AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN CAMPUS GOVERNANCE
AS A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

by

Joan W. Lipscomb

Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

Committee:

M. C. Rockey, Chairman

H. Conley

J. Fortune

A. Herbert

C. Kinard

May 1979

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author extends grateful appreciation to her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Levi T. Lipscomb, Sr., for their support and encouragement during the pursuit of course work and research toward completion of this dissertation.

Other persons who made significant contributions by their assistance or patient understanding were Mrs. Sylvia Johnson, Mr. James Dean, and my co-workers at the University of the District of Columbia.

Special appreciation and thanks are offered to the members of my committee - Dr. Houston Conley, Dr. Jim Fortune, Dr. Adam Herbert, Dr. Charles Kinard, and in particular, Dr. Marybelle Rockey, for her calm, learned guidance throughout all stages of this investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

One controversy existing in higher education today among trustees, faculty, administrators and students - highlighted by the student revolts on college campuses in the 1960's - concerns the extent to which students should be involved in the governing of the institution, particularly in those affairs which, by traditional definitions do not immediately impact on student welfare or activities. These affairs have included determining institutional fiscal allocations, establishing and implementing hiring policies for faculty and administrators, setting departmental objectives, curriculum planning, and collective bargaining.

Student development as a concept was expressed in the model drafted by Brown (1972) and involves:

1. Goal setting - the collaboration between student and professional for determining the specific behaviors toward which a student wishes to strive.

2. Assessment - determining where the student is currently located in pursuit of the desired behaviors.

3. Strategies for change - assisting the student in achievement of reasonable desired goals through modification and mobilization of campus resources.

Havighurst (1948, 1953) provided a framework for the philosophy of student development by isolating as developmental tasks those behaviors or activities which an individual must learn in order to become and to be judged a reasonably happy and successful person. Other theorists and practitioners in higher education note that those concerned with helping students in colleges and universities must be committed to maximizing the individual development of all students. (Hoyt, 1968; Korn, 1969; Morrill and Hurst, 1971).

Many college and university catalogs state that their missions include providing opportunities for the student to grow and develop in order to insure their successful functioning in a modern society; however, the means to achieving these ends are frequently obscure and immeasurable. Brown (1972) noted that college and university goal statements are attempts to articulate the institutions' purpose of making students better persons. He recommended careful scrutiny of that purpose to determine its congruence with the enhancement of student development.

The extensive studies of Feldman and Newcomb (1969), perhaps more than any other research, have elucidated that students do change while in college. These researchers reviewed extant literature on the effects of college on students over a forty-year period from the middle twenties to the middle sixties, and sought to reveal what conditions made what kinds of students change in what specific ways. In studying the effects of college on students' values, attitudes, satisfactions, personality characteristics, and orientations toward post-college life, the researchers noted that some changes emerged which are characteristic of nearly all American college students. Most salient were increases in "open mindedness" (reflected by declining authoritarianism, dogmatism, and prejudice), decreasing conservatism on public issues, and growing sensitivity to aesthetic experiences. In addition, a majority of the Feldman and Newcomb research indicated declining commitment to religion, increases in intellectual interests and capacities, increases in independence, dominance, and confidence, and increased readiness to express impulses. Feldman and Newcomb concluded that the college experience, at the very least, accentuates changes inherent in the developmental patterns of individuals.

Katz and Associates (1968) presented the results of a five-year longitudinal study of changes in college students which contrasted with the Feldman and Newcomb (1969) findings. The research was conducted at Stanford and the University of California at Berkeley. It included semi-annual interviews of selected samples of 250 students, an analysis of freshman-senior personality scales, and a variety of case studies. The researchers found that college had little impact on student development, which led to their conclusion that colleges must change curricular offerings and other components of the educational environment if changes in students were to occur. The final recommendation was that the focus of education should be on the student's development, rather than on the accumulation of course credits (Korn, 1969).

Chickering (1969) contended that colleges and universities will be educationally effective only if they reach students "where they live," and connect with those concerns of central importance to students - civil rights, the draft, managing violence, conflict, interpersonal relationships, sexuality, and religious orientation. Chickering formulated seven (7) major areas common to the stages of development, growth trends, or student typologies of college students. He maintained that the college years differed substantially from the adolescent and adult years, and therefore, the tasks needed for development during the college years would be unique. To show how the college developmental tasks differed, he labeled the areas of development vectors because each seemed to have direction and magnitude. Unlike a mathematical vector which represents a force or velocity by equal and parallel straight lines, Chickering noted that the vectors of development could best be diagrammed by a spiral, since they suggest continuous upward motion. The seven (7) vectors he identified were: achieving competence, managing emotions, becoming autonomous, establishing identity, freeing interpersonal relationships, clarifying purpose, and developing integrity.

Chickering's thesis (1969) was that these changes, all of which may not occur in all students, do occur for some students and can occur more frequently for others depending upon the environmental conditions at some institutions. He noted that systematic modification within the institutional environment can increase the frequency of valued development of the student.

The modifications reported in the approaches utilized by colleges and universities to address student concerns are not inconsistent with the theses of Chickering (1969) and others (Butler, 1966; Feldman, 1969; Brown, 1972; Gross, 1977) who have acknowledged the existence of change in students and who report the institution's adjustment to the recurring change. Yet, few data are available on the specific areas of the campus environment which foster or inhibit change or that link specific college activities in which a student participates to the growth and development of the student.

Participation in the decision-making process involves the ability to express opinions clearly, conceptualization of ideas, learning to follow rules of order and procedure, consideration of the opinions of others, and consultation with others involved in the process (Follett, 1940). Becoming adept at these skills seems to be congruent with Chickering's vectors of development and his theory that modification of the institutional environment can increase the frequency of student development. It also seems apparent that student development is directly related to the amount and kind of experiences in chich a student is involved while in college.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between student participation in campus governance and student development.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The literature reveals that there is broad support for student participation in campus governance; however, the justification usually offered refers to the moral or legal rights of students. There are few data which document the impact of participation on the individual student. Corson (1975) indicated that the brief experiences in those institutions where students have been given the opportunity to participate is inconclusive. The lack of such substantiation may be perpetuating the dilemma among institution factions concerning student participation in governance.

The present research was needed (1) to determine if student participation in the governance of institutions does have an effect on individual student development, and (2) to identify the characteristics which may distinguish those students who participate in governance from those who do not. Such data might enable university trustees, faculty, and staff to reach consensus that there is a significant relationship between student participation in campus governance and achievement of developmental tasks. Faculty may be inspired to open faculty senates, policy making or planning committees to students if participation can be interpreted as important to the development of students during the college experience.

Finally, as student personnel professionals apply the concepts of student development in guiding students to realization of their goals, the professional may be able to more effectively assist the student in planning his or her academic program for optimum achievement of those goals.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The major research questions of this study were: (1) What are the effects of student participation in campus governance activities on student development? (2) Do the characteristics of the student participant in governance at the University of the District of Columbia differ from the non-participant in such activities.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For purposes of this study, the following terms are defined:

1. Developmental Task - tasks an individual must learn and successfully achieve in order to become a reasonably happy and successful person. Achievement of a developmental task was measured by the student's responses to items on the Student Development Task Inventory. (See Appendix F)

2. Student Development - mastery of increasingly complex developmental tasks which lead to achievement of self-direction and becoming independent.

3. Governance - the processes and functions by which institution policy is established and maintained.

4. Participation - consistent involvement of students in governance processes by virtue of their full voting membership on deliberating bodies.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The sample for this study included all students at the University of the District of Columbia who are involved in campus governance activities and a matched sample students who are not so involved. Second, the study was conducted over one school semester. One semester is twelve (12) weeks long at the University.

OVERVIEW

Literature pertinent to the study is reviewed in Chapter 2 and is divided into four (4) subject areas: perceptual studies of faculty, administrators, and students of student participation in governance activities at higher education institutions; rationales for, models, and patterns of student participation in governance; analyses of higher education goal statements and activities as contributing factors to student development; philosophies and opinions about student participation in campus governance activities.

Chapter 3 contains the methodology, including the population, the instrument, collection of the data and treatment of the data. The analysis of the data is presented in Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 includes the summary, implications and recommendations for further study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter is presented according to the following subject areas: perceptual studies of faculty, administrators, and students of student participation in governance activities at higher education institutions rationales for, models, and patterns of student participation in governance; analyses of higher education goal statements and activities as contributing factors to student development; philosophies and opinions about student participation, and general discussions for and against student participation in campus governance activities.

PERCEPTUAL STUDIES OF FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS, AND STUDENTS

Several studies are available providing data on the perceptions held by campus faculty, administrators, board members, and students of student participation in institutional governance.

As a part of a larger study of Faculty Characristics and Faculty Influence on Students conducted at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, Wilson (1969) presented evidence about the attitudes of faculty toward student participation in governance. Questionnaires covering a wide variety of faculty attitudes, values and behaviors were sent to over 1,500 faculty members at six (6) diverse colleges and universities located in three (3) states; usable returns were received from 70 percent or 1,069 persons. The institutions included a large public university, a large state college, a medium-sized public junior college, a small private university, and a small private liberal arts college. No definitions were given of the terms small, medium, and large.

Two-thirds of the faculty respondents favored students holding formal (voting) responsibility for formulating social rules and regulations. Forty-five percent supported student membership equal to faculty on college committees, and 21 percent favored students having sole responsibility for their own social regulations.

Faculty response to student participation in setting academic policies was less liberal than their responses on purely social issues. Only four (4) percent of the faculty respondents indicated that students should have no role in formulating academic policies, such as graduation requirements, curriculum design, and related issues. Of the 60 percent who replied that students should have a voice in academic matters, 22 percent stated they should be consulted informally (at informal social gatherings with committee members, or with campus surveys), and 38 percent felt they should hold non-voting memberships on committees, while only nine (9) percent were willing to grant them an equal vote with faculty.

While the Wilson (1969) study was limited to perceptions of faculty toward student participation, Kamp (1971) investigated the preferences of four (4) categories of formal institutional leaders for student participation in policy formulation of three (3) major policy areas including Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Staff Personnel Affairs. The four (4) categories of formal leaders were campus presidents, board chairmen, presidents of faculty organizations, and student government presidents.

The sample was selected from public junior-community colleges in Illinois. Of the 186 asked to participate in the study, 160 or 86 percent responded. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed students should participate in policy formulation for 24 policy items. The response choices included: (1) should NOT participate, (2) participate as ADVISORS without voting rights, (3) have MINORITY REPRESENTATION with voting rights, (4) have EQUAL REPRESENTATION with voting rights, (5) have MAJORITY REPRESENTATION with voting rights, and (6) have EXCLUSIVE CONTROL. The 24 items were categorized into the aforementioned policy areas (Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Staff Personnel).

In all three (3) major policy areas, student presidents indicated preference for the greatest extent of participation in policy formulation, followed by faculty presidents, campus presidents, and board chairmen. Each of the four (4) respondent groups indicated that the greatest extent of student participation should be in Student Affairs, then in Academic Affairs, with the least participation in Staff Personnel Affairs.

McDonald (1971) sought to determine if faculty, administrators, and trustees differed in their attitudes toward student involvement in the governance of three (3) higher education institutions in Colorado. The schools were the University of Colorado, the University of Northern Colorado, and the Colorado College. Each of the institutions was governed by a different board of control.

The University of Colorado, the largest public coeducational institution in the state, had three (3) campuses - in Boulder, Denver, and Colorado Springs. Approximately 20,000 students were enrolled at the Boulder campus where the study was conducted. The University was governed by six (6) regents elected by the voters. The primary mission of the University, as stated in the catalog, was to "...carry out the mission of education at the lowest possible cost to the student..." (University of Colorado Bulletin, 1970-71, p.ii)

The University of Northern Colorado was one (1) of five (5) publicly supported state colleges, managed by a Board of Trustees appointed by the governor. The coed student body numbered over 10,000 when the study was conducted. The UNC held to a reputation and tradition of teacher preparation, and stressed its dedication to the continuing advancement of knowledge.

Colorado College was a private, non-denominational college of approximately 1600 students in 1971. Its 1970 Bulletin stated that its fundamental commitment was "...to offer the best possible liberal arts education to a select body of students." (Colorado College Bulletin, 1970, p.5) The college was governed by a 21-member board of trustees; four (4) alumni elected by alumni; sixteen (16) members selected by the board; and the college president.

McDonald attempted to disprove the hypothesis that there would be no differences in the perception of faculty, administrators, and trustees at three (3) distinct types of higher education institutions in Colorado. What she found was that there were few similar perceptions of actual or optimum student participation among the three (3) groups on the three (3) campuses. The paucity of agreement, McDonald concluded, may have been caused by the differences in the goals of the three institutions.

The Colorado College administrators and faculty agreed on 20 percent of the 50 items included in the scale, eight (8) of actual participation and two (2) of optimum participation. The faculty, administrators, and trustees of the University of Northern Colorado agreed on one (1) item concerning actual involvement, and one (1) item on optimum involvement. The former item concerned actual student participation in developing campus safety programs. The latter item stated that students should play an important part in planning the curriculum. The faculty, administrators, and regents of the University of Colorado did not agree on any of the 50 items. However, administrators and trustees agreed on one (1) item, and faculty and administrators agreed on two (2) items.

In summarizing the findings of the Colorado College, McDonald queried whether the 20 percent agreement was a function of better communication, an attraction of like-minded individuals to a small liberal arts college, or a common understanding of the College's goals. She recommended further research in these areas.

In a 1972 study, Glasscock found no significant differences in the attitudes of students, faculty, and administrators on student participation in decision-making at Milliken (Illinois) University. The groups generally agreed that the objectives of student participation in decision-making at the University were being met, and indicated that student participation was a worthwhile educational experience.

Quite different results were produced by a survey of the attitudes of the 134 student, faculty, and administrator members of the 1972-73 Michigan State University Academic Council regarding one (1) year of student participation in academic governance (Shipley, 1973). The respondents were asked to indicate their feelings concerning the impact of student participation on the Council in four areas; academic freedom - defined as the atmosphere in which scholarly efforts were pursued; administrative efficiency - the impact of student involvement in the governance process and the weighting of negative aspects of student participation (inexperience, time needed to reach decision) over the positive aspects; community cohesion - whether student participation contributed to greater communication and interpersonal relations with faculty, administrators, and other students; educational value - the degree to which student participation provided new educational experiences for those involved.

In general, the researcher found that (1) although student members did not act in ways detrimental to academic freedom, faculty did not agree with students that student involvement should be increased; (2) students were capable of making important, responsible decisions which contributed to the efficiency of governance; (3) improvements in intergroup and interpersonal relations resulted from student participation on the Council, and (4) participation was a means of developing student maturity and responsibility.

Rowe (1973) examined students, faculty, administrators, and trustees at Indiana University to determine their views on student participation in policy formulation, the differences between those views, and the extent and direction of the differences. All four (4) groups agreed in principle that students should participate in the decision-making process. The student respondents along with lower ranking faculty, academic administrators, younger administrators, and trustees with more than four (4) years board tenure favored a greater degree of student participation.

In 1964, Golden conducted a study to determine in what areas of college administration students desired to participate, and to investigate the relationship between attitudes toward such participation and authoritarianism as a personality trait. The study also considered the relationship of sex to such attitudes and examined the relationship between attitudes toward participation in administration and general satisfaction with college and student achievement.

The study was carried out on three (3) separate college campuses in New York State, each a "liberal arts and general" college with a population of approximately 1,500 students, and 350 to 400 students in the junior class. The junior year was chosen because of observations, reported by Sanford (1956), that the junior year was probably the year of maximum solidarity in the college community both educationally and socially. He considered juniors as the chief heirs and transmitters of the student culture (Sanford, 1956).

Of these three (3) institutions, one (1) was public, the second was a private, non-denominational college, and the third was a Catholic college. A participation scale was developed after pre-test data were collected on a fourth campus. Questionnaires were received from 168 students (56 percent) of whom half were male. Respondents were asked to indicate, according to a Likert type scale, if students SHOULD or ACTUALLY DO participate in specific activities.

Student respondents seemed to be most concerned with those areas which had an immediate influence on their everyday campus lives, not on a friend's or a classmate's or on that of a future student. The most significant items seemed to be those related to the student agitations (of the 1960 campus demonstration period) such as intellectual programs, off-campus housing, selection of visiting speakers and lecturers, library policy, and dormitory policies.

The least significant items were of two (2) kinds: those indicating areas in which students probably felt they already had a voice, such as executing freshman orientation, and planning charity campaigns; and those representing areas in which students probably felt unqualified, for example, establishing admissions policies or meeting with college trustees or regents. The findings regarding authoritarianism and participation revealed that the more authoritarian the student, the less legitimate he perceived student participation; also, the more authoritarian, the smaller the difference between his perception of what should be done and the amount of participation he saw actually taking place. The data also showed that women perceived student participation to be more legitimate and more prevalent than men. Finally, correlational analyses suggested that those students having the most liberal attitudes regarding student participation in decision-making (they wanted to participate), also tended to be less authoritarian generally. Such students also had better academic records, and were more likely to be female than their less liberal peers.

In the Spring of 1969, College Management asked 500 deans of students about student participation in campus decision-making and other questions related to student activism. The reported opinions at that time were that:

1. Students should be voting members of the college committees governing areas other than extra-curricular and social life.

2. Student participation in college governance was too low.

3. Administrators encourage and the faculty discouraged student participation in university governance.

4. Student participation in university governance was growing, was desirable, and would get stronger in the next few years.

The periodical repeated its survey, again of deans of students, in August 1970. In 1969, 27.6 percent of the deans surveyed thought that students should participate in college and university governance. That figure decreased to 23.1 percent in 1970. In 1969, 65 percent of the deans thought that students should participate as voting members of committees. In 1970, 75 percent of the deans indicated that students should have that right. In the first study, 7.4 percent of the deans were opposed to voting rights for students, while only 1.9 percent were opposed in 1970.

Approximately half the deans (51.5 percent) felt that students took too small a part in college governance in the initial survey. By 1970, that figure had changed to 38.5 percent.

An interesting change occurred on the item questioning if the students who were asking for a larger share in institutional governance were highly representative of the student body. In 1969, 8.2 percent of the deans responded positively; in 1970, the response increased to 17.7 percent.

Faculty continued to be the most resistant to expanding student participation, according to the survey, while administrators supported expansion for students. In 1969, 58.9 percent of the deans felt that the administration was taking the lead in encouraging student participation. The 1970 survey indicated that 56.6 percent considered administration leading the way. Also, 55.4 percent of the deans reported in the initial study that faculty was the most resistant to student participation. In 1970, 68.7 percent felt that way.

The opinions on the type and degree of student participation as indicated by various members of the campus community may be attributable to the times, the nature of the institutions responding to the survey, traditions of viewing students as receptacles of the knowledge and skills which universities impart, or numerous other reasons. What the data indicated was that there was little agreement on campuses or among campuses on what student participation was and how it should be achieved.

RATIONALES FOR, MODELS AND PATTERNS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Some of the justifications, patterns, and models developed in recent years to answer several of the concerns surrounding student participation in the governance of institutions are reviewed in this section. The rationales may differ due to the specific characteristics of the proposing institution.

The Report of the Commission on Student Participation in University Life (Knock, 1969) identified the many dimensions of student life and university affairs with the objective of providing a framework for increasing students' responsibility for the consequences of their own behavior. The rationale developed by the Commission stated that students have a right to participate in the total life of the University because the student body is a basic and permanent component of the University. They have a need to participate, according to the Commission, because involvement in the total learning milieu of a university contributes appreciably to the development and improvement of the quality of each student's educational experience. Cross (1975) contended that higher education is still in the early stages of defining the myriad contributing factors to student development, but noted that maximum experience should yield increased development. The Commission proposed a model in which students would have full voting membership.

Davis (1969) surveyed practices related to student membership on academic committees. Of 59 public and private institutions throughout the country which responded to a questionnaire, 52 (88.1 percent) reported student membership on some academic committees; 45 (76.2 percent) indicated that students held voting membership on these committees; 38 (64.4 percent) stated that students held voting seats on at least two (2) committees, and 26 (44 percent) reported student voting rights on at least three (3) committees. Ten (10) (16.9 percent) of the 59 schools indicated that students were voting members on six (6) or more academic committees.

Adams (1971) conceived an imaginary new institution of approximately 2,000 students in the process of development and focused only upon the place of students in the government of the institution. He reviewed recent and current patterns of student participation as well as organizational and administrative guidelines, principles and concepts derived from literature and research conducted in the field. The question Adams posed concerned the effective involvement of students in the government of higher educational institutions. In the model, the policy-making system consisted of a board of trustees, a university senate, a council on student affairs, and a faculty or school council for each organized faculty or school within the university. Students were given membership on all bodies.

In examining the patterns of student participation in policy-making in Illinois public community colleges, Neher (1971) found that participation ranked highest in Student Affairs, then in Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, and last in College Staff Personnel Affairs. The 46 community college chief student personnel officers comprised the population for the study. The percentage of student voting membership on committees was found to be lower than the overall percentage of student participation in most of the policy areas, indicating that formal inclusion of students in the policy-making process does not necessarily reflect an equality of "power" on the committee. Administrators and student personnel workers were most commonly reported as the groups providing impetus for the initial inclusion of students, while faculty were most commonly regarded as resisting student participation.

ANALYSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS AND ACTIVITIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Research in student development has also focused on the correlation of college and university goal statements and their efforts to institute specific programs to put the stated goals into practice. Some of these studies are reviewed in this section.

Prior to 1957, many studies of the effects of college on students focused attention on specific changes in student attitudes and opinions, while others were concerned with such personality characteristics as authoritarianism, ethnocentrism, and rigidity. Dressel (1965) argued that most of these studies were cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, and usually involved small numbers of students.

The Harvard Student Study is a longitudinal research project on personality changes during the college years, carried out by the University Health Services at Harvard. It is unique in that it utilized a multidisciplinary approach, including staff sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts (Whiteley, et al, 1972). The study had three (3) purposes: (1) to investigate the process of change or stability in the personalities of Harvard undergraduates as the changes related to the student's personality structures and their interaction with different aspects of the college; (2) to study the socializing function of the college as an organization; and (3) to develop methods and research strategies suitable to the nature of the study.

Evaluation of Harvard's official publications showed that all emphasized General Education, the development of the student in breadth of conceptualization. The actual effect of Harvard's four (4) years was to diminish the student's habits of generalization and greatly increase the number of major details to which the student attended. In addition to the classroom experience, student-faculty contact in the residence halls was credited for these increases.

Cangemi (1974) investigated the perceptual differences of students, faculty, and administrators concerning the philosophy that self-actualization was a major objective of higher education. A questionnaire was administered to 100 students, 69 faculty, and 24 administrators of a large Southern university, to determine if there were any significant differences between the perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators regarding self-actualization as an important purpose of higher education. The three (3) groups were in general agreement that the purpose of higher education was to help those associated with it to move toward self-actualization. The administrators responding to the questionnaire felt that the development of interpersonal relations was an important function of higher education, while students tended not to support that view. Professors indicated a concern for students, especially in assisting them to develop their capacities to the fullest.

In 1975, Mauss conducted research to reveal the effects of orienting the community college student to the nature, functions, and purpose of higher education. The sample for the study consisted of 147 students in a large California community college who had registered for one (1) of the three (3) orientation courses involved in the study. Student perception and change was measured by a pre-test/post-test administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory developed by Educational Testing Service. The study showed (1) a clear need for the administration and faculty to communicate effectively the nature, functions, and purposes of higher education to students when they enter college; (2) a discrepancy between students and college personnel perceptions of the priorities of higher education, and (3) that student perceptions of higher education's nature, functions, and purposes can be modified through a course covering those areas.

Taylor (1975), interested in the present and future purposes and functions of higher education administered the Institutional Goals Inventory to faculty, students and administrators at Oregon State University to discern the congruence or dissonance of perceived and preferred ratings of institutional goals. In the perceived category, faculty and students showed congruence on 19 of 20 goal areas. Faculty and administrators were congruent on 15 of the goal areas, and students and administrators were equally divided between congruence and dissonance on the goal areas. In the preferred category, faculty and students agreed on 14 of the 20 areas; faculty and administrators reached consensus on all 20 goals; and students and administrators were congruent on 17 of the goal areas.

PHILOSOPHIES, OPINIONS, PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE

A 1968 issue of the NASPA Journal included an article by Kenneth E. Young, at the time the President of the State University College at Cortland, New York, in which he predicted that in future years students would be pressing for more meaningful involvement in the decision-making processes, such as appointment to faculty committees.

Gross (1977) theorized that the route to student involvement in decision-making is through access to budget information. He contended that students have little or no power in the institution because they are not a factor in power negotiations. Gross supported the suggestion of

Richman and Farmer (1974) that student governments could maintain a student lobby at the state legislature and publish information about the progress of ex-students and student evaluation of instruction. Such activities, Gross evaluated, might influence the hiring and firing of staff, and the nature of course offerings.

Butler (1966) expressed the opinion that students must become involved in decision-making and recommended that informal dialogues with faculty, administrators, and trustees be an on-going activity for students. He urged students to prepare themselves to participate by collecting and evaluating facts pertinent to decision-making before making formal recommendations to the university.

The role of students in the collective bargaining process has been reported by Hays (1977). The recognition of student bargaining units that include both manual hourly workers and advanced graduate students has given substance to the argument for inclusion of students in all phases of bargaining. Since Hays' contention is that an "adversary spirit" will only serve to divide the institution, to deter effective accountability practices and wise institutional planning, as well as to impede the educational process for thousands of students, he strongly recommended the inclusion of students as principals in collective bargaining.

The editors of College Management interviewed two (2) members of the staff of the University of Delaware in May, 1969, concerning their views on ways in which students can - or should - be further involved in decision-making. The assistant provost, one of the principals in the interview, felt that there were areas of governance where students should tread very slowly. The other principal, a professor of chemistry, looked forward to the appearance of students on important faculty committees, in increasing numbers.

The same issue of the journal (May, 1969) included an article reporting on the successful involvement of students in governance at Hiram College, a small private college in Ohio, with an enrollment of 1,150. The size of the school, youthfulness and liberalism of the faculty, and awareness of the greater maturity of today's college students by the administrators were offered as explanations for the favorable accomplishment of participation, which has spanned several decades. The faculty stated that students were used as "sounding boards" before any curriculum modifications took place, and on a continuing basis in curriculum evaluation.

It seems obvious from the foregoing that the dilemma of "whither student participation, and how much" will not be easily resolved. Even with more data, models, and increasing numbers of college personnel showing support for full participation, institutions will still exercise the privilege of determining the scope of participation.

SUMMARY

The studies reviewed herein have provided some justification for the formal inclusion of students in the governance process. Most of the research reviewed, however, accentuates the lack of any standardized method for evaluating student development. Perhaps this is due, as Cross (1975) has suggested, to the limited knowledge about student development.

The Wilson (1969), Kamp (1971), and McDonald (1971), studies each produced different findings from faculty, students, and administrators about their perceptions on types of student participation. Further, the Shipley (1973) and Rowe (1973) research corroborated hypotheses that students could have meaningful participation in governance. These researchers developed questionnaires or surveys for their specific purposes, after discovering that a standardized method was not available.

It is hoped the findings of this study will add to the knowledge about the elements of student development, enabling administrators, trustees, faculty and student personnel staff to define the characteristics they perceive necessary to effective participation, identify students with those characteristics and match them to governance positions, and thereby reach consensus on the extent of participation for students. It is also hoped the present research will assist students in achieving the characteristics perceived by institution officials as pertinent to development of skills leading to participation as they confer with student personnel professionals who guide students toward goal attainment.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine student participation in campus governance activities to determine its effects on student development. The order for presentation of this chapter is: (1) the population, (2) the instrument, (3) collection of the data, and (4) analysis of the data.

POPULATION

The population for the study consisted of 27 students who were elected or appointed to college committees at the University of the District of Columbia in the Spring or Fall 1978, and 27 students who did not participate in such activities. The non-participants in the study were randomly selected on the basis of characteristics similar to the participant group (age, sex, major, classification, marital status).

The Spring 1979 student profile data reveal that the average age of UDC students is 28 years. Ninety-two percent of the student population reside in the District of Columbia, 55 percent are female, 61.4 percent are single, 20 percent are married, and 84.5 percent are

Black. Of the 13,034 students enrolled in Spring 1979, 72.4 percent carry less than a full academic load (12 semester hours), 47.7 percent are enrolled in day classes, 31.3 percent take evening classes, and 24 percent attend both day and evening classes. Approximately 45 percent of the population are employed full-time, 24.8 percent employed part-time, and 19.6 percent unemployed.

The University of the District of Columbia, in Washington, D.C., is a public, land-grant institution governed by a fifteen (15) member Board of Trustees appointed by the Mayor. One (1) student elected by the student population serves on the Board with full voting privileges. The functioning college-wide committees and councils on which students hold voting membership are listed in Appendix A. Appendix B lists the organizations associated with departments of the University which include students as voting members. At this writing, students did not hold membership on faculty senate, or collective bargaining groups or on committees responsible for hiring University personnel.

INSTRUMENT

The Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI) is a standardized instrument representing a sample of behaviors which students can be expected to demonstrate when they have satisfactorily achieved a developmental task. The phenomenon with which the SDTI is concerned is the change produced in individuals as a result of passing through a developmental task.

The SDTI consists of 180 items which characterize three (3) basic developmental tasks: developing autonomy, developing mature interpersonal relationships, and developing purpose. Nine (9) developmental subtasks have been included to clarify the three (3) basic tasks. Mastery of the subtasks leads to achievement in the basic tasks. The basic developmental tasks were formulated from Chickering's (1969) vectors of development.

<u>Developmental Task I: Developing Autonomy</u>

Subtask A. <u>Developing Emotional Autonomy</u>

To be free from continual and pressing needs for reassurance, affection or approval from parents, peers, and institutional forms.

Subtask B. <u>Developing Instrumental Autonomy</u>

The ability to carry on activities and to cope with problems without seeking help, and the ability to be mobile regarding one's needs and desires.

Subtask C. Developing Interdependence

Recognizing that one cannot dispense with one's parents; that one must work for continuing support; that one must contribute to society as well as receive benefits from it.

Developmental Task II. Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships

Subtask D. Developing Tolerance

Respect for those of different backgrounds, habits, values, and appearances; a diminished need to manipulate others.

Subtask E. Developing Mature Relationships with Peers

Relationships become less anxious, less defensive, more spontaneous: friendships survive the development of differences and episodes of disagreement; they persist through times of separation and non-communication.

Subtask F. Developing Intimate Relations with the Opposite Sex

Relationships shift from primarily serving self-discovery and self-definition to a mutually supportive commitment.

<u>Developmental Task III: Developing Purpose</u>

Subtask G. <u>Developing Appropriate Educational Plans</u>

Formulating conscious and fairly well-defined educational goals and developing an ability to see the relationship between study and other aspects of life.

Subtask H. <u>Developing Mature Career Plans</u>

An accurate understanding of individual abilities, limitations, and motivations applicable to occupations.

Subtask I. <u>Developing Mature Life-Style Plans</u>

A direction and orientation that balances vocational aspirations, avocational interests, and future family plans is formulated.

To establish reliability of the SDTI, a sample of 50 students randomly selected from a sample population of 850 college men and women from six (6) different colleges was administered the SDTI on a retest basis four (4) weeks following the initial testing. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was calculated for each subtask. The high correlation coefficients, suggest a relatively high degree of stability over a short period of time. (See Appendix H)

Internal consistency was estimated by means of the Cronbach-Alpha procedure. Data from 401 college students from ten (10) colleges were analyzed. Validity for the SDTI, that is, content validity, results from its formulation based upon the constructs developed by Chickering (1969).

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

The SDTI was mailed to 54 students - 27 who participate in governance activities at UDC and 27 who did not - at the beginning and end of the Fall Semester 1978. The names of the participants were obtained from UDC department chairmen, the Office of Student Program Development which maintains a directory of campus organizations, and the Deans of the Colleges. The names of the non-participants were chosen at random from a printout of over 300 student names which was provided by the UDC Computer Center. The non-participants were matched to the participant group on the characteristics of age, sex, major, classification, and marital status. Every tenth name was selected from the printout for comprising the non-participant group.

The pre-test was mailed in September 1978 and the post-test in January 1979. Upon receipt of the pre-test responses, individual interviews were held with each student to determine if the student had been involved in any activities prior to entering the University in his or her community, church, or employment which may have influenced their desire to participate in activities at UDC. The lists of the questions asked of each student appear in Appendixes D and E.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The SDTI answer sheets were scored by hand according to instructions in the instrument guidelines. Student characteristics and interview responses were then coded for processing via Analysis of Covariance. This statistical procedure was selected because of its flexibility in correlating two (2) or more independent variables (in this study the characteristics of the students, i.e., age, sex, major, classification, previous experience) with one (1) dependent variable (participation in governance).

SUMMARY

The population for this study consisted of 27 students who participate in governance activities at UDC, and 27 students who do not participate in such activities. The students were mailed the Student Development Task Inventory in September 1978 and again in January 1979. Answer sheets were hand-scored according to SDTI Güidelines. Respondents were then interviewed to determine any previous experiences of a decision-making nature which may have influenced their desire and type of participation. The SDTI consists of 180 items to which a student is asked to reply true or false, and is based on Chickering's (1969) vectors of development. Interviews included questions to determine experiences students may have had before entering the University which possibly influenced their participation level. Answer sheets and interview responses were coded for processing with Analysis of Covariance.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter 4 contains the analysis of data on the effects of student participation in campus governance as a contributing factor to student development. The sections in this chapter include: (1) the introduction, (2) an analysis of the data, and (3) the summary.

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if student participation in campus governance activities at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) is a contributing factor to student development. The secondary purpose was to determine if the characteristics of students who participate in governance activities are different from those of students who do not participate.

The Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI) was used to obtain the data for this research. In addition to the SDTI, students were interviewed to learn if there was a relationship between participation and experiences the student may have had before entering the University.

The 27 students now participating in governance activities at UDC matched on the bases of sex, age, major, classification and marital status to 27 students who do not participate in activities constituted the sample for the study. The SDTI was mailed to the 54 students in September 1978. Five (5) days following the mailing, telephone calls were made to the students to schedule appointments for interviews. The instrument was administered the second time in January 1979, again by mail and in individual settings for students who had not been interviewed prior to the second mailing date. Seven (7) such individual sessions took place.

Sixteen (16) usable responses were obtained from the participant group. Six (6) students refused to complete the instrument, two (2) instruments were returned because of incorrect addresses, and three (3) were returned too late for inclusion in the analysis. Of the 27 instruments sent to the non-participants, five (5) were not returned, and one (1) student was no longer enrolled in the University, making a total of 21 usable responses from the non-participants.

Of the 16 students participating in activities, seven (7) were majors in the School of Business and Public Management, three (3) in Liberal and Fine Arts, five (5) in Natural, Applied, and Health Sciences, and one (1) in Education. The numbers of non-participants were nine (9), five (5), five (5), and two (2) respectively. Five (5) of the 16 participants were males, 11 were females. Three (3) of the non-participants were males, 18 were females. The total population for the study was 37 students. (See Appendix C)

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compute Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the dependent variable (test scores of each of the Student Development Task Inventory tasks) by each of the independent variables (sex, age, major, classification, previous experience in decision-making, and participation in governance activities at UDC) with each dependent variable pre-test score as a covariable.

Since norm data were not provided on the SDTI, the Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) procedure was used with ANCOVA to produce a grand mean score for the dependent variables and covariables (post-test score with pre-test score) with the independent variables (sex, age, major, classification, previous experience, and governance participation). Successful achievement of a developmental task was measured, according to the SDTI Guidelines, by the total responses given. Each task contained 20 items which could be marked true or false by respondents. The closer the total figure in a task category approached zero (0), the fewer behaviors a student had to master. The closer the total responses approached 20, the more behaviors one had to master.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In the first developmental task, Developing Emotional Autonomy, the ANCOVA procedure indicated that the participants and non-participants were different before the experiment. Table 1 shows that the significance of the group differences and amount of regression did not allow change in comparison of the group means to be attributed to the treatment alone.

The variables sex and age did have an effect on the means of the two groups in the Emotional Autonomy category. Females had a mean of 2.93 on the post-test and achieved a lower mean (2.79), with correlation of the pre-test score, than males. The lower mean suggests that fewer behaviors needed to be mastered by the females. Males had a mean of 2.37 on the post-test and achieved a higher mean of 2.91 on the pre-test correlation, suggesting more development was needed on the Emotional Autonomy category.

The mean for students 30 and under was 2.43 on the post-test and 2.71 on the pre-/post- correlation indicating a slight increase in the need for developing emotional autonomy over one semester; those 31 and over showed a decrease from a mean of 4.00 to 3.14 for the same period. The reduction in mean scores of the 31 and over age group was slightly more (.86) than the increase (.28) in mean scores of the 30 and under age group.

Table 1. Task 1 - Developing Emotional Autonomy

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 2.81			
by Sex, Age							
Main effects	3	35.188	.001	Female	29	2.93	2.79
Sex	1	0.102	.999	Male	8	2.37	2.91
Age	1	1.142	.999	30 & Under	28	2.33	2.71
with Pretest	1	88.095	.001	31 & Over	9	4.00	3.14
by Classification, Major							
Main effects	5	25.103	.001	Junior	9	3.67	3.13
Classification	1	1.171	.999	Senior	28	2.53	2.71
Major	3	6,656	.252	Business	16	3.62	3.58
with Pretest	1	95.968	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	2.37	2.41
				Science	10	1.90	2.36
				Education	3	2.67	1.25
by Marital Status							
Main effects	2	54.979	.001	Single	25	3.12	3.08
Marital status	1	3.579	.283	Married	12	2.17	2.25
with Pretest	1	102.588	.001				
by Previous Experience, Participation							
Main effects	3	34.877	.001	Some experience	17	3.06	2.72
Previous experience	1	0.221	.999	No experience	20	2.60	2.88
Participation	1	0.074	.999	No participation	21	3.24	2.85
with Pretest	1	95.346	.001	Participation	16	2.25	2.76

The data suggest that even with an increase in mean scores, the 30 and under age group demonstrated more Emotional Autonomy than the 31 and over group.

The classification and major variables had effects similar to those of sex and age on Emotional Autonomy. The groups showed significant differences which could not be attributed to the treatment alone. Seniors showed more Emotional Autonomy than juniors, and Science and Education majors showed development of more Emotional Autonomy than the Business and Liberal/Fine Arts majors.

Marital status had a significant effect on development of Emotional Autonomy before treatment that remained stable after adjustment. The married students showed more Emotional Autonomy than the single students.

Finally, Table 1 shows that students with some previous experience in decision-making demonstrated more Emotional Autonomy than those without such experience. The data revealed that participation in activities accounted for only 18 percent of the difference in the two groups. The decrease in the mean scores of students who did not participate in activities (from 3.24 to 2.85) indicated an increase of approximately 39 percent in development of Emotional Autonomy. The increase in means of students who do participate in activities (from 2.25 to 2.75) indicated a need for development of Emotional Autonomy.

In Table 2, Development of Instrumental Autonomy, the groups showed significant differences on the variables sex and age before treatment and again with correlation of pre- and post-test scores. Mean scores for females indicated more development of Instrumental Autonomy than males, whose scores suggested a need for such development. The 30 and under age group, as on the first task, demonstrated more Instrumental Autonomy with a mean of 1.69 than the 31 and over group who produced a mean of 2.39.

Juniors showed more Instrumental Autonomy than seniors on Task 2 (Table 2), and Business and Education majors demonstrated greater Instrumental Autonomy. The Business and Science majors showed slight increases in their need for developing the task, while Liberal/Fine Arts and Education majors' mean scores indicated they had achieved more Instrumental Autonomy. On this task single students showed more development than the married students. The differences in the groups were significant at the .05 level on the post-test and remained stable when correlated with the pre-test scores.

The correlation of the pre-test to the post-test score produced significant differences between participants and non-participants on the variables previous

Table 2. Task 2 - Developing Instrumental Autonomy

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.86			
by Sex, Age							
Main effects	3	5.911	.033	Female	29	1.96	1.92
Sex	1	0.426	.999	Male	8	1.56	1.65
Age	1	3.037	.200	30 & Under	28	1.60	1.69
with Pretest	1	9.490	.027	31 & Over	9	2.66	2.39
by Classification, Major							
Main effects	5	5.275	.022	Junior	9	1.66	1.29
Classification	1	3.484	.156	Senior	28	1.92	2.04
Major	3	3.153	.153	Business	16	1.87	1.93
with Pretest	1	23.858	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	2.25	2.13
				Science	10	1.70	2.09
				Education	3	1.33	-.02
by Marital Status							
Main effects	2	6.956	.039	Single	25	1.76	1.86
Marital Status	1	0.000	.999	Married	12	2.08	1.86
with Pretest	1	13.065	.014				
by Previous Experience, Participation							
Main effects	3	5.033	.076	Some experience	17	2.05	1.96
Previous experience	1	0.286	.999	No experience	20	1.70	1.78
Participation	1	0.625	.999	No participation	21	2.14	1.98
with Pretest	1	10.975	.025	Participation	16	1.50	1.70

decision-making experience and participation in governance activities. No significant differences were found in the two groups before treatment. (See Table 2) According to the mean scores, students with some previous experience at decision-making showed development of Instrumental Autonomy while those without experience showed a slight increase in the need for development. The students who do not participate in activities showed more development on the task than the participant group.

Sex and age were again significant on Developing Interdependence (Table 3) when correlated with the pre-test scores. The unadjusted mean for females was 2.24, which decreased to 2.08 after correlation. The decreased mean score indicated an increase in development of the task. Males had a mean of 1.37 before adjustment and 1.93 after correlation with the pre-test, indicating an increase in the need for development. The 30 and under age group showed an increase in need for development, the 31 and over group showed an increase in development of the task after adjustment. The younger age group, nonetheless, had a lower mean score than the older group suggesting they had more interdependence than the older group.

Juniors more than seniors showed Interdependence, and Liberal/Fine Arts majors and Education majors

Table 3. Task 3 - Developing Interdependence

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 2.05			
by Sex, Age							
Main effects	3	31.271	.001	Female	29	2.24	2.08
Sex	1	0.135	.999	Male	8	1.37	1.93
Age	1	1.428	.999	30 & Under	28	1.75	1.94
with Pretest	1	80.229	.001	31 & Over	9	3.00	2.41
by Classification, Major							
Main effects	5	21.179	.001	Junior	9	2.11	1.76
Classification	1	0.961	.999	Senior	28	2.03	2.14
Major	3	4.412	.099	Business	16	2.37	2.66
with Pretest	1	95.797	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	2.00	1.35
				Science	10	1.30	2.04
				Education	3	3.00	0.71
by Marital Status							
Main effects	2	48.542	.001	Single	25	2.00	2.31
Marital status	1	4.953	.123	Married	12	2.16	2.00
with Pretest	1	96.858	.001				
by Previous Experience, Participation							
Main effects	3	30.752	.001	Some experience	17	2.29	2.03
Previous experience	1	0.010	.999	No experience	20	1.85	2.05
Participation	1	0.099	.999	No participation	21	1.39	2.00
with Pretest	1	71.060	.001	Participation	16	1.18	2.12

showed an increase in development of the task while Business and Science students had an increased need for Developing Interdependence. Single students showed increased need for Interdependence and married students showed development of the task.

The students who had no previous experience at decision-making showed increased need for Interdependence and those with previous experience showed development had occurred. The stuents who now participate in activities and those who do not showed an increase in needed development.

Males showed more development of Tolerance than females on Task 4 although the mean score for females did reduce by less (.09 percent) than the score for males (.31 percent). The 30 and under age group were more tolerant than the 31 and over group. Liberal/ Fine Arts majors indicated a higher level of tolerance than the other majors. The data showed that married students were more tolerant than single students, those with no previous experience were more tolerant, and the group who participated in activities were less tolerant than their counterparts. (See Table 4)

Table 5, Task 5 - Developing Mature Peer Relationships, did not produce any significant differences. After adjustment, males demonstrated a slight increase in the need to develop Mature Peer Relationships (1.63 to

Table 4. Task 4 - Developing Tolerance

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.73			
by Sex, Age							
Main effects	3	16.142	.001	Female	29	1.83	1.74
Sex	1	0.016	.999	Male	8	1.38	1.69
Age	1	7.265	.027	30 & Under	28	1.25	1.45
with Pretest	1	21.780	.001	31 & Over	9	3.32	2.60
by Classification, Major							
Main effects	5	11.343	.001	Junior	9	2.11	1.50
Classification	1	0.584	.999	Senior	28	1.61	1.80
Major	3	5.184	.020	Business	16	2.38	2.21
with Pretest	1	40.706	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	0.75	0.96
				Science	10	1.60	2.02
				Education	3	1.33	0.24
by Marital Status							
Main effects	2	20.762	.001	Single	25	1.68	1.82
Marital Status	1	0.541	.999	Married	12	1.83	1.55
with Pretest	1	41.334	.001				
by Previous Experience, Participation							
Main effects	3	13.988	.001	Some experience	17	2.00	1.87
Previous experience	1	0.614	.999	No experience	20	1.50	1.61
Participation	1	0.588	.999	Some participation	21	1.95	1.61
with Pretest	1	38.222	.001	No participation	16	1.44	1.89

Table 5. Task 5 - Developing Mature Peer Relationships

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.73			
by Sex, Age				Female	29	1.76	1.74
Main Effects	3	3.798	.242	Male	8	1.63	1.69
Sex	1	0.018	.999	30 & Under	28	1.57	1.60
Age	1	1.758	.999	31 & Over	9	2.22	2.12
with Pretest	1	8.503	.076				
by Classification, Major							
Main Effects	5	4.010	.195	Junior	9	2.22	1.68
Classification	1	0.018	.999	Senior	28	1.57	1.74
Major	3	3.475	.270	Business	16	2.13	2.06
with Pretest	1	9.230	.063	Lib/Fine Arts	8	1.00	1.15
				Science	10	1.90	2.07
by Marital Status				Education	3	1.00	0.39
Main Effects	2	4.908	.156				
Marital Status	1	0.289	.999	Single	25	1.64	1.67
with Pretest	1	0.196	.061	Married	12	1.92	1.86
by Previous Experience,							
Participation				Some experience	17	1.53	1.58
Main Effects	3	3.688	.249	No experience	20	1.90	1.86
Previous Experience	1	0.639	.999	No participation	21	1.67	1.86
Participation	1	0.489	.999	Participation	16	1.81	1.86
with Pretest	1	9.777	.057				

1.69) and females showed slight development of the task (1.76 to 1.74). Males, however, showed more Mature Peer Relationships than females, juniors showed more than seniors, and the Liberal/Fine Arts and Education majors' mean scores after adjustment indicated more maturity in peer relationships. Single students more than married students had developed Mature Peer Relationships, students with some previous experience showed more development on the task than those without experience, and those not participating in activities had developed more than the participants.

On Task 6, Developing Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex (Table 6), significant differences existed in the groups before treatment, and the correlation of the pre-test to the post-test score of the category accounted for a slight increase in the difference (.003 to .002). Although females showed a slight increase in development of Task 6, the mean score for males (1.47) indicated they had developed better relationships with the opposite sex than females, whose mean was 1.94. The 30 and under age group showed an increased need for better intimate relationships with the opposite sex, yet, their level of development was higher (1.61) than that for the over 31 age group (2.56). Juniors, Liberal/Fine Arts and Education

Table 6. Task 6 - Developing Intimate Relationships with Opposite Sex

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.84			
by Sex, Age				Female	29	2.04	1.94
Main Effects	3	12.716	.003	Male	8	1.13	1.47
Sex	1	1.356	.999	30 & Under	28	1.50	1.61
Age	1	5.963	.105	31 & Over	9	2.78	2.56
with Pretest	1	24.300	.002				
by Classification, Major							
Main Effects	5	7.405	.031	Junior	9	1.89	1.35
Classification	1	2.534	.999	Senior	28	1.82	2.00
Major	3	1.673	.999	Business	16	2.00	2.09
with Pretest	1	36.126	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	1.63	1.60
				Science	10	1.80	1.96
by Marital Status				Education	3	1.67	0.72
Main Effects	2	15.252	.004				
Marital Status	1	0.560	.999	Single	25	1.56	1.75
with Pretest	1	24.561	.003	Married	12	2.42	2.03
by Previous Experience,							
Participation				Some experience	17	1.94	1.91
Main Effects	3	10.056	.016	No experience	20	1.75	1.78
Previous Experience	1	0.142	.999	No participation	21		
Participation	1	0.129	.999	Participation	16		
with Pretest	1	27.986	.002				

majors and single students indicated less need for development of the task than their counterparts.

The correlation of the pre-test score on Task 6 accounted for a change in the difference of the two (2) groups on the variables previous decision-making experience and participation in activities. Those with no experience and those who did not participate in activities demonstrated better intimate relationships with the opposite sex according to their mean scores (See Table 6).

The pre-test scores accounted for slight changes in the differences between the two (2) groups when correlated with the post-test scores on Task 7, Developing Appropriate Educational Plans (Table 7) on each of the independent variables. Males showed less development of the task was needed than females, and the two (2) age groups (30 and under, 31 and over) scored identical means after adjustment. Juniors, Liberal/Fine Arts and Education majors and married students showed less development was needed on Task 7, students with some previous decision-making experience and those who participate in activities demonstrated more development of Appropriate Educational Plans. (See Table 7)

On Task 8, Developing Mature Career Plans (Table 8) females remained stable on pre- and post-test

Table 7. Task 7 - Developing Appropriate Educational Plans

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.16			
by Sex, Age				Female	29	1.20	1.25
Main Effects	3	15.434	.001	Male	8	1.00	0.83
Sex	1	1.093	.302	30 & Under	28	0.93	1.16
Age	1	0.000	.000	31 & Over	9	1.89	1.16
with Pretest	1	39.997	.001				
by Classification, Major							
Main Effects	5	9.398	.001	Junior	9	1.78	0.92
Classification	1	0.540	.999	Senior	28	0.96	1.24
Major	3	0.525	.999	Business	16	1.25	1.22
with Pretest	1	39.882	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	0.87	0.83
				Science	10	1.00	1.40
by Marital Status				Education	3	1.90	0.90
Main Effects	2	23.728	.001				
Marital Status	1	2.284	.122	Single	25	1.12	1.34
with Pretest	1	47.319	.001	Married	12	1.25	0.79
by Previous Experience,							
Participation				Some experience	17	1.17	0.87
Main Effects	3	16.581	.001	No experience	20	1.15	1.41
Previous Experience	1	2.416	.104	No participation	21	1.57	1.43
Participation	1	3.179	.063	Participation	16	0.62	0.81
with Pretest	1	41.150	.001				

Table 8. Task 8 - Developing Mature Career Plans

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 1.19			
by Sex, Age				Female	29	1.21	1.21
Main Effects	3	9.681	.001	Male	8	1.13	1.10
Sex	1	0.077	.999	30 & Under	28	0.97	1.10
Age	1	0.839	.999	31 & Over	9	1.89	1.47
with Pretest	1	23.201	.001				
by Classification, Major							
Main Effects	5	5.679	.001	Junior	9	1.89	1.16
Classification	1	0.007	.999	Senior	28	0.97	1.20
Major	3	0.125	.999	Business	16	1.25	1.22
with Pretest	1	20.299	.001	Lib/Fine Arts	8	1.00	1.01
				Science	10	1.00	1.30
by Marital Status				Education	3	2.00	1.15
Main Effects	2	14.041	.001				
Marital Status	1	0.064	.999	Single	25	1.04	1.16
with Pretest	1	26.366	.001	Married	12	1.50	1.13
by Previous Experience,							
Participation				Some experience	17	1.29	1.24
Main Effects	3	9.410	.001	No experience	20	1.10	1.15
Previous Experience	1	0.063	.999	No participation	21	1.33	1.24
Participation	1	0.096	.999	Participation	16	1.00	1.13
with Pretest	1	27.105	.001				

scores, males showed increased development, those 30 and under showed increased need for development, and students 31 and over showed increased development. Juniors showed an increase in development on the task, seniors did not; mean scores of Liberal/Fine Arts and Education majors indicated more development than Business and Science majors. Married students had an increase in their development of Mature Career Plans, single students showed a slight increase in need to develop this task. Students with no previous experience and students who participate in activities showed more development than their counterparts. (See Table 8)

Correlation of the pre-test score to the post-test score on Task 9 accounted for some of the difference in the two (2) groups in the category, Developing Mature Life-Style Plans. (See Table 9) Males and students over 30 showed more development of the task; seniors indicated more development than juniors; the Liberal/Fine Arts majors and Education majors produced scores indicating a higher development level; married students were slightly more developed than single students (2.07 and 2.01 respectively), the students with previous experience gained in development producing a slightly lower mean than the students with no experience; and the students who do not participate

Table 9. Task 9 - Developing Mature Life-Style Plans

Source of Variation	df	MS	Significance of F	Variable & Category	N	Unadjusted	Adjusted
				Grand Mean = 2.05			
by Sex, Age				Female	29	2.13	2.15
Main Effects	3	8.910	.010	Male	8	1.75	1.70
Sex	1	1.177	.999	30 & Under	28	1.82	1.92
Age	1	1.757	.999	31 & Over	9	2.77	2.45
with Pretest	1	20.120	.004				
by Classification, Major							
Main Effects	5	6.882	.017	Junior	9	2.11	2.40
Classification	1	0.994	.999	Senior	28	1.71	1.94
Major	3	1.477	.241	Business	16	2.56	2.48
with Pretest	1	13.910	.014	Lib/Fine Arts	8	1.62	1.72
				Science	10	1.70	2.06
by Marital Status				Education	3	1.66	0.64
Main Effects	2	11.632	.008				
Marital Status	1	0.033	.999	Single	25	1.96	2.07
with Pretest	1	22.581	.002	Married	12	2.25	2.01
by Previous Experience,							
Participation				Some experience	17	2.11	2.00
Main Effects	3	7.959	.020	No experience	20	2.00	2.01
Previous Experience	1	0.077	.999	No participation	21	2.04	1.93
Participation	1	0.642	.999	Participation	16	2.06	2.21
with Pretest	1	23.731	.002				

in activities showed slightly more development of Mature Life-Style Plans than the participant group.

SUMMARY

The Analysis of Covariance procedure (ANCOVA) showed that there were differences in the students who participate in campus governance activities and those who do not prior to correlation of the pre-test scores with those of the post-test on the nine (9) categories of the Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI).

The correlation did account for increases in the differences on Task 2, Developing Instrumental Autonomy; Task 6, Developing Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex; and Task 9, Developing Mature Life-Style Plans. After adjustment for differences prior to correlation, males showed more development than females on eight (8) tasks - Developing Instrumental Autonomy, Interdependence, Tolerance, Mature Peer Relationships, Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex, Appropriate Educational Plans, Mature Career Plans, and Mature Life-Style Plans. Females showed more development in the Emotional Autonomy category. Mean scores of students 30 and under indicated they had achieved more development than the 31 and over age group on all but one (1) of the tasks. The means for these two (2) age groups were the same on

Developing Appropriate Educational Plans. Juniors showed more development than seniors on seven (7) of the categories; seniors had scores indicating more achievement in Developing Emotional Autonomy and Developing Mature Life-Style Plans.

The mean scores for students majoring in Liberal/Fine Arts fields and in Education indicated they had achieved more development than students majoring in Natural, Applied, and Health Sciences and in Business and Public Management.

Married students showed more development of Interdependence, Tolerance, Appropriate Educational Plans, Mature Career Plans, and Mature Life-Style Plans than single students; they were evenly developed on Instrumental Autonomy; and single students more than married students showed development of Emotional Autonomy, Mature Peer Relationships, and Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex. Students with previous decision-making experience showed more development than those without experience on Emotional Autonomy, Instrumental Autonomy, Interdependence, Mature Peer Relationships, Appropriate Educational Plans and Mature Life-Style Plans. The students who participate in activities showed more development than the students who do not participate in only four (4) of the developmental tasks - Emotional Autonomy, Appropriate Educational Plans, Instrumental Autonomy, and Mature Career Plans.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

SUMMARY

The sample for this study consisted of 54 students - 27 who participated in campus governance activities at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) and 27 students who did not participate in governance activities. The students were matched on the characteristics of age, sex, marital status, major, and classification. The age range for the sample was 21 to 57 years - with an average age of 28 years. Twenty-nine (29) of the respondents were female (79 percent), eight (8) were male (21 percent); 79 percent were under 30 years old, 21 percent were 31 or older; 25 (68 percent) were single, 12 (32 percent) were married; 34 were Black (92 percent), three (3) were non-Black (eight (8) percent).

According to Spring 1979 data from the UDC Office of Institutional Research, the average age of UDC students is 28 years, 92 percent reside in the District of Columbia, 55 percent are female, 20 percent are married, 61.4 percent are single and 84.5 percent are Black. The selected sample for the study was representative of the UDC population.

The Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI) was mailed to the 54 students in September 1978 and January 1979, before and after one (1) full semester at UDC. A total of 37 instruments were returned, for a response rate of 68.5 percent. The instrument is designed to measure a student's level of development in nine (9) categories: (1) Emotional Autonomy, (2) Instrumental Autonomy, (3) Interdependence, (4) Tolerance, (5) Mature Relationships with Peers, (6) Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex, (7) Appropriate Educational Plans, (8) Mature Career Plans, and (9) Mature Life-Style Plans.

In addition to the Inventory, the 54 students were interviewed to determine if any experiences they had outside or before entering the University may have influenced their decision about participation in governance activities. Responses to the interview questions and scores from the SDTI were coded for analyzing utilizing Analysis of Covariance.

Two (2) non-metric variables (previous experience/no previous experience, participation/no participation) were added to the characteristic indicators (sex, age, major, classification, marital status) for a total of seven (7) independent variables. The dependent variable was the post-test score of the

SDTI correlated with the pre-test score. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to compute the results.

Two (2) major questions formed the basis for this study:

1. What are the effects of student participation in campus governance activities on student development?

2. Do the characteristics of the student participant differ from those of the non-participant?

The limited knowledge about student development (Cross, 1975) may account for the lack of data in the literature on factors contributing to student development. A study on the effects of student participation in governance activities was important in approaching identification of one (1) component of student development.

In response to the first question, the ANCOVA showed that student participation was significantly related to student development on four (4) of the nine (9) developmental tasks: Developing Emotional Autonomy, Developing Instrumental Autonomy, Developing Appropriate Educational Plans, and Developing Mature Career Plans. The procedure also produced data indicating there was no significant difference in the characteristics of students who participate in governance and those who do not, as the response to the second question.

The major findings of the study were that: (1) student participation in campus governance has a significant effect on some developmental tasks of college students as measured by the SDTI, and (2) the characteristics of students who participate in governance activities do not differ significantly from students who do not so participate.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Reliability and validity analyses for the SDTI were performed on undergraduate students between the ages of 18 and 23. In addition, normative data are not available for the instrument, which precluded any comparison of the students used in this research with data collected from other samples.

The age range of the sample used in this study was 21 to 57, the median age was 28 years. The low mean scores on all nine (9) categories or developmental tasks suggest that the characteristics of the urban student (age, sex, marital status, major, classification) make the developmental tasks identified in the SDTI inapplicable to an older (over 23 years of age) urban student population.

The urban student in general has needs that are different from the traditional student of the 1950's and 60's (Feldman, 1969; Brown, 1972). These needs become more acute when the urban student is also older and involved in a life-style quite unlike that of the more traditional residence hall college student. The measures to identify the needs of the older, urban student should, therefore, differ from those used on the younger, campus resident.

The development and validation of the SDTI on a student age group falling within the range of Chickering's (1969) "Young Adult" (i.e., 18 to 25 years old) result in two (2) concerns: (1) it becomes very difficult for students over 25, married and single, self-supporting, and not residing in campus facilities to respond to certain items on the Inventory, and (2) it may be that some developmental tasks of older, urban students have yet to be identified while others have been mastered and discarded.

In considering the first concern, five (5) of the twenty (20) items in the Emotional Autonomy category appeared less applicable to single, self-supporting or married students than to single students who are still dependent on their parents. These were:

"I rely on my parents for solutions to my really important personal problems."

"My parents are the cause of a lot of my troubles."

"I feel guilty when I don't obey my parents' wishes."

"It is extremely important for me to please my parents."

"Arguments with my parents often upset me."

Seven (7) of the twelve (12) married students in the sample stated the item did not apply to them, and even after verbal instructions to substitute the words "significant others" for parents, eleven (11) respondents indicated that one (1) or more of the items did not apply to them. These responses, according to SDTI Scoring Instructions, had to be counted as behaviors to be mastered.

Thirteen (13) students responded that it was important to them to please their parents. During discussion of the item, eight (8) of the students stated they wanted to please their parents because of parents' past sacrifices or because of the assistance parents volunteered (moral support and babysitting were two (2) prime reasons). A "true" response to the statement on pleasing parents had to be counted as a behavior (Emotional Autonomy) to be mastered. The reason for the response from this sample would seem incongruent with the intent of the statement.

One statement in Developing Mature Relationships with Peers and one in Developing Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex posed some difficulty for married students. The first statement was, "I feel a strong need to have a loving relationship with someone of my own peer group." The response "false" had to be counted as a task or behavior needing development according to the Inventory, yet married students answered it "false" because of its inapplicability to them.

The second statement posed even greater complications, "Failure to maintain a previous dating relationship does not deter me from establishing a new one." Even when "marriage" was substituted for "dating relationship" according to the instructions, the question was answered "false" by married students, indicating a behavior not yet mastered, or marked as inapplicable which had to be counted as a "false" answer by the SDTI Guidelines. The twelve (12) married students stated that a marriage relationship simply could not be entered into as easily as a dating relationship.

The second concern raised by this research was that some developmental tasks of older, urban students have not yet been identified while others have been mastered and discarded, either before entering college or during the college years.

The pre- and post-scores achieved on the instrument, the discussion with students about the responses indicating a task had yet to be mastered, and the interviews to identify previous decision-making experience strongly suggest that a majority of the respondents had mastered the tasks isolated in the SDTI. These students, in some cases, appeared to be at another developmental stage in which other behaviors or tasks needed measurement. Five (5) of these tasks or behaviors were: (1) achieving self-reliance, (2) managing time, (3) setting an example, (4) being depended upon, and (5) achieving selflessness.

1. Achieving Self-Reliance

The SDTI development task which appeared related to this behavior was Developing Interdependence. The nature of the task as defined in the Inventory is: Developing "mature dependence" - the primary objective of this task. Recognizing that one cannot dispense with his parents; that one cannot comfortably accept continuing support without working for it; that one cannot receive benefits from a social structure without contributing to it; that loving and being loved are complementary and important aspects of this task. An individual becomes aware of the relationship between his behavior and community welfare in general. Awareness of the need to work effectively with others and skills contributing to working with others must be developed.

Students in this sample, however, appeared to have achieved a certain independence which differs from the "mature dependence" to which the SDTI refers. The nature of the independence seemed to be: reliance on one's own ability to obtain information; identifying and adjusting to areas of conflict with peers and others, e.g. professors, employers, family, etc. (family in this sense refers to spouse and children rather than parents). Some examples of mastery of this independence were the decision to attend UDC, the reason for selecting a major, and the setting of an academic goal. Decisions concerning these issues were usually made independently and without professional or other consultation.

2. Managing Time

All students in the study (37) stated that they arranged and adjusted their daily schedules - school, home, employment, studying, and leisure. During the interviews, students were asked to rate the importance of "time" in their individual activities. Of the 21 students who do not participate in governance activities at UDC, 17 are involved in community activities. When asked to rate time on a scale of one (1) (low importance) to five (5) (high importance), four (4) students rated it three (3), eleven (11) students rated it four (4), and six (6) students gave "time" a rating of five (5). The consensus was that one had to squeeze activities in if they were important to family members, and still make time for study. The subtask, Developing Mature Life-Style Plans on the SDTI defines the formulation of "a direction and orientation that balances vocational aspirations, avocational interests, and future family plans" as the nature of this subtask. The definition appears to relate to the management skill referred to by the sample; however, the respondents in the sample had passed the formulation stage of the direction and were in some stage of implementation. The implication is that measurement is needed beyond the point of identification or formulation, and during the process of implementation for older, urban students. Mastery of the subtask may have occurred before entering college, and development of a task to test its mastery during college is needed.

3. Setting An Example

An important behavior for the older, urban student expressed by this sample was setting an example or creating an image for others to follow (younger siblings, children). Eleven (11) of the twelve (12) married students indicated they wanted their children (current or future) to attend college; one (1) married student responded that if he did have children in the future he would encourage the child's specific interest. All of the single students in the sample felt college was important, and indicated they would encourage others to attend. Some expressed the opinion that in addition to attending college, general attitudes about school, religion, and getting along socially were emphasized during college. The SDTI does not appear to attach significance to this behavior as a developmental task, yet the respondents in this sample implied they felt they were judged by their attitudes and mannerisms as well as their skills in and outside the University environment.

4. Being Depended Upon

Male and female, single and married respondents stated that they considered themselves the person about whom some of the SDTI statements were concerned. That is, they were frequently relied upon to help others solve problems or to make decisions about issues important to them. This role seemed to take on a different meaning than setting an example. Respondents suggested that family (spouse and children), parents, friends, and often co-workers would wait for them to initiate certain tasks.

5. Achieving Selflessness

Consideration of others, mutual respect and support, and bending to another's wishes were suggested as important tasks by some respondents. The SDTI did give attention to these behaviors in the subtask of Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships. Yet, there seems to be a need to go beyond the behaviors identified on the SDTI to measuring the application of yielding to a spouse or other significant person. In addition to Developing Tolerance and Mature Relationships with the Opposite Sex, it is necessary to develop a certain responsiveness to the needs of others. Employers and spouses were cited as examples of persons who may sometime request more than an allotted amount of time.

It therefore, seems apparent that more research is needed on the developmental tasks of college students, particularly more research to determine if more tasks need identification and measurement as they apply to different student populations.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The data produced in this study suggest additional research is needed on (1) older, urban students and developmental tasks specifically applicable to them; (2) identification of additional tasks of student development, and (3) identification of activities in the campus environment that impact on developmental tasks.

The scores obtained on the SDTI in the present study suggest that the chronological or emotional maturity of some students (single and married) may be more responsible for their mastery of currently identified developmental tasks than the influences of the college environment on their development.

Second, other developmental tasks, more applicable to the older, urban, non-traditional student, need identification, e.g., achieving self-reliance, development of responsibility for guiding others.

In addition to identification of additional tasks for older students, it appears necessary to measure mastery of the task or behavior according to a degree of implementation.

Several observations can be drawn from the present study:

1. The Student Development Task Inventory appears best suited to a traditional college student (i.e., single, financially dependent on parents, 18 to 24 years of age, living in a residence hall, primarily suburban or rural).

2. Developmental tasks for non-traditional students (single and married, self-supporting, 25 and older, living in private housing, primarily urban) differ from traditional students and must be identified.

3. Activities in the campus milieu must be identified and assessed for their usefulness as developmental tasks and relationship to student development.

4. The experiences of the older student outside and before entering the college should be isolated and assessed for their relationship to student development.

5. In addition to mastery of certain developmental tasks, student development must encompass the application of specific behaviors by the student in given situations.

Some research questions formulated from these observations are:

1. "What are the developmental tasks of non-traditional college students?"

2. "Do non-traditional and traditional students differ on measures of student development?" "Why do these students differ?"

3. "What are the characteristics of students who participate in governance activities on the traditional campus?"

4. "Is there a relationship between the characteristics of students who participate in governance and those who do not on traditional campuses?"

In the present research, the characteristics of the sample were different at the outset of the experiment.

Further research is needed to identify other characteristics for correlation. The study might be replicated at another insitution where more similarities might exist in the population than in the UDC sample.

The data to establish student participation in campus governance as a contributing factor to student development suggest that some development is significantly related to governance participation while other development is not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Paul R. "Student Participation in University Governance. An Alternative Model." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Brown, Robert D. Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education - A Return to the Academy Washington, D.C., American College Personnel Association, 1972.

Butler, William R. "Student Involvement in the Decision-Making Process." Journal of College Student Personnel. (November 1966), p. 331-335.

Cangemi, Joseph P. "Perceptions of Students, Faculty and Administrators Regarding Self-Actualization as the Purpose of Higher Education." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1974.

Chickering, A.S. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

________. "Institutional Objectives and Student Development in College." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3(3), (1967), 287-304.

Corson, John J. The Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Cross, K.P. "Assessment of Student Development." Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association Convention, Atlanta, March, 1975.

Davis, John B., Jr. "A Survey of Practices Related to Student Membership on Academic Committees." Greenville, N.C. Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, East Carolina University, 1969.

Dressel, Paul L. and Irvin J. Lehmann. "The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values and Critical Thinking Abilities." The Educational Record, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Winter 1965) 248-258.

Feldman, K. and R. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Feldman, K. "Measuring College Environments: Some Uses of Path Analysis." American Educational Research Journal, (1971) 51-70.

________. "Reserach Strategies - Studying College Impact." ACT Research Report 34, ACT Program 1970.

Follett, Mary, Dynamic Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

Glasscock, David G.A. "Survey of Attitudes Concerning Student Participation in University Decision-Making at Milliken University." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champlain, 1971.

Golden, M.P. and Rosen, N.A. "Student Attitudes Toward Participation in Unversity Administration: An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Prerogatives." Journal of College Student Personnel, 7 (1966) 323-330.

Gross, E. & Grambsch, P.V. University Goals and Power. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1968.

Gross, Stanley J. "The Importance of the Unimportance of Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, (1977) 87-92.

Havighurst, R.J. Developmental Tasks and Education. New York, McKay, 1952.

________. Human Development and Education. New York, Longmares, Green & Co., 1953.

Hays, John W. "Student Involvement in Collective Bargaining." Journal of College Student Personnel, 18 (1977) 5-10.

Hodgkinson, Harold, "Governance and Factions - Who Decides Who Decides?" Research Reporter, Berkeley, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1968.

________. "Student Participation in Campus Governance. California University, Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968.

________. "Students and an Intellectual Community." Educational Record, 49, Fall 1968.

Hodgkinson, H.L. & Meeth (Eds.) Power and Authority: Transformation of Campus Governance, San Francisco: Jossey-Bas, 1971.

Hoyt, Donald P. "The Impact of Student Personnel Work on Student Development." NASPA Journal, 1968, Vol. 5, 269-275.

Kamp, Gene A. "Preferences of Junior Community College Formal Leaders for Student Participation in Policy Formulation." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 1971.

Katz, J. & Associates. No Time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Korn, H.A. "Jogjer Edication Programs and Student Development." Review of Educational Research, 39 (1969) 155-171.

Knock, Gary H. et al. "The Report of the Commission on Student Participation in University Life." Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1969.

Mauss, Gordon E. "The Impact on Community College Students of an Orientation Course Emphasizing the Nature, Functions, and Purposes of Higher Education." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, 1975.

McDonald, Verna P. "Perceptions of Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees of Student Participation in the Governance of Three Colorado Institutions of Higher Education." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of Northern Colorado, 1971.

Miller, Theodore K. & Judith S. Prince. The Future of Student Affairs, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Morrill, W.H. & Hurst, J.C. "A Preventive and Developmental Role for the College Counselor." The Counseling Psychologist, 1971, 2, 90-94.

Neher, Timothy J. "Patterns of Student Participation in Policy Making in Illinois Public Community Colleges." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971.

Paltridge, J.G., Hurst and Morgan. "Board of Trustees" Their Decision-Making Patterns." Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. University of California, 1973.

Panos, R.J. "Criteria of Student Development." Journal of College Student Personnel, 9 (1968) 308-311.

Prince, Judith Sosebee. "Identification & Analysis of Selected Developmental Tasks of College Students." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University-of Georgia, 1973.

________, and others. "Student Developmental Task Inventory." Athens, Ga., Student Development Associates, 1974.

Richman, B.M. & Farmer, R.N. Leadership, Goals and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Rowe, Robert I. "Student Participation in University Policy Formulation at Indiana University: Views of Faculty Students, Administrators and Trustees." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Sanford, N. "Personality Development During the College Years." Personnel & Guidance Journal, 35 (1956) 74-80.

Shipley, Thomas B. "A Survey of Attitudes of 1972-73 Members of Michigan State University Academic Council with Respect to One Year of Student Participation in Academic Governance." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.

Stenard, Richard A. "A Study to Determine the Congruence of the COSPA Statement, 'Student Development Services in Higher Education.' The Requisites of Student Development Services at Selected External Degree Programs." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1975.

Stroup, H.H. "Values and Disvalues of Faculty-Student Committees." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 35 (1957) 289-292.

Taylor, WIlliam L. "A Study of Perceived and Preferred Ratings of Institutional Goals & Priority Rankings as Viewed by Faculty, Students and Administrators at Oregon State University." Oregon State University, 1975.

Whiteley, John M. and Sprandel, Hazel (Eds.). The Growth and Development of College Students. American College Personnel Association, APGA, 1970.

Wilson, Robert C. and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Voice - Faculty Response." The Research Reporter, 4, Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1969, pp 1-4.

Young, Kenneth. "The Coming Conflict Between Students & Faculty." NASPA Journal, 1968, Vol. 5, 277-282.

Zaccaria, J.S. "Developmental Tasks: Implications for the Goals of Guidance." Personnel & Guidance Journal, 44 (1965) 373-375.

Zultowski & Catron. "Students as Curriculum Advisers: Reinterpreted." Journal of College Student Personnel. Vol. XVIII.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FUNCTIONING COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS WITH STUDENT MEMBERS AT UDC

Functioning Committees, Councils, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Committee	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Self Study Steering Com.		x	weekly		2	Appointed by SGA	Special fund of President	Collect information and prepare documents for re-affirmation of accreditation.
Catalog Com.		x	bi-weekly and as needed		1	Appointed by SGA	Special appropriation.	Prepare and publish UDC catalog.
Campus Safety and Security Committee	x		Periodic and as needed	17	1	Appointed by SGA	None	1)Develop policies for safety and security of campus personnel. 2)Assure compliance of all campus components to regulations. 3)Make recommendation to President re: violations.
Board of Trustees	x		monthly	15	1	Elected by Student body.	Appropriation.	Develop policies for operation and functioning of University.

APPENDIX B

FUNCTIONING DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONS WITH STUDENT MEMBERS AT UDC

Functioning Department Organizations, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Organization	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Alumni Affairs Program Committee	x		1/semester	7-9	1	President of alumni association.	Alumni contributions	Plan and implement programs for alumni. Prepares newsletter Prepares periodic reports to President, Board and alumni
Communications and Fine Arts Council	x		Periodic	12	2	Elected by students in department.	None. Irregular funds received from program receipts.	Produce dramatic events. Seek funding outside University. Make recommendation to faculty and dean regarding curriculum.
Student Pro-gram Board	x		Prior to each semester, others as needed	15	5	Appointed by Deans of Colleges	Student activity fees	Review funding requests from student groups, determine allocation. Plan out-of-classroom activities for students.

Functioning Department Organizations, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Organization	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Business School Council	x		Monthly	12	2	President of DPMA. One (1) elected by all business majors.	Small appropriation and donations	Sponsors annual honors banquet. Develops recruitment schedule. Plans and produces job fairs. Makes recommendations to dean re. faculty, curriculum, facilities.
Cooperative Education Advisory Council	x		Bi-monthly	(23 full committee 12-15/ meeting	1	Selected by Co-op Director (Procedure may change. Committee is new.)	None	Advises and assists in developing new co-op employers Assists in promotion of co-op to students, business and academic communities.

Functioning Department Organizations, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Organization	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Institutional Research	x		As needed		1 (Intern)	Individual Applica-tion	None Student receives credit.	Collect and analyze data on UDC students employees, curriculum and procedures for dissemina-tion.
Special Stu-dent Services Project in Higher Edu-cation (HEW grant project)	x		1-2/semester	15-20	1	President of Student Organi-zation	None	Advisory to Director of SSSPHE. Review total program and make recommen-dation to Director for modification Assists in preparation of funding proposal.
Veterans Affairs Council	x		1/semester	10	1	President of Veterans Club	None	Develops broad program goals for veterans. Assists in planning annual Veterans Opportunity Fair. Assists in recruiting veterans to UDC.

Functioning Department Organizations, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Organization	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Library/Media Services Committee	x		Monthly or as needed	10-12	1	Volunteer usually student worker in one of centers	Appro-priation	Develop and implement procedures governing use of facilities and equipment Assist faculty and students in presenting programs using equipment Assures center services meet needs of faculty and students.
International Student Development Advisory Committee	x		1/semester	10-15	1	President of student associa-tion	None	Assists office staff in developing goals. Plans special pro-gram activities for inter-nationals esp. during school breaks.
Athletic Committee	x		1/semester	15-20	2	1 male 1 female Elected by student majors	Athletic fees	Plans the UDC Athletic Program.

Functioning Department Organizations, UDC Fall 1978-Spring 1979

Organization	Standing	Ad-Hoc	Frequency of of Meetings	Total Members	No. Students	Manner of Selection	Committee Funding	Primary Functions of Committee
Student Travel Committee	x		2-3/semester	9	3	1 appt. by V.P. of Student Affairs 1 appt. by V.P. Academic Affairs 1 appt. by Dean of Graduate School	Appropriation	Review student requests for travel to conferences, workshops, meetings and other educational activities and make recommendations for approval to Vice President for Student Affairs.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY TABLE OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Summary of Student Participation by Characteristics.

	30 & Under								31 & Over							
	Juniors				Seniors				Juniors				Seniors			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
School of Business																
Females																
Married					1										1	
Single	1	1			2	1		1		1					2	1
Males																
Married							1								1	
Single		1						1								
School of Liberal & Fine Arts																
Females																
Married							3									
Single						1										
Males																
Married								1								
Single		1				1	1									
Natural, Applied, Health Sciences																
Females																
Married		1					1								1	
Single		2			4											1
(No Males)																
School of Education																
Females																
Married											1					
Single					1	1										
Males																
Married																
Single																

Legend

1 - No Previous Experience, No Participation
2 - No Previous Experience, Participation
3 - Some Previous Experience, No Participation
4 - Some Previous Experience, Participation

APPENDIX D

NON-PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RESPONSE SUMMARY

Non-Participant

Interview Questions

1. Are you a member of any club, group, or organization in your community?

Yes 17 No 4

Advisory Neighborhood Commission	1
Sorority, Fraternity	5
Volunteer Fireman	1
Church activity	7
Political Campaign Worker	1
Scout Leader	1
Senior Citizens Group Volunteer	1

2. Have you had to participate in a vote to decide how funds of the goup should be spent?

Yes 13 No 8

3. (If answer to #2 was Yes) How did you make a determination to vote?

Using own judgment.
Discussion with other members.
Polling interested partieis outside group.
Learning the costs now and later.
Combinations of above.

4. Does this represent a change in your way of doing things?

Yes 4 No 17

5. What are some of the key things that aid you in your group work?

Time.
Ability to get things done.
Desire to be helpful.
Listening, communicating ability.
Interest in neighborhood improvement.

6. Why did you decide to participate in this particular group?

My family.
General interest.

7. Will you become active in activities at UDC where you can use your skills?

Yes 2 No 7 Uncertain 12

8. How would you rate the skills for being effective on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 is the most important?

	1	2	3	4	5
Time			4	11	6
Productivity		2	2	3	14
Compassion	1		5	3	12
Listening				2	19
Speaking			2	1	18
Writing	1	2	4	11	3

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT INVERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RESPONSE SUMMARY

Participant

Interview Questions

1. Have you had occasion to vote on any expenditure of funds for a project or activity since you've been a member of the ____________ Committee?

   Yes 2 No 14

2. (If answer to # 1 was Yes) How did you make a determination to vote?

   Reviewing justifications.
   Using my own judgment.
   Discussing it with my wife (Not a student).
   Talking to other students.
   Will approve if the funds are available.
   UDC can use all the improvements it can get - if I think it's an improvement, I'll vote for it.

3. Does this (or any of the above) represent a change in your way of doing things?

   Yes 1 No 15

4. Have you ever had to participate in a vote or as a group member to decide how funds should be spent, outside UDC?

   Yes 5 No 11

   Commencement activities (the program, the speaker, the place)
   Spending our tax return; buying a house.
   Various activities for our social group.
   Bus trip for my church (over a weekend).

5. What are some of the key things you think aid you in being an effective committee member?

   Ability to express own ideas.
   Listening and critiquing abilities.
   Good average as a "cushion" against the reading one has to do for class and committee work.
   An understanding wife.

6. Why did you decide to participate in this committee?

   The dean asked me.
   It should look good on my resume.
   Plain crazy.
   I'd like to look back and think I helped build UDC.
   I hope to go into law one day, and I thought the experience might sharpen my listening and other skills. Also I thought it would help me to learn to juggle my time and still get my work done.

7. If you had to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 was the most important, these skills for being effective, how would you do it?

	1	2	3	4	5
Listening					16
Good average					16
Communicating (Speaking)				3	13
Communication (Writing)				11	5
Analyzing					16

8. Do you feel any different since you've been a committee member? More or less important, more or less disciplined, more or less capable?

   Yes 12 No 4

   Not really, committee only meets occasionally.
   Maybe not more important, because only a few students know or care what we do, but I think I'm learning something.
   I try to contact as many other students as possible when something important is happening on the committee, and I find they usually seek me out for questions and complaints.

APPENDIX F

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT TASK INVENTORY

STUDENT DEVELOPMENTAL TASK INVENTORY

JUDITH S. PRINCE, ED.D.
THEODORE K. MILLER, ED.D.
ROGER B. WINSTON, JR., PH.D.

DIRECTIONS

1. Do not mark on this booklet. Mark all answers on the separate answer sheet provided. Other people will be using this booklet.
2. Please provide the information requested at the top of the answer sheet. Print clearly.
3. After having completely read these directions, turn to page 2. Read each statement and decide either whether the statement is TRUE (or USUALLY TRUE) of you or whether FALSE (or NOT USUALLY TRUE of you). If true, completely darken the Ⓣ; if false, completely darken the Ⓕ. Be sure that the number of the statement corresponds to the number on the answer sheet. Use FIRM PRESSURE in recording answers, so they will show through the carbon.
4. Sample Answers:
   181.● Ⓕ (Indicating the statement is true)
   182.Ⓣ ● (Indicating the statement is false)
5. Respond to all statements. One or two of these statements may not be applicable to you. If this is the case, draw a single line through both the Ⓣ and Ⓕ (Sample: ~~ⓉⒻ~~).
6. When responding to statements referring to "dating partner," married students should substitute the word "spouse" or "marriage partner."
7. Before turning the page make sure you have supplied all the information requested at the top of the answer sheet.

Copyright © 1974 by Student Development Associates (Judith S. Prince, Theodore K. Miller, Roger B. Winston, Jr.) No part of this instrument may be reproduced in any way without written consent of the authors.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOOKLET.

1. My parents sometimes make mistakes.
2. I can express both warm and angry feelings to my parents.
3. I am aware of the expense and responsibility of owning a car.
4. I earned at least $300 a year from part-time or summer employment to support some of my needs.
5. The health and welfare of my family concerns me.
6. I feel that some rules are necessary.
7. I have attended an International Coffee Hour, or a Black Culture Program, or a Spanish dancing program, etc., to learn about ethnically, racially, and culturally different people.
8. I avoid using such phrases as "Blacks have rhythm."
9. I introduce myself to strangers at parties.
10. I don't worry about what others say about me when I am not with them.
11. I feel that I would be able to terminate a relationship with a member of the opposite sex without undue hurt to either of us.
12. I consider dating an important part of my total life pattern.
13. I am aware of my academic strengths and weaknesses based on my past performance in school.
14. Even though I sometimes have become discouraged, I am determined to achieve my educational goal.
15. I know what kinds of work activities give me satisfaction and what kinds do not.
16. I have imagined myself several times in different work roles.
17. I have discussed sports, a movie, or some cultural event with other students recently.
18. I feel I can create my own future by realistically assessing opportunities open to me.
19. I rely on my parents for solutions to my really important personal problems.
20. My parents are the cause of a lot of my troubles.
21. I meet most problems and solve them without turning to someone else.
22. I feel secure with most decisions that I make.
23. I keep in regular communication with my parents.
24. I can accept help from others.
25. I have participated in some effort to promote racial understanding among others.
26. I actively seek ideas different from my own.
27. I feel a strong need to have a loving relationship with someone of my own peer group.
28. I am satisfied with having only a few close friends.
29. I cooperatively establish with my dating partner the limits of our physical relationship.
30. I believe my dating partner should always meet my personal needs.
31. I feel confident that I can attain my educational goal.
32. I can list at least three reasons why I chose a college education over other types of education or immediate work.
33. I rarely think about the occupation that I want to enter.
34. I feel confident in my ability to make decisions regarding a career.
35. I follow through on most plans that I make.
36. I don't have any immediate goals.

GO TO PAGE 3

37. I talk easily with my parents on a variety of topics.

38. At home, I present my views and ideas in such a manner that it is clear that I have given them some thought.

39. I have volunteered for a project or accepted responsibility for a task even though I risked failure.

40. I chose the place in which I now live.

41. When I care for other people I let them know.

42. I like to get involved with other people in projects for our mutual benefit.

43. I allow other people to change their views and attitudes.

44. I have set up standards which I feel most people should meet.

45. I make sure that I spend adequate time with my friends.

46. I resume relationships easily even after extended separations.

47. Outward appearances (e.g., looks, dress, status) are very important to me in a continuing dating relationship.

48. I feel confident in my ability to establish and maintain a continuing relationship with a member of the opposite sex.

49. I have decided on the field in which I would like to study, such as the fine arts, or education, or the physical sciences, etc.

50. I have decided on an academic major that is consistent with my interests and abilities.

51. I have read an article or book that deals with some aspect of my field of vocational interest.

52. I know how big the demand is for people with a degree in the career areas I am considering.

53. Even with academic pressures, I still find time to lead a well-rounded life.

54. Although I don't know exactly where I will be living next year, I have some plans in mind.

55. I remain firm in decisions that I consider to be valid even when my parents offer no support.

56. I don't like to depend on my parents for so much.

57. I have successfully completed an extended trip on my own.

58. I could live anywhere in this country.

59. I can list reasons for obeying most of the laws and regulations of the community.

60. I have been active on at least one school committee or group within the past year.

61. I am not tolerant of selfish, status-seeking behavior in others.

62. I work at promoting mutual respect and communication among people.

63. Generally, I am able to communicate my true feelings to others.

64. I feel free to express both warm and angry feelings to my friends if the situation warrants either.

65. I am able to communicate intimate personal feelings with my dating partner.

66. I can converse easily with members of the opposite sex.

67. I feel that achievement in school is important for attaining my plans and goals.

68. I know what is required of me to graduate with my academic major.

69. I can list specific personal abilities and limitations to use as guidelines for narrowing the number of career areas I wish to explore.

70. I know at least five requirements necessary for the occupations I am thinking about entering.

71. I have played tennis, exercised, or engaged in some other physical activity in the last week.

72. I regularly participate in cultural activities.

GO TO PAGE 4

73. I feel guilty when I don't obey my parents' wishes.

74. I can accept criticism from others without getting upset.

75. I feel confident in my ability to direct my life.

76. It is hard for me to work intently on something for more than a short time.

77. I help others become involved in solving mutual problems at school or work.

78. I repay my parents' support now by doing the best I can while in college.

79. I have a friend of a race or ethnic group different from my own.

80. It is necessary that others accept my point of view.

81. It doesn't bother me if my leisure time activities are different from those of my friends.

82. I can accept teasing by my friends.

83. Failure to maintain a previous dating relationship does not deter me from establishing a new one.

84. I believe that my dating partner has a right to develop friendships with other members of my sex.

85. I have developed a financial plan for achieving my educational goals.

86. I have acceptable alternatives to my educational plans in mind.

87. I have thought of a plan for gaining practical experience while in college through a part-time job, summer job, internship, or similar employment related to my educational goals.

88. I know what kinds of jobs I will be able to get with certain degrees.

89. I give my best to the goal before me but would change my priorities as opportunities arise.

90. I have carefully considered the place of marriage, children, and a career in my future.

91. I need to be regularly reassured to get things done.

92. It is extremely important for me to please my parents.

93. I manage my personal finances.

94. I like to take responsibility.

95. I do not hesitate to seek help to deal with pressures in college life.

96. I regularly follow local and national happenings through various news media.

97. I enjoy making friends with a wide variety of people.

98. I do not judge individuals on the basis of whether they belong to a fraternity or sorority or similar social organization.

99. I am receptive to new friendship possibilities when they arise.

100. I cannot have disagreements with my friends and maintain friendly feelings toward them.

101. I am not afraid to be tender.

102. I have established a close relationship with a member of the opposite sex.

103. I am familiar with various college majors and their requirements in terms of coursework and academic skills.

104. Before enrolling here, I weighed the advantages and disadvantages of a small and large school.

105. I know of several occupations in which I could be successful.

106. I have asked relatives, faculty, or other persons to explain kinds of positions available in certain work fields.

107. I have formulated my position about the use of alcohol and drugs.

108. I have determined the extent to which material things (e.g., house, cars, money) contribute to my happiness.

GO TO PAGE 5

109. I have felt homesick recently.

110. I feel comfortable disagreeing with my parents on topics like sex.

111. I set up priorities in planning my time so I can get things done.

112. I like to have others plan my activities for me.

113. I voted in the last local/state/national election.

114. When there is a job to be done, people will call upon me for help.

115. I get along quite well with different types of people.

116. It is a waste of money to attempt to rehabilitate criminals and social deviates.

117. Friends know my weaknesses, but still like me.

118. I usually know when someone is lonely.

119. I am able to deal with most conflicts that arise in my dating relationship.

120. I can list at least five important characteristics I think essential in a marriage partner.

121. I really enjoy my academic and other educational experiences.

122. I participate in campus activities, although not required in or related to my academic program.

123. I am satisfied with the career plans I have formulated.

124. I have used my leisure-time activities, and my liking for certain courses to get an indication of my career interests.

125. I plan to restrict the size of my family according to population analysis.

126. I have determined my position about the place of organized religion in daily life.

127. I have an adult type relationship with my parents.

128. I treat my parents as well as I should.

129. I carry most projects through to completion.

130. I am satisfied with my ability to be self-disciplined.

131. I have identified ways in which I can be an asset to the community.

132. I am willing to share responsibility for other people.

133. I am sometimes made uncomfortable by the way others treat people who are different.

134. I usually get along quite well with young and old alike.

135. I don't mind losing a friend if I get what I want.

136. I find that I can trust the people with whom I maintain a continuing relationship.

137. I ask my dating partner how he/she would like to spend an evening.

138. I feel that I could maintain a loving relationship even when my partner is not with me.

139. I have made up my mind about graduate or professional school.

140. I improve continuously my learning and study habits.

141. I feel certain that the career for which I am preparing will allow me to live the way I wish.

142. I can name at least two entry-level work positions which would be open to me in business, industry, government, or education.

143. I feel as if I just drift along with life.

144. I know what I will be doing a year from now.

GO TO PAGE 6

145. I arrive at acceptable compromises in misunderstandings with my parents.

146. It does not embarrass me to become emotional in front of others.

147. I do not allow others to take advantage of me.

148. I have undertaken either an independent study or a service project on my own.

149. I voted in the last student election or referendum.

150. It is helpful to me when people tell me frankly how they see me.

151. I try to understand why people behave as they do.

152. I try to listen to and understand persons who express ideas different from my own.

153. I take into account the feelings of others in my relationships.

154. I do not let small differences of opinion interfere with my friendships.

155. I try to help my dating partner attain his/her goals.

156. I know the advantages and disadvantages of a long term relationship with one member of the opposite sex.

157. How well I do in college reflects how well I will probably do after college.

158. My grades are consistent with my ability.

159. I have formulated a clear plan for getting a job.

160. I know what to expect in a job interviews.

161. I have developed a set of personal values to guide my life.

162. I have established the priorities for my personally important goals.

163. Arguments with my parents often upset me.

164. I behave as an adult.

165. I do not have to be sure of something before attempting it.

166. I am confident in my ability to earn a living.

167. During the past year, I have been involved in at least one civic project or activity — Clean-up Week or Communiversity, for example.

168. I have attended a meeting of a community (city, dorm, etc.) recently.

169. I respect the different beliefs and life styles of others.

170. I have read an article, a book, or watched a T.V. program about people of other races or cultures.

171. I have listened to a friend discuss a personal problem and have offered some advice.

172. I enjoy friendships with both males and females.

173. It is not necessary that my dating partner agree with everything I say or do.

174. When my dating partner feels sad, I try to understand and help him/her express those feelings.

175. I meet with my academic advisor often.

176. I have a mature working relationship with at least one member of the community (faculty, student affairs staff, administrator.)

177. I have prepared my placement credentials.

178. I am a member of at least one club or organization that is specifically related to my occupational field.

179. I have a clear plan of what I will do with my life.

180. I often achieve to the limits of my abilities.

END

APPENDIX G

ANSWER SHEET
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT TASK INVENTORY

STUDENT DEVELOPMENTAL TASK INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

NAME ______________________ INSTITUTION ______________ DATE ____________

SS NUMBER ______________ ACADEMIC MAJOR ______________ BIRTHDATE ____________

Circle Correct Response: CLASS: Fr So Jr Sr; SEX: Male Female; MARITAL STATUS: Married Single

DIRECTIONS: Complete this answer sheet by darkening in the appropriate circle for each of the statements in the *Inventory*. Please use ample pressure when darkening your answer so that your response will carry through the carbon.

T = True or Usually True
F = False or Usually NOT True

PAGE 2		PAGE 3		PAGE 4		PAGE 5		PAGE 6	
1. T F	19. T F	37. T F	55. T F	73. T F	91. T F	109. T F	127. T F	145. T F	163. T F
2. T F	20. T F	38. T F	56. T F	74. T F	92. T F	110. T F	128. T F	146. T F	164. T F
3. T F	21. T F	39. T F	57. T F	75. T F	93. T F	111. T F	129. T F	147. T F	165. T F
4. T F	22. T F	40. T F	58. T F	76. T F	94. T F	112. T F	130. T F	148. T F	166. T F
5. T F	23. T F	41. T F	59. T F	77. T F	95. T F	113. T F	131. T F	149. T F	167. T F
6. T F	24. T F	42. T F	60. T F	78. T F	96. T F	114. T F	132. T F	150. T F	168. T F
7. T F	25. T F	43. T F	61. T F	79. T F	97. T F	115. T F	133. T F	151. T F	169. T F
8. T F	26. T F	44. T F	62. T F	80. T F	98. T F	116. T F	134. T F	152. T F	170. T F
9. T F	27. T F	45. T F	63. T F	81. T F	99. T F	117. T F	135. T F	153. T F	171. T F
10. T F	28. T F	46. T F	64. T F	82. T F	100. T F	118. T F	136. T F	154. T F	172. T F
11. T F	29. T F	47. T F	65. T F	83. T F	101. T F	119. T F	137. T F	155. T F	173. T F
12. T F	30. T F	48. T F	66. T F	84. T F	102. T F	120. T F	138. T F	156. T F	174. T F
13. T F	31. T F	49. T F	67. T F	85. T F	103. T F	121. T F	139. T F	157. T F	175. T F
14. T F	32. T F	50. T F	68. T F	86. T F	104. T F	122. T F	140. T F	158. T F	176. T F
15. T F	33. T F	51. T F	69. T F	87. T F	105. T F	123. T F	141. T F	159. T F	177. T F
16. T F	34. T F	52. T F	70. T F	88. T F	106. T F	124. T F	142. T F	160. T F	178. T F
17. T F	35. T F	53. T F	71. T F	89. T F	107. T F	125. T F	143. T F	161. T F	179. T F
18. T F	36. T F	54. T F	72. T F	90. T F	108. T F	126. T F	144. T F	162. T F	180. T F

Return to: Student Development Associates
110 Crestwood Drive
Athens, Georgia 30601

STUDENT DEVELOPMENTAL TASK INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

NAME ______________________ INSTITUTION ______________ DATE __________

SS NUMBER ______________ ACADEMIC MAJOR ______________ BIRTHDATE __________
Day/Month/Year

Circle Correct Response: CLASS: Fr So Jr Sr; SEX: Male Female; MARITAL STATUS: Married Single

Task	Subtask											
TASK I DEVELOPING AUTONOMY	A	1. T	19. F	37. T	55. T	73. F	91. F	109. F	127. T	145. T	163. F	
		Developing Emotional Autonomy										
		2. T	20. F	38. T	56. T	74. T	92. F	110. T	128. T	146. T	164. T	
	B	3. T	21. T	39. T	57. T	75. T	93. T	111. T	129. T	147. T	165. T	
		Developing Instrumental Autonomy										
		4. T	22. T	40. T	58. T	76. F	94. T	112. F	130. T	148. T	166. T	
	C	5. T	23. T	41. T	59. T	77. T	95. T	113. T	131. T	149. T	167. T	
		Developing Interdependence										
		6. T	24. T	42. T	60. T	78. T	96. T	114. T	132. T	150. T	168. T	
TASK II DEVELOPING MATURE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS	D	7. T	25. T	43. T	61. F	79. T	97. T	115. T	133. T	151. T	169. T	
		Developing Tolerance										
		8. T	26. T	44. F	62. T	80. F	98. T	116. F	134. T	152. T	170. T	
	E	9. T	27. T	45. T	63. T	81. T	99. T	117. T	135. F	153. T	171. T	
		Developing Mature Relationships with Peers										
		10. T	28. T	46. T	64. T	82. T	100. F	118. T	136. T	154. T	172. T	
	F	11. T	29. T	47. F	65. T	83. T	101. T	119. T	137. T	155. T	173. T	
		Developing Intimate Relationships with Opposite Sex										
		12. T	30. F	48. T	66. T	84. T	102. T	120. T	138. T	156. T	174. T	
TASK III DEVELOPING PURPOSE	G	13. T	31. T	49. T	67. T	85. T	103. T	121. T	139. T	157. T	175. T	
		Developing Appropriate Educational Plans										
		14. T	32. T	50. T	68. T	86. T	104. T	122. T	140. T	158. T	176. T	
	H	15. T	33. F	51. T	69. T	87. T	105. T	123. T	141. T	159. T	177. T	
		Developing Mature Career Plans										
		16. T	34. T	52. T	70. T	88. T	106. T	124. T	142. T	160. T	178. T	
	I	17. T	35. T	53. T	71. T	89. T	107. T	125. T	143. F	161. T	179. T	
		Developing Mature Life – Style Plans										
		18. T	36. F	54. T	72. T	90. T	108. T	126. T	144. T	162. T	180. T	

APPENDIX H

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT TASK INVENTORY TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY ESTIMATES

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT TASK INVENTORY

Test-Retest Reliability Estimates

(N=50)

Subtask	r
A. Developing Emotional Autonomy	.91
B. Developing Instrumental Autonomy	.89
C. Developing Interdependence	.92
D. Developing Tolerance	.79
E. Developing Mature Relationships with Peers	.71
F. Developing Intimate Relations with the Opposite Sex	.88
G. Developing Appropriate Educational Plans	.81
H. Developing Mature Career Plans	.84
I. Developing Mature Life-Style Plans	.89

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN CAMPUS GOVERNANCE AS A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

by

Joan W. Lipscomb

(ABSTRACT)

Student involvement in the management and operation of the institution of higher education is perhaps one of the most controversial issues on college and university campuses resulting from the campus unrest in the 1960's. Many university officials, faculty and administrators have ceded long standing and exclusive controls of governance to students.

The purpose of this study was to determine if student participation in campus governance activities was significantly related to student development. The study was important in approaching identification of the characteristics of students who participate in the governance process and to identify specific activities in the campus environment which enable students to master the developmental tasks isolated as factors of student development.

The Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI) is a measure of a student's mastery of nine (9) developmental tasks. The Inventory was completed by sixteen (16) students who participate in campus governance activities

at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) in Washington, D.C. and twenty-one (21) students who do not so participate, before and after one semester at UDC. The students were matched on the bases of sex, age, marital status, classification and major.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compute Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the dependent variable (development as measured by the post-test scores of the SDTI) by each of the independent variables (sex, age, major, classification, previous experience in decision-making, and participation in governance activities at UDC) with each dependent variable pre-test score as a covariable. Since norm data were not provided on the SDTI, a Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) procedure was used to produce a grand mean score for the dependent variable with covariables and the independent variables.

The ANCOVA procedure showed that differences in the two groups existed prior to the analysis. The correlation did account for a significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables in three (3) developmental tasks: Developing Instrumental Autonomy, Developing Intimate Relationships with the Opposite Sex, and Developing Mature Life-Style Plans. The students who participate in governance activities showed more development than their counterparts on only four (4) of the nine (9) tasks: Emotional Autonomy, Appropriate Educational Plans, Instrumental Autonomy, and Mature Career Plans.

The data strongly suggest that the characteristics of the urban, non-traditional student may make the SDTI invalid for use with this population. The Inventory was validated on a traditional student population (campus residents, 18-23 years of age, predominantly suburban or rural, single, dependent upon parents for financial support). The UDC student profile (Spring 1979) indicates its students are distinct from traditional students (they dwell in the city, are 24 and older, predominantly urban, 61 percent are single, 20 percent are married, they are employed full- or part-time and are self-supporting).

The principal finding of the study was that student participation in campus governance activities is significantly related to student development on some developmental tasks, and not significantly related on others.