</b>					
=1	4	8.7	4	2.8	$X^2=0.2505$ $p =0.8822450$
=2	8	17.4	16	11.3	
=3	5	10.9	11	7.8	
<b>Registrar:</b>					
=1	4	8.7	10	7.0	$X^2=0.2945$ $p =0.8635366$
=2	21	45.7	72	50.7	
=3	8	17.4	29	20.4	
<b>Student Affairs:</b>					
=1	2	4.4	13	9.2	$X^2=2.0803$ $p =0.3548305$
=2	11	23.9	27	19.0	
=3	6	13.0	11	7.8	
<b>Tutorial Program:</b>					
=1	4	8.7	8	5.6	$X^2=0.0600$ $p =0.8065800$
=2	4	8.7	22	15.5	
=3	0	0	2	1.4	
<b>Undergraduate Advisement:</b>					
=1	7	15.2	19	13.4	$X^2=1.3744$ $p =0.5078241$
=2	10	21.7	40	28.2	
=3	5	10.9	29	20.4	

TABLE 9

A Comparison of Personal Characteristics Between Dropout and Persistent Students: Frequencies, Percentages, Chi-Squares, and Probabilities

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
Had Health Problems:					
seldom or never=1	29	63.0	112	78.9	$X^2=15.1137$ $p = 0.0008729***$
sometimes=2	9	19.6	27	19.0	
frequently or most of the time=3	7	15.2	2	1.4	
Had Home Problems:					
=1	31	67.4	104	73.2	$X^2= 7.5920$ $p = 0.0221783**$
=2	8	17.4	33	23.2	
=3	6	13.0	4	2.8	
Church Attendance:					
never=0	10	21.7	30	21.1	$X^2= 5.7242$ $p = 0.1249850$
once in awhile=1	20	43.5	39	27.5	
about half the time=2	6	13.0	25	17.6	
almost every Sun=3	9	19.6	48	33.8	

\*\*  $p < .05$  but  $> .01$

\*\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 10 indicates the influence of personal characteristics on dropouts and persistent students. In regard to a number of listed items, students were instructed to check any one, all, or none of the items which had an influence on them while they were in school. Dropouts indicated they had more medical problems, higher percent of marriages, and fewer friends. Counterwise, a greater percentage of the persistent students than dropouts expressed a dislike for their teachers.

-----  
Insert Table 10 here  
-----

TABLE 10

The Influence of Personal Characteristics While in School Between Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142	
	f	%	f	%
Financial	16	34.8	54	38.0
Medical	14	30.4	10	7.0
Marriage	9	19.6	20	14.1
Few Friends	6	13.0	7	4.9
Disliked Teachers	6	13.0	34	23.9
Other Vocation	7	15.2	21	14.8
Failure in Grades	11	23.9	44	31.0
Joined U.S. Armed Services	1	2.2	9	6.3

#### Personal, Emotional Characteristics

Table 11 presents data related to the personal, emotional characteristics of the students. In general, both dropouts and persisters indicated similar feelings regarding their degree of happiness while in college. However, a difference is observed in the frequency with which dropouts responded that they were "frequently" unhappy (15.2% versus 9.2%).

Among 21.7% dropouts versus 6.3% of the persisters indicated "frequently or most of the time" being discouraged while in school. Approximately 16% more persisters than dropouts expressed lacking self-confidence "seldom or never," and "sometimes." But 19.6% dropouts versus 7% persisters indicated "frequently" or "most of the time" lacking self-confidence.

More persisters (50.8%) than dropouts (39.1%) admitted that they felt timid or shy "frequently" or "sometimes." However, a greater percentage of dropouts indicated they lacked responsibility "more frequently" than did persisters. It seems the dropout was not a fully participating member of the student body. Dropouts (41.3%) versus persisters (27.5%) stated "seldom or never" being involved in extracurricular activities, while 15.3% more persisters than dropouts stated they were "sometimes" involved in outside activities. A great deal of similarity in the percent of dropouts and persisters was noted in regard to getting along with other students. Another finding of the study revealed more persisters (35.2%) than dropouts (21.7%) expressed "frequently" or "sometimes" resented authority.

-----  
 Insert Table 11 here  
 -----

#### Academic Characteristics

The major differences between dropouts and persisters as indicated in Table 12 were: dropouts participated in fewer class discussions, attended fewer classes, and were more disinterested in school. Study habits did not distinguish the characteristics of dropouts from persistent students. A large majority of both the dropouts (67.4%) and the persisters (78.2%) categorized themselves as "sometimes," "frequently," or "most of the time" having poor study habits. In regard

TABLE 11

Comparison of Personal-Emotional Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Frequencies, Percentages, and Chi-Squares

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
Unhappy in College:					
seldom or never=1	18	39.1	58	40.9	$X^2=1.3145$ p =0.5232784
sometimes=2	21	45.7	70	49.3	
frequently or most of the time=3	7	15.2	13	9.2	
Became Discouraged:					
=1	8	17.4	34	23.9	$X^2=9.4430$ p =0.0092205***
=2	27	58.7	98	69.0	
=3	10	21.7	9	6.3	
Lacked Self-Confidence:					
=1	18	39.1	51	35.9	$X^2=7.5126$ p =0.0230521
=2	18	39.1	80	56.3	
=3	9	19.6	10	7.0	
Felt Timid or Shy:					
=1	27	58.7	68	47.9	$X^2=6.1400$ p =0.0453700**
=2	11	23.9	61	43.0	
=3	7	15.2	11	7.8	
Lacked Responsibility:					
=1	28	60.9	102	71.8	$X^2=6.1416$ p =0.0453739**
=2	13	28.3	36	25.4	
=3	4	8.7	2	1.4	
Involvement in Outside Activities:					
=1	19	41.3	39	27.5	$X^2=4.0172$ p =0.1324592
=2	15	32.6	68	47.9	
=3	11	23.9	34	23.9	
Got Along With Other Students:					
=1	1	2.2	1	0.7	$X^2=0.8533$ p =0.6587310
=2	6	13.0	12	8.5	
=3	38	82.6	128	90.1	
Resented Authority:					
=1	35	76.0	95	64.0	$X^2=3.6218$ p =0.1618600
=2	7	15.2	45	31.7	

\*\* p < .05 but > .01

\*\*\* p < .01

to possession of skills basic in academic subjects, dropouts felt that they were "more frequently" deficient than persisters. Regarding class attendance, as many as 4.4% of the dropouts indicated they "seldom or never" attended classes, while 17.4% indicated they "sometimes" attended. Among the persisters only .7% stated they "seldom or never" attended classes and 4.4% stated they "sometimes" attended.

-----  
 Insert Table 12 here  
 -----

#### Significant Chi-Squares

As mentioned earlier in the preceding section, this section deals with the presentation and interpretation of significant items.

Only one item generated a significant chi-square for the home environmental factors. The item dealt with the size of the high school graduating class. A significant difference was found between the dropouts and persisters, with a greater percentage of dropouts having graduated from high schools with 50 or less students in the graduating class. This data are presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Comparison of the Home Environmental Factors Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Item	Dropouts N=46 % X	Persisters N=142 % X	Chi-Square and Probability
Size of High School Graduating Class:			
50 or less students	15.2	6.3	$X^2=5.06$
51-150 students	26.1	39.4	$p =0.07830^*$
151 or more "	58.7	54.2	

\*  $p < .10$

TABLE 12

A Comparison of Academic Characteristics Between  
Dropout and Persistent Students

Items	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Chi-Square and Probability
	f	%	f	%	
<b>Disinterested in School:</b>					
seldom or never =1	16	34.8	62	43.7	$X^2=6.4787$ $p =0.0383547^{**}$
sometimes =2	18	39.1	67	47.2	
frequently or most of the time =3	10	21.7	12	8.5	
<b>Had Poor Study Habits:</b>					
=1	13	28.3	29	20.4	$X^2=2.5988$ $p =0.2722327$
=2	24	52.2	95	66.9	
=3	7	15.2	16	11.3	
<b>Participated in Class Discussions:</b>					
=1	9	19.6	14	9.9	$X^2=6.2871$ $p =0.0421945^{**}$
=2	16	34.8	79	55.6	
=3	19	41.3	48	33.8	
<b>Lacked Skills in Basic School Subjects:</b>					
=1	25	54.4	82	57.8	$X^2=2.8581$ $p =0.2385443$
=2	15	32.6	52	36.6	
=3	5	10.9	6	4.2	
<b>Class Attendance:</b>					
=1	2	4.4	1	0.7	$X^2=5.7242$ $p =0.1249850$
=2	8	17.4	6	4.2	
=3	36	78.3	134	94.4	

\*\*  $p < .05$  but  $> .01$

In the analysis of data in Table 14 a significant chi-square was obtained which indicated that the distribution between the dropouts and persisters was significant at the .10 level. It was observed that 15.6% of the dropouts "frequently or most of the time" had health problems in comparison to 1.4% of the persistent students. In regards to home problems (financial, illness, death, personal, etc.), both dropouts (68.9%) and persisters (73.8%) expressed high percentages in "seldom or never" having home problems. However, 13.3% dropouts versus 2.8% persisters indicated "frequently or most of the time" having home problems. Thus, health and home problems were identified as important factors contributing to students dropping out of school.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Personal Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters:  
Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Items	Dropouts N=46 % X <sup>2</sup>	Persisters N=142 % X <sup>2</sup>	Chi-Square and Probability
Had Health Problems:			
seldom or never =1	64.4	79.4	X <sup>2</sup> =15.11
sometimes =2	20.0	19.2	p = 0.00087***
frequently or most of the time =3	15.6	1.4	
Had Home Problems:			
=1	68.9	73.8	X <sup>2</sup> = 7.59
=2	17.8	23.4	p = 0.02218**
=3	13.3	2.8	

\*\* p < .05 but > .01

\*\*\* p < .01



Results of the chi-squares as indicated in Table 15 revealed that persisters experienced discouragement "more frequently" than dropouts while in college. Among persisters, 92.9% indicated they lacked self-confidence "seldom or sometimes" versus 80% for dropouts in these same categories. However, 20% of the dropouts versus 7.1% of the persisters expressed lacking self-confidence "frequently or most of the time." Interestingly, 77.4% of the dropouts versus 91.5% of the persisters stated they were "seldom or sometimes" disinterested in school. However, 22.7% of the dropouts versus only 8.5% of the persisters indicated they were "frequently or most of the time" disinterested in school. Among 24.4% of the dropouts versus 43.6% of the persisters indicated they felt timid or shy "sometimes," yet 15.6% of the dropouts versus 7.9% of the persisters expressed feeling timid or shy "frequently or most of the time."

The comparisons in this table indicate that students who persist in their college career are often more discouraged with school than dropouts. However, dropouts are clearly disinterested and more dropouts lack self-confidence "frequently or most of the time" than persistent students.

-----  
Insert Table 15 here  
-----

TABLE 15

Comparison of Personal and Emotional Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Items	Dropouts N=46 % X <sup>2</sup>	Persisters N=142 % X <sup>2</sup>	Chi-Square and Probability
Discouraged While in School:			
seldom or never =1	24.1	17.8	X <sup>2</sup> =9.44
sometimes =2	69.5	60.0	p =0.00922***
frequently or most of the time =3	6.4	32.2	
Lacked Self-Confidence:			
=1	40.0	36.2	X <sup>2</sup> =7.51
=2	40.0	56.7	p =0.02305**
=3	20.0	7.1	
Disinterested in School:			
=1	36.4	44.0	X <sup>2</sup> =6.48
=2	41.0	47.5	p =0.03835**
=3	22.7	8.5	
Felt Timid or Shy:			
=1	60.0	48.6	X <sup>2</sup> =6.14
=2	24.4	43.6	p =0.04537**
=3	15.6	7.9	

\*\* p < .05 but > .01

\*\*\* p < .01

An analysis of the data in Table 16 indicates that dropouts clearly attended significantly fewer classes than did persistent students. A total of 21.8% of the dropouts attended classes "sometimes" or "seldom" versus 5% for the persistent students. Approximately 10.6% more of the dropouts than the persisters indicated that they "seldom" participated in classroom discussions. Surprisingly, 9.2% more of the dropouts than persistent students indicated they participated "frequently or most of the time" in classroom discussion. However, 36.4% of the dropouts indicated they "sometimes" participated in class discussions versus 56% of persistent students.

TABLE 16

Comparison of Academic Characteristics Between Dropouts and Persisters:  
Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Items	Dropouts N=46 % X <sup>2</sup>	Persisters N=142 % X <sup>2</sup>	Chi-Square and Probability
Class Attendance:			
seldom or never =1	4.4	0.7	X <sup>2</sup> =8.28
sometimes =2	17.4	4.3	p =0.01595**
frequently or most of the time =3	78.3	95.0	
Participated in Classroom Discussion:			
=1	20.5	9.9	X <sup>2</sup> =6.29
=2	36.4	56.0	p =0.04219**
=3	43.2	34.0	

\*\* p < .05 but > .01

Table 17 presents data relative to the percentage of significant chi-square between dropouts and persistent students for personal-medical reasons. The comparison focuses on the personal-medical reasons which have been expressed as being influential on dropouts and persistent students. Surprisingly, 23.4% more persisters than dropouts experienced medical influences while in school.

TABLE 17

Comparison of Personal-Medical Reasons Which Influenced Dropouts and  
Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Items	Dropouts N=46 % X <sup>2</sup>	Persisters N=142 % X <sup>2</sup>	Chi-Square and Probability
Medical Reasons:			
checked	69.6	93.0	X <sup>2</sup> =15.04
(blank) omitted	30.4	7.0	p = 0.00030***

\*\*\* p < .01

Persistent students found the attitude of their advisor as significantly more concerned than did dropouts. The difference between the two groups was significant. More dropouts (14.4%) than persisters believed advisors maintained an unconcerned attitude, while 22% more persisters than dropouts found their advisor's attitude was one of concern. The percentages and comparisons are located in Table 18.

TABLE 18

Evaluation of the Attitude of Advisor and Comparison Between Dropouts and Persisters: Percentages of Significant Chi-Square

Items	Dropouts N=46 % X <sup>2</sup>	Persisters N=142 % X <sup>2</sup>	Chi-Square and Probability
Evaluating Attitude of Advisor:			
unconcerned =1	22.2	7.8	X <sup>2</sup> =6.25
slightly concerned =2	37.0	29.4	p =0.04308**
concerned =3	40.7	62.7	

\*\* p < .05 but > .01

## SUMMARY

The study focused on the differences between the home environment, college environment, and the personal, emotional, and academic characteristics of dropout and persistent students at Western Kentucky University.

Of the 43 items presented to both samples, 32 items were found to be non-significant, and 11 items were found to be significant. The significant items were as follows:

Home Environment Factors: size of high school graduating class, significant at .10.

College Environment Factors: evaluation of the attitude of advisors, significant at .05.

Personal, Emotional, and Academic Factors:  
health problems, significant at .01;  
home problems, significant at .05;  
discouraged while in school, significant at .01;  
lacked self-confidence, significant at .05;  
disinterested in school, significant at .05;  
felt timid or shy, significant at .05;  
attended classes, significant at .05;  
participated in classroom discussion, significant at .05;  
medical reasons, significant at .01.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of Chapter V are threefold: (1) to present a general summary of the background and procedures of the present investigation, (2) to present the conclusion of the study, and (3) to present the recommendations based on the conclusions of the study.

#### Summary of Background and Procedures

The school dropout problem has been a national as well as an international concern at all levels of education. Furthermore, the dropout problem is not a new phenomenon. As early as 1872 the problem of dropouts was discussed at the annual convention of the National Education Association.

A review of the literature indicated approximately 40% of entering college students graduate within four years, another 20% graduate in succeeding years, and approximately 40% fail to graduate at all (Laird, 1969 & Pervin, 1966). Also, data at the national level indicate a variety of reasons for students dropping out of college (Laird, 1969; Marshall & George, 1971; & Rose, 1966). Students withdraw for personal, environmental, financial, academic, or medical reasons. Furthermore, the data have indicated students seldom leave for a single reason.

Western Kentucky University has been concerned about its dropout problem. A recent study completed on a sample of full-time

freshmen students at Western Kentucky University indicated 58% of the sample withdrew during a five-year period (Sutton, 1973).

Little additional information regarding withdrawal factors of students at Western Kentucky University was available. Thus, it appeared that other studies concerned with the dropout problem at Western Kentucky University were needed. The present study examined the responses of a sample of dropouts and persistent students regarding their home environment, college environment, and the personal, emotional, and academic characteristics of students. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to identify and contrast the differences between the two groups' responses to a number of questionnaire items related to their home environment, college environment, and personal, emotional, and academic characteristics.

#### Methods

Since very little data were available about Western Kentucky University dropout students, a survey form of research was adopted for use in this study.

The general procedure in this study utilized the random selection of a sample of dropouts and a sample of persistent students. The design called for the development of a questionnaire. The information was compiled into statistical data which when analyzed allowed for comparisons between dropouts and persistent students on selected questionnaire items.

A pilot study preceded the present study. The first draft of the questionnaire was developed in the spring of 1972. The initial version of the questionnaire was checked and evaluated by a number of students and also critiqued by a number of faculty members.

In April, 1972, the pilot questionnaire was mailed to 200 randomly selected dropouts from the 1971 fall semester. Sixty-seven questionnaires (33.5%) were returned. Based on review of the limited information gathered by the pilot questionnaire, the researcher further modified the content of the questionnaire.

Several different types of questions were incorporated into the questionnaire. Once again, faculty members were consulted in the final modifications of the questionnaire. Their input was utilized in completion of the revised questionnaire. The final version of the questionnaire contained items which related to the dropouts' and persistent students' home environment, college environment, and the personal, emotional, and academic characteristics.

The names, addresses, and status of the students were obtained from the Office of Undergraduate Advisement and the Registrar's Office. On November, 1972, the appropriate questionnaire, cover letter, and self-addressed, stamped envelopes were mailed to 80 dropouts and to 182 persistent students. On February, 1973, non-respondents were followed up with a post card as a reminder and another follow-up questionnaire with a cover letter.



In March, 1973, a follow-up was made to check whether the non-respondents differed from the respondents. Five students were randomly selected from each group of non-respondents. A combination of a mailed questionnaire and a telephone call were utilized wherever necessary.

Of the 80 dropouts surveyed, 46 responded. Of the 182 persistent students surveyed, 142 responded. As a result of the follow-up of non-respondents, all five persistent students and four out of the five dropouts responded.

The data from the returned questionnaires were transferred to IBM cards at the Western Kentucky University Computer Center. The Area of Research and Computer Services utilized Programs R001 and R014 to provide necessary statistical information.

#### Summary of Findings

As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to examine the variety of factors associated with attrition of students from Western Kentucky University. Specifically, the present study examined from a sample of dropouts and persistent students, their home environment, college environment, and the student's personal, emotional, and academic characteristics. The focus of this study was to compare the differences between these two groups. There are significant differences in certain characteristics between the dropout and persistent students. In analyzing the data, 43 items were investigated for significant differences. Of these, 11 were found to be significant, and 32 were found to be non-significant. The significant and non-significant items are as follows:

Significant Items Related to Withdrawal from College

1. Size of high school graduating class
2. Became discouraged
3. Lacked self-confidence
4. Home problems
5. Health problems
6. Felt timid or shy
7. Lacked responsibility
8. Disinterested in school
9. Participation in class discussions
10. Attitude of the advisor

Non-Significant Items Related to Withdrawal from College

1. Number of brothers and sisters in family
2. Married or unmarried while in school
3. Parental status (living or deceased)
4. Family conditions or circumstances
5. Size of home community
6. Unhappy in college
7. Resented authority
8. Involvement in outside activities
9. Study habits
10. Getting along with other students
11. Skills in basic school subjects
12. Church attendance
13. Satisfaction with living condition
14. Living on campus or off campus
15. Personal-financial
16. Personal-medical
17. Personal-few friends
18. Personal-marriage
19. Personal-dislike certain teachers
20. Personal-decided on another vocation
21. Personal-failed to make good grades
22. Personal-joined U. S. Armed Services
23. Academic-(evaluation of) - Counseling Center
24. Academic-Health Service
25. Academic-Financial Aid
26. Academic-Reading Laboratory
27. Academic-Registrar's Office
28. Academic-Student Affairs Office
29. Academic-Tutorial Program
30. Academic-Undergraduate Advisement
31. Need to talk to Advisor
32. Need to talk with any faculty member
33. Attitude of faculty member

## Conclusions

The results of the present study appear to warrant the following conclusions based on the analysis of data relative to the dropouts and persistent students from the 1972 spring semester at Western Kentucky University.

1. Personal, emotional factors were the major category associated with students dropping out of college. Personal and health reasons seemed to be the most pervasive cause followed by discouragement while in school, class attendance, home problems, a lack of self-confidence, disinterested in school, classroom participation, attitude of advisor and feelings of timidity or shyness.
2. Thus, students with personal, health, and emotional problems can be identified as potential dropouts.
3. Another finding of this study showed that persistent students had more unfavorable ratings of their teachers than did dropouts.
4. None of the student personnel services were rated high (above average) by either dropouts or persistent students. It was also apparent that dropouts failed to utilize the student personnel services while in school maximally.
5. Academic programs at the university are of sufficient number, availability, and flexibility. No student withdrew because of the lack of a desired program.

## Recommendations

1. The University should attempt to help students who come to college with personal, emotional, and home problems since such problems are often the cause of students withdrawing from college. Thus, the University must provide a strong program of personal counseling conjoint with other student personnel programs.
2. Some students leave school because of medical problems. Institutions of higher education must attempt to develop alternatives for such students to complete their education. The development of new programs to meet this need is essential.
3. A careful evaluation by related student personnel services should be made with an emphasis on identifying potential dropouts before they become dropouts.
4. Improved academic guidance for students on the part of University personnel appears to be warranted.
5. University faculty should be selected not only for their ability to teach but also for the capability to act as effective student advisors. Of the existing faculty members, only those who are capable and want to work with students as advisors should be allowed to do so.
6. An improved and expanded orientation program should be developed for faculty and advisors concerning the psychodynamics of student behavior and its relationship to persistence in college. Too few college and university personnel are aware of the seriousness of their roles in assisting students to stay and graduate from college.

7. A follow-up study should be made on dropouts to determine how many eventually return to complete their education. The differences between those students who return and those who don't may be significant.

APPENDIX: A

Questionnaires and Cover Letters Used in Study with  
Dropouts and Persisters



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

November 27, 1972

Dear former Western Student,

Each semester a number of undergraduate students leave school without graduating. At Western, the withdrawal rate has been comparable to the national average. Still, this is a matter of some concern here at Western.

Data at the national level indicates no one really knows why these students drop out of school. We know some students leave for academic, financial, or medical reasons. Yet, this explains only a portion of the many reasons why a student like yourself leaves school. My interest is to find out the reasons why some students withdraw and to determine what steps can be taken to relieve the problems which confront students, causing them to drop out.

In an effort to determine why students leave Western, I am enclosing a questionnaire. Because of your experiences, you have been selected as an individual who could give me some information concerning this problem. Please take the five minutes that it would require you to complete the questionnaire and return it to me by December 8, 1972. This information will be compiled into statistical data and possibly be utilized to strengthen and improve existing programs or to create new programs to assist students with problems similar to yours. A place is provided for your name if you wish to include it. If not, feel free to leave that space blank. All replies will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Cash Kowalski*

Cash Kowalski  
Graduate Student

1-3. Name \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Class Fr. Jr.  
Soph. Sr. 5. Age \_\_\_ 6. Sex: male  
female

DIRECTIONS please read each question. Answer each question with what you believe to be the correct response for you.

I. Personal Data: This information pertains to you before you withdrew from Western.

7. \_\_\_ Number of brothers and sisters in your family?

8. Were you married while attending school? \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_

9. Were either of your parents deceased (not living) at the time you withdrew from school? \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_. 10. If yes, which one? \_\_\_mother, father\_\_\_, both\_\_\_.

11. Do you feel that some family condition or circumstance had influence upon your leaving school? \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_. If yes, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

12. Check the size of your high school graduating class: \_\_\_50 or less students, \_\_\_51 - 150 students, \_\_\_151 or more.

13. Check the approximate population of your home community: \_\_\_under 2,500, \_\_\_2,500 - 8,000, \_\_\_8,000 - 20,000, \_\_\_20,000 and over.

II. Describe yourself as you feel you were prior to withdrawing from school. Indicate by circling one of the following numbers:

- 3. frequently or most of the time
- 2. sometimes.
- 1. seldom (or never).

- |  |          |   |                        |
|--|----------|---|------------------------|
| 14. Unhappy in college?                | 3. 2. 1. | 25. Participated in classroom discussions?  | 3. 2. 1.               |
| 15. Became discouraged?                | 3. 2. 1. | 26. Got along with other students?          | 3. 2. 1.               |
| 16. Lacked self-confidence?            | 3. 2. 1. | 27. Lacked skills in basic school subjects? | 3. 2. 1.               |
| 17. Disinterested in school?           | 3. 2. 1. | 28. Had home problems?                      | 3. 2. 1.               |
| 18. Felt timid or shy?                 | 3. 2. 1. | 29. Attended church regularly?              |                        |
| 19. Resented authority?                | 3. 2. 1. |   | 3. almost every Sunday |
| 20. Lacked responsibility?             | 3. 2. 1. |   | 2. about half the time |
| 21. Had health problems?               | 3. 2. 1. |   | 1. once in awhile      |
| 22. Involvement in outside activities? | 3. 2. 1. | 30. Other? (Please explain) _____           | 0. never               |
| 23. Attended classes?                  | 3. 2. 1. | _____                                       |                        |
| 24. Had poor study habits?             | 3. 2. 1. | _____                                       |                        |



III. Specific reasons for not returning to Western after the fall semester.

31. Transferred to another college or university \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_?

32. \_\_\_program not offered at Western \_\_\_wanted a college closer to home  
\_\_\_less expensive at another school \_\_\_any other reason (Please explain)\_\_\_\_\_

33. I was satisfied\_\_\_, dissatisfied\_\_\_with living condition? 34. Lived: on campus\_\_\_, off campus\_\_\_.

35.-42. Personal reasons for not continuing program. Please check all those that apply to your situation.

\_\_\_financial reasons \_\_\_decided on vocation not requiring college education  
\_\_\_medical \_\_\_failure to make good grades  
\_\_\_marriage \_\_\_joined U. S. Armed Services  
\_\_\_had few friends Other reasons (explain)\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_disliked certain teachers \_\_\_\_\_

IV. 43.-64. Evaluation of Services:  
Please check the services you used while at Western, and evaluate them:  
Indicate by circling one of the following numbers:

3. Above Average  
2. Average  
1. Below Average

\_\_\_Counseling Center 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Health Service 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Financial Aid 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Reading Laboratory 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Registrar's Office 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Student Affairs 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Tutorial Program 3. 2. 1.  
\_\_\_Undergraduate Advisement 3. 2. 1.

\_\_\_Advisor: Did you ever find a need or reason to talk or discuss some problem with your advisor at Western? \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_.  
If yes, please evaluate (rate) his attitude toward you by circling one of the following numbers: 3. concerned, 2. slightly concerned, 1. unconcerned.

\_\_\_Faculty member: Did you find a need to talk with or discuss some problem with any faculty member (or instructor) at Western? \_\_\_yes, no\_\_\_.  
If yes, please evaluate his attitude toward you.  
3. concerned, 2. slightly concerned, 1. unconcerned.



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

November 27, 1972

Dear Western Student,

Each semester a number of undergraduate students leave school without graduating. At Western, the withdrawal rate has been comparable to the national average. Still, this is a matter of concern at Western.

Data at the national level indicates no one really knows why these students drop out of school. We know some students leave for academic, financial or medical reasons. Yet, this explains only a portion of the many reasons why students leave school. My interest is to find the reasons why students withdraw and compare the findings with students like yourself who have remained at Western. Hopefully, we can determine some steps that can be taken to relieve the problems which confront students, causing them to drop out and assist those who remain at Western.

In order to be able to compare dropout students with those who remain at Western, I am enclosing a questionnaire.

Because of your experiences, you have been selected as an individual who could give me some information concerning this problem. Please take the 5 minutes that it would require you to complete this questionnaire and return it to me by December 8, 1972. This information will be compiled into statistical data and possibly be utilized to strengthen and improve existing programs or to create new programs to assist students whose problems are similar to yours. A place is provided for your name if you wish to include it. If not, feel free to leave that space blank. All replies will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Cash Kowalski*

Cash Kowalski  
Graduate Student

Enclosure

## APPENDIX: B

First Follow-up: Post Card Mailed to Non-Respondents

January 22, 1973

Dear Student:

Recently you were sent a letter and a questionnaire requesting information about your experiences at Western Kentucky University during the Spring semester 1972.

Probably due to the holidays, etc., you were delayed in responding. Since your information is an important part of this project, your response and assistance are valuable.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could take the few minutes to complete the form previously mailed to you and return it in the self-addressed envelope by January 31, 1973.

In case you have already responded please disregard this reminder. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Cash Kowalski  
Graduate Student

Office of Undergraduate Advisement  
Western Kentucky University  
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

## APPENDIX: C

Tables Showing Comparison of Respondents with a  
Follow-up Sample of Non-Respondents

TABLE 19

Comparison of Data From Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents-  
Dropouts and Persisters by: Age, Class, and Sex

Items	Respondents				Sample of Non-Respondents				
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Age: years									
18	1	2.2	12	8.5	0	0	1	20	
19	12	26.0	37	26.0	2	50	1	20	
20	10	21.7	40	28.2			3	60	
21	5	10.9	27	19.0	1	25			
22	5	10.9	11	7.8	1	25			
23	4	8.7	4	2.8					
24	0	0	2	1.4					
25	1	2.2	2	1.4					
26	2	4.3	2	1.4					
27	4	8.7	2	1.4					
30	0	0	1	0.7					
31	0	0	1	0.7					
32	1	2.2	0	0					
46	1	2.2	0	0					
49	1	2.2	1	0.7					
Mean Age:	23.2		20.7		20.3		19.4		
Median Age:	20.5		21.0		20.0		20.0		
Class:									
Freshman	20	43.5	12	8.5	2	50	0	0	
Sophomore	11	24.0	46	32.4	1	25	2	40	
Junior	11	24.0	45	31.7	1	25	2	40	
Senior	4	8.7	38	26.8	0	0	1	20	
Sex:									
Males	17	37.0	56	39.4	2	50	0	0	
Females	29	63.0	86	60.6	2	50	5	100	

Percentages rounded to nearest tenth of percent

TABLE 20

Comparison of Home Environmental Factors Between Respondents and  
Sample Non-Respondents for the Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Sample of Non-Respondents				
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
No. Brothers & Sisters:									
0	3	6.5	11	7.8	0	0	0	0	
1	10	21.7	40	28.2	0	0	1	20	
2	11	23.9	40	28.2	2	50	2	40	
3 or more	22	47.8	51	46.0	2	50	2	40	
Marital Status:									
married	9	19.6	26	18.3	0	0	1	20	
unmarried	37	80.4	116	81.7	4	100	4	80	
Parental Status:									
living	41	89.1	136	95.8	4	100	5	100	
deceased	4	8.7	6	4.2	0	0	0	0	
Which Parent Deceased:									
mother	0	0	0	0	0		0		
father	4	8.7	5	3.5	0		0		
both	0	0	1	0.7	0		0		
Size of High School Graduating Class:									
50 or less students	7	15.2	9	6.3	1	25	2	40	
51-150 students	12	26.1	56	39.4	2	50	2	40	
151 or more "	27	58.7	77	54.2	1	25	1	20	
Population of Home Community:									
under 2,500	11	23.9	44	31.0	1	25	3	60	
2,500- 8,000	6	13.0	21	14.8	2	50	0		
8,000-20,000	12	26.1	21	14.8	1	25	0		
20,000- over	16	34.8	56	39.4	0		2	40	
Influential Family Condition:									
yes	18	39.1	38	26.8	3	75	3	60	
no	28	60.9	68	47.9	1	25	2	40	

TABLE 21

Comparison of Factors Expressed for Not Returning to School Between  
Respondent Dropouts and a Sample of Non-Respondent Dropouts

Items	Respondents		Non-Respondents	
	Dropouts N=46		Dropouts N=4	
	f	%	f	%
Transferred To Another College:				
Yes	7	15.2	0	0
No	35	76.0	3	75
Transferred Or Left Because:				
Program Not Offered at WKU	0	0	0	0
Less Expensive Elsewhere	2	4.3	0	0
Closer to Home	7	15.2	0	0
Other...	27	58.7	2	50

TABLE 22

Comparison of the Satisfaction With Living Condition Between Respondents  
and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Place of Residence:								
On Campus	22	47.8	76	53.5	3	75	4	80
Off Campus	22	47.8	60	42.3	1	25	1	20
Satisfaction With Living Condition:								
Satisfied	33	71.7	113	79.6	1	25	5	100
Dissatisfied	11	23.9	23	16.2	3	75	0	0



TABLE 23

Comparison of the Need to Talk With and Evaluation of the Attitude of the Advisors and Faculty Members Between Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts		Persisters		Dropouts		Persisters	
	N=46		N=142		N=4		N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Need To Talk With								
Advisor:								
Yes	28	60.9	101	71.1	3	75	4	80
No	18	39.1	36	25.4	1	25	1	20
Evaluate Attitude								
Of Advisor:								
unconcerned=1	6	13.0	8	5.6	0	0	0	0
slightly concerned=2	10	21.7	30	21.1	2	50	3	60
concerned=3	11	23.9	64	45.0	1	25	1	20
Need To Talk With								
Faculty Member:								
Yes	31	67.4	110	77.5	4	100	4	80
No	15	32.6	28	19.7	0	0	1	20
Evaluate Attitude Of								
Faculty Member:								
unconcerned=1	5	10.9	9	6.3	2	50	0	0
slightly concerned=2	7	15.2	21	14.8	0	0	2	40
concerned=3	19	41.3	79	55.6	2	50	2	40

TABLE 24

Comparison of the Evaluation of the Student Personnel Services Between Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Counseling Center:</b>								
below average=1	2	4.4	10	7.0	0	0	0	0
average=2	15	32.6	26	18.3	1	25	0	0
above average=3	5	10.9	11	7.8	0	0	0	0
<b>Health Services:</b>								
=1	6	13.0	25	17.6	1	25	1	20
=2	13	28.3	46	32.4	0	0	2	40
=3	6	13.0	21	14.8	0	0	1	20
<b>Financial Aid:</b>								
=1	6	13.0	22	15.5	0	0	0	0
=2	11	23.9	30	21.1	0	0	0	0
=3	7	15.2	18	12.7	0	0	0	0
<b>Reading Lab:</b>								
=1	4	8.7	4	2.8	0	0	0	0
=2	8	17.4	16	11.3	0	0	0	0
=3	5	10.9	11	7.8	0	0	0	0
<b>Registrar:</b>								
=1	4	8.7	10	7.0	1	25	1	20
=2	21	45.7	72	50.7	1	25	3	60
=3	8	17.4	29	20.4	0	0	0	0
<b>Student Affairs:</b>								
=1	2	4.4	13	9.2	1	25	0	0
=2	11	23.9	27	19.0	0	0	0	0
=3	6	13.0	11	7.8	0	0	0	0
<b>Tutorial Program:</b>								
=1	4	8.7	8	5.6	0	0	1	20
=2	4	8.7	22	15.5	0	0	1	20
=3	0	0	2	1.4	0	0	0	0
<b>Undergraduate Advisement:</b>								
=1	7	15.2	19	13.4	0	0	0	0
=2	10	21.7	40	28.2	3	75	1	20
=3	5	10.9	29	20.4	0	0	1	20

TABLE 25

Comparison of Personal Characteristics Between Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Had Health Problems:								
seldom or never =1	29	63.0	112	78.9	3	75	3	60
sometimes =2	9	19.6	27	19.0	1	25	2	40
frequently or most of the time =3	7	15.2	2	1.4	0	0	0	0
Had Home Problems:								
=1	31	67.4	104	73.2	1	25	3	60
=2	8	17.4	33	23.2	2	50	2	40
=3	6	13.0	4	2.8	1	25	0	0
Church Attendance:								
never =0	10	21.7	30	29.1	2	50	0	0
once in awhile =1	20	43.5	39	27.5	2	50	0	0
about half the time =2	6	13.0	25	17.6	0	0	2	40
almost every Sun. =3	9	19.6	48	33.8	0	0	3	60

TABLE 26

Comparison of the Influence of Personal Characteristics While in School Between Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Financial	16	34.8	54	38.0	0	0	1	20
Medical	14	30.4	10	7.0	0	0	1	20
Marriage	9	19.6	20	14.1	0	0	1	20
Few Friends	6	13.0	7	4.9	2	50	1	20
Disliked Teachers	6	13.0	34	23.9	1	25	4	80
Other Vocation	7	15.2	21	14.8	0	0	0	0
Failure in Grades	11	23.9	44	31.0	2	50	0	0
Joined U.S. Service	1	2.2	9	6.3	0	0	1	20

TABLE 27

Comparison of Personal-Emotional Characteristics Between Respondents and a Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Unhappy in College:								
seldom or never =1	18	39.1	58	40.9	0	0	1	20
sometimes =2	21	45.7	70	49.3	3	75	3	60
frequently or most of the time =3	7	15.2	13	9.2	1	25	1	20
Became Discouraged:								
=1	8	17.4	34	23.9	0	0	2	40
=2	27	58.7	98	69.0	2	50	3	60
=3	10	21.7	9	6.3	2	50	0	0
Lacked Self-Confidence:								
=1	18	39.1	51	35.9	0	0	1	20
=2	18	39.1	80	56.3	4	100	4	80
=3	9	19.6	10	7.0	0	0	0	0
Felt Timid or Shy:								
=1	27	58.7	68	47.9	2	50	2	40
=2	11	23.9	61	43.0	2	50	2	40
=3	7	15.2	11	7.8	0	0	0	0
Lacked Responsibility:								
=1	28	60.9	102	71.8	0	0	5	100
=2	13	28.3	36	25.4	4	100	0	0
=3	4	8.7	2	1.4	0	0	0	0
Involvement in Outside Activities:								
=1	19	41.3	39	27.5	3	75	1	20
=2	15	32.6	68	47.9	0	0	3	60
=3	11	23.9	34	23.9	1	25	1	20
Got Along With Other Students:								
=1	1	2.2	1	0.7	0	0	0	0
=2	6	13.0	12	8.5	2	50	0	0
=3	38	82.6	128	90.1	2	50	5	100
Resented Authority:								
=1	35	76.0	95	64.0	3	75	4	80
=2	7	15.2	45	31.7	0	0	0	0
=3	3	6.5	5	3.5	0	0	0	0

TABLE 28

Comparison of Academic Characteristics Between Respondents and a  
Sample of Non-Respondents: Dropouts and Persisters

Items	Respondents				Non-Respondents			
	Dropouts N=46		Persisters N=142		Dropouts N=4		Persisters N=5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Disinterested in School:								
seldom or never =1	16	34.8	62	43.7	1	25	3	60
sometimes =2	18	39.1	67	47.2	0	0	2	40
frequently or most of the time =3	10	21.7	12	8.5	2	50	0	0
Had Poor Study Habits:								
=1	13	28.3	29	20.4	1	25	3	60
=2	24	52.2	95	66.9	2	50	2	40
=3	7	15.2	16	11.3	1	25	0	0
Participated in Class Discussions:								
=1	9	19.6	14	9.9	3	75	1	20
=2	16	34.8	79	55.6	0	0	4	80
=3	19	41.3	48	33.8	1	25	0	0
Lacked Skills in Basic School Subjects:								
=1	25	54.4	82	57.8	2	50	4	80
=2	15	32.6	52	36.6	1	25	1	20
=3	5	10.9	6	4.2	1	25	0	0
Class Attendance:								
=1	2	4.4	1	.7	0	0	0	0
=2	8	17.4	6	4.2	3	75	0	0
=3	36	78.3	134	94.4	1	25	5	100

## APPENDIX: D

Cover Letter Used in Follow-up of Non-Respondents



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

March 2, 1973

Dear

As you probably already know, I am involved in doing a study which may provide information (reasons) about students who withdrew from Western Kentucky University.

A number of questionnaires were sent out and a satisfactory response has been received. However, I am still interested in the views and opinions of the group that hasn't responded.

In order to make my data more accurate, I need some information from the large groups that failed to respond. I have randomly selected five people from those students who withdrew and five students from those that are attending Western and wish to compare their responses with those previously contacted.

Enclosed you will find the questionnaire needing your response.

Your response is critical to my study. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Cash Kowalski*

Cash Kowalski



# WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY

Office of Undergraduate Advisement

February 8, 1973

Dear former Western Student,

Each semester a number of undergraduate students leave school without graduating. At Western, the withdrawal rate has been comparable to the national average. Still, this is a matter of some concern here at Western.

Data at the national level indicates no one really knows why these students drop out of school. We know some students leave for academic, financial, or medical reasons. Yet, this explains only a portion of the many reasons why a student like yourself leaves school. My interest is to find out the reasons why some students withdraw and to determine what steps can be taken to relieve the problems which confront students, causing them to drop out.

In an effort to determine why students leave Western, I am enclosing a questionnaire. Because of your experiences, you have been selected as an individual who could give me some information concerning this problem. Please take the five minutes that it would require you to complete the questionnaire and return it to me by February 16, 1973. This information will be compiled into statistical data and possibly be utilized to strengthen and improve existing programs or to create new programs to assist students with problems similar to yours. A place is provided for your name if you wish to include it. If not, feel free to leave that space blank. All replies will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Cash Kowalski*

Cash Kowalski  
Graduate Student

P.S. This is my second request. Since your cooperation and information is so valuable to my study, your assistance will be highly appreciated.





# WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY

Office of Undergraduate Advisement

February 8, 1973

Dear Western Student,

Each semester a number of undergraduate students leave school without graduating. At Western, the withdrawal rate has been comparable to the national average. Still, this is a matter of concern at Western.

Data at the national level indicates no one really knows why these students drop out of school. We know some students leave for academic, financial or medical reasons. Yet, this explains only a portion of the many reasons why students leave school. My interest is to find the reasons why students withdraw and compare the findings with students like yourself who have remained at Western. Hopefully, we can determine some steps that can be taken to relieve the problems which confront students, causing them to drop out and assist those who remain at Western.

In order to be able to compare dropout students with those who remain at Western, I am enclosing a questionnaire.

Because of your experiences, you have been selected as an individual who could give me some information concerning this problem. Please take the 5 minutes that it would require you to complete this questionnaire and return it to me by February 16, 1973. This information will be compiled into statistical data and possibly be utilized to strengthen and improve existing programs or to create new programs to assist students whose problems are similar to yours. A place is provided for your name if you wish to include it. If not, feel free to leave that space blank. All replies will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

P.S. This is my second request. Since your cooperation and information is so valuable to my study, your assistance will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Cash Kowalski*

Cash Kowalski  
Graduate Student

## REFERENCES

- Bailey, B. H. Characteristics of high school seniors as related to subsequent college attendance. Cooperative Research Project No. 2157, West Virginia University, June, 1966 (LC 148 B3).
- Cangemi, J. P. & Coan, D. L. A clinical method for identifying potential dropouts. College Student Journal, January, 1973.
- Cope, R. G. & Hewitt, R. G. Types of college dropouts: An environmental press approach. College Student Journal, 1971, 5 (2), 46-51.
- George, R. L. Resident or commuter: A study of personality difference. The Journal of College Student Personnel, May, 1971, 12, 216-219.
- George, R. L. & Marshall, J. C. Personality of young adults: College vs. non-college. The Journal of College Student Personnel, November, 1971, 438-444.
- Gibson, R. L.; Higgins, R.; & Mitchell, M. H. The high school dropout goes to college. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 824-827.
- Goetsch, H. B. Parental income and college opportunities. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 798. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- Hannah, W. Personality differentials between lower division dropouts and stay-ins. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12 (1), 16-19.
- Hornbostel, V. O., et al. The rehabilitation of school dropouts in Oklahoma City (an experimental appraisal), sponsored by the Ford Foundation, Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1969.
- Kirkpatrick, J. L. Financing higher education: The role of the state. American Government Board Reports, 1971, 14 (1), 2-7.
- Knoel, D. M. A critical review of research on the college dropout. In Lawrence A. Pervin, et al., The college dropout and the utilization of talent. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Kooker, E. W. & Bellamy, R. I. Some psychometric differences between graduates and dropouts. Psychology, 1969, 6 (2), 65-70.

- Kowalski, C. J. & Cangemi, J. P. High school dropouts: A lost resource. AAUW Journal, 1973.
- Kramer, L. A. & Kramer, M. B. The college library and the dropout. College and Research Libraries, 1968, 29 (4), 310-312.
- Laird, A. W. Dropout: Analysis of high aptitude college students-- Western Kentucky's search for clues to this problem. Western Kentucky University Faculty Research Bulletin, 1969, 1 (1).
- Landis, P. H. A personal inventory. So this is college. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Landrith, H. F. Two year colleges: Prescription for junior college dropouts. School and Society, January, 1971, 49, 49-51.
- Lehmann, I. J. American college students and the socialization process. The college student. New York: The Library of Education, The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Levenson, E. A.; Stockhamer, N.; & Feiner, A. H. Family transaction in the etiology of dropping out of college. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 1967, 3 (2), 134-157.
- Madron, T. Special Program Manual, Western Kentucky University Computer Center, Copy No. 34, June 10, 1972.
- Marks, E. Student perceptions of college persistence and their intellectual, personality and performance correlates. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58, 210-221.
- Meyerson, M. Ethos of the American college student: Beyond the protests. In R. S. Morrison (Ed.), The contemporary university. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Nicholi, A. M. Harvard dropouts: Some psychiatric findings. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1967.
- Pace, R. C. & Stern, G. D. An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49 (5), 269-277.
- Pervin, L. A., et al. The dropout in conflict with society. The college dropout and the utilization of talent. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.

- Reik, L. E. The college dropout in clinical perspective. In L. A. Pervin, et al., The college dropout and the utilization of talent. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Ridlon, H. G. Why freshmen fail. In N. T. Bell, Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Rose, H. A. & Elton, C. F. Another look at the college dropout. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13 (2), 242-245.
- Rose, H. A. & Elton, C. F. Attrition and the vocationally undecided student. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1971, 1 (1), 99-103.
- Rose, H. A.; Elton, C. F.; & Marsh, L. M. College dropouts: A review. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 475-481.
- Rossman, J. E. & Kirk, B. A. Factors related to persistence and withdrawal among university students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17 (1), 56-62.
- Saranoff, I. & Theophile, R. Five failing college students. In M. Korwich, Underachievement. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1965.
- Savicki, V., et al. Student role orientations and college dropouts. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17 (6), 559-566.
- Schreiber, D. 700,000 dropouts. American Education, 1968, 4, 8-13.
- Sievert, W. A. Who drops out of college? A new study draws a profile. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1972, 6 (19), 1 & 4.
- Starr, A.; Betz, L.; & Menne, J. Differences in college student satisfaction: Academic dropouts, nonacademic dropouts, and nondropouts. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19 (4), 318-322.
- Suczek, R. & Alfert E. Personality characteristics of college dropouts. Berkeley: University of California, Student Health Service, 1966 (mimeo).
- Sutton, R. N. Five-year longitudinal study on dropout rate of a sample of freshmen, fall, 1967-spring, 1972. Unpublished report, Western Kentucky University, 1973.
- Thistlethwaite, D. L. College press and student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50 (5), 183-191.

- Turner, H. J., Jr. The half that leaves: A limited survey of attrition in community colleges. Florida Community Junior College, Florida University, Gainesville, Institution of Higher Education, March, 1970 (ED 038-127).
- Vener, A. M. College education and vocational career. In W. B. Brookover, The college student. New York: The Library of Education, Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Withey, S. B. A degree and what else? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiken, J. A comparison of junior college withdrawees, University of Missouri, 1968 (ERIC - ED 023-389).
- Aiken, L. R., Jr. A composite monograph for predicting achievement in college. The Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 60 (3), 127-129.
- American Council on Education. Spotlight on the college. Washington, D. C., 1959.
- Astin, A. W. & Holland, J. L. The environmental assessment techniques: A way to measure college environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52 (6), 308-316.
- Bell, N. T., et al. Introduction to college life: Meanings, values and commitment. (2nd ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Bendig, A. W. & Gluck, M. R. Consistents of achievement test frustration in college students. The Journal of Educational Research, 1956, 49, 365-371.
- Berdie, R. F. & Stein, J. A. A comparison of new university students who do and who do not seek counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 310-317.
- Bloom, B. L. A university freshman preventive intervention program: Report of a pilot project. Journal of Counseling & Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37 (2), 235-242.
- Book, W. F. How to succeed in college. Baltimore: Warwich and York, Inc., 1927.
- Bronson, G. F. Part-time professionals: More well-educated women find firms willing to hire them for less than full-time employment. The Wall Street Journal, Friday, September 8, 1972, p. 26.
- Brown, W. F.; Webe, N. O.; Zunker, V. G.; & Harlam, W. L. Effectiveness of student-to-student counseling on the academic adjustment of potential college dropouts. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1971, 62 (4), 285-289.
- Burkhardt, R. W. What college can do for you. In N. T. Bell, et al., Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- "Campus Unrest" (Excerpt from Scranton Commission's Report), Today's Education: NEA Journal, January, 1971, pp. 41-65.

- Chase, C. T. The university freshman dropout, Report CRP-S-D38, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1965 (ERIC ED 003-672).
- Cohen, A. M. The relationships among student characteristics, changed instructional practices and students attrition in junior colleges, Final Report, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., Bureau of Research, June, 1969 (ED 032-074).
- Coker, D. L. Diversity of intellectual characteristics between persisting and non-persisting students among campuses. Wisconsin State University, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, April, 1968 (ED 038-645).
- Cook, R. Upperclassmen's satisfaction with college. Dissertation Abstracts, International A, 1972, 32 (4), 6147-A.
- Cope, R. G. Selected omnibus personality inventory scales and their relationship to a college's attrition. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28 (2), 599-603.
- Cross, R. K. Higher education's newest student. Junior College Journal, September, 1968, 38-42.
- Feldman, K. A. & Newcomb, T. N. The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1969, 1, 383.
- Gaj, P. An analysis of a follow-up questionnaire administered to 743 students who had been enrolled in freshman English at nine junior colleges. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1969 (ERIC ED 033-154).
- George, R. F. & Hood, A. B. How effective do we predict plans for college attendance? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 487-493.
- Gibson, R. L.; Higgins, R.; & Mitchell, M. H. The high school dropout goes to college. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 824-827.
- Gottlieb, D. College climates and student subcultures. In W. B. Brookover, The college student. New York: The Library of Education, The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Gross, R. A challenge to this generation of students. In H. A. Estrin & E. J. Jones, How many roads? The 70's. California: Glencoe Press, 1970.
- Hackman, R. J. & Dysinger, W. S. Reactions to college withdrawal. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1970, 38 (3), 23-31.

- Hackman, R. J. & Dysinger, W. S. Research notes: Commitment to college as a factor in student attrition. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 311-324.
- Hart, J. Educated people said industrially illiterate. Daily News, Bowling Green, Kentucky, Thursday, June 22, 1972.
- Heist, P. Creative students: College transients. The creative college student. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1968.
- Hoover, B. College students who didn't seek counseling during a period of academic difficulty. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28 (4-A), 1298.
- Hornbostel, V. O., et al. The rehabilitation of school dropouts in Oklahoma City (an experimental appraisal), sponsored by the Ford Foundation, Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1969.
- Ikenberry, S. O. Factors in college persistence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8 (4), 322-329.
- Jacob, P. E. College expectations. In N. T. Bell, et al., Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Johnson, C. B. & Rossman, J. E. Persistence at a liberal arts college: A replicated five-year longitudinal study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20 (1), 1-9.
- King, P. T. & Matterson, R. W. Student perceptions of counseling center services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 37, 358-364.
- King, S. H. Emotional problems of college students: Facts and priorities. The American Association of University Professors, 1964, 49 & 50, 327-332.
- Knopp, E. From a symbolic-interactionist perspective: Some notes on college dropouts. The Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 60 (10), 450-452.
- Koelsche, C. L. A study of the student dropout problem at Indiana University. The Journal of Educational Research, 1956 (49), 358-364.
- Kooker, E. W. & Bellamy, R. I. Some psychometric differences between graduates and dropouts. Psychology, 1969, 6 (2), 65-70.



- Levenson, E. A. Some socio-cultural issues in the etiology and treatment of college dropouts. The college dropout and the utilization of talent. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Merigold, F. A. A scale to identify male dropouts at liberal arts colleges. College Student Survey, 1969, 3 (1), 19-22.
- Morgan, E. S. What every Yale freshman should know. In N. T. Bell, et al., Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Munger, P. F. Student persistence in college. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1956, 35, 241-243.
- Norris, L. W. The professor as a leader. In N. T. Bell, et al., Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Reboussin, R. Trend and issues at Beloit College, Report No. 3, The Class of 1972, Beloit College, Wisconsin.
- Rice, G. A. An examination of the earned grade distribution between successful and dropout students at Yakima Valley College. Washington, D. C.: Yakima Valley College, 1969 (ED 036-293).
- Richards, R. The college student in changing America. In W. R. Brookover, et al., The college student. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Riesman, D., et al. Spotlight on the college student. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.
- Rose, H. A. & Elton, C. F. Attrition and the vocationally undecided student. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1971, 1 (1), 99-103.
- Rose, H. A.; Elton, C. F.; & Marsh, L. M. College dropouts: A review. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 475-481.
- Rust, R. E. & Davis, J. S. The personal problems of college students. Mental Hygiene, 1961, 45, 247-257.
- Sandell, A. S. & Rossman, J. E. College freshmen view their parents. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49 (10), 820-826.
- Snyder, F. A. & Blocker, C. E. A profile of non-persisting students: A description of educational goals and achievements, activities, and perceptions of non-graduates, Report No. 3, spring, 1969. Pennsylvania: Harrisburg Area Community College, 1970 (ED 037-218).

- Snyder, J. F.; Hill, C. E.; & Derkson, T. P. Why some students do not use university counseling facilities. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19 (4), 263-268.
- Sutton, R. N. Five-year longitudinal study on dropout rate of a sample of freshmen, fall, 1967-spring, 1972. Unpublished report, Western Kentucky University, 1973.
- Tannebaum, A. J. Dropout or diploma. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.
- Taylor, H. The American teacher. In N. T. Bell, et al., Introduction to college life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Thorndike, R. L. The concepts of over and underachievement. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1963.
- Whittaker, D. The psychological adjustment of intellectual nonconformists, collegiate dropouts. Adolescence, 1971, 6, 415-424.
- Whittaker, D. & Watts, W. A. Personality characteristics associated with activism and disaffiliation in today's college age youth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18 (3), 200-206.
- Whitehead, P. C. Does drug use interfere with academic success? Toxicomanies, 1970, 3 (2), 227-235.
- Zaccaria, L. & Creaser, J. Factors related to persistence in an urban commuter university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12 (4), 286-291.