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CHAPTER I

FORMULATION AND DEFINITION
OF THE PROBLEM

The emergence of the two-year junior college, as an unique institution of higher education, has occurred during the Twentieth Century. Even though higher education in the United States may be considered the off-spring of educational institutions of England and Western Europe, it has grown and adapted itself to the varied cultural demands and needs of American society.

California has long been a leader in the development and implementation of the junior college concept. In 1907, California passed legislation permitting secondary schools to extend their programs for an additional two years and/or provide college transfer programs at their discretion (Blocker, 1965, p. 27). It is estimated that by 1970, seventy-five per cent of all freshmen and sophomores will receive their education in the junior college. The latest state-wide study, the Master Plan Survey of Higher Education, recommended that the junior college be recognized as a full partner in higher education in California.

The broadening of the concept of the two-year college
was relatively slow in coming, wrote Blocker (ibid., p. 27). Although California again led in the passing of new legislation in 1917 and 1921, providing for vocational and technical courses and general education courses for citizens, there was a significant lag between the statement of the concept in law and its implementation (ibid., pp. 27-31).

In the 1960's, the two-year colleges in California function to meet a variety of community needs: a two-year trial period for students, who could not enter a university or state college immediately, for financial or academic reasons; a two-year liberal education for some; a technical-occupational program for others; and a multitude of vocational, avocational, and cultural offerings as desired by the local residents. Through their "open-door" admission policies, absence of tuition, geographical convenience, and sensitivity to immediate community wishes, the community colleges have made possible the democratization of higher education.

The five fundamental characteristics, thought by Fields (1962 pp. 63-95) to describe clearly the uniqueness of the community college are:

1. Democratic: non-selective, free, public, accessible.

2. Comprehensive: preparation for advanced study, vocational education, general education, community service.
3. Community-centered: commitment of the college toward efforts to improve the community.

4. Life long education: meets the needs of young and old.

5. Adaptable: to changing functions of education and to individual differences.

Ideally, the community college will educate the young, continue the education of older citizens, and generally uplift the community through beneficial, cultural, and educational services.

However, the comprehensiveness of the programs attempted by these multi-purpose colleges, heightens the need for clarity in this complex image possessed by the community college. The purpose of a program, which prepares a student for transfer to a state college or university, is clearly perceived. The purposes of courses for specific occupational fields and pre-professional programs are also easily understood by the students. However, many students, claimed Fields, see the transfer program as the line of least resistance rather than a path to a goal, and for them college attendance becomes exploration without purpose (ibid., p. 316). The very advantages of the local community college -- low cost, open to all, close to home, and the lack of social barriers -- add to the likelihood that students will enter without clearly perceived goals. In this way, the "open-door" of the community college may become a "revolving-door."
The Need for the Proposed Study

The college dropout has become the focus of widespread concern in American higher education. The national importance of dropout and attrition studies is attested to by the appearance of numerous journal articles and books, two major studies by agencies of the federal government, the allocation of federal grants, and countless institutional self-studies. While research in this area has a history of at least fifty years, still relatively little is known about the causes of attrition. Economic and administrative approaches to the study of attrition, concludes Summerskill (1962), have not been adequate in developing a better understanding of college dropouts, nor have they succeeded in substantially reducing high attrition rates (pp. 627-9).

Thornton (1960) wrote that data from the issues of The Junior College Directory show that over 50 per cent of freshman students leave at the end of the first year in college. While some of these students may transfer to other colleges at the end of the first or second semester, actually as many as 10 per cent dropout between fall registration and Christmas vacation (pp. 155-6).

Many community junior colleges are concerned about the high proportion of entering students who withdraw without completing their objectives. For junior college
administrators, it is a "costly, perplexing, and persistent problem" (O'Connor, 1965, p. 12). The size of the dropout component has major implications for the operation of the junior college. O'Connor continues:

By predicting operations, financial outlay, staffing and facilities development on what may be false enrollment statistics, the college stands to suffer budgetary losses of sizable proportions (ibid.).

Roueche (1967) in his review of "Research Studies of the Junior College Drop-out," concluded that relatively few studies are reported that relate to the reasons for dropouts or withdrawals or that suggest procedures by means of which attrition rates may be reduced. The need also exists for studies to evaluate the accomplishments of students who leave the junior college prior to earning a degree or completing a program of instruction.

The dynamic nature of the student population in the junior college requires continuous and effective research on the students and the college program. O'Connor (1965) affirms the importance of follow-up studies when he stated:

Two year colleges must be especially sensitive to all sociological and technological changes if they are to meet the needs of business and industry and at once satisfy the requirements of students with a broad range of interests, aspirations, and abilities. .. Follow-up, therefore, is an indispensable aid to vitality, efficiency, and productivity of the institution. (p. 10)

Foothill College, the college selected as the setting for this research, is a public junior college in California
serving the northern part of Santa Clara county about 30 miles south of San Francisco. From the summer of 1958, when the college first opened its doors, a rapid increase in enrollment has been experienced. During any one fall semester, the average rate of attrition has been consistently about 11 per cent. This community college prides itself on offering a diversified curriculum and in providing extensive counseling facilities to assist students in self-evaluation and attainment of their maximum potential. Why then is the attrition rate so high in an institution which attempts to meet a number of the educational needs of the community it serves?

In an effort to seek some of the answers to this question, Foothill College began "The Study of the Day Withdrawal Student" (see Appendix). This research project has attempted to isolate all of the student characteristics which could identify the student who withdraws during the semester, and to also ascertain the one basic reason why he chooses to leave college. Shortly after this project began, a group of consultants, headed by H. B. McDaniel, wrote in their Review of Student Personnel Services at Foothill College (April, 1967) that it was apparent from the drop-out rates that many students were not finding effective reinforcement and challenge. They recommended that after the characteristics of the drop-out students
had been identified, the college should then isolate the factors which contribute to student withdrawals. "At this point, a rational evaluation can be made of specific student characteristics and related or unrelated individual causes of withdrawal" (p. 82).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine through semi-structured, in depth interviews the reasons for student withdrawal and student persistence in the community college. The multiple factors under investigation are: perceptions of the college environment, socio-economic status, racial and ethnic barriers, educational and vocational goals, individual motivation for academic achievement.

The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

1. Will a personal interview conducted one year later by an independent researcher, produce the same reasons for withdrawal as the exit interview conducted by the counselor in the college?

2. Have the withdrawal students followed their plans as stated at the time of their departure from the college?

3. What are the reasons for withdrawal most frequently mentioned by students who voluntarily leave college?
4. If the withdrawal student has returned to college, what factors have encouraged him to return?

5. What are the most important factors keeping the persisting student in college?

6. What effect do conditions external to the college environment have upon college attendance?

**Personal-social characteristics.**--

1. What differences exist in the personal-social characteristics (age, marital status) of the withdrawal group as compared with the persisting group? (Selection of the sample of persisting students is based upon stratification of the withdrawal group for academic aptitude, ratio of males to females, and racial characteristics.)

2. Does student employment distinguish between the withdrawal and persisting groups?

3. Does the occupation of the father determine membership in the persisting or withdrawal groups?

**Attitudes toward the teaching-learning environment.**--

1. Do those students remaining in school evaluate faculty differently than those who withdraw?

2. In what ways do the withdrawals and the persisters differ in their perceptions of counseling services?
3. Does Psychology 50 play a constructive role in the orientation of freshmen to Foothill College?

4. Do students remaining in college participate more in extra-curricular activities than those who withdraw?

5. Does the individual overall evaluation of the educational experience at Foothill College distinguish between the groups of withdrawals and persisters?

**Individual academic motivation.**

1. What relation does the time of college decision for the individual have on persistence in college?

2. Does a high level of aspiration affect persistence in college attendance?

3. Is the rate of withdrawal higher among those students in a transfer program than those enrolled in a technical-occupational program?

4. Are there a larger percentage of students "undecided" about curricular choice among the withdrawals than the persisters?

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses are stated positively:

I. There will be a significant difference between the reason given for withdrawal from college, as expressed in the structured exit interview, and the reasons
revealed in an indepth, semi-structured interview one year later.

II. There will be a significant difference in the possession of certain non-intellective characteristics (personal-social, attitude toward the teaching-learning environment, and individual academic motivation) between those students persisting in college and those students who withdraw during the semester.

Definition of Terms

"Withdrawal student" will be defined in this follow-up study as it appeared in the original study (Mizel & Stevens, 1967, p. 1).

Those day students who withdraw completely and in accordance with established procedures from Foothill College between the fourth week and the last day of classes during the Fall Semester, 1966.

This definition of withdrawal is apparently becoming accepted in attrition research as it was used in both Matson's (1955) and Harwood's (1961) doctoral dissertations.

"Persisting students" are those who have remained in the college from September, 1966 through February, 1968.

The term "academic motivation" will be defined separately. English and English (1958) define "academic" as "having to do with formal schooling, particularly with those aspects involving the study of books" (p. 4). They
define "motivation" as "the nonstimulus variables controlling behavior; the general name for the fact that an organism's acts are partly determined in direction and strength by its own nature (or enduring structure) and/or internal state" (p. 330).

Another definition of "motivation," as expressed by Shaw (1965) originating from the Experimentalist School, is helpful toward an operational understanding of an individual's academic motivation. Motivation is described as goal-seeking behavior. This behavior can be observed as persistence toward a goal despite obstacles and difficulties (p. 65).

In describing the intrinsic and extrinsic elements of motivation, English and English state:

Any complex situation contains both extrinsic and intrinsic motivational elements. Intrinsic is "a motivation in which the satisfaction is obtained within the activity itself;" extrinsic applies where ...the satisfaction is artificially related to the activity.

A common example of this in academic motivation is one where the student works very hard in a course for a good grade (extrinsic) and finds himself later engaging in the activity for its own satisfying aspects (intrinsic).

Assumptions
The Original Study

Since this study is a follow-up of the original study,
"A Study of the Day Withdrawal Student at Foothill College,"
the assumptions underlying that research will be stated.

The interview method was selected rather than the
mailed questionnaire because the research team felt it
would be a better way to seek the single basic cause motivat­ing withdrawal. It was assumed that there is a singular
cause that motivates people to withdraw, and that by prob­
ing this array of motives, the one basic motive, which
gives life to all others, could be singled out. Because
the student, himself, may not be aware of his basic motiva­
tion for withdrawal, the interview, with some probing by
the counselor if necessary, is more likely to seek out the
cause than the questionnaire.

The students were made aware of the nature of the
study, the value of the interview, and the need to isolate
one single cause for his withdrawal. In this framework, it
was assumed that the student will respond in good faith and
that the interviewer will arrive at a motive which will have
validity for that student. (This motive is the best guess
that can be made by a professional counselor and will be of
more value than a student-stated reason on a questionnaire.)
Furthermore, it is assumed that the motive list is inclu­
sive and that the motives are important variables worth re­
searching. The division of the motive variables is not a
clear one. There are shades of overlap and the threads of
a given variable may run through other variables (Mizel and
Stevens, 1967).
Follow-up Study

In contrast to the assumptions of the original study, this follow-up study assumes that the causal factors of student withdrawal are multiple in nature. Iffert (1957), Summerskill (1962), Knoell (1964), and O'Connor (1965) conclude that it is well-established that the typical college dropout is due to "a complex of causes." Academic failure, is cited by Summerskill (1962) in his extensive review of attrition research, as the leading single cause of dropouts or as one of two or three leading causes—depending upon the college studied. In 19 investigations of scholastic aptitude scores in relation to subsequent attrition, the average scores were found to be lower for dropouts than for graduates in 16 of these investigations (pp. 635-7). Both Summerskill and Knoell (1964) conclude that while one third of college dropouts are due to poor grades and academic failure, it is important to recognize that the majority of students leave college for non-academic reasons (p. 7).

Financial problems, lack of interest or motivation, illness, poor adjustment, ethnic barriers, and military service all contribute to student withdrawal. While acknowledging the primary causal role of academic aptitude and its relationship to college grades, this study has investigated the multiple non-intellective factors
which are assumed to contribute to the majority of withdrawals from the community college.

An assumption, inherent in studies of this nature, is that the community college is responsible for providing every opportunity for the success of its students. Indeed, the philosophy of Foothill College is capsulized in this motto: "Educational Opportunity For All." This implies, however, the acceptance of the concept of universal higher education, which is not yet a reality (McGrath, 1966). The five characteristics of the community college, cited earlier, delineate its "ideal" role in higher education, in general, and the student personnel services, in particular, in the self-actualization of the individual. The possibility still exists, that for some, the attainment of intellectual and emotional growth, remains outside the province of the community college.

Therefore, the traditional concept of the college dropout as a loss needs to be re-examined (Knoell, 1964, p. 11). As Summerskill notes, "...withdrawal may be a positive and satisfactory solution to problems of an academic, psychological, social, or financial nature" (p. 650). Rather than viewing this elapsed period since withdrawal as essentially unproductive and devoid of intellectual and psychological growth, this study will attempt to provide some insight into the effect of an
individual's exploratory activities as they related to his attainment of his goals.

A theoretical framework for this assumption is provided by social theorists, who have been concerned with the development of young people as they reach the transition point from late adolescence to young adulthood. The place of higher education in this developmental process may be viewed as offering the setting for the young person's accomplishment of the necessary developmental tasks of this period. Mueller (1961) describes these major tasks for college youth as: integrating and stabilizing the self; identifying the different roles for the self; practicing and evaluating the activities and attitudes necessary for future roles (p. 110). Erikson (1963) theorizes that the period immediately following high school is a "moratorium" during which the individual seeks and learns his identity in preparation for adult maturity (pp. 262-3). It is during this period that the young adult tries out, in reality or fantasy, a variety of social and occupational roles. This moratorium may begin early or late, and be protracted indefinitely or be of relatively short duration, all dependent upon the needs of the individual as he perceives them. The accomplishment of these tasks will occur, both within and without the college classroom.
Assumptions concerning the validity of the data collected from the interview are predicated on the perceptual view of behavior as stated by Combs and Snygg (1959) in their book, *Individual Behavior*. Behavior is assumed to be regular and lawful. Good (1963) states that the scientist accepts "...a lawfulness in the events of nature as opposed to capricious, chaotic, or spontaneous occurrences" (p. 137). The physical situation, defined as the community college experience in this research, is the perceived situation as it is related by the persisting student or the withdrawal student. To understand the behavior of these groups of individuals, the interviewer must attempt to understand as clearly as possible, the factors controlling and limiting the processes of perceiving, and the function of the perceptual field (p. 36). The perceptual field is defined as the universe as it appears to the individual at the moment (p. 44).

Combs and Snygg have postulated that "...the striving for adequacy" is the basic need of human beings. Man seeks both to maintain and enhance his perceived self (p. 45). College attendance, placed in this context, is sought by the individual to make himself ever more adequate to cope with the exigencies of life. In order to investigate college attendance, it is further assumed (Good, 1963) "That every natural event or phenomenon has
a discoverable and limited number of conditions or factors which are responsible for it" (p. 137).

The self report is a product of the individual's total phenomenal field. Any behavior is always the product of the individual perceptions of himself and his perceptions of the situation which he is involved with. The accuracy of the self report is dependent upon the clarity of the subject's awareness, adequate symbols for expression, social expectancy, the cooperation of the subject, freedom from threat, and the change brought about in the field organization by the request for a self report (ibid., pp. 440-2). It will be hoped that the investigator, albeit an unknown variable, is able to explore and to report accurately the perceptions of the subjects.

The Scope of the Study

This study is designed to follow-up the research project executed at Foothill College, entitled "A Study of the Day Withdrawal Student (Fall, 1966)". In order to define the limits for the follow-up study, the original study will be discussed briefly.

The original study was limited to the day student population of the college as a result of the assumption that the day student population and the evening student population were two unique populations with distinct and
separate characteristics. The students, who withdrew during the first three weeks of the semester, were not combined with students who withdrew after the third week of the semester. The first three weeks of the semester are not typical, due to program changes, availability of classes, and other technical causes. The objective of the study was limited to investigating a basic causal factor, global in nature, but sufficiently specific to present the college with directions for further studies.

A descriptive study was developed which envisioned the study of interview-centered with biographical data from a search of the records. The students to be interviewed were those who went through the official withdrawal procedure. Thus the population was refined to include only those students who officially withdrew during Fall Semester, 1966. According to the registrar's report, 823 students withdrew from the college in the semester under study. Four hundred of these students went through the official withdrawal procedures. Roughly one-half the total withdrawal population was studied, and it will be assumed that this constitutes a representative sample of the population. An additional search of the records of students, who had completed Fall Semester, 1966, with similar biographical data as the withdrawal group, was conducted. From this population, 400 students were
selected randomly to form the control group.

The total population for the follow-up study consists of 400 withdrawal students and 400 persisting students. Approximately 200 students were randomly selected from each of these groups to be contacted for personal interviews. Fifty withdrawal students and 50 persisting students were located and interviewed. The scope of this investigation is limited by the size of the population sample. However, if the sampling procedures reflect accurate probability samples, the data will be valid for the populations under study.

The follow-up interviews took place during the months of January, February, and March, 1968. The time of the study is of critical importance, as it was during and prior to this period that an escalation occurred in the Vietnam war. This external factor directly influences the educational plans of the male population.

A further concern of the scope of this study involves the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other community colleges. The student characteristics in a junior college will vary with the location, size, emphasis of the curriculum, and type of college. While no one institution may be said to be "typical," the characteristics of the students at Foothill College roughly parallel those reported by Medsker, in his study of ten junior
colleges in 1960. In the "Annual Report of Student Characteristics," by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning at Foothill College, it was noted that: the modal age of the students is 18 years, the proportion of men to women is 57 to 43, 16 per cent of the students are married, 81 per cent live within the district, a transfer program is selected five times as often as a terminal one, 39 per cent of the student body scored higher than the national average on tests of academic aptitude.

The Plan of the Study

Chapter II will contain a review of the literature. Previous studies relating to both aspects of college attendance, persistence and withdrawal will be presented. These pertain to high school students, and students in the four-year college and the two-year college. Studies will also be included relating to non-intellective factors and their influence on patterns of college attendance. These include socio-economic factors and the development of academic motivation.

Chapter III will present the procedures of the research: the selection of the subjects of the study; the interview method employed in gathering the data; the interview schedules. The characteristics for both the
withdrawal and persister populations under study, will be defined.

Chapter IV will contain the analyses of the data through a descriptive approach and a statistical approach, Chi-square.

Chapter V will present a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research in college student attrition is a continuing concern to the field of higher education. Studies of attrition in the four-year college may rival prediction studies in sheer numbers, while studies in the two-year college appear less frequently.

This review of the literature will discuss first the factors which contribute to college attendance. Next, the characteristics of the junior college student are outlined, and the problems faced by a junior college, relative to attrition, are described.

A section will be devoted to the development of academic motivation, as previous research indicates the importance of its role in college persistence. The critical nature of the high school period as it contributes to the development of college expectations, will be explored.

Two general studies of attrition in the four-year college, and two comprehensive reviews of the literature are next abstracted. Other studies, representing current research, both cross-sectional and follow-up, will be cited.
Attrition research in the two-year college includes summaries of general studies, and similar studies to the current research.

Statements on the importance of continued research seeking the causes of student attrition, and the reduction of the current high levels of attrition, conclude the chapter.

**Factors Contributing To College Attendance**

The probability that a given boy or girl will go to college depends on the following factors: mental ability; social expectation, or what the family and society expects of him; individual motivation or his own life goals; financial ability, in relation to the cost of continued education; propinquity to an educational institution (Havighurst & Rodgers, 1952, p. 137).

Havighurst and Rodgers cited Carson McGuire's study of adolescent social mobility, which identified three groups that have the individual motivation to acquire post-high school education (ibid., p. 141).

a. **The High-Status Static:** This is a person of upper or upper middle-class, who attends college because it is normal for his group.

b. **The Climber:** This is a lower-middle class youth, who has a solid and realistic ambition to "get ahead" in life.

c. **The Strainer:** This is a lower-middle class youth whose goals in life are mixed. He wants to
"make good," yet is not completely sure what this means.

The role of individual motivation is a stronger determining factor that social expectation or financial ability in youths' seeking higher education, because if a youth has a strong desire, he will surmount social and economic barriers to get into college, assert Havighurst and Rodgers. In attempting to apply this theory of the determining factors of post-high-school education, they developed the following table, which combines three of the five factors (ibid., p. 143). Propinquity and mental ability are kept constant.

**TABLE 1.—PROBABILITY OF GOING TO A POST-HIGH-SCHOOL INSTITUTION FOR YOUTH OF SUPERIOR OR OF HIGH AVERAGE MENTAL ABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Status</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (upper &amp; upper middle)</td>
<td>3 Doubtful</td>
<td>2 High</td>
<td>1 Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (lower middle)</td>
<td>6 Low</td>
<td>5 Doubtful</td>
<td>4 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (working class)</td>
<td>9 Very low</td>
<td>8 Low</td>
<td>7 Doubtful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Probability levels are indicated in the respective cells.

Low socio-economic level and low individual motivation make it a practical certainty that a youth will not
go to college and a high probability that he will not even finish high school. Cells 5 and 7 contain relatively large numbers of people, and here probability is influenced by procedures for motivating boys and girls to want higher education, and by free public higher education, specifically the community college. Probability is also increased when there is a college nearby.

Goldsen et al. (1960) described the effect of social class expectation toward higher education in a manner similar to McGuire (p. 15). Students who describe themselves as "upper class" are most likely to value a general or liberal arts approach to education. However, a disproportionate number of students, who emphasize the instrumental value of higher education, are in the "working class." For them, college is a vehicle that will allow them to surpass their parents in income and social status.

Characteristics of Junior College Students

Medsker (1964) presented a number of tentative assumptions about the nature of the junior college student (pp. 5-10). These generalizations are based on data collected in numerous studies conducted by Medsker and others at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.
Although junior college students represent a cross-section of the community's population (Clark, 1960), in many junior college districts, students from the homes of upper-middle class families are underrepresented. Medsker concluded that the more metropolitan the community, the greater the representation from homes on the lower end of the socio-economic scale (p. 6).

As a result of this, many of the parents of junior college students have had only a high school education or less. Rezler (1960) wrote that parents without a college background tend not to have a clear-cut value system to pass on to their children (p. 142). In lower class homes, where the press for upward mobility results in great stress on college, levels of aspiration may be raised unrealistically. Studies have shown that cultural and civic interests in the homes of a majority of junior college students are modest as evidenced by the nature and number of periodicals and books read, the type of music preferred, and frequency of discussions about civic and world affairs (Medsker, p. 6).

In a study conducted by Shore and Leiman (1965), it was reported that parental attitudes towards their children seem to be significantly related to a student's academic achievement in junior college. The open-end
questions sought the parental perceptions of the individual student's interests, plans, assets, and liabilities. Shore and Leiman stated:

Of particular significance is that the parent's perceptions of their children were not based on a realistic appraisal or acknowledgment either of the child's abilities or of his level of achievement as revealed by achievement tests (p. 393).

Values and Orientations

Medsker (1964) wrote that a large number of junior college students do not possess well-defined attitudes toward the purposes of education, and are in college because of cultural expectations or because they cannot find employment (p. 7). Junior college students show a greater tendency toward authoritarianism and are less likely to tend towards reflective thinking and intellectual commitments than students in four year colleges.

Clark and Trow (1966) have analyzed the leading types of student sub-cultures present to some degree on college campuses. This typology includes the "collegiate" culture, the "vocational" culture, the "academic" culture, and the "non-conformist" culture (pp. 19-23). The sub-culture most clearly represented in the junior college is the vocational. In these urban colleges, there is not enough time or money to support the collegiate culture. The students commute daily to the college, and many finance their education through part-time work. For these
students, wrote Clark and Trow, "...college is largely off-the-job training, an organization of courses and credits leading to a diploma and a better job than they would otherwise command" (p. 21). This is not to imply that the academic culture is completely absent from the junior college campus. There are students, who are interested in pursuing knowledge, and they are actively engaged in seeking a good general education. The non-conformist culture is becoming more apparent on many campuses, and this culture may grow owing to the sheer increase in the numbers of students attending the junior college. The formation of sub-cultures, in general, is less distinct on the junior college scene due to the very short duration of the average student's period of attendance.

Educational Plans

A high percentage of students entering junior colleges have not given adequate attention and time to long-term college planning (Medsker, p. 8). Studies have documented a lack of congruence between actual junior college attendance and the college plans as stated by students prior to graduation from high school. A majority of students display a lack of realism when they enroll in transfer programs. An earlier study of Medsker's (1960) involving students
from 63 junior colleges, found that only one in every three students actually transferred to a four-year insti-
tution (pp. 92-3).

Academic Aptitude

The full range of ability distribution, as measured on tests of academic aptitude, is found in junior college student bodies. These colleges tend to draw about equally from all quartiles of ability levels. Medsker wrote in 1960 that the facts indicate that the average academic aptitude is somewhat below that of those who enter four-year colleges (p. 30). However, the overlap of ability within the two types of institutions is great.

Peer Group Influences

It is significant that most junior college students continue to associate with their high school friends. Not only does this peer group influence his attitudes toward the college, they also tend to reinforce his feeling that college is no different than high school.

Changing Trends in a Public Junior College Student Body

Mellinger (1962) instituted a study focused on the dominant factors which predisposed the members of a single student body to enroll in a public junior college in a
multi-college city (p. 167). Using the Hollingshead Revision of the Warner Index of Status Characteristics, which emphasizes the education and occupation of the family head, it was found that the social class distribution of the freshman population conformed generally to that reported in other studies. Students in the lower and lower-middle classes accounted for 96 per cent of the freshman population (p. 168).

When the respondents were asked to state their reasons for deciding not to enroll at the three most popular local four-year colleges, nearly one-half the interviewees said that the chief deterrent was the higher standards at these colleges (p. 169). Although 30 per cent mentioned the high cost, when the students' responses were probed more deeply, some explained that actually their families could finance the venture, but they refrained from applying because either they could not meet the entrance requirements or they lacked confidence in their academic prowess (p. 170).

Mellinger felt that respondents' expectations for higher education might furnish a clue to the weight which they attached to a college education as a lever for climbing the social ladder. Interviewees were asked to explain what values they expected to derive from a college education. One-half of the responses were subsumed under the
category of "Vocational-Professional." Another 38 per cent emphasized "Social Development." Only 12 per cent identified "Intellectual Development." Mellinger concluded that utilitarian values overshadowed intellectual values for these respondents (p. 172).

The students in this junior college tended to view themselves "...as an uncoordinated mass of individuals rather than as part of a cohesive group" (p. 174). The problem of student identification with the public junior college is a recurring one. When the student realizes that only an unselective college will accept him, he finds himself receding from other colleges rather than gravitating toward the public junior college.

**The Open Door College**

A major determinant of the character of a college is the kind of student body it is able to attract, wrote Clark (1960) in his book *The Open Door College* (p. 41). The public junior college in California is expected to admit all applicants, without regard to ability, type of curriculum completed in high school, or any other aspect of background. The power to determine educational objectives is widely diffused, and students' desires have determined that many junior colleges are a place where unselected students engage in a college "tryout." Junior
colleges in California find that their student bodies are also shaped by the place of the junior college within the structure of higher education. In California's public tripartite system -- university, state college, and junior college -- the university has a student body high in academic ability, the state college has students of lesser ability, and the junior college has the lowest average of the three (p. 48).

The low-ability, transfer-oriented clientele of San Jose Junior College, Clark indicated, can be more fully understood if the non-academic element of socio-economic background is considered (p. 51). Two indicators were used in his study: the occupation of the student's father and the economic level of the section of the city in which the student's family resided. Only the index relating to the father's occupation will be discussed here. The junior college was found to have a clientele base virtually identical with the city-wide occupational structure. The junior college exceeded the city distribution only in the category of skilled and semiskilled workmen, which accounted for 45 per cent of its student body. According to this index, the junior college is relatively a "working class" college (ibid., p. 56). Less than a fourth of its students come from business or professional families, while two out of three had a blue collar background.
A major characteristic of the junior college student body is a heavy turnover in membership. Nearly one out of three students enrolled at San Jose Junior College in the fall semester had left in the second semester. And of the students on campus at midyear, about one out of two had disappeared the following fall. Clark concluded that a large number of students stay in college for a short time only, and the turnover is rapid (p. 63).

The basic problem of the junior college, according to Clark, is the processing of the student who falls between the transfer and terminal groups. He said, "The student who filters out of education, while in the junior college, appears to be very much what such a college is about" (p. 84). The non-selective two-year college needs to "administer" the student who is, in fact, destined to be a terminal student, but who does not know it or refuses to recognize this likelihood at time of entry. "For the pure terminal and the pure transfer students, destiny is in line with intention," but Clark continued, "this latent terminal, the 'overintender', whose transfer status belies his terminal future, is a candidate for the cooling-out function of the junior college" (ibid., p. 63).

This important educational problem has wide social implications. The aspirations of students, supported by the hopes of their parents, build a general pressure for
higher education. The open-door policy of the college encourages this belief that college attendance is a right, controlled by the standards of higher education in general. These standards are most apparent in those courses parallel to those offered by the University of California, the state colleges, and private colleges and universities.

At San Jose Junior College, the cooling-out function is not easy to perform and requires various devices. The latent terminal is allowed into transfer curricula, but encounters counseling and testing that invite him to consider the alternatives. The innovation of the junior college is in providing these structured alternatives (ibid., p. 174). If the student persists in the transfer curricula, his instructors inform him through their grades that he is not qualified to continue. Ideally, the role of the counselor is to redirect the student into the technical-occupational program or to suggest vocational opportunities and/or on-the-job training in the world of work. Unfortunately, most students withdraw without seeking this help, and are thus cooled-out of higher education.

The Development of Individual Academic Motivation

From the preceding sections, "Factors Contributing to College Student," it is evident that non-intellective factors contribute to both college persistence and withdrawal
from college. But the junior college student is more than a compilation of current statistical data. Prior to his enrollment, he has encountered many educational, social and cultural forces during his formative periods of development. These experiences, together with his innate intellective and physical capabilities, will determine the amount of individual academic motivation he possesses for the demands of higher education.

In a study by Maccoby and Gibbs, (Thornton, 1961), an attempt was made to understand the individual differences of adolescents, by investigating the childhood training methods practiced by the mothers. The training habits of mothers from the upper-middle, socio-economic level were compared with those of mothers from the upper-lower level. Using a structured interview technique, they found that although upper-middle mothers allow as much aggression among neighborhood children as do upper-lower mothers, upper-lower mothers tend to overlook aggression toward parents more often. Upper-middle mothers assumed that their children would go to college and were not so concerned about current school achievement. In the upper-lower group, more parental pressure was needed to keep the child's performance up to average, and these mothers tended to use negative punishment more often (p. 10).
Allison David (Thornton, 1961) pointed to the fact that children in the middle classes find that rewards in learning are increasingly those of status. The class goals in education, occupation and status are made to appear real, valuable, and certain to him, because he begins to experience in his school these prestige responses. The lower-class youngster learns by not being rewarded in these situations, that middle class goals are neither likely nor desirable for one in his position. Even if he avoids the sexual and recreational exploration available to him in his lower-class environment and studies his lessons, he learns that he is not going to be rewarded in terms of these long range status goals. Davis concluded that if this lower-class youngster is to profit from school, discriminations must be removed from the school and ways found to reward his strivings (p. 11).

Gordon (1965) in his review of the research on motivation and aspiration of socially disadvantaged children, wrote that the degree and the direction of their motivation is inconsistent with the demands and goals of formal education (p. 383). The symbolic rewards and postponements inherent in middle class culture appear to be inoperative for these children as positive norms of motivation. "Goals for these children tend to be more self-centered, immediate and utilitarian. There is usually no concern with aesthetics
of knowledge, symbolization as an art form, introspection, and competition with self" (ibid., p. 383). While drive is present, its direction and goals may not be complementary to academic achievement. Gordon stated that little research has been done in this area, and these assumptions are based on theory.

Research cited by Gordon, included a study by Rosen in 1956, which concluded that high motivation is related to high grades. The middle class children are more likely to be taught motives and values which make achievement possible. A study by Edwards and Webster (1953) found that favorable self concepts were related to higher aspiration and to greater academic achievement. Ethnic anxiety was negatively related to self perception and aspiration. In general, attitudinal factors are related to motivational, and these are apparently class values. It is also accepted that lower class students learn better with material incentives, and Gordon suggested that a new pedagogy be organized for the wide variety of underdeveloped learners (ibid., p. 384).

Ausubel (1966) indicated that the "...causal relationship between motivation and learning is typically reciprocal rather than unidirectional." The emphasis in classroom learning should be placed on the intrinsic and positive
motives — curiosity, exploration, mastery, competence, and the need for stimulation (p. 480).

McClelland (1963) commenting on the topic, "Motivation to Achieve," said that unfortunately, psychology is long on diagnostic knowledge and short on therapeutic or educational knowledge. The need is great for research that attempts to shape human motives, particularly lower class groups, where the need for change is the greatest (p. 65).

From existing empirical findings, McClelland declared that there is only one generalization for change that most psychologists would readily accept — the famous Hawthorne effect. To change motivation, it takes above all, someone who cares. Many students have come to the junior college because someone cared — a parent, a teacher, or a counselor. McClelland felt that the problem facing society in dealing with large numbers of students and attempting to increase motivation, is how best to institutionalize it. Too often he continued, enthusiasts and innovators do not stay on the firing line; they are "rewarded" by administrative jobs or their enthusiasms are cooled by the professionalism of occupational routine (p. 66).

McClelland, noted for his work with N achievement, cautioned that it represents only one type of achievement motivation. N achievement, as measured by the content
analysis of daydreams or fantasy, specifically prepares men to act in an entreprenurial way. These positions include primarily executive roles in business, consulting, and independent sales positions. Such positions provide great opportunity for satisfaction from personal achievement. A method used successfully by him in increasing Nach in underachieving boys, is training them in the ability to recognize an achievement related thought and to assess the number they have. Another method is through the use of various game situations. The person learns in a concrete situation, simulating as nearly as possible the life situation toward which he is pointing, to behave like a person with high Nach. These boys, who received this training, improved more in school grades the following semester than any other group (ibid., p. 67).

The High School Period

By the time a young person is old enough to be called an adolescent, he has learned from experience to behave in accordance with the picture he has of himself, i.e., the way he sees himself and relates to his environment. This self picture is very complex for the young person sees himself differently from day to day, from situation to situation, and from one person to another. It differs with
the way others see him. The young person learns to see himself in relation to the school in a number of roles.

Rogers, Havighurst, Murphy, and Jersild have contributed much to our understanding of the self. It is beyond the scope of this review of the literature to cite each of these contributions.

The influence of social class, upon the way students are processed in the high school today, is reflected in new and more subtle family-school relations, than the direct manipulation of family pressure documented earlier by Hollingshead. Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963) wrote that the influence of social class on the treatment accorded students has become a built-in feature of the organizational activities of the modern comprehensive high school, especially those with highly developed counseling programs. Counselors will tend to devote more of their time and activities to those students, who plan and are most likely to go to college, and whose parents actively support these plans. These students are predominantly from the middle and upper social classes. Cicourel and Kitsuse concluded that one of the consequences of this disproportionate attention to the "college-bound" is that recognition and exploration of the range and variety of talents in the entire student population is limited, if not precluded (ibid., pp. 144-5).
Sexton (1961) performed a study of the conditions in education that existed in a large city in the midwest. She felt that much of the debate over education could be reduced to a simple contest between mass and elite education. In addition, she felt that in order for mass education to be effective, it would have to consider the handicaps of the under-privileged and the culturally deprived.

Social class became more apparent at the high school level than in the lower grades. Many schools sorted young people into inflexible, so-called ability groups, so that young people in one group had no contact with those in other groups. In addition, students were placed in three basic areas: college preparatory, vocational and general. She found moreover, that about 50 per cent of the students, who dropped out of school before reaching the twelfth grade, were in the lower income groups. The drop-out rates by major income groups were as follows (p. 202):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Groups</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ($5,000--)</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ($6,000--)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ($7,000--)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV ($8,000--)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V ($9,000--)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarships in this community tended to be awarded to children of high income families, and failures in school
were ten per cent higher among children from low income families than among all other students.

In a study by Montague (in Sexton, 1961, pp. 206-7), of 4,400 high school seniors, it was found that students in the Lower Social Status had many more personal, school, and social problems than other students. The study was not of drop-outs, but of high school seniors who, since they had remained in school until the twelfth grade, presumably had made a fairly successful adjustment in school. Lower Status students are more troubled on the following items: dissatisfaction with school, difficulties in self-expression in school situations, self-criticism. Their most frequent complaints in the latter item are that they are unable to express themselves well, and that they "can't seem to concentrate" (ibid., p. 207).

Sexton also found that college expectations depend more on the occupation of the student's father than his I.Q. score (ibid., p. 190). The following table illustrated this relationship (p. 191):
TABLE 2.—PERCENTAGE OF BOYS WHO EXPECT TO GO TO COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Lowest I.Q. Quintile</th>
<th>Highest I.Q. Quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major white collar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle white collar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor white collar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled labor and service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other labor and service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was further noted that among the "common man" boys none craved the intellectual life for its own sake. And apparently some ethnic groups, i.e., Jewish, do a more effective job of motivating their children toward college than other groups.

Duncan (1965) in the study, Family Factors and School Dropout: 1920-60, concluded that family type, the occupation score of the head of the family, and the education of the head of the family account for a substantial part of the variance in the schooling for the national population (p. 91). The ethnic status, type of school, and place of residence (rural-urban) were also important considerations. And it was found in the urban West, especially pertinent to the present study, that students remained in school for two years longer than the average student in the national population (ibid., p. 114).
To some extent, the motivational problem as seen by educators, reflects the conflict between their values and those which operate in students who drop out of high school or college. Social psychologists are likely, as demonstrated in these studies, to redefine the underlying problem in terms of middle-class versus lower-class attitudes and value orientations. Stated thus, the problem of increasing motivation in lower class students, who make up one-half the junior college population, is one involving drastic changes in the prevailing structure of our society.

Another discouraging conclusion was reached by the participants at a Research Conference on College Dropouts (Montgomery, 1964) who agreed repeatedly that the science of psychology must advance before some of the basic problems of alleviating the frequency of college dropouts will be understood or solved (p. 21). While motivation is frequently discussed, little of practical value is known about it -- how to measure it with reliability and validity and how to change it with dispatch. Motivation and other contributing factors to college attendance and withdrawal will be discussed in the next section on attrition studies.

**Attrition Research in the Four-Year College**

The descriptive study reported by Iffert (1958) has become a national yardstick for any subsequent research
attempts. Under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education, a carefully stratified sample was selected on the basis of geographic region, size of institution according to control and organization, and sex of the students. The study was begun with 12,667 students who entered 149 institutions of higher learning in 1950. The students were followed for a four-year period. Comparisons were made, environmental variables such as source and amount of financial aid, socio-economic status, parents' background, and place of residence while in college. The student's standing in his high school class and cumulative grade-point average were also compared. Questionnaires concerning their reasons for attending college and for leaving college were analyzed (pp. 1-12).

Iffert reported a dropout rate of 60.5 per cent over the four-year period as the national average. This rate varies with the type of institution, with an average rate of 67 per cent in public colleges, and 52 per cent in private colleges.

**Beyond High School (Trent & Medsker).**—A very recent study, by Trent and Medsker (1967), follows the personal and vocational development of 10,000 high school graduates during the first four years after graduation. This research was made possible through funds from the Cooperative Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education. This
sample of representative high school seniors was surveyed in 16 communities throughout the Midwest, California, and Pennsylvania.

Prior to graduation, the students were given five attitude scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1962), which measured manifest feelings of anxiety, and scholarly and social attitudes. They also completed a Student Questionnaire which elicited information about: academic interests and extracurricular activities; educational and occupational plans, values, and goals; occupational, cultural, political, and religious backgrounds of families; quality and kind of interest and encouragement received from parents; and post-high school plans of peers. High school ranks were obtained, and the existing academic aptitude scores were converted to SCAT score equivalents (pp. 24-5).

Four years after the graduates were originally surveyed, they completed a questionnaire and the O.P.I. to which had been added scales measuring autonomy, and social, esthetic, and religious attitudes and interests. Complete longitudinal data were obtained from nearly 50 per cent of the original sample; approximately 70 per cent of those still in college responded (pp. 33-4).
The study traced the graduates' employment and college attendance patterns, and included an investigation of factors associated with withdrawal from college. In this sample, nearly half the students who entered college full time in September 1959, had withdrawn before June 1963, and 23 per cent of the students remained in college for four years without obtaining their baccalaureate degree, leaving 28 per cent who obtained degrees within the conventional four-year period (pp. 90-1). This study indicated not only the expected attrition, but also a widespread tendency, among those who persist in college for four years, to take more than four years to get a degree. A portion of this high level of attrition was related to the assumption that all junior college students, except those who were enrolled in terminal or vocational programs, were regarded as potential transfer students. Junior college students constituted one-third of the total entering college group, and it appears that fewer than one-third of these students did in fact transfer.

The finding in this present research was that withdrawals began with at least as great a complexity of outlook as the persisters, and subsequently decreased in this trait, whereas the persisters increased. The persisters entered college with considerably more intent than the withdrawals to attend and graduate. They studied harder, and were less
prone to allow social life to interfere with their studies. They became even more intellectually oriented and autonomous after four years of college. None of these findings could be attributed to differences in ability or socio-economic status to any major extent (ibid., pp. 122-37).

This research indicated that one prime source of academic motivation is parental influence. This influence was composed of several factors: the communication of their educational values and encouragement, the parents' temperaments, other interactions with their children (ibid., p. 154). Approximately 20 per cent more persisters than withdrawals reported while still seniors in high school that their parents definitely wanted them to attend college. When asked how important it was to their parents that they graduate from college, three-fourths of the persisters, but only one-third of the withdrawals felt it was very important. These differences existed regardless of sex, ability, or socio-economic level. However, the lower the socio-economic level, the less they reported parental encouragement, whether or not they persisted in college (ibid., p. 276). It appears reasonable to conjecture that parental characteristics have a great deal to do with the differences in academic motivation that distinguish the two groups.
Level of ability was related to entrance into college but there was a closer relationship between socio-economic status (defined by father's occupation) and college entrance. This research, like Sexton's (1961), revealed that few students at the high socio-economic level failed to attend college, regardless of ability, but a disproportionate number of students at the lower levels failed to attend even if they possessed high academic ability.

Trent and Medsker concluded that while there may be multiple reasons for nonattendance and withdrawal, it was evident from this study that most of the able students left college because they lacked academic orientation and motivation.

Their stress on the importance of rules and regulations, and their relatively low scores on the autonomy scales indicated how much more than the persisters, they sought outside control over their lives (p. 318).

"Dropouts from College" (Summerskill).—In Summerskill's (1962) comprehensive review of the literature, he set forth the general findings of research on the factors associated with dropping out of the four-year college. Those factors that have a bearing on the current investigation of the junior college withdrawal student will be described.

Biological and Social: A general conclusion from the literature is that age does not affect attrition although
older undergraduates may encounter more obstacles to graduation (ibid., p. 631).

The attrition rates for men and women do not differ significantly, because more women withdraw for nonacademic reasons, primarily marriage (ibid.).

The student's social and economic background definitely affects his adjustment to college, but research findings on this factor are equivocal. Summerskill feels that more research is warranted in this area (ibid., pp. 632-33).

Motivation: Summerskill wrote that the largest number of dropouts involve motivational forces — goals, interests, and satisfactions relative to college and other facets of the student's life (p. 637). In most studies of attrition, the reasons attributed to withdrawal are "lack of interest in college," "lack of interest in studies," "marriage," "entered military service," "or accepted a job." The underlying problem with research on lack of motivation is that the motivational factors predictive of college success are not known, nor is a method available to accurately assess these motives in students (ibid., p. 639).

Vocational motivation is more directly related to attrition. Studies indicate that students with definite
vocational choices are more likely to be overachievers in college, and to graduate from college (ibid.).

The change and conflict in motivation are rooted in family relationships, affiliations with the opposite sex, external conditions, and environmental circumstances. Summerskill wrote that attrition through motivational causes is widespread, and that basic research in the psychology and sociology of college students is a prerequisite to improving the situation (ibid., p. 643).

Adjustment to College: About 10 per cent of college dropouts are due to personal and social maladjustment in college, although many clinicians believe that these problems are more prevalent. Research does not confirm that dropouts are caused by overparticipation in extracurricular activities (ibid., pp. 644-5).

Illness: Dropouts due to illness and injury constitute a small but significant portion of the total population of students leaving.

Finances: Financial difficulty is one of the three most important factors in attrition. This factor varies with the type of institution.

"College Dropouts" (a review by Marsh) -- Marsh (1966) classified the literature in the past ten years as being Philosophical and Theoretical, Descriptive, and Predictive.
longer afford to dismiss the dropout as merely lacking in intelligence, but must recognize his problem as one of great complexity (p. 476).

Descriptive studies, Iffert's and Trent and Medsker's, attempted to describe the dropout in terms of what he brings to college, how he lives while on campus, and his reasons for leaving college as perceived at the time of departure.

Predictive studies using correlations of test scores and high school grades with college grade-point averages, have been seriously limited by results seldom rising above the .50 and .60 level. Further, these studies do not account for a significant number of students who drop out with satisfactory ability and grade-point averages.

The use of existing personality inventories, either the Minnesota Counseling Inventory or the M.M.P.I., have not met with great success as predictors, and Marsh hypothesizes that their weakness may lie in their clinical orientation. Possibly the underlying structures of the personality of the dropout, are less abnormal than once supposed, and perhaps, not too deviant in the sense of neurotic patterns (p. 479). Marsh concludes that the conflicting results indicate a variation among colleges, as well as the likelihood of change from year to year within one campus, and stresses the importance of up-to-date
evaluation, as well as the desirability of research on a longitudinal basis.

Other Studies.—Two studies, limited to the investigation of attrition at a particular college will be briefly described. They represent the kinds of research now being conducted at the four-year college.

Greenfield (1964) studied attrition among first semester engineering freshmen. The factors studied were: college aptitude and achievement; high school achievement and training; guidance and career information in the high school; nonintellective and nonacademic factors including interest and motivation, housing, social group affiliation, and work habits. The reasons stated for leaving were: change in vocational goal, change in place of residence, familial influence, finances, average study time. In the category of familial influence, the occupation of the father was significant. Of those who withdrew, 61 percent reported that they were the first in their family to attend college. If college attendance was part of the family pattern, the student was more likely to transfer than withdraw.

Goetz and Leach (1967) studied a randomly selected group of freshmen, which included continuers and withdrawees. They were asked to respond to a questionnaire composed of items generally assumed to be related to
attrition. In comparing the attitudes of withdrawees and continuers to various aspects of campus life, i.e., facilities, teachers, and counselors, almost no significant differences in attitude were found. Both groups expressed positive feelings toward the teachers. Other times both groups expressed negative feelings toward faculty advisers and counselors. The existing differences showed that continuers had more negative feelings than did the withdrawees.

The reasons for withdrawal as defined in Iffert's (1958) study were included in their questionnaire as problem areas encountered by students, which could contribute to withdrawal. Both the continuers and the withdrawees had these problems. However, the withdrawee felt more strongly that each was a problem to him. Possibly the withdrawee was unaware of his real reasons for leaving and consciously felt that the reasons he was selecting were the causes for his attrition (pp. 883-87).

Four studies of withdrawal students, closely related to the nature of the present research, will be discussed. The common element in each, is that they can be classified as follow-up studies.

Eckland (1964) studied the academic and social careers of students who entered the University of Illinois as freshmen in 1952. His research included 1,332 male
students who were enrolled as full-time students. In this study, 417 or 70.2 per cent of the dropouts returned to college sometime during the 10-year period after they had left. His results indicated that out of every 10 male freshmen, four graduated from the University of Illinois in continuous progression, one graduated elsewhere in continuous progression, and five dropped out. Of the five who dropped out, three came back to college -- one graduated from the University of Illinois, one graduated elsewhere, and the remaining three failed to graduate for a second time. Eckland concluded that drop-out rates have been exaggerated (p. 406). He stated:

Furthermore, we shall find that the over-estimated rates are due primarily to the failure of earlier studies to make adequate allowance for the prolonged nature of academic careers and the drop-outs who came back. Apparently, four years is not the empirical average for men who eventually attain degrees (p. 403).

Eckland (1964b) suggested that social class predicts graduation better than high school performance. This conclusion was based on his exploration of the relationship of the social class of the parents, the ability of the students, and occupational mobility and social class of the college graduates (pp. 36-50).

Pervin (1965) followed-up a group of students who had withdrawn from Princeton University. He cautioned that his data may be biased because embarrassment at having
withdrawn may have prevented some students from returning the questionnaire. The problems of the dropout, viewed retrospectively, were boredom, apathy, and lack of goals. The students reported that they experienced a feeling of "relief," upon leaving college, but they continued to be nagged by a sense of guilt over their decision. They felt that counseling at the time of their departure would help them return to college at a later date. Pervin's findings suggested that the period following withdrawal, can be potentially profitable for some students -- 
".. it may be an inefficient, but effective means of obtaining an education" (p. 128).

Faunce (1953) in a study of within-term male dropouts at Michigan State College, used official records and a questionnaire sent to each student at least one year after withdrawal. He reported: (p. 191)

The study revealed that within the college community the potential dropout fails to participate, on a par with others, in campus organizations. The requirements of academic discipline are more of a casual anchoring point for him, while his housing, health, personal matters, and finances stand in the foreground.

Further, students acknowledged poor academic work as a reason for leaving, only as a last resort. Those students, who gave illness, finances, or employment as reasons for leaving, were functioning at the same academic level as
those who recognized academic difficulty as their reason for leaving (p. 192).

Gekoski and Schwartz (1961) reported a study designed to find in what respects students leaving college differed from those who remained in college to complete their work. Selected samples were obtained from each of the groups under study. The students in both groups were tested for mental ability, occupational interest, personality, and study habits. Each student was then interviewed and the following areas were explored: reasons for withdrawal, vocational goals, types of extra-curricular activities, and opinions concerning the courses, instructors, administrators, and the facilities.

In comparing the test scores of the two groups, it was found that there was a significant difference between them on the scholastic aptitude test, the reading test, and the social adjustment section of the personality test. In all of these cases the withdrawal group scored lower. However, the ability of the withdrawal group was still sufficiently high that they could have completed college under optimum conditions.

The chief reasons for withdrawal from college were (pp. 192-3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of interest or plans</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with courses and/or university</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial difficulties 12%
College adjustment problems 12%
Job interference - to go to work 12%
Health 9%
Low grades 9%
Entering armed forces 5%
Commuting problems or others 4%

Interviews with the control groups indicated that they, too, had similar difficulties, yet they remained in school.

Twice the percentage of the control group, as compared with the withdrawals, felt that their courses were preparing them well for their vocational objectives. This indicates that one's attitude toward the quality of vocational training is an important factor in college persistence. In an overall evaluation of the faculty, the withdrawal groups rated them much lower than the control group. Similarly, fewer of the withdrawal students, as compared to the persisters, felt that their adviser had had a favorable effect on their progress in school.

The final question in the interview asked what the college might have done to prevent their leaving. About 50 per cent of the withdrawal students felt that more counseling, improved courses and instruction, a more personal attitude toward the student, and financial help from the college would have encouraged them to stay (ibid., p. 194).
Summary

Attrition research in the four-year college indicates the presence of multiple factors in college attendance and withdrawal. While academic ability is a good predictor in college attendance, other non-intellective factors contribute to the probability that a given student will remain in school. These include family background, academic and vocational motivation, adjustment to college, illness, and finances.

Follow-up studies indicate that many students require longer than the traditional four-year period to graduate. It cannot be assumed that every student, who fails to enroll in each successive semester, is a dropout. The period following withdrawal can be profitable. Attrition for academic or other reasons is not necessarily harmful to the student and a loss to the college.

Attrition research in the two-year college will be discussed in the next section.

Attrition Research in the Two-Year College

Institutions differ with respect to a variety of characteristics, which are logically related to attrition rates. In a highly selective college, attrition takes place before admission, and the college makes every effort to retain those it has admitted. A private college may
formulate goals of its own choosing, and establish the programs and standards, which it feels are appropriate. A large state university, primarily concerned with subject matter and scholarly pursuits may expect to lose large numbers of students, who may have ability but no strong academic interests.

The two-year public junior college, or more precisely the community college, has been described as possessing five characteristics: democratic, comprehensive, community-centered, life-long education, and adaptability (Fields, 1962, pp. 63-95). It is a service institution for all high school graduates and others, with opportunity for all to try any program offered. The educational program includes both career and transfer curricula. The instructional staff exclusively teaches rather than engage in research. Counseling co-exists with instruction as a major function. And the students possess a wise range of ability and motivation. Not surprisingly, the attrition rate is higher in the two-year college than in four year colleges.

Medsker's Summary of Studies

Medsker (1960) reported a summary of studies of the students attending 20 junior colleges between 1949 and 1957 (p. 48). He obtained responses from almost 3,000 students
in four colleges to questions on their primary reason for attending. Two-thirds of the students listed either:
1) persuasion by parents, counselors or friends,
2) location of the college (proximity), 3) lower cost.
He wrote that the number of students who choose the public junior college, because of its prestige or program is small, and that once he is enrolled he may or may not be enthusiastic about the institution, depending upon how well the college is able to inspire him to use his opportunity and to make him feel satisfied (p. 47).

From reports on drop-out studies completed by 20 two-year colleges between 1949 and 1957, it was possible to categorize the reasons students gave for withdrawal, (Medsker, 1960, p. 48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Stated for Withdrawal</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and health</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved or transferred</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonattendance</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or faculty action</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enter armed forces</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in school or dissatisfied</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational goals completed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other studies have drawn similar conclusions concerning reasons given by students for withdrawing from college, and Medsker feels these reasons are characteristic for students of college age.

Withdrawal Studies

Orange Coast College has kept records of withdrawing students from its opening in 1948. In this report, *Educational and Occupational Needs of Coastal Area*, as described by De Hart (1962, p. 23), some of the conclusions reached were:

1. 75 per cent of the total number of dropouts were made up of first and second semester students;

2. For every 100 full-time students who enter Orange Coast College for the first time in September, the best estimate is that 39 will drop out before the school year ends, 15 will not return for the third semester, 11 will drop out during the second year, and 35 will graduate.

3. One-third of the dropouts seem due to some extent to a failure in the college, while the balance seem justifiable. A more careful analysis should be made in an effort to learn the real reason for each withdrawal. This would necessitate tracing and obtaining an exit interview with those students who fail to complete a formal withdrawal. Follow-up might determine that these dropouts occur for justifiable reasons — financial need, permanent jobs, etc...
4. Academic ability scores seem to be of no value in predicting dropouts...

5. The counseling service does not have the time nor opportunity to act with one-third of the dropouts which occur in the first ten weeks of the semester.

Amori (1941) selected 100 former San Francisco Junior College students, who had voluntarily withdrawn from school, to determine what factors are at work which cause students to leave college when they are doing satisfactorily in their studies. In an attempt to build better rapport and discover the true reason for dropping out, he interviewed twenty-five personally, and contacted the other seventy-five by telephone. In his telephone interview, he talked either with the student concerned or with some member of his family. Amori stressed the inadequacy of the questionnaire when seeking answers to questions of a personal and intimate nature. The emphasis was placed on the outcomes of the study, and how much interest the college authorities had in the welfare of the students; their problems; their hopes; their aspirations; etc. This helped place the student at ease. The questions were made deliberately general in order to bring out points of dissatisfaction among the students.

In the following table, Amori compared the signed reason (from withdrawal blanks) with the real reason for
leaving college, as determined from the interview outcomes (p. 19).

TABLE 4.— COMPARISON OF SIGNED REASON AND REAL REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Real</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness in family</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In listing the varying students' reasons for discontent with the college, Amori concluded that the factor of emotional maladjustment was an important contributive cause as to why junior college students withdraw (p. 24).

Faul (1948) interviewed students withdrawing from Visalia College in the fall semester, 1947, in an effort to obtain valid evaluation data, and to test the exit interview as a method of obtaining reliable information from the withdrawing student. He found that 17.3 per cent of the total student body dropped out prior to completing their first semester. Discontent was given as the reason for leaving by 32.4 per cent of the total dropouts. Twenty-nine per cent indicated work, while 15 per cent gave health, and 10 per cent stated transfer. The categories of trip,
marriage, failing, and miscellaneous were indicated by five per cent in each of these categories respectively.

Faul found that there was a wide discrepancy between the distribution of reasons given for withdrawing, by the group who had exit interviews, as compared with those who filled out a check-list withdrawal form. In the latter group, work was indicated as the reason by 50.8 per cent, discontent by only 9 per cent. He concluded that:

"...the exit interview is one of the basic evaluation tools that junior colleges must use, if they are going to study their programs and evaluate the school in terms of meeting the needs of the students." (Faul, 1948, pp. 97-8).

In discussing exit interviews, Montgomery (1964) wrote that the exit or terminal interview was usually too little and too late to prevent dropout. "The conditions and thought processes, which have led up to it cannot be changed, or if apparently changed, do not remain so for long" (p.11). However, the exit interview does serve several useful purposes. Montgomery stated:

1. To ascertain with whom the student has talked and consulted during his stay as a student in order to find what steps and procedures are working and not working.

2. To allow the student to put his exit in proper perspective, and to plant the idea, that the step being taken is not irrevocable.

3. To help the student leave with a favorable picture of the institution, and to know what steps might be taken, should he decide to re-enter at some future time.
This study, "The Relationship of the Social Status of Students to Their Retention and Progress at the Junior College Level," designed by Burack (1952), investigated three variables in relation to the progress of metropolitan junior college students: scholastic aptitude or general intelligence, previous academic accomplishment, and social status. The population of 1,292 students, who entered the junior college was followed for a three year period. In the following table, Burack compared the socio-economic distribution of this population with that of a four-year midwestern college.

TABLE 5.— COMPARISON OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS IN A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE AND A JUNIOR COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Status</th>
<th>Four-year Midwestern College %</th>
<th>Metropolitan Junior College %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-lower</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-lower</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings demonstrate that this junior college more closely approaches the estimated socio-economic distribution of the national age group, of eight per cent in the two top statuses, 40 per cent in the lower-middle, and 52 per cent in the two lower statuses. "The relation
of status to progress and retention did not appear to be strong, probably because of the selectivity of a college population by motivation, even at the junior college level (ibid., p. 178).

Matson's study (1955), "Characteristics of Students who Withdraw from a Public Junior College," will be described in detail for later comparison with the findings of the current research.

Students, who officially withdrew from East Contra Costa Junior College during the fall and spring semesters, 1953-4, were selected for the study. The community served by this college appears to possess similar characteristics to the one served by Foothill College. The withdrawal group totalling 144 students was divided into two subgroups. Group I, consisting of 49 cases, included those students who filled out an evaluation opinionnaire, and who had been interviewed by a counselor at the time they withdrew from college. Group II, totalling 95 students, consisted of students for whom data were available only through personnel files. A sample of the total student population was selected for comparison with the withdrawal group.

The evaluation opinionnaire was a series of 12 open-ended statements. The items covered various aspects of the college program, i.e, "I think the counseling service."
Each item was rated on a three point scale: favorable, mixed feelings, and unfavorable. The purposes of the counseling interviews, for this study, were to expand and verify the data. A number of the opinionnaires were found lacking in detail for rating purposes.

The total student population and the withdrawal group were compared in respect to twelve characteristics. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following five factors (Matson, 1955, pp. 83-9):

1. A significantly greater proportion of the students who withdrew during the semester, were not high school graduates at the time they enrolled in the junior college. (P = .01)

2. Those students, who had taken a college preparatory course in high school, were more likely to complete at least one semester in the junior college, than were those who followed other curricula in high school. Of the students studied, a larger percentage of the withdrawal group had apparently not planned or prepared for college attendance while in high school. (P < .02)

3. More students who leave junior college during the semester, perceive their educational plans in terms of two years or less, than do those students who remain. (P < .01)

4. The younger junior college student was more likely to remain for at least a semester. A larger percentage of persons leaving during the semester were 30 years of age or over. (P < .02)

5. The occupational aspiration level of the students who withdraw differs from that of the total student population. (P < .001) The difference seems to be accounted for chiefly by the categories of clerical work and undecided, in which the proportions in the withdrawal group were large.
For the other seven characteristics studied, the differences between the total student population and the withdrawal group were not significant:

Sex, marital status, veteran status, high school attended, socio-economic status (father's occupation), academic aptitude, and grade point average in college failed to distinguish between the two populations.

Matson concluded that the results of the study as a whole seem to indicate the possibility that the student who withdraws lacks a sense of belonging or identification with the college environment (ibid., p. 90).

Harwood's study (1962) of "Curricular Offerings and Drop-out in Evening Programs of California Public Junior Colleges," investigated the relationship of the nature of curricular offerings to dropouts. He found more dropouts in the academic programs than in the vocational programs among students who withdrew during the semester.

O'Connor (1965) cited a study by Roleder, using a projective technique of personality assessment directed toward five attitude areas representative of the student's background. These were motivation, collegiate culture, levels of aspiration, family relationships, and socio-economic status. He experienced measurable success in predicting the type of student attitude, which could identify the probable dropout. The scale used in this experiment labeled correctly 81 per cent of the dropout group and 73 per cent of those who remained in college (p. 47).
Rose and Elten (1966) investigated personality differences between students who withdrew from college within the semester and students who persisted successfully through one year. Independent variables were Omnibus Personality Inventory scores and Rotter Incomplete Sentences scores. A multiple discriminate analysis revealed that the withdrawals were more dependent, more hostile, more maladjusted, and less scholarly oriented than the persisters (pp. 242-44).

Summary

The exit interview and follow-up research will help the community college learn why students are leaving. With this information, the college could institute new programs, revitalize current programs, and improve its counseling function, in order that it will better meet the needs of all of its students.

Descriptive studies indicate that high school graduation, a college preparatory background in high school, a high level of occupational aspiration, and long term educational plans will identify those students most likely to persist in the junior college.

The psychological assessment of personality differences, between the withdrawal student and the persisting student, offer exciting directions for future research in attrition.
Concluding Statements on Attrition

The relentless trend continues year after year toward higher and higher educational requirements for present and future jobs. Porter (1968) wrote that by 1975, the U.S. Labor Department predicts nearly one in three young workers beginning their careers, will have had at least some college education versus a little more than one in four today. In this period, the most rapid growth in jobs will be in fields demanding the most education. These predictions have great relevance for the community college. This college is in a position to provide a smooth and natural transition to further education.

Athey and Trent (1965) pointed out the need for young citizens of this modern, technological society to obtain a basic liberal education, which will give them flexibility to change roles, and offset the intellectual stagnation which may result from accelerated automation (p. 20). Educational and campus conditions should be made so stimulating that the student would not dare to miss the next installment. "Exciting teachers, who aid students to make new discoveries, and to want to learn, could go a long way toward encouraging students to press for further education" (Montgomery, 1964, p. 21).

Knoell (1964) wrote that one of the biggest problems facing us in higher education now, is the frustrations we
are creating by our expansion of opportunity, the implication being that providing the opportunity alone is not enough without assisting students to profit from it. The challenge is to expand higher education to all who can profit from education beyond high school, regardless of social class, race, ethnic origins, and other traditional handicaps (p. 29).

For the community college to achieve this goal of educational opportunity for all, there must be campus-wide recognition and acceptance of the aims and objectives of the college. Medsker (1964) admonished student personnel workers, who understand the needs of students, to lead the way, by being willing and able to influence faculty and administrative thinking, concerning the purposes and nature of the junior college (p. 12).
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This chapter will describe the procedures employed in the study. These include: the selection of the subjects; the pilot study; a description of the method, the personal interview; interview schedules for the withdrawal students and the persisting students; the stratification of the sample; the statistical technique. The chapter concludes with the definitions of the characteristics under investigation.

Selection of the Subjects

The subjects of this study are the group of day students, who withdrew from Foothill College through the official channels, between the fourth week and the last day of classes, Fall Semester, 1966, and the control group of randomly selected day students, who have persisted through February, 1968. Approximately 200 students were selected from the original groups, which numbered 400 each. Every second name from the computer print-out sheet was selected to achieve a random sample. An inspection of these samples revealed that the distribution of American College Test (ACT) scores was lower in the with-
drawal group. (The method is described in the section, "Stratification of the Sample".)

The Pilot Study and The Personal Interview

A pilot study was undertaken to evaluate the questions to be included in the interview schedules for the withdrawal group and the persisting group. The following chart presents the nature of the groups under consideration:

The interview was chosen as the method for collecting data for several reasons. The most determining reason was that an exit interview had been used in the original study of withdrawal students. In order to compare the results of the follow-up study with the original study, the method should remain constant. The nature of the research
indicated the need for subjective data emphasizing goals, values, and attitudes. And last, Americans are a highly mobile society. It was anticipated that a large number of students would no longer be living in this area. If questionnaires had been employed, a low rate of return might have resulted, judging from the number of telephones that were no longer in service.

The personal interview has certain distinct advantages, as compared with the questionnaire. Good (1963) describes these concisely:

1. The interviewees may require the stimulus and confidential relationships of the interview in order to provide personal and confidential information which they would not ordinarily place on paper.

2. The interviewer may follow up leads and clues in a manner that is not possible by means of an instrument prepared in advance.

3. The interviewer may form some impression of the interviewee, in relation to the truth of the answers and the things that may have been left unsaid.

4. The interviewer may give information and develop attitudes on the part of the respondent, especially in a therapeutic relationship (not applicable), sometimes encouraging exchange of ideas and information. (p. 288)

O'Connor (1965) in Follow-up Studies in Junior Colleges, recommends the use of interviews because the personal nature of the interview will assure greater rapport than can be obtained through a questionnaire. He feels that students are eager to cooperate when their
opinions are invited, and that interviews provide the opportunity for the expansion and explanation of these opinions. (p. 30)

Dole (1965) in his elaborate follow-up study of college students at the University of Hawaii used semi-structured interviews to explore students' reasons for attending college. He adapted Iffert's questionnaire and expanded it to include factors that may affect persistence in college. His success in this approach may be contrasted with Matson's (1955) problems with the semi-structured questionnaire. Matson used incomplete sentences and the students did not fill them in adequately. Possibly there was a natural reluctance in the students who had withdrawn from the junior college to look at themselves as "failures" or a lack of ability or desire to communicate.

In a semi-structured interview, definite subject-matter areas are involved, yet the interviewer remains free to arrange the form and timing of the question. In this way, the interviewee will feel free to give responses to each of the areas to be covered, and in as great a detail as he feels adequately covers the subject. This technique may overcome the weakness of the limited response interview by avoiding the assumption that the interviewer can understand these meanings without explanation. (Richardson, 1965, p. 264)
The interview schedules were used as guidelines to insure that the interviewer would cover all the subject areas necessary for later analysis. The questions used were derived from similar areas of inquiry in the original study at Foothill College (Appendix), a review of the literature on both attrition research and follow-up studies (Chapter 2), and from the pilot study which was conducted prior to the actual study itself.

The purposes of the pilot study were to evaluate the questions for the interview schedules, to estimate the amount of interview time necessary to cover all areas, to develop an appropriate form for note-taking during the interview, and to obtain data for the rough tabulation of responses. Ten students from the withdrawal group and ten students from the control or persisting group were interviewed for the pilot study.

**Interview Schedule for Withdrawal Students**

The student, who was identified as a member of the group formerly in attendance at Foothill College, was first contacted by telephone. At that time, the researcher explained that a study is underway to find out what he or she is presently engaged in doing and to seek information as to how the college might have helped in the past or in the future to meet the needs of the individual. An
appointment was made to meet the person in their home at their convenience.

A letter of introduction, with a photograph (Appendix) written by the Director of Research at the college, was shown to the individual at the beginning of the interview, confirming the fact that the research has the sanction of the college. The confidentiality of the interview content was emphasized, and at this time, any questions about the nature of the research were answered. The independent status of the investigator was also emphasized, stressing that she was not employed at the college, but was gathering this information for a doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University. Many times it was desirable to indicate that Foothill College is a community college and is anxious to meet the needs of persons living in this area. The random nature of the selection of those to be interviewed was also mentioned. After rapport had been established in order that the individual would not feel defensive, but rather attempt to relate his experiences in a positive manner to what had been an expressed need in 1966 for higher education, the interview proper began.
Present Activities

What have you been doing since you left Foothill College?

A. Work: yes no. If yes, more than one job? yes no
   Part-time: 0-10 hrs./wk. 10-20 20+___
   Full-time: 30 or more hrs./wk. If full-time, do you plan to make this work a permanent occupation?
   yes no
   What kind of work are you doing?
   Does this work involve on-the-job training? yes no

B. Attending some institution of higher education: yes no
   If yes, a community college: Foothill College
   De Anza Other____
   If yes, a state college: San Jose State College
   Other____

C. Trade school: yes no. Kind:

D. Unemployed

E. Military service: Waiting to enter service

F. Housewife

G. Other

Personal-social background

Sex: Male, Female
Marital status: single, married
Age: 18-20 years, 20-30 years, 30+ years
Ethnic origin: Caucasian, Other

Occupation of father or primary wage-earner:
(Roe's Classification of Occupations will be used for categories.
(Roe, 1956, pp. 149-50)
Attitude Toward Teaching-learning Environment

How do you feel now about your experience at Foothill College?

a. Wish I were back in college now_______) positive
b. Plan to return sometime___________________
c. Tried it, but it's not for me___________) negative
d. Other_________________

Probes: What did you think about your instructors?
Were they interested in their students?
Were they enthusiastic in their teaching?

In what ways did your counselor help you at Foothill College?

a. No help, even hurt. (negative)
b. Helpful. (positive)
c. Great help.
    Probe: In what ways?_________

Did you participate in any extra-curricular activities?

no_________yes______ Would you describe them?_________

Did Psychology 50 (Orientation to College) help you?

no_________yes______

Was there anything the college might have done that would
have encouraged you to remain in school?

no______yes______ If yes, what?__________________________

a. more interesting courses what kind_________________
b. helped me to define my educational or vocational
goals_________________

Where might you have sought this help?_________________

c. placement in part-time work_________
d. transportation_________
e. other_______

Individual Academic Motivation

1. Looking back now, a year after you have left Foothill College, what do you think your reasons for leaving were?

Probes:
Were there any other reasons that made you decide to leave at this particular time?
When did you first begin to think about leaving?
Were any of your friends leaving?
How do you feel about your decision now?
Why?
2. When did you first decide to go to college?
   a. Parents or others decided for me __________
   b. Own decision: Elementary or junior high school __________, During high school __________, after high school __________.
   Probe: Why did you want to go? Any other reasons?

3. Had your parents attended college? Neither parent ___
   Father only _____ Mother only _______ Both parents _____

4. Can you identify any external conditions (outside of the college) that affected your decision to leave college? No _______ Yes _______ If yes, then _______
   a. Draft.
   b. Financial need.
   c. Physical disability.
   d. Other.

5. If interviewee is not attending college - Do you have any plans to return in the future?
   Definitely plans to return ________ Foothill College ________ Other community college ________ State College ________ Might return in the future ________ (vague) Never plans to return ________ (concrete)

This section will be completed if the student has re-enrolled in a college.

What college are you now attending? ______________________
In what program are you enrolled? ______________________
   a. Transfer.
   b. Technical-occupational.
   c. Enrichment.
   d. Undecided.
   e. Four year college ______ If yes, what major? ______

What is your educational goal?
Are you attending full-time? ______ (more than 12 units);
   Part-time ______ (Under 12 units)

What were the reasons that encouraged you to return?
How long were you out of school? 0-3 months ______,
6-12 ______

What are the factors that are keeping you in school and would you rank them in the order of their importance to you?
Probe: Why do you think that you will be successful in staying in school?
Interview Schedule for Persisting Students (Control Group)

The same introductory pattern is followed for obtaining the interview with the persisting students as was described in the withdrawal schedule. The original study at Foothill College as conducted by Mizel and Stevens is described to the students. Their passive role in this study as a member of the control group is explained, as well as the nature of the follow-up study. These students were more anxious, as a group, about the nature of the interview and its possible consequences for them than the withdrawal group. The students are told that the researcher is not a member of the staff at the college, and is performing this research independently. Acknowledgment is made of the cooperation extended to the researcher by the college, and that a report of a general nature will be presented to the college. The confidentiality of the interview content is stressed, and the students are reassured that neither the detailed contents of the interview nor the names of the students involved, will be communicated to the college. Since many of these students asked to be interviewed on-campus, an office in the counseling area at Foothill College was made available.
Personal-social Background

Sex: Male__________, Female__________.
Marital status: single__________, married__________.
Age: 18-20 years______, 20-30 years______, 30+ years______
Ethnic origin: Caucasian__________, Other______________
Occupation of father or primary wage earner______________

Attitude Toward Teaching-learning Environment

How would you describe the instruction at Foothill College?
Excellent______, Very good______, Average______, Poor______
Probe: What positive educational experiences have you had?
What negative educational experience have you had?
Other possible probes:
Are the instructors interested in you?
Are they available when you want to see them?
Do they have an adequate knowledge of their subject?
Are they enthusiastic about their teaching?

How would you describe the student personnel services at Foothill College? (specifically, your counselor)
Great help__________, Some help__________, No help__________
Probes: In what ways has your counselor helped you in planning your program?
In what ways has he hurt you? (if applicable)
If you are or were undecided about your objectives at Foothill, has he suggested sources of information, possible choices or other alternatives?
(If student has received advice from other sources than his counselor, indicate source here.__________)

Did Psychology 50 help you in your adjustment to college life?
yes__________, no__________
Do you have any suggestions for improving the course?

Do you participate in any extra-curricular activities?
yes__________, no__________ Would you describe them?______

Individual Academic Motivation

1. In what educational program are you now enrolled?
Transfer______, Technical-occupational______, Enrichment______, Undecided______
Semesters completed at Foothill College: less than three_____, Four or more_____.

What is your educational goal? A.A. degree_____; Transfer (no degree)_____; Other_____.
If A.A. degree or transfer, to: state college_____; university_____.

2. When did you first decide to go to college?
   a. Parents or others decided for me_____.
   b. Own decision: Elementary or junior high school_____; During high school_____; After high school_____.
   Probe: Why did you want to attend college?
   Any other reasons__________?

3. Had your parents attended college? Neither parent_____; Father only_____; Mother only_____; Both parents_____.

4. What is your vocational goal?__________(Classify according to degree of clarity: Very clear_____; General area clearly defined_____; Unclear or undecided_____.

5. What are the factors that are keeping you in school? Would you rank them in the order of their importance to you?

Description of the Interviews

Both the persister group and the withdrawal group were extremely cooperative in setting up appointments for the interviews. Only one student declined to be inter­viewed, as he felt the content was too personal. A mother asked that her daughter not be included in the study because the use of drugs had been instrumental in her withdrawal, and she has now returned to Foothill College.

A number of withdrawal students could not be contacted because their telephones had been disconnected or the num­ber reassigned. It is estimated that three telephone
numbers were called to produce one appointment. Possibly this is to be anticipated, as the numbers had been listed by the students eighteen months ago. A number of the withdrawal students were no longer living at home or within commuting distance for the investigator. This group and those with no phones had to be eliminated from the sample. Two hundred withdrawal students had been randomly selected from the original group, and an attempt was made to contact practically every member of the sample.

The average length of the interview for the withdrawal student was approximately one hour. The interview schedule was more involved and longer for the withdrawal student than the persister. For the withdrawals, more than the persisters, the interview was a period of exploring their own motives for past and present actions. Some individuals needed more than an hour to express themselves in the areas covered. It was noted, that if the interview lasted longer than 1½ hours, the interviewee tended to become repetitious, and sometimes bored. At the close of each interview, the investigator summarized the content of the interview, and stressed the confidentiality of the information.

The average length of interviews for the group in school was about 45 minutes. Many of the persisting students were equally interested in self-exploration relative to higher education in general, and their own educational
and vocational goals, in particular. Many of the individuals from both groups expressed surprise, because they found the interview to be a pleasurable experience. They appeared pleased to be participating in a research effort, and very interested in possible outcomes of the project.

Brief notes were taken during the interview, and the details were filled in after the interview had been completed.

**Stratification of the Sample.**

In the *Technical Report* published by the American College Testing Program, the following normative characteristics of the scale are described:

1. is the lowest possible score;  
36 is the highest possible score;  
16 is the approximate median score of national samples of first semester high school seniors;  
20 is the approximate median score of first semester college bound seniors taking the ACT battery.  

*(ACT, 1965, p. 12)*

The ACT composite score has been used in this study, which represents the average of the four subtests: English, Mathematics, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. For stratification purposes, these scores have been divided into three categories:

I. Scores of 16 or below.  
II. Scores ranging from 17 to 24.  
III. All scores 25 or more.
The students in the persisting group were stratified to approximate the distribution of ACT scores in the withdrawal group.

The group of persisting students was also stratified to include a proportionate number of men to women, and Caucasian race to other races (Mexican and Japanese) as observed in the withdrawal group.

**Statistical Technique**

Chi-square analyses have been computed when inference have been made about differences between two groups on a particular variable beyond a description of them. Over-all Chi-square analyses indicate the significance of the difference between the observed versus the expected frequencies (based on the law of probability) across the entire table. A difference at the 5-per-cent level or better ($p < .05$) indicates that it could have occurred by chance only 5 out of 100 times at most; a difference at the 1-per-cent level or better ($p < .01$) could have occurred by chance no more than 1 out of 100 times.

Ferguson (1959) writes that the distribution of Chi-square used in determining critical significance values is a continuous theoretical frequency curve. Where the expected frequencies are small, the actual sampling distribution of Chi-square may exhibit marked discontinuity. He
suggests that for 1 degree of freedom (all tables are 2 X 2), a correction be applied known as **Yate's correction for continuity** (p. 171). By reducing by .5 the obtained frequencies that are greater than expectation, and increasing by .5 the obtained frequencies that are less than expectation, the observed and expected values are brought closer together, and the value of Chi-square is decreased. This correction has been applied where any of the expected frequencies are less than 10.

The level of significant difference has been set at the five per-cent level.

**Definition of Characteristics**

Ten characteristics, relating to persistence in the junior college, have been defined for the three general areas under study. Two other factors, paid employment and academic course load, will also be investigated.

I. **Personal-social**

1. Age:
   a. 18 - 20 years.
   b. 21 - 29 years.
   c. 30 years of age or older.

2. Marital status:
   a. Single.
   b. Married.

3. Occupation of the Father (or primary wage earner):
   a. Professional and managerial.
   b. Semiprofessional, small business, and skilled.
   c. Semiskilled and unskilled.
The classification of occupations by level of function, as interpreted by Roe (1959, pp. 149-50), has been used to categorize the occupations of the father as described by the subjects in the interviews. This classification is based upon degrees of responsibility, capacity, and skill.

a. (Roe's categories 1. and 2.)

**Professional and managerial:** Independent responsibility - for occupations at this level, there is generally no higher authority, except the social group.

Criteria: Important, independent, and varied responsibilities.
Policy-making.
Education, when high level of education is relevant.

**Professional and managerial:** Medium level responsibilities, for self and other, both with regard to importance and variety.

b. (Roe's categories 3. and 4.)

**Semi-professional and small business:** Low level responsibility for others.

Criteria: Application of policy, or determination for self only.
Education: High school plus technical school or the equivalent.

**Skilled**

Skilled occupations require apprenticeship or other special training or experience.

c. (Roe's categories 5. and 6.)

**Semiskilled:** These occupations require some training and experience, but markedly less than occupations in level 4.

**Unskilled:** These occupations require no special training or education and not much more ability than is needed to follow simple directions and to engage in simple repetitive actions.

II. **Perceptions of the Teaching-learning Environment**

1. General evaluation of the faculty:
   a. Excellent.
   b. Very good.
2. General evaluation of the counselor
   a. Excellent (great help)
   b. Very good (very helpful)
   c. Good (helpful, on occasion)
   d. Poor (no help, possibly even detriment).

3. Participation in Extra-curricular Activities
   a. Yes (one or more activities).
   b. No

III. Individual Academic Motivation

1. Time of College Decision.
   a. Elementary or junior high school.
   b. During high school.
   c. After high school.

2. Educational Program.
   a. Transfer.
   b. Technical-occupational.
   c. Enrichment.
   d. Undecided or other.

3. Clarity of Vocational Goal.
   a. Clearly defined choice (specific).
   b. General area clearly defined, but uncertain about specific occupation.
   c. Choice is only vaguely known, or undecided.

4. Education of Parents.
   a. Father has attended college.
   b. Mother has attended college.
   c. Both parents have attended college.
   d. Neither parent has attended college.

IV. Other Factors

1. Paid Employment
   a. Not working.
   b. Working: 0 – 15 hours/week.
   c. Working: 16 or more hours/week.

2. Academic Course Load.
   a. Six semester hours or less.
   b. Seven to twelve semester hours.
   c. More than 12.5 semester hours.
The data collected in these personal interviews of the persister group and the withdrawal group will be analyzed to test the hypotheses under examination in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter contains a description of the individuals in the withdrawal group and their reasons for leaving college. Since a number of these individuals have returned to college, it was hypothesized that there would be differences in selected characteristics between the individuals in college and those not in college. These differences will be analyzed by Chi-square investigating the following areas: personal-social characteristics, perceptions of the teaching-learning environment, and individual academic motivation.

The second hypothesis as posited in Chapter I will also be tested statistically. The relation of the findings of the present research will be discussed, where pertinent, to earlier findings.

The last half of the chapter will be devoted to comparisons between the persister and withdrawal groups on the following characteristics: personal-social, perceptions of the teaching-learning environment, individual academic motivation.
Analysis of the Data

Hypothesis Number One:

There will be a significant difference between the reason given for withdrawal from college, as expressed in the structured exit interview, and the reasons revealed in an in depth, semi-structured interview one year later.

From the total group of 50 students who withdrew during Fall Semester, 1966, 16 individuals would, one year later, state a different major cause for leaving college. And in each of these cases, several factors had contributed to their decision. Twenty-five dropouts felt that the reason given at the time of withdrawal was essentially correct, but would elaborate upon many contributing reasons to their withdrawal. Nine of the withdrawal group did not change their reason as stated in the exit interview, nor did they feel that more than one reason was appropriate for them. If the college is seeking only the primary reason for withdrawal, a structured exit interview is sufficiently valid. However, if the college wishes to investigate the multiple factors of withdrawal, then a semi-structured interview is necessary.

An important finding of this study is that 22 of the 50 individuals in this withdrawal group are now attending college. Personal and environmental changes have altered the original conditions, which brought about their
withdrawal from school a year ago. A discussion of the multiple factors of withdrawal will be pursued separately for those individuals attending college from those not in school at this time.

Withdrawing Students Currently Enrolled in College

Three students listing "health" as their reason for withdrawal returned either to Foothill College or De Anza College (a sister college in the Foothill College District) the following semester. Their illnesses were real, hepatitis, mononucleosis, and an accident, and their period of withdrawal only temporary. Another individual, also listing "health" feels that sickness only partially contributed to her decision to leave college. She wanted to live away from home and work, and after a nine-month period, has defined her vocational goals and returned to college.

Six of the students, who withdrew for "personal" reasons, also returned to college the following semester. Their reasons were complex -- lacking in goals and interest, family problems, and desire to work. Two of the men came back, they said, "To beat the draft, like everyone else!" All felt that the intervening period had helped them to clarify their thinking. They feel that they will be successful because the desire to attend college is their own decision, they possess more well defined goals, and
they are more interested in their courses and in learning now.

One student, listing "Academic Transfer" is now attending the University of California at La Jolla. He had completed his educational goals at Foothill College. Another leaving for the same reason, enrolled briefly in a business school, hoping to develop secretarial skills. She feels that she originally left because she was "tired" of college, but her experience outside of college, made her decide to return. She now enjoys the academic atmosphere. Another student transferred to a four-year college, because she could not adjust socially to the community college. Low grades forced her to attend De Anza College, and she feels now that the environment of the community college is more conducive to her needs.

Two students, who withdrew listing "Academic-low achievement" feel now that family pressures and course content contributed to their decision. Both are in school, and have changed the direction of their programs to meet their interests.

Two students, who reported that they planned to transfer to another school, went directly to work. This experience helped them to "grow up" and made them decide to return to college. They feel the decision is their
own, although other individuals close to them encouraged
them to try again.

One student, who left listing "Job-shift Change" now
feels he was tired of school. His company has encouraged
him to return, and he feels that education is important for
advancement.

Two men, listing "Military Enlistment" did attempt to
enlist in the armed services, but were turned down for
medical reasons. This attempt was due to "the draft
hang-up of our generation," friends enlisting at the time,
and to their own problems in adjusting to college life.
One returned to Foothill College and the other is attending
a state college. Both feel that they can "settle down"
and pursue their academic careers in earnest.

One student, who listed "Financial" problems as his
reason for withdrawal, is attending a private junior col-
lege away from home. He feels now that he needed to live
away from home, and immediate family problems were the
cause of his withdrawal.

The last student to return, had listed "Other" as her
reason for leaving, and now says she had no interest in her
college "tryout." However, her parents continued to en-
courage her, and she is now living away from home at a four-
year college. She remained out of college over a year, and
seems unsure if this second attempt at higher education will succeed.

Summary

Eight of the students, who withdrew only to return, would now change their reason as stated in the exit interview for leaving college. Previous research has also encountered and noted the problem of validity of expressed reasons at the time of withdrawal.

In most of the students' opinions, the period following withdrawal was productive. Whether they worked or not, this "moratorium" helped them to establish their own educational and vocational goals. With few exceptions, notably those involving a dislike of course offerings, most felt there was little that the college might have done through its student personnel services to encourage them to stay, either before or during their exit interview. Many felt that they had to work through their problems themselves. One might speculate that those students, who have expressed intrinsic motives for college attendance, as opposed to the draft and family or company imposed goals, will be more successful in remaining in college.
Withdrawal Students Not Attending College

The complex problems of those withdrawal students, as stated in their in depth interviews, fall most conveniently into the following categories: "the perennial student and drop-out," college-related problems, and non-college related problems.

Three of these "perennial" students have attended this community college and others of similar nature, and have maintained a pattern of completing some semesters and withdrawing during others. One student has tried several times to complete a pre-medical program. He has usually given financial reasons for withdrawing, but now through extensive counseling, realizes he cannot achieve this goal. He hopes to return and major in a business-related program. In a sense, he is an example of the "cooling-out" function of the junior college. Another student has accumulated 70 units through intermittent attendance. He has twice dropped out during the semester: the first time because of a job-shift change; the second, because of marriage. The third student has had to withdraw several times during the semester because of family responsibilities. She has completed about 30 units. All three of these withdrawals are older, but the probability that they will continue to avail themselves of the educational opportunity offered by the community college is high. Their inner drive to attend
college, even sporadically, indicates they will continue their pattern of attendance. In all three instances, effective counseling and teaching have allowed them to explore their potentials.

For this group of seven withdrawals, the academic offerings of the college and inadequate counseling have contributed, in their opinion, to their decision to leave college. Their personal problems and the possibility of low grades were also important factors. However, they have all rated counseling as poor as indicated by these typical comments: "Counselor is nice, but he's not much help." "I was placed in general education courses, when I should have been in a vocational program." "I had a poor arrangement of classes, so that I could not work part-time." "Counselor 'shoved' a full load of courses in order to qualify for G.I." (He found out later, too late, that he could attend part-time and still qualify for partial support.) One student interested in Mechanical Drawing was urged to take the general education courses to "get them out of the way" for degree requirements. He floundered in English and dropped out.

Vocational programs have long been viewed in the junior college as "second-class" programs. The stress is placed on the more prestigious transfer program. Many of these students feel that they would be in college today if
only they could have developed more interest in their studies. In part, counselors may themselves be responsible for the high attrition rate in the transfer program. The technical-occupational program is the more expensive for the college to operate, but the need for highly skilled technicians is increasing daily.

Four of the male withdrawal students are now in the service. Their reasons for leaving college range from, "To get the military over with," to being "tired of school." Several travelled around the country before enlisting or being drafted. They all seemed anxious to explore the world. Two others, still awaiting induction, have worked since leaving college. Both hope to return after the service. Clearly, external conditions play an important role in determining the educational plans of young men.

Four of the men, who left college, are working full-time in occupations which are satisfying to them. One withdrew during his sixth semester because he was advised, that for the time, he had completed his educational goals as a law enforcement officer. Two left during their third semester -- one for financial reasons, and the other to concentrate on his work. The last of this group left in his first semester, ostensibly because of health, but now
feels his attitude was poor. All of these men hope to return to take courses related to their work.

The remaining male member of this withdrawal group is a "self-styled" hippie. He would like to please his parents and feels guilty that he cannot be a "carbon-copy" of his father. He left college because he was flunking out, and his friends did not value school. However, he feels he has grown up, and because his current friends are now in college, he would like very much to return.

The 12 women withdrawals may be classified into two groups: those who are presently working, and those who are married.

None of the women who has married since leaving Foothill College is working now. They all stated that their primary reason for going to college had been to satisfy parental expectations. Several stated that they did not plan to stay long when they first enrolled, and apparently this was a self-fulfilling prophecy. Several wish they were now back in college. However, they have not made the effort in this interim period to explore actively any academic opportunities available to them. A few had worked before marriage but quit. Some are presently looking for part-time work.

Their reasons for leaving involve personal feelings, usually related to themselves and/or their families. These
reasons can be summed up in the following comments: "I withdrew for the 'usual' reasons - family, work load, emotional problems." "I feel that I had to get away from home and school." "I wanted to be on my own." None of these students felt that the college could have helped her to stay: rather the problems lay within herself.

The five girls, who are presently working, had all been encouraged by their parents to attend college, and most felt that the decision had been made for them. All but one were the first in their families to attend college. They expressed some disappointment in their college experience, commenting that it was "too much like high school." Most said that they were "tired of studying," and felt that they needed the money -- either for themselves or for their families. Only one girl has found an occupation (geriatric nursing) which interests her. The others are performing clerical work and do not find it satisfying.

Summary

Implicit in these multiple reasons for withdrawal from college, is the necessity for youth, as they approach or are in young adulthood, to work through certain developmental tasks. These tasks are "...many, diverse, and difficult" (Mueller, 1961, p.110). For a large percentage of this group (56), the community college has not offered
the desired environment. Closely related to this, is that by attending a local college, these young adults remained at home, and were subject to the prevailing family pressures. Many leave the college, to marry or to work, to develop an identity apart from their parents and assert their independence from their families. Many expressed the need to explore the world outside of the college. The community college has allowed them, however, the opportunity to test themselves in one kind of an academic environment.

Statistical Analyses of Differences in Characteristics of Sub-groups Within the Withdrawal Population

At the time this study was designed, it was not realized that a number of individuals, classified by Foothill College as dropouts, would be currently attending college. Consequently, an hypothesis was not stated to test the differences in personal-social characteristics, perceptions of the teaching-learning environment, and factors involving individual academic motivation, between the group who are attending college and the group who are not. It will now be hypothesized that differences in these characteristics exist in these sub-groupings as defined, within the withdrawal population. Over-all Chi-square analyses will be employed to indicate the
significance of the difference between the observed versus the expected frequencies across the entire table. Yates' correction for continuity (appropriate for small samples) has been utilized. The level of significant difference has been set at the five per-cent level.

**Personal-social Characteristics**

**Sex.**—Of the original group of 50 students withdrawing from Foothill College, 22 are now attending college. Sixteen of the students who returned are men, and six are women. Exactly 50 per cent of the men returned, and 33 per cent of the women. This difference is not significant.

Of the 12 withdrawals not now attending college, two definitely plan to return, three feel they might come back, and seven state positively they will not return. Four of the 16 men are in military service, and three feel they probably will go back to college. Of the remaining 12, five definitely plan to return, four possibly may, and three feel that they definitely will not go back to college. These differences are not significant for this characteristic.
Marital Status.

TABLE 6.—COMPARISON OF MARITAL STATUS OF INDIVIDUALS IN COLLEGE AND NOT IN COLLEGE

N = 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>In College</th>
<th>Not in College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.44 \]

\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]

This Chi-square value approaches significance, and does indicate that a single marital status enhances the probability of returning to college after withdrawal. The responsibility of providing for a mate is apparently a deterrent to college attendance for this group.

Age.—When the age group, 18-20 years, was compared with the group, 21 and older, no difference was indicated between those in college and not in college after withdrawal. For this group, age is not a determining factor in college attendance.
Father's Occupation.

TABLE 7.—COMPARISON OF FATHER'S OCCUPATION OF INDIVIDUALS IN COLLEGE AND NOT IN COLLEGE

\[ N = 50 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>In College</th>
<th>Not in College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled &amp; unskilled semi-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.26 \]

\[ \alpha_{.05} = 3.84 \]

This Chi-square value also approaches significance and indicates that if an individual's father occupies a professional or managerial position, he is very likely to return to college. When the professional category was combined with semi-professional and skilled and compared with the unskilled group, there was not a significant relationship. In this study, socio-economic status is based on father's occupation, one of the best known single indicators of this variable (Trent and Medsker, 1967, p. 64). Clearly, as indicated also in Chapter II, a high socio-economic status is highly predictive of college attendance.
A middle or lower status does not predict attendance even in a college which is tuition free.

Perceptions of the Teaching-learning Environment

During the interview, the individuals were asked to evaluate the faculty at the community college in general terms and these responses were placed on a continuum ranging from excellent to poor. There was no difference in the perceptions of the faculty between those students who returned to college and those who did not. They were also asked if they were participating or had participated in extra-curricular activities at the college. Again, there was no difference between the groups.

Perceptions of Counseling.—

TABLE 8.—COMPARISON OF THE EVALUATION OF COUNSELOR BY INDIVIDUALS IN COLLEGE AND NOT IN COLLEGE

\[ N = 50 \]

| Evaluation of Counselor | In College | | Not in College | | Total |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|
|                         | n | %    | n | %    | n | %    |
| Excellent, Very good    | 10| 45   | 5 | 18   | 15| 30   |
| Good, Poor              | 12| 55   | 23| 82   | 35| 70   |
| Total                   | 22| 100  | 28| 100  | 50| 100  |

\[ x^2 = 3.25 \]

\[ \alpha.05 = 3.84 \]
This comparison between the groups approaches significance. Individuals who perceive their counselors as extremely helpful or helpful, are more likely to persist in college. Those who felt that their counseling experience was of some help or no help are less likely to return. Admittedly, many of these encounters by students no longer in college were of short duration. However, many of these ex-students, as described in the preceding section, feel quite strongly about counseling inadequacies at the college.

**Individual Academic Motivation**

**Educational Program Chosen by Student.**

**TABLE 9.**—COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF INDIVIDUALS IN COLLEGE AND NOT IN COLLEGE

**N = 50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>In College</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not in College</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.52 \]

\[ \alpha_{.05} = 3.84 \]

\[ p < .05 \]
The level of significance of this finding exceeds the .02 level. Students currently enrolled in college have chosen transfer, technical-occupational, or enrichment programs. Those individuals, who as students were "undecided" about their goals, are more likely to withdraw from college and not return. This finding is supported by other research. One function of the counseling staff in the community college is to facilitate decision-making for their counselees. The indecision of this group of individuals, at the time of their withdrawal, has contributed to their feeling less need to return to the academic world.

Time of College Decision.—In the interview, the individuals were asked to recall at what point in their lives they had first decided to attend college. The responses were grouped: during elementary or junior high school, during high school, and after high school. There was no significant difference between these groups on this characteristic.
Education of Parents.

TABLE 10.—COMPARISON OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BY PARENTS OF INDIVIDUALS IN COLLEGE AND NOT IN COLLEGE

N = 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Attendance By Parents</th>
<th>In College n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not in College n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither parent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father only, Mother only, both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.55 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 3.84 \]
\[ p < .02 \]

If neither parent has attended college, their children are less likely to re-enter college after withdrawal. This finding exceeds the .02 level in significance. Previous research suggests that one prime source of academic motivation is parental influence. Parents without a college background tend not to have a clear-cut value system to pass on to their children (Chapter II).

This difference is not as significant, when other groups are compared. Only a slightly higher percentage of withdrawals have returned to college, whose parents, one or both have attended college.
Clarity of Vocational Goals.--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of Vocational Goal</th>
<th>In College</th>
<th>Not in College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very clear, clear</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.15 \]

\[ p < .02 \]

This finding approaches the .01 level of significance. An unclear vocational goal is defined in this study as only vaguely known to the individual or he is undecided. A clear goal is one in which the general area is well delineated, but not the specific occupation. A very clear goal indicates the individual is working towards a definite occupational choice.

Individuals with clear vocational goals are more likely to return to college following withdrawal, and conversely those with only vaguely defined or unknown goals, are more likely to remain outside of the community college classroom. This finding could plausibly relate to the
to the often-deplored climate of "vocationalism" prevalent in the junior college. Possibly those students, who have definite vocational goals, are more at ease in its environment.

Summary

Only two of the characteristics examined under "Personal-social" are significant: Marital status and Father's occupation. A high socio-economic status and a single marital status make some contribution to the probability that an individual will return to college after withdrawal. Effective counseling, as perceived by the student, will also encourage him to return.

The most significant findings occurred in "Individual academic motivation." Those students who were committed to an educational program, are most likely to return. College attendance by the parents definitely influences an individual to re-enter college. A clear vocational goal is also characteristic of students returning to college after withdrawal.

Hypothesis Number Two:

There will be a significant difference in the possession of certain non-intellective characteristics (Personal-social, Perceptions of the Teaching-learning environment, and Individual academic motivation) between those students
persisting in college and those students who withdraw during the semester.

**Personal-social Characteristics**

**Age.**—There is not a significant difference between the withdrawal group and the persisting (control) group when the age category, 18-20 years is compared with the category, 21 years of age and older. For this sample of 100 students, the percentage of those students persisting in school 21 years and older, is the same as the percentage of students in this category withdrawing from school during the semester. Age, for this population, does not contribute to withdrawal.

**Marital Status.**

**TABLE 12.**—COMPARISON OF MARITAL STATUS OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.65 \]

\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]
This Chi-square value closely approaches significance, and indicates that being married increases the probability of a student withdrawing during the semester. It is interesting to note that Matson's study (1955) found this characteristic not to be significant.

The effect of marriage upon women's academic motivation has been discussed endlessly (Heist, 1963). The relation of this factor to the male gender has been less clearly defined in the literature. The proportion of men to women in this sample of the population is roughly 3:2. Marriage is equally detrimental to persistence in college for this population of men, probably because of the added financial responsibilities involved in the relationship.

**Father's Occupation.**

TABLE 13.—COMPARISON OF FATHER'S OCCUPATION OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

\[ N = 100 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Persisters Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total n=%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Semi-professional, Skilled</td>
<td>40 80</td>
<td>36 72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>14 28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.57 \]

\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]
This Chi-square value approaches significance only at the .1 level. If the groups are compared, Professional versus all others as in Table Seven, the result is not significant. It is important to note for the overall population, that the professional factor, upper-middle socio-economic status, related less to persistence in college. Only when Unskilled is compared versus all others, does Chi-square begin to approach significance. This indicates not only the predominately middle-class nature of this junior college population, but also the democratizing effect the college is having on college attendance in the community through its "open door," tuition free policies. Generally, only those students from the lower socio-economic strata are more prone to withdraw from college during the semester.

Perceptions of the Teaching-learning Environment

Perceptions of the Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Evaluation</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent, Very good</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good, poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 23.0 \]

\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]

\[ p < .001 \]
This characteristic did not distinguish within the withdrawal group between the sub-groups in college and those not in college. However, when the persister group is compared with the withdrawal group, the difference in perceptions of the faculty is highly significant. Junior colleges have been traditionally proud of the primary teaching role of their faculty. Ninety-six per cent of the persisting students reported that generally their teachers' performance in the classroom was excellent or very good. Only 52 per cent of the withdrawal group chose these superlatives. Undoubtedly, this judgment by the withdrawal group is colored by their perceived inadequate response to the academic environment of the college.

Perceptions of Counseling.—

TABLE 15.—COMPARISON OF THE EVALUATION OF COUNSELOR BY STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Counselor</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent, very good</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good, poor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 11.6

α < .001

α .05 = 3.84

p < .001
As noted in Table Eight, withdrawal students in general, felt their counselor to be of some help or no help to them. In Table Fifteen, while a higher percentage of persisting students than withdrawals, feel that their counselor has been of great help or very helpful, the persisters do not rate the performance by the counselors as highly as the performance of the faculty. Theoretically, counseling coexists with teaching as a major function of the junior college (Knoell, 1964, p. 14).

The conclusion that this college is performing its teaching function more effectively than its counseling function is untenable for the following reasons. Medsker (1964) writes that the counseling process in the junior college is complicated by a multitude of problems: "...lack of motivation stemming from environmental factors, unrealistic aspirations, deficiencies in learning skills, lack of intellectual commitment, lack of adequate vocational orientation, and authoritarian personalities" (p. 13).

The counseling process is intricate and involved, and the effect of counseling is difficult to evaluate. It is also difficult to generalize from these results, because the counseling process was not under investigation -- only the student's evaluation of his counselor was probed. In view of the characteristics of the junior college student in this developmental period, one would
Psychology 50.—Psychology 50, as it is conceived at Foothill College, has a three-fold purpose:

1. To impart general information needed by all entering students.

2. To enable the counselor to establish a relationship with students assigned to him, and the students to identify and form an initial acquaintanceship with the counselor.

3. To assist students with special problems and needs in identifying and utilizing the special services, which the institution has to offer (McDaniel et al., 1967, p. 59).

This course is required of all entering students and meets one hour a week, carrying one unit of credit. It is taught by the counselors and follows a general course outline, which has been developed over a period of time. The consultants (McDaniel, et al. ibid.) concluded that the size of the classes (large) and the demand for the coverage of topics, has defeated the individualization, as originally intended. The course is graded, and the consultants felt that this is detrimental to student motivation.

In the follow-up interview, the individuals in both groups, persisters and withdrawals, were asked to respond to the following question: "Did Psychology 50 help you in your adjustment to college life?" In the persister group, 17 found the course helpful, and 23 felt it was of
no help. The students not responding had not taken the course. These results are not significant, and probably reflect the findings of the consultants (McDaniel, et al). They found in their survey: "In the eyes of many students and the faculty, Psychology 50 is a 'Mickey Mouse' activity" (ibid.).

This term or "waste of time" were most frequently used to describe the course by students who responded negatively to the question. Students, who responded positively, liked the group discussions, enjoyed writing their autobiographies, and felt the tests, (S.V.I.B. and the Kuder) were helpful to them in exploring their vocational interests.

Extra-curricular Activities.—There was no difference between the persister group and the withdrawal group in participating in extra-curricular activities. Foothill College provides a comprehensive, well-organized, and well-financed program of student activities. Apparently participation in these activities is more a function of individual interests, and bears no relation to persistence in college.
Individual Academic Motivation

Education Program Chosen by Student.—

TABLE 16.—COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total n=%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0 n 0 %</td>
<td>8 n 16 %</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other programs</td>
<td>50 100 %</td>
<td>42 84 %</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 100 %</td>
<td>50 100 %</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.92 \]

\[ \alpha^{.05} = 3.84 \]

\[ p < .01 \]

Students, who are likely to persist in college, have selected a program — transfer, technical-occupation, or enrichment. They have made a commitment, either of an extrinsic or intrinsic nature. This characteristic distinguishes the persister group from the withdrawal group, and also predicts who among the withdrawals will return to college (Table Four).
Time of College Decision—

TABLE 17.—COMPARISON OF THE TIME OF COLLEGE DECISION OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of College Decision</th>
<th>Persister Group n</th>
<th>Persister Group %</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group n</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group %</th>
<th>Total n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or junior high sch.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During or after high school</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.77 \]
\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]

This characteristic, the time of college decision, approaches significance at the .1 level. It does tend to distinguish between the persister group and the withdrawal group. The level of significance is not as high as those elicited in comparable studies in four-year colleges nor as high as Matson's finding (\( p < .02 \)) in a similar junior college (Matson, 1955, p. 88). She found that of the students studied, a larger percentage of the withdrawal group had apparently not planned or prepared for college attendance while in high school.

A large percentage of this group did not decide to attend college until their high school years or after graduation from high school. This substantiates Medsker's
generalization that a high percentage of students entering junior college have not given adequate time or attention to their college plans. The accessibility and availability of the community college reduces the significance of the time of college decision, but the latter does tend to indicate which students are more likely to persist.

TABLE 18.—COMPARISON OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BY PARENTS OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Attendance By Parents</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither parent, father only, mother only</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 8.65 \]

\[ \alpha .05 = 3.84 \]

\[ p < .01 \]

Students, whose parents have both attended college, are likely to persist in the community college. Parents, especially when both have experienced college, are able to communicate these educational values to their children. The influence of the early environment, especially that
provided by the parents, is of critical importance in the development of academic motivation.

Goetz and Leach (1967) reported that while the education of the father did not significantly differentiate the persisters from the withdrawals, the mothers of the persisting students had significantly more education than mothers of withdrawals (p. 886).

TABLE 19.—COMPARISON OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BY PARENTS OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Attendance By Parents</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father only, Mother only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 6.85\]

\[\alpha_{.05} = 3.84\]

\[p < .01\]

While this Chi-square value well exceeds the .05 level, the finding is in the inverse direction of the researcher's expectation. This table indicates that an individual, whose father or mother has attended college is more likely to withdraw. One possible explanation is that the individual feels that the decision to attend college
was not made by him, but rather for him. Consequently, he expresses his need for establishing his own identity by withdrawing from college.

Clarity of Vocational Goals.--

TABLE 20.--COMPARISON OF CLARITY OF VOCATIONAL GOALS OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

\[ N = 100 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of Vocational Goal</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and very clear</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 14.3 \]

\[ \alpha_{.05} = 3.84 \]

\[ p < .001 \]

Not only are students with clear vocational goals likely to return to college after withdrawal (Table Eleven), but they are far more likely to persist in college. Most of the students interviewed in the persister group were at least in their fourth semester of attendance at the college. Again, this conformity to the vocational climate of the junior college is related to student persistence on its campus.
Other Characteristics.—In addition to the preceding characteristics, two other factors related to college persistence warrant investigation. They are number of semester units carried by the students, and the number of hours spent in paid employment.

TABLE 21.—COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SEMESTER UNITS CARRIED BY STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Units</th>
<th>Persister Group n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6 units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7 units</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.4 \]

\[ \alpha_{.05} = 3.84 \]

The student who is more prone to withdraw during the semester, for the groups under study, is taking 6 units or less of course work. Generalizations, for this type of data could be more efficiently collected by the registrar's office than by personal interviews; and the conclusions would be more valid, because large numbers of students could be tabulated. However, it was noted in this group of withdrawals, that as they approached the time of departure from the college, they were in the process of
dropping courses. Many felt unable to cope with a full schedule (12.5 units or more).

TABLE 22.—COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF HOURS OF PAID EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE

\[ N = 100 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total n=%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 15 (part-time)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+15 (full-time)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.02 \]

[\( \alpha .05 = 3.84 \)]

\[ p < .05 \]

The demands of paid employment apparently do not encourage withdrawal. For this group, significantly more persisters are working part-time or full-time than were the students who withdrew from college.
TABLE 23.—COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF HOURS OF PAID EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS PERSISTING IN COLLEGE AND STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COLLEGE
N = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week</th>
<th>Persister Group</th>
<th>Withdrawal Group</th>
<th>Total n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working,</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ hours</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 10.7 \]
\[ \chi^2 .05 = 3.84 \]
\[ p < .001 \]

This finding indicates that a significantly greater number of persisting students are working part-time than withdrawals. The percentage of students working full-time (15+ hours) is about the same for the two groups. Both this table and the preceding one indicate that students do persist in college, even with the additional responsibility of outside employment. It could be conjectured that a student in the community college, who is working is more likely to persist than one who is not.

Summary

This follow-up study revealed that 22 of the 50 students, who withdrew from Foothill College, are presently attending college. These students withdrew for complex
reasons related to their personal, academic, and social adjustment to college. Students who withdrew because of poor health were most likely to return. For these returning students, the interim period was productive. The remainder of this withdrawal group left for similar reasons, and are engaged in many diverse activities outside of the college environs.

Within this withdrawal group, two sub-groups emerged. A comparison was made between these groups to seek out characteristics that might identify those students who return to college after withdrawal and those who do not. Those individuals most likely to return are: single; their father is professional or managerial; they perceive the teaching-learning environment favorably; they have chosen an educational program and have a clear vocational goal; one or both of their parents attended college.

When the overall differences between the persister group and the withdrawal group were examined, it was found that age is not a factor in withdrawal. A student is more likely to withdraw if he is married; if his father is unskilled; if he made his decision to attend college in high school; if he is undecided about his educational program and vocational goal; if neither parent attended college; if he perceives the teaching-learning environment unfavorably. A summary and conclusions will be presented in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

California, with the largest number of public junior colleges and enrolled students in the United States, attempts to provide the opportunity of higher education for all. However, these junior colleges, noting the high level of withdrawal during the freshman year, express concern that large numbers of its students are leaving prior to the achievement of their educational objectives.

In an effort to learn why students leave college during the semester, Foothill College began "The Study of the Day Withdrawal Student." Every student, who withdrew during the Fall Semester, 1966, through official channels, was interviewed by a counselor assigned to the project. This structured interview was designed to secure the primary reason, which was causing him to leave the college. This interview information together with data from the student's cumulative record, was then compared with a control group of persisting students to identify the characteristics of students who withdraw from college. The results of this study were inconclusive, and suggested the need for further investigation of the withdrawal problem.
The current study has followed up fifty individuals, randomly selected from each of the two groups, withdrawal and persister, as defined in the original study. The two groups of fifty were matched for academic aptitude as measured by the A.C.T. Testing Program. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, exploring not only the multiple causes of withdrawal, but also characteristics that might identify a potential withdrawal student prior to his departure.

This follow-up study affirmed the validity of the primary reason for withdrawal stated by the student at the time of his exit interview. However, with several exceptions, more than one reason was involved in the decision by the student to leave college. Generally, the reasons fell into three categories: personal, social, and academic. For a majority of the withdrawals, each of these categories was represented in their reasons for leaving college.

An analysis of these reasons suggested that they be further categorized into groups of reasons: those related directly to the college; those causes beyond the control of the college. Placed in this context, the college is in a better position to institute preventive measures. Possible actions for the college, as a result of these interviews, are: a more positive attitude by the counselors toward the technical-occupational program; more flexibility
to permit the student to enroll in courses that interest him, rather than to fulfill degree requirements; classify remedial courses as electives; to extend the relevancy of the curriculum to meet the needs of all students.

An important finding of this study is that almost one-half of the withdrawal group have returned to a junior college. This suggests that the final attrition rate in the community college is not as high as originally estimated. Without adequate follow-up of students, colleges remain unaware of this large group of "temporary" withdrawals. This finding also emphasizes the need to institute exit interviews as a part of the official withdrawal procedures.

The second part of this study investigated the contributions of characteristics from the following areas to persistence in college: personal-social; perceptions of the teaching-learning environment; and individual academic motivation. A statistical comparison (Chi-square) of the subgroups of these classifications, revealed the following profiles of the "typical" persister and withdrawal student.

A student is most likely to persist in the junior college, if:

1. he is single;
2. his father is skilled or professional;
3. both parents have attended college;
4. he made his decision to attend college either before or after high school, but not during;
5. he has definite educational and vocational goals;
6. he evaluates the faculty and counselors favorably;
7. he is carrying a full academic load.

A student is most likely to withdraw and not re-enter college, if:

1. he is married;
2. his father is unskilled;
3. neither parent has attended college;
4. he made his decision to attend college in high school;
5. he is undecided about his educational and vocational goals;
6. he perceives the faculty and counselor unfavorably;
7. he is carrying a low academic load;
8. he is not working.

Age, sex, and participation in extra-curricular activities do not differentiate the persisting student from the withdrawal in this study.

Students, possessing the characteristics and behavior patterns of the "typical" withdrawal, require the attention of both faculty and counselors to help them fulfill their educational potential. Realistically, however, for many of these students, efforts at the college level are too late. Rather, a casework approach at the junior high and high school level, to assist these students in remedying one or more of the factors responsible for withdrawal, would be the most effective method to lower attrition in the junior college.
CONCLUSIONS

Follow-up is a process by which an educational institution seeks to determine how effectively it is meeting the needs of those it serves. This study was concerned with a sample of day withdrawal students from a junior college. It is concluded that in most areas, Foothill College is responding adequately to the needs of its students. A large proportion of students who leave, return within a year, and only a small segment of the population state that they will never re-enter. For many of these students, this moratorium period away from college, was a period of growth that produced a positive solution to problems of a financial, social, developmental, or academic nature.

This study is only a beginning in the development of characteristics, which may identify the withdrawal student and the persister in the junior college. Many of these characteristics originate in the lower socio-economic status of the students who attend the community college. As Goldsen, et al., (1960) stated, a disproportionate number of students from the working class emphasize the instrumental value of college. As a group, they strive for upward mobility. The transfer program offers prestige and status, but the rewards are not immediate. The vocational program is "terminal," and thus the student
remains undecided and uncommitted. Counseling, especially, can help students in this exploratory period learn to live with tentative vocational commitments and inspire them to develop the interests they possess. A deeper understanding of the motivational patterns of these students will help them find the place in ne junior college where they can succeed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Several indicators of individual academic motivation were used in this study — time of college decision, college attendance by the parents, choice of educational program, clarity of vocational choice. These are inadequate measures. Further research should be attempted to develop a scale, perhaps similar to McClelland's N ach, that will more accurately describe this important psychological construct.

2. Studies should be undertaken in the junior college to develop norms on academic and other aptitudes, socio-economic status, vocational aspirations, and other characteristics.

3. Follow-up studies should become an integral part of institutional research at the junior college level. These studies should include not only the withdrawal student, but those who leave at the end of a semester before they graduate.
A STUDY OF THE DAY WITHDRAWAL STUDENT
FOOTHILL COLLEGE

THE PROBLEM

This study resulted from a series of recommendations by the Office of Research and Planning during the school year 1965-66 for areas of institutional research that offered great promise of being of value in providing suggestions for improvement of Foothill College operations and procedures. One of the subjects for careful, in-depth study was felt to be that of the college withdrawal student.

This research project defines the term as follows:

Withdrawal: Those day students who withdrew completely and in accordance with established procedures from Foothill College between the fourth week and the last day of classes during Fall Semester, 1966.

The research team, headed by Robert Mizel, was immediately confronted with a fundamental question: "Should we seek those multiple causal factors that students offer as reasons for withdrawal, or should we look for a basic causal factor, global in nature, but sufficiently specific to present the college with directions for further studies?" It was recognized that the objectives of the
study had to be limited, and the research team took the single basic cause approach.

Since this study involves a considerable expenditure in man hours and money, the following considerations were offered as justification for the study. For many students, withdrawal means a loss of investment or a painful, emotional experience. The philosophy at foothill College is "Educational Opportunity for All," but it is equally concerned with assisting students to arrive at personal goals and in facilitating the achievement of those goals through providing an empathetic educational environment. Not only is it expensive to students to withdraw from college, but it is equally costly and wasteful to the college for whom an empty chair means lost funds, which by necessity leads to a curtailment of offerings. The value of this study to the community and the nation is further evident in that this research was funded by federal grants and local matching funds to find ways to improve the school's retention powers through helping the student realize his potential.

THE STUDY

There are a number of hypotheses that this project will attempt to study.

1. Students withdraw during a college semester for certain basic reasons which are valuable for the college to know.
2. The college can act upon these reasons and the recommendations they elicit to reduce the withdrawal rate.

3. There are significant differences in student characteristics between those who withdraw during the Fall Semester, 1966-67 and those who finished Fall Semester, 1966-67.

Student characteristics for this study were collected from two sources: file record search and an interview. The student characteristics from the file record search were the following:

1.0 High school grade point average.
2.0 High school graduate.
3.0 Foothill cumulative grade point average.
4.0 Last semester grade point average if at Foothill College.
5.0 ACT composite standard score.
6.0 ACT English standard score.
7.0 Educational objective.
8.0 Changes in major.
9.0 Previous colleges' cumulative grade point average.
10.0 Total units earned - all sources.
11.0 Last high school of attendance.
12.0 Student enrollment status.
13.0 Previous record of probations.
14.0 Previous Foothill College withdrawals.
15.0 Previous college withdrawals.
16.0 Previous Foothill College disqualifications.
17.0 Previous college disqualifications.

The student characteristics, which were elicited from the interview procedure were defined to be:

1.0 Sex.
2.0 Day or Day/Night Combination.
3.0 Age.
4.0 Unit load at time of withdrawal.
5.0 Semester.
6.0 Educational objective
   6.1 Transfer
   6.2 Vocational
   6.3 Enrichment
7.0 Average hours worked per week.
8.0 Method of transportation to Foothill
9.0 Marital status
10.0 Living status
11.0 Attitude of student toward college
12.0 Distance from the college to the residence

One counselor would conduct all of the interviews, and he would attempt to determine the real single basic cause which prompted the student to withdraw. The interviews varied in time from 10 to 15 minutes. The time duration was kept minimal to make the interview an integral part of the official college withdrawal regulations.

Comment: This procedure is not mandatory, and a student could simple stop attending classes, and if making a D or better grade, withdraw without penalty. Therefore the interview had to be as relatively painless as possible to insure that students would go through the official procedure and not evade it to avoid the interview. Each student had to be sold on the value of the study and not communicate negative feelings to friends who were contemplating withdrawal also.

The interview form was designed to serve several functions. First, it collected information from the interview in an easily accessible manner. Second, the data was collected in a manner which was readily convertible for analysis by a data processing system. This form was set up on one page in such fashion that the interviewer had to do as little writing as possible, so as not to detract from the interview.
Analysis of the Interview Sheet

The form has two basic divisions. The first division is that of biographical variables which as discussed above, assumed to be worthy of study and were not available from student folders. The second division was the "motive" section which included a list of 28 basic variables which the research team selected as the most inclusive of all possible motives which prompt students to withdraw from college.

This second division, entitled Basic Motive, was where the one basic motive that was prompting a student to sever his relations with the college in the role of student, was determined by the interviewer. Using counseling techniques to reduce multiple causes to one basic cause, the interviewer placed each student's motive in one of the following areas.

A. Military - Drafted  If a student comes in to withdraw and he indicates he is to be drafted and the day for induction is set in the near proximity, then this is used as his basic motive for withdrawal.

B. Military - Enlisted  When a student indicates he is enlisting, the date for induction is set in the near proximity, he sees opportunity in the service and/or desires to satisfy his military obligation, and would not quit Foothill if he did not choose to enlist, then this is accepted as basic motive.

C. Military - Reserve  This category is for students who by virtue of their military reserve status find themselves being called up to active duty in the immediate future.
D. **Health - Illness** The student who has become ill or who returns from a prolonged illness, mental or physical, which has adversely affected his work progress necessitating his withdrawal from college, would be placed here.

E. **Health - Pregnancy** Women who must quit because of pregnancy are classed in this category.

F. **Health - Family** Students who must quit because of family health problems, illness, pregnancy, etc., which has impeded their studies and progress, are classified here.

G. **Health - Accident** A student who has had an accident and this has necessitated his withdrawal, will be placed here.

H. **Financial - Personal Maintenance** When a student manifests financial need, is usually self supporting, and the need arises for reasons not of a family conflict (i.e. a conflict which prompts his "moving out") then this category is used.

I. **Financial - Family Maintenance** Students who express the problem of increased costs, bills, expenses in maintaining the family, and health is not a factor, will be classed here.

J. **Financial - Transportation** This category is used for the student who is quitting to buy a car or support a car.

K. **Job - Going to Work** When a student indicates he is quitting college to go to work and has no financial or personal crisis, then he is recorded in this category.

L. **Job - Training Program** This student is quitting college to go into a training program which affords him opportunity as he sees it.

M. **Job - Advancement** This student is electing to leave as the result of a promotion in his job increasing his responsibilities and demands for his time.

N. **Job - Shift Change** A change in work hours has necessitated withdrawal from College.
O. **Job - Added Work Load** This student must leave because the nature of the job has called for an added work load either in quantity or hours.

P. **Religion** This student is leaving as a result of some mission or undertaking connected with his church.

Q. **Moving - Job Transfer** The fact that the student's job demands that he change locales is prompting him to leave college.

R. **Moving - Parents** For students living with their parents, this situation may arise.

S. **Moving - Personal Desire** The student desires to change locale. A wife following a husband who is transferred on a job would be placed in this category.

T. **Personal - Family** With the two personal areas, family and self, there are two categories truly global in nature, but specific enough to point up the importance of the emotional factors involved in being a student. The student who manifests a family conflict prompting him to take actions and for whom needs arise as a result, would be placed here. When interpersonal family relationships appear to be the prime mover of the withdrawal action, this variable is used.

U. **Personal - Self** This is the second part of the personal variable. The student who indicates general disinterest with school, but not with the course content, the student whose goals are not clear and objective uncertain, the student evidencing strong emotional feelings which may cap inner conflicts, the student who will not or cannot talk about his motives, is placed here.

V. **Academic - Low Achievement** The student who indicates low achievement and does not manifest strong emotional conflicts which might prompt low achievement, would be placed here.

W. **Course Content** Here the student manifests a sincere disinterest in course content.
X. **Academic - Instructor Conflict** This classification is for the student who manifests a dislike for instructors or method or presentation of material. He may have elected to go to another institution more attuned to his interests and preferences.

Y. **Academic - Institutional Transfer** This category is for the student who attends another school. He has been happy at Foothill, but has been accepted at a four year institution or has changed majors and elected to go to a vocational training school or been selected for special projects, such as Seven Seas.

Z. **Academic - Counseling** Where counseling has played a basic role in helping the student to make the decision to withdraw, this category is used.

AA. **Other** This is the miscellaneous category for which none of our other variables will fit. This category is used as little as possible.

BB. **Marriage.** This category is for the student who is quitting to get married. However, this reason is probed in depth because of the proximity of the marriage or its indefiniteness may signal other more basic motives.

**Collation of Data**

The data collected on the interview forms were punched on IBM cards. The IBM deck thus includes all the biographical and motivational information collected in the interview. The 1620 computer can control on one to five of these biographical variables and provide an analysis of five other variables. Hence there is created a number of populations of greater and greater refinement.

An additional search of similar biographical information was made of 400 students selected randomly from the population of students who completed Fall
Semester, 1966, at Foothill College. This group of 400 persisting students serves as the control group.
**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**

**PRE-EXIT INTERVIEW COUNSELOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>M-D</th>
<th>Day-0</th>
<th>F-1</th>
<th>D/Night-1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unit Load</th>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>R C-O</th>
<th>N-1</th>
<th>M-2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. Educational Objective
- A Transfer - 0
- B Vocational - 1
- C Undecided - 2
- D Vocat-Trans - 3
- E Enrichment - 4
- F Other - 5

## II. Work (Hrs)
- A Unemployed - 0
- B 1-5 Hrs - 1
- C 6-10 Hrs - 2
- D 11-15 Hrs - 3
- E 16-20 Hrs - 4
- F 21-30 Hrs - 5
- G 31-40 Hrs - 6
- H 41+ Hrs - 7

## III. Transportation:
- A Owns own car-single rider - 0
- B Parents' car-single rider - 1
- C Car pool-owns no car - 2
- D Car pool-own or parent car - 3
- E Public transportation - 4
- F Two wheel vehicle - 5
- G Other - 6

## IV. Work (Type):
- A Farming, fishing - 0
- B Forestry - 1
- C Clerical-sales - 2
- D Professional - 3
- E Processing - 4
- F Machine - 5
- G Bench work - 6
- H Structural - 7
- I Miscellaneous - 8
- J Unemployed - 9

## V. Marital Status:
- A Single - 0
- B Married - 1
- C Married n/children - 2
- D Separated w/o child - 3
- E Separated w/child - 4

## VI. Living Status:
- A Home with parents - 0
- B Apartment single - 1
- C Apartment shared - 2
- D Boarding house - 3
- E Rooming house - 4
- F Other - 5

## VII. Motive:
- A Military-drafted - 11
- B Military-enlisted - 12
- C Military-reserve - 13
- D Health-illness - 21
- E Health-pregnancy - 22
- F Health-family - 23
- G Health-accident - 24
- H Financial-personal maint - 32
- I Financial-family maint - 33
- J Financial-transportation - 34
- K Job-going to work - 41
- L Job-training prog. - 42
- M Job-advancement - 43
- N Job-shift change - 44
- O Job-added work load - 45
- P Religion - 50
- Q Moving-job transfer - 61
- R Moving-parents - 62
- S Moving-personal desire - 63
- T Personal-family - 71
- U Personal-self - 72
- V Academic-low achieve - 81
- W Academic-course content - 82
- X Academic-instructor conflict - 83
- Y Academic-instit. transfer - 84
- Z Academic-counseling - 85
- AA Other - 91
- BB Marriage - 92

**REMARKS:**
The bearer of this document, Doris S. Bossen, whose picture appears above, is engaged in a research project involving follow-up interviews of former students of Foothill College.

All who see this document are requested and encouraged to give Mrs. Bossen such assistance and information as she may require in connection with this research project.

JAMES W. KEENE
Director of Institutional Research
Foothill Junior College District

Expires December 31, 1968
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