

THE RELATIONSHIP OF VALUES TO DECISIONS TO  
PERSIST IN OR WITHDRAW FROM TEACHER TRAINING

by

LAWRENCE (LARRY) HENRY STRUTYNSKI  
B.A., SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, 1971

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

ACCEPTED  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

in the Faculty

of

Education

DATE Feb 80 DEAN

We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

(Dr. Roger A. Ruth)

(Dr. Rey A. Carr)

(Dr. Richard L. Williams)

©

LAWRENCE (LARRY) HENRY STRUTYNSKI, 1979

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

JUNE, 1979

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced  
in whole or in part, by mimeograph and other means,  
without the permission of the author.

Supervisor: Dr. Roger A Ruth

ABSTRACT

The relationship of values to decisions to persist in or withdraw from teacher training was examined by comparing the stated value differences between dropouts and persisters. The study was based upon two assumptions: (i) personal values are central to the decision-making process, and therefore, related to decisions to continue in teacher training, or withdraw; and (ii) students with a particular value profile compose the dropout group ( i.e., are covertly screened out, after enrolling, by the selection process inherent in teacher training).

Within the hypothesis that value differences between dropouts and persisters exist, it was predicted that the latter would tend to place more importance on structure-oriented values than on people-oriented values; the structure-oriented values being presumably those rewarded by the institution.

The values of both groups were determined by asking current students (persisters) and recent dropouts to rank two sets of eighteen values in order of importance to them.

In addition, a questionnaire was completed and many students made comments.

Analysis of the data yielded statistically significant differences across all variables between groups, and on certain specific values. However, when interpreted for their educational significance (i.e., practical implications to teacher training), the groups were found to share virtually the same value patterns, thus negating the differences found between them. Dropouts and persisters ranked people-oriented values high, or most important, and structure-oriented values low, or least important. It was concluded that dropouts and persisters were not significantly different on the measured variable (educationally oriented values) as interpreted, thus the hypothesis of the relationship of values to decisions to persist or withdraw was not supported.

Analysis of the questionnaire data and student comments showed similar concerns by both groups, particularly in regard to employment opportunities. However, students' comments strongly indicated a state of disillusionment by dropouts with education in general, and teacher training programs in particular. By implication, it was apparent that the examination of values did not reflect the dissatisfaction, or incongruency, experienced by dropouts.

This observation, coupled with the limitations of this study (difficulty in assessing true values, and bias due to response/nonresponse parameters ), lead to a recommendation for further examination of differences between dropouts and persisters by stressing a comparison between the groups' stated values and the values they ascribe to the institution. An examination of perceptions would delineate the differences in satisfaction/dissatisfaction between dropouts and persisters, which would then reveal the relationship of values to decisions to persist or withdraw from teacher training.

Examiners:



(Dr. Roger A. Ruth)



(Dr. Rey A. Carr)



(Dr. Richard L. Williams)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been undertaken without the cooperation of students currently enrolled in teacher training, and especially those who withdrew, yet were interested in, and genuinely concerned with, the educational process to respond to the survey even though they no longer play an active role. The successful completion of this study rested upon the cooperation of the responding students.

Recognition is also given to the personnel at each participating university for their permission to obtain data and access to student records.

The help and encouragement provided by the members of my Committee - Dr. Roger A Ruth, Dr. Richard L. Williams, and Dr. Rey A. Carr - is gratefully acknowledged. The additional guidance from Dr. Carr, whose interest in understanding human affairs is encouraging in itself, was particularly helpful and greatly appreciated.

Appreciation is also directed to Dr. Norman E. Gleadow for his assistance with the statistical procedures and analysis, and to his assistant, Melvin Ball, for his

patience in instructing me in the technical aspects of the Script program.

In a study such as this, many individuals play a part in the various stages of development, to each and every one I express my sincere thanks.

Finally, without the patience and love of my family - Nicole, Stephen, and Heather - this study would never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	page v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Research on Dropouts from Higher Education.	9
Values and Decision-making . . . . .	25
HYPOTHESIS . . . . .	34
III RESEARCH METHODS	
Design . . . . .	36
Subjects . . . . .	37
Variables. . . . .	38
Data Analysis. . . . .	43
Procedure. . . . .	45
IV RESULTS	
The Scope of Withdrawal from Teacher Training . . . . .	47
Survey Return Rate . . . . .	48
Summary of Demographic Information . . . . .	49
Questionnaire Results. . . . .	50
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	53
Post Hoc Analysis. . . . .	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS(Continued)


	page
CHAPTER	
V DISCUSSION . . . . .	67
LIMITATIONS. . . . .	76
CONCLUSIONS and IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	82
RECOMMENDATIONS for FURTHER RESEARCH . . . . .	89
REFERENCES	93
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX ONE	
Survey Information . . . . .	.98
APPENDIX TWO	
Hypothetical Profiles. . . . .	.105
APPENDIX THREE	
Student Comments . . . . .	.108
APPENDIX FOUR	
Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges . . . . .	.114

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Enrollment and Withdrawal in Teacher Training at the Three Universities in British Columbia: 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 (to Feb. 15). . . . .	47
2. Overall Survey Return Rate. . . . .	49
3. Summary of Group Composition. . . . .	50
4. Reasons Related to Withdrawal, or Contemplating Withdrawal. . . . .	51
5. End-state Value Means, Composite Rank Orders and t Tests for Dropouts and Persisters . . . .	56
6. Mode-of-conduct Value Means, Composite Rank Orders, and t Tests for Dropouts and Persisters.	57
7. Degree of Agreement Among Rankers. . . . .	62
8. Summary of Most Discriminating Values . . . . .	63
9. Reclassification Results. . . . .	64
10. Hypothetical Profile with End-state Values. . .	106
11. Hypothetical Profile with Mode-of-conduct Values. . . . .	107
12. End-state Value Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Dropouts and Persisters. . . .	114
13. Mode-of-conduct Value Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Dropouts and Persisters. . . .	115

CHAPTER ONEIntroduction

Decreasing enrollment in post-secondary institutions has generated widespread concern resulting in a number of studies of college attrition on national and local levels. These studies do not appear to have had a direct effect on teacher training programs, especially when the supply of teachers exceeds the demand. It seems that withdrawal from teacher training is viewed by many as being analogous to the process of natural selection in which those students who are not suited to the teaching profession decide, or are sometimes asked, to withdraw. Subsequently, withdrawal from teacher training is not considered to be a serious problem; on the contrary, this process is perceived as a positive sign of the program's effectiveness in selecting students deemed suitable for the teaching profession. This position has been supported in the "McGregor report" ('The Education and Training of Teachers in British Columbia', 1978) which recommends that high standards for admission and completion in teacher training programs be rigorously applied in light of prospects for employment. It is not likely, therefore, that withdrawal from teacher training programs is, or will be in the next few years, of great concern to the major universities in British Columbia. Consequently,



investigations focusing on withdrawal from teacher training will be minimized because declining enrollment is not a factor. The declining enrollment rationale underlying most studies of college attrition is one valid reason for investigating withdrawal from college in general terms. However, this rationale does not apply to teacher training.

If declining enrollment is not a problem in teacher training programs, what is the rationale for examining withdrawal for this group? Justification for a rationale rests in the realm of educational change. Regardless of the numerous educational innovations and changes to programs at all levels, the genuine success of educational change rests on one factor, people. People educate our youth, not programs. Therefore, the alternate rationale for a study of withdrawal from teacher training emphasizes those individuals who, for some vague reasons (vague to most instructors), withdraw from teacher training. In other words, those students alluded to by the selection process inherent in teacher training. The alternate rationale underlying this examination of withdrawal from teacher training has implications for the selection process.

Because of the dearth of studies that actually examine withdrawal from teacher training, little is known about this phenomenon, except that almost all students leaving teacher

training do so voluntarily (this was the case in university A). In light of this, it is possible that the selection process might be more subtle and complicated than it first appears.

The rationale adopted for this study raises a number of questions: Could it be that students with a definable set of values typically compose the dropout group, and, by implication are students who remain in teacher training representative of another specific set of values? In other words, are there value differences and patterns that distinguish those who withdraw (dropouts) and those who remain (persisters) in teacher training? Are the values of persisters, assuming that they differ from dropouts, a reflection of the institution's values that may be operating in the selection process? Using the value survey designed for this study, is it possible to distinguish potential dropouts from persisters? What is the scope of withdrawal from the major teacher training institutions in this province? Answers to these questions could be instrumental in revealing some aspects of the selection process and the dynamics of the transaction between student and the institution, by examining the relationship of values to decisions to persist in or withdraw from teacher training.

Recognizing that the measurement of values is not an easy task, value was selected as the distinguishing variable because it was assumed to be central to the decision-making process (although we may not be conscious of its effect), and because it has not been included as a variable in studies found on withdrawal from college. While personality differences between dropouts and persisters have been examined (Smith,1976), value differences have not been examined to any degree. Assuming, then, the centrality of values to decision-making, it was through an examination of the relationship of values to decisions to persist or withdraw, that the selection process was viewed.

In view of the fact that no studies were found that specifically investigated withdrawal from teacher training, and that studies on attrition were stimulated largely by declining enrollment, the potentially important contribution of this study was grounded in the emphasis placed on the adoption of an alternate rationale that questioned the selection process inherent in teacher training programs. The rationale was stimulated, not by numbers, but by regarding people qualitatively. The justification for this rationale increases when it is acknowledged that students leaving teacher training do so voluntarily in almost every

instance. To suggest that voluntary dropouts have simply made an inappropriate decision may be true in some instances, but it should be noted that adequate information on this group is seldom available to justify such a statement.

Most studies on college attrition consider voluntary withdrawal as a loss that reflects not only the student's decision, but also the interaction between student and university. Beyond this little is known about the voluntary dropout. To change this situation, dropout characteristics must be viewed in the context of this interaction between student and the program's ability, or inability, to meet the needs of most students. Therefore, the significance of this study was not to discover a single global category that distinguishes the dropout from the persister, but to clarify the selection process by examining the values of dropouts and persisters.

The hypothesis tested in this study was that value differences between dropouts and persisters exist, and more specifically, that significant differences on particular values delineate the value differences. Assuming that the values of the persisters reflect the values of the institution, it was expected that dropouts tended to be more

people-oriented and less structure-oriented than persisters. If persisters held many of the institution's values and dropouts tend not to hold the same values, then the interaction between dropouts and program can be seen. The relationship of values to decisions to persist or withdraw could be described if major differences in values exist between dropouts and persisters.

CHAPTER TWOReview of Related Literature

With the exception of one tangentially related comparison of student teachers who failed to complete their studies with those who completed their studies ( McLeish, 1970), there were no studies found on dropouts from teacher training, nor were there any comparative studies on dropouts and persisters found that used values as a dependent variable. The following review focuses, therefore, on related research. McLeish's study is described before reviewing research on dropouts from higher education; finally theoretical and empirical views of values are reviewed.

In a large scale study examining the measurable effects of differing environments, including a teacher training college, on students' attitudes and values, McLeish found that ten per cent of the college population failed to complete their studies. A detailed analysis was undertaken for the purpose of comparing the group that withdrew with those that persisted, to discover whether the dropout group differed significantly from the total population.

Viewed from the perspective of the whole group, it was found the dropouts differed only in being older and generally 'more radical' than the average. Since the findings did not support the a priori speculations that dropouts would differ from persisters, the dropout group was examined closely.

It was found that attitudes and values did not afford a firm basis for predictive purposes because the differences between dropouts and persisters were not large. However, it was suggested that knowledge of the individual student would provide more useful information to be used for predictive purposes.

A group by group analysis was subsequently conducted in light of the total group results. It appeared that the three-year students who failed to complete their courses tended to be more anxious, more radical, and probably more neurotic than their peer group. In addition, there was a tendency for the dropouts to be less satisfied with teaching as a career, which, as will be reviewed later, reflects upon the students' commitment to their respective goals and institution.

In short, McLeish's complex study did not support the hypothesis that dropouts differed significantly from

persisters on the measurable variables employed in his study.

### Research on Dropouts from Higher Education

There have been numerous large scale studies on dropouts in the last twenty-five years that have attempted to answer the following questions: What is the present dropout rate? What effect does the institution's environment have on students' decisions to persist or withdraw? How much difference does a student's ability make? How important are demographic factors such as race, sex, and parental background?

Two national studies that attempted to answer these questions were undertaken in recent years in the United States (Astin, 1972; Fetters, 1977). They found that there were general variables that characterize dropouts that can also be used as predictors. These variables were: <sup>①</sup> high school grades and <sup>②</sup> aptitude test results; <sup>③</sup> finances - scholarships, financial assistance, <sup>④</sup> employment while in college; <sup>⑤</sup> student's plans and aspirations; demographic attributes - sex, race, socio-economic status, and family background; behavior while in college, including academic performance at college; institutional environment and selection process.

Relatively large scale studies in Canada (Vander Wells, Sartois, 1973; Farine, 1973; McIntosh, Wilson, Lipinski, 1974) and the U.S.A. (Womsack, McClusky, 1973; Shaumburg, 1973; Maudal, Butcher, Manger, 1974; Brooks, Emery, 1974; Chase et al, 1976; Kohen, 1976) attempted to relate those questions posed in national studies to one or more institutions. Their results basically support the general variables found in the national studies. The one variable typically cited as the leading single cause of withdrawal, or as one of two or three main causes, was academic failure.

Despite the academic factor, however, a large proportion of students left college for nonacademic reasons. In addition, even those students whose college records indicated that they withdrew due to 'academic failure' probably included many in which underlying problems (e.g., anxiety) were highly correlated with academic failure. Academic failure, therefore, may be viewed as a symptom, and possibly a coping strategy, when the underlying problems appear to be insurmountable (Summerskill, 1962). As a result, many questioned the predictive validity of the general variables due to the wide variance of institutional characteristics and individual student characteristics (Peng, Fetters, 1977). The concept of drawing up a dropout profile has received a cool reception by many researchers (Kohen, 1976).

As an outcome of this skepticism, many studies incorporated questionnaires seeking dropouts' reactions to their decision, and their perceptions of the institution. Others used objective personality tests to determine to what degree personal characteristics either, singly or in combination with other variables, contributed to the decision to withdraw (Womsack, McClusky, 1973; Maudal, Butcher, Manger, 1974; et al.). These studies emphasized the perceptions of students as major variables.

Before examining studies that incorporated personal characteristics in their research on dropouts, let us review two developments; one that clarified the dropout problem, and one that attempted to conceptualize the dropout process.

In his synthesis of research on dropouts, Tinto (1975) argued that a major problem encountered in the interpretation and applicability of research focuses upon the definition of the term 'dropout'. Some researchers have included all those students who have not completed their requirements for graduation within four years upon entering an institution (Astin, 1972), while others differentiate the dropouts population into 'academic dropouts', 'non-academic dropouts' or 'voluntary dropouts', 'stopouts', and 'transfers' (Tinto, 1975; Rootman, 1972; Bean, Covert, 1973). Nickens (1976) defined the term 'dropout' as being

those students who have not attained their personal educational goals and have no plans to attain their goals in the same institution from which they withdrew, or any other institution. One possible explanation for the differences of definition was a result of the studies' objectives. The objectives of national studies seemed to differ considerably from those of local studies. The former tended to be objectively oriented as compared to the latter, which often included personality variables. It became clear, nonetheless, that all research on dropouts should be interpreted cautiously due to the variance in definitions.

A second development in research on dropouts has been an attempt to 'conceptualize' the dropout process. Spady's 'model' approach (1971) to understanding the dropout phenomenon implied a need for multi-variate, longitudinal studies; a definite need, since most studies were based upon entering college populations. This approach incorporated the national variables, individual attributes, and pre-college schooling to determine the extent of an individual's commitment to a personal goal, and to the institution as a means to reach his/her goal. The student's commitment was subsequently related to the degree of integration into the academic and social systems at the institution, which in turn reinforced the individual's commitment to his goals and the institution. Based on this conceptualization, Spady

contended that the factors contributing to the decision to persist or withdraw can be better understood. Spady's emphasis on commitment was a significant development and will be reintroduced later in this review.

Related to the second development was another conceptualization: 'Cost-Benefit Analysis' (Tinto, 1975). This perspective suggested that a person's decision with regard to any form of activity can be analyzed in terms of perceived costs and benefits of that activity relative to those perceived in other activities..."(In other words, when a student) perceives that an alternate form of investment of time, energies, and resources will yield greater benefits, relative to costs, over time than will staying in college...(that student may consider withdrawing)." (47, 98-7) Viewed from an economic position, this conceptualization placed more emphasis on external factors that contributed to a student's decision to persist or withdraw.

Even though some researchers contend they know the major variables that relate to college attrition, others were not satisfied and continued to ask: "Why do students whose work is academically acceptable leave the university?" In addition, others simply stated that any single set of variables, or a single formula to predict dropouts is a myth

(Kohen, 1976), while other researchers have conducted studies that challenge the validity of certain variables commonly used. For example, several studies indicated that there were no significant difference regarding academic achievement between persisters and dropouts (Wright, 1976; Lueptow, 1973; Chase, et al., 1976). However, in all fairness to studies that found differences, the studies where no significant differences were found differentiated between 'academic' and 'non-academic' dropouts. When academic and voluntary dropouts were combined, grade point average appeared to be the most significant distinguishing variable (Astin, 1972). However, most researchers concur that 'voluntary dropouts' do not withdraw for primarily academic reasons.

With increasing interest in voluntary dropouts and the factors related to their withdrawal, researchers have incorporated personal factors, motivation, and students' perceptions of the faculty and the institution in their studies (Vander Wells, Sartois, 1973; Maudal, Butcher, Manger, 1974; Farine, 1973; Brooks, Emery, 1974). With the exception of academic dropouts who are forced out due to low achievement, the inclusion of personal factors has provided researchers with a more complete picture of dropouts.

The results of the expanded variable studies have introduced two additional explanations to account for the withdrawal of voluntary dropouts. Spady's model and Tinto's Cost-Benefit Analysis incorporated students' perceptions (i.e., general dissatisfaction with the faculty and/or institution) and, concomitantly, incongruency between a student's perception of self, and his perception of the institution.

Regarding student dissatisfaction, it is quite obvious that most dropouts, including academic dropouts, experience a certain degree of dissatisfaction. In the case of academic dropouts it was difficult to ascertain whether low achievement was related to a below-average grade point average upon entering, academic performance in college, personal factors such as lack of personal goals, or simply dissatisfaction with the institution. Due to this ambiguity, studies that included student dissatisfaction as a variable have focused primarily on voluntary dropouts' stated reasons for leaving (Starr, Betz, Menne, 1972; Womsack, McClusky, 1973; Shaumburg, 1973; Hayes, 1977). Recognizing that dissatisfaction among voluntary dropouts was related to a wide variety of personal factors, research in this area has revealed findings that do not parallel the characteristics of the national profile. Many studies have indicated that the average academic standing of voluntary

dropouts was equal to, and often higher than, the persisters' (Womsack, McClusky, 1973; Kohen, 1976; Wright, 1976), and others have found that voluntary dropouts were "intellectually more aware" (Womsack, McClusky, 1973). It was abundantly clear that voluntary dropouts were capable students. What were the reasons that relate to their dissatisfaction and subsequent withdrawal?

Incongruency, the concomitant of dissatisfaction, between a student's perception of self and the institution may contribute most to explaining the withdrawal of eligible students. Many studies have concluded that one or more variables do not explain the voluntary withdrawal phenomenon, however there was concurrence when 'lack of fit' between the individual and the institution was discussed (Summerskill, 1962; Rootman, 1972). It appeared that the larger the discrepancy between a student's self-image and his/her perception of the college, the more dissatisfied he/she would be, and the more likely to withdraw. Rootman (1972) examined this premise by investigating the characteristics and reasons for withdrawal of eligible students. He found that voluntary dropouts had higher academic interests and higher aptitudes than persisters, and the main reason for withdrawing was a lack of 'person-role' fit between student and the university. Rootman supported the concept of incongruency as a major factor contributing to dropping out.

In a study that paralleled Rootman's, Hackman and Dysinger (1970) found that, although most students experienced common difficulties that may cause some to withdraw ( e.g., financial problems, academic problems, family problems, lack of interest, etc.), it was the student's commitment to his/her personal goal and to the institution which was the major variable related to withdrawing. They summarized their findings: high academic competence & low commitment to the institution = voluntary dropouts/transfers/stopouts; poor academic competence & low commitment to the institution = academic dropout; poor academic competence & high commitment to the institution = academic dropouts/persist and succeed; high academic competence & high commitment to the institution = persisters.

Tinto (1975) also summarized his explanation for dropouts in a simple manner:

Individual's commitment to goal & Individual's  
commitment to the institution = the decision to  
persist or withdraw

In summary, the studies cited support the position that a student with a low commitment to a personal goal was likely to become a stopout (i.e., dropout temporarily), or drop out completely until personal future plans were clarified.

Often students who were pressured by parents to attend college were in this situation. On the other hand, a student with a high commitment to a goal and a lower commitment to the institution was likely to become a voluntary dropout or transfer student. Ultimately, it may be the student's perception of congruency/incongruency between self and the institution that relates to the decision to withdraw.

In retrospect, the major variables, such as those listed by Astin (1972) in his national study, seemed to be most applicable to the study of attrition with freshmen and sophomores. The major variable which appeared to be applicable beyond the first and second years was the 'goal and aspiration' of the individual student. This variable was similar to the satisfaction/dissatisfaction concept, and it related to the individual's commitment to a personal goal and institution. The concept of congruency/incongruency between the student and the institution was central to understanding withdrawal. The complexities of investigating the dropout phenomenon in light of this concept may account for the paucity of research on withdrawal from the latter stages of higher education.

Prior to the conclusion of this review, it may be helpful to consider a relatively recent study of dropouts by Smith

(1976), who employed a multivariate approach, clearly defined dropout, and examined withdrawal at one college: Personality Differences Between Persisters and Withdrawers - in a Small Women's College. It was decided to review this study in detail because it most closely resembled the study undertaken in this thesis.

The purpose of Smith's study was to investigate student withdrawal from one a humanities oriented college. Based on two entering freshmen populations (1967, N=171; 1968, N=159), the subjects were classified as persisters (graduated four years after entry), Voluntary Withdrawals (no intention of returning even though eligible), Academic Withdrawals (forced out), and Returners (temporary stopouts). The need to differentiate between types of dropouts was exemplified in Smith's study.

The study incorporated measurements aimed at viewing each student's personal characteristics, academic scores, academic interests, and stated reasons for attending this particular college. Demographic measures were also obtained which included the applicant's age, hometown, high school rank, marital status of parents, birth order in the family, mother and father's educational background and their occupational status, whether financial aid was received after admission, whether a student was given honours due to

outstanding high school performance, and whether the student was on academic probation while at college. The measurement methods used in this study reflected a multivariate approach, believed by many researchers to be essential in understanding the factors that contribute to student dissatisfaction and ultimately to the decision to withdraw.

Results indicated that over a two year period 45.7% of the freshmen population withdrew. Out of the total dropout population, 84% withdrew within the first two years and 15% dropped out in the third year. The significant statistic, however, was that 38% of the total entry population dropped out voluntarily, though they were academically eligible to continue. Why? Smith summarized the voluntary dropouts' stated reasons for leaving: personal reasons 52%, health 21%, financial difficulties 5%, academic difficulty 4%, family problems 2%, and no stated reason 14%. Based on stated reasons it was evident in this study that those variables that contributed to personal factors were the significant ones.

A closer examination of the results supported studies previously mentioned indicating that dropouts equalled or surpassed persisters on certain variables. In general, Smith found the following: dropouts were more complex (i.e., dealt with uncertainty more effectively); were more

autonomous; had a higher intellectual disposition; had higher interest in humanities; were higher in the birth order; academic scores were higher; were less socially extroverted; marital status was more insecure in their families; and they were less practical.

These findings only applied to the 1967 class of freshmen. The only difference found in the 1968 group was that the average high school rank of the dropouts was higher than the persisters. In regard to the dropouts from both years, Smith found that they were less impulsive, less content to play it safe if dissatisfied, and had higher expectations than persisters.

Why the discrepancy between the two groups? Smith's study effectively demonstrated the need to interpret and apply any research on dropouts cautiously. At best, it appears that the utility of this type of research should not be considered representative of the whole dropout population. In other words, factors related to withdrawal are not globally applicable to all studies of withdrawal.

While not ignoring the discrepancy just mentioned, a closer examination of the results lended support to the assumption that personal characteristics shed more light on the problem of dropping out than some of the general

variables, such as achievement. The results of Smith's study emphasized student dissatisfaction and a student's perceived incongruency between 'self' and the institution. To illustrate, students with a high interest in the humanities coupled with high intellectual disposition probably had expectations that were not being met. As a result, some withdrew voluntarily. Viewed through Spady's model (1970) of the dropout process, it appeared that the voluntary dropouts were committed to a personal goal, but they did not become committed to the institution as a means to attain that goal. Tinto, using the Cost-Benefit-Analysis model (1975), argued that the return to the student was not equal to, or greater, than the personal costs of time, energy, and resources. Regardless of the model utilized, it was quite apparent that dissatisfaction and incongruency can best be understood by learning more about the personal factors, and how they interact with the institution's environment. This appeared to be the most enlightening path to follow even though there were limitations to obtaining an accurate picture of the personal factors.

In conclusion, Smith's study illustrated the strengths and the weaknesses of research on dropouts. His study emphasized the importance of (i) employing a multivariate approach, and (ii) defining the term 'dropout'. In addition, if one could determine how, and to what degree, an

individual's personal characteristics interact with the institution's environment, educators would be closer to an understanding of the complex process of withdrawal.

In concluding this portion of the literature review on dropouts, the development of research included large scale, descriptive studies, and studies that focus upon single institutions. The latter incorporated a variety of measurements designed not only to understand the reasons for dropping out, but which can be employed in an attempt to learn more about the process of dropping out. Regardless of the nature of the study, most researchers concurred that defining the term dropout was necessary before undertaking a study. The variables that seemed to be the most useful when focusing on voluntary withdrawers were personal characteristics and demographic information. Following the isolation of these variables, the most difficult task was to understand the interaction of the student and the institution which could lead, subsequently, to an understanding of congruency/incongruency between the student and the institution.

At this point there are some general remarks regarding the studies cited in this review that should be made. First, there seemed to be a paucity of research on dropouts from the later stages of higher education. The fact that

there are fewer dropouts at this stage, and the complexity of investigating personal variables probably accounted for this vacuum. This was no surprise since we can safely assume that many students who are approaching graduation, even if they do experience dissatisfaction, are motivated by the thought that the end is in sight. In addition, relative academic progress insures graduation.

Second, the research studies found related to the whole student population, almost all of which focused on the first two years when the greatest number of students withdraw. There were no studies found of students who withdrew from a specific faculty, nor studies on students who withdrew from their professional year studies. However, McLeish (1970) identified and recognized the need to investigate this population in his investigation of changes in college students' attitudes (1970).

Third, although the results of studies referred to in this review were of interest, the results could only serve as guides to this study. As in other large studies, particularly in the field of education, significant differences were partially a reflection of the large number of participants. When the same questions were asked in small scale studies, the differences were less clear, if they were found at all. Consequently, the smaller and more

esoteric the population, the more difficult it was to employ measurement methods used in larger studies.

### Values and Decision-making

The purpose of this part of the review is to consider literature relating to the assumption that values are major factors that contribute to one's decision to persist in or withdraw from his/her studies; and, when possible, to relate values to teaching.

The importance of the role of personal values is not a new concept. As early as the first century A.D., Epictetus said that men are disturbed not by things, but by the views which we take of them. Modern-day theorists contend that the values held are central to thoughts, opinions, decisions, and actions (Dewey, 1939; Rokeach, 1973; Hodgkinson, 1978). Therefore, every decision made and every course of action taken is strongly influenced, either consciously or unconsciously, by values (Simon, Howe, Kirschenbaum, 1972). Rokeach supported this view by stating that values are determinants of virtually all kinds of behavior that could be considered social behavior (36,24).

It should be noted, however, that there were some writers who entirely disagreed with this view (e.g., McLeish). It is apparent, therefore, that proponents of values (Dewey, 1939; Rokeach, 1968; et al.) and 'Values Clarification' (Simon, Howe, Kirschenbaum, 1972; Raths, Harmin, Simon, 1966) supported the concept that values are central to the rational decision-making process.

What are values? How do they affect the decision-making process? These questions can be examined by referring to the writings of Dewey and Rokeach. Their ideas parallel the popular views of most values-oriented theorists and researchers. Dewey defined values as being the "...rules of methodic procedure in the conduct of investigations that determine the respective conditions and consequences of various modes of behavior." (6, 58) Values were viewed as being 'ends' and 'means' simultaneously. Dewey referred to the 'means' as a valuation process that appraises, or evaluates, to determine what are the most suitable means of attaining a particular goal. The 'ends' serve as a 'guide' to the valuation process. The influence of values renders this process a rational decision in which the end-in-view is formed, and, if acted upon, valuation occurs (i.e., the selection of means most appropriate to the ends). It is by no means an impulsive decision.

Similarly, Rokeach defines values as...

...an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or an end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. (36, 5)

Unlike Dewey, Rokeach does not use the terms 'ends - means', but shared the view that values are ends that influence the means, so that a particular goal can be met. Personal values were perceived as a set of criteria, or standards, in terms of which evaluations are made. Viewed in this light, the criteria Rokeach referred to could be interpreted as ends that determine which means (i.e., evaluations) are appropriate.

The definitions of values and the emphasis on 'ends-means', or decision-making, supported the premise that values are a major factor in all forms of rational decision-making. Values are, in other words, 'preferred ends' and rationally conceived, expedient 'means' that are central to the determination of one's mode of conduct.

We can assume that an individual is a selective perceiver, a decoder of information, or a stubborn interpreter of inter-personal activities in his environment. The main instrument with which each individual interprets information and then selects behaviors appropriate to his

needs is the individual's value system. Values become central, therefore, to his decision-making process. Hodgkinson supports this position by stating that (1978) the value component in decision-making is a significant factor in the practices of administration. He referred to the basic dualism (20, 103) inherent in all decisions: fact plus value. The factual component is 'given' (i.e., objective), while the value component stresses what is 'made' (i.e., subjective). The former represents that part which is true and objectively verifiable; and the latter represents the 'value attributed'. By identifying the fact and value components, the basic dualism stresses the interdependence of the two components in decision-making?

Assuming the 'centrality' of values, should educators consider values in the educational (i.e., growth) process? It was suggested by Givens (1974) that values education should be included in the primary grades through to higher education. This was also supported by other researchers (Thistlethwaite, 1973; Privett, 1974; Eddy, 1977), not to mention the Value Clarification proponents such as Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (1972). Their suggestions do not merely refer to the study of values as a subject area, rather they suggest an on-going exploration of personal values, how values are derived, and the way in which values affect the way we think, feel, and behave. The need for

student teachers and practicing teachers to become aware of their personal values was illustrated in a study by Butzow and Ryan (1975). They reported that teachers found it difficult to relate learning theory to practice. As a result, the choice of a particular learning theory was not found to be related to psychological evidence, but to each teacher's values.

Apropos of Butzow and Ryan's findings, Zahorik (1977) contended that empirical research has not, and cannot prove which method is best; only one's personal values (i.e., 'teaching values') determine which methods to implement. In the same study, Zahorik stated that values are the major factor in one's career choice as well. Based upon Zahorik's position, the need to understand one's values increases in importance.

A study (Miller, 1974) examining the relationship between teachers' personal values and the priorities they held in terms of the primary tasks of secondary school yielded findings that tangentially support Zahorik's view. It was found that a general lack of agreement existed among teachers regarding educational task priorities. The values part of the study indicated that values could be considered in explaining the congruence or dissonance in teachers' perceptions of educational priorities. Values appeared to

account for more of the ranking variance among teachers than more obvious situational variables such as teacher training or training assignment.

These references illustrated the relationship between 'teaching', decision-making, and values in the educational process. One can also infer that the consideration of values was a significant factor when attempting to understand a particular individual's decisions. The inference was supported by Carlson and Koval (1973), who purported that values should be the first priority in the 'helping profession' (which includes 'teachers to be').

Specifically, there were no studies found that used values as a variable when studying dropouts; therefore a synthesis of values theory and research on dropouts should be helpful at this point.

An important factor in the decision to withdraw found in research on dropouts was the concept of a student's perceived incongruency between his intellectual development and the demands, practices, and structure of the institution (Smith, 1976; Tinto, 1975; et al.). This incongruency can be related to an individual's commitment to a personal goal and/or the institution (Spady, 1970), which subsequently might be related to the individual's values. McSweeny

(1973) found that students' involvement in the school was dependent upon their perception of the extent to which that institution contributed toward their desired occupational and personal goals. If students perceived the institution as being supportive of their values, they were more likely to perform well academically, to be more cooperative, and become satisfied with their school experience. Personal factors, including values, were instrumental to one's perception of the school program.

An interesting relationship can be made between Smith's study (1976) which found that dropouts were not an impulsive group, and the cognitive component of valuation as described by Dewey. Accepting the premise that withdrawing is a result of a calculated decision, values are probably central to that decision-making process. The student must determine whether or not the institution (i.e., the means) is suited to his personal goals (preferred ends). In other words, the net outcome, as Dewey might have explained, took into consideration 'means-ends' in which the ends are attainable only on the grounds that the means are appropriate to bring them about. Subsequently, the decision to persist or withdraw appears to be a rational decision involving values.

The dynamics of the decision to withdraw forces the individual to order his/her personal values. Using Rokeach's

theory to explain this process, there are interpersonal situations in which several values, rather than one value, may be in competition with one another. A decision as to which value is more important must be made. Based upon that choice, one's concomitant behavior conforms to that decision - withdraw or persist. This explanation also sheds some light on the central question in a study by Dysinger and Hackman (1970), regarding why one individual chooses to withdraw and another chooses to persist even though they share many similar experiences. The difference may be found in the order of each student's values.

In conclusion, there were few studies that examine the role of values in the decision-making process. However, it should be noted that this may be related to the difficulty in subjecting values to empirical investigation. Although it was necessary to separate factual elements from value elements, there is no known scientific way to determine which values one should hold and which values are True or False.

When focusing our attention on dropouts, particularly voluntary dropouts from the latter stages of higher education, it was found that personal factors provided the most meaningful information. One personal factor not emphasized was values. In the latter stages of higher

education, this factor becomes increasingly important because we can assume that students at this stage are more goal oriented, and less affected by the factors listed in dropout profiles that relate to dropouts from the first and second years of higher education. A study of values at this stage could yield interesting information in our attempts to understand the dropout process. Assuming, then, that values affect decision-making, and recognizing that withdrawing is a result of a decision-making process, a comparison of dropouts' and persisters' values may contribute new information to the understanding of why some students persist and others withdraw.

Hypothesis

This study examined the hypothesis that value differences exist between dropouts and persisters, and more specifically that significant differences on particular values would delineate the value differences. Within this hypothesis, it was assumed that the values of persisters tend to reflect the values of the institution, unlike the dropouts whose values would differ. This assumption supported Rokeach's theoretical view (1973) that social institutions can be conceptualized as specializing in the enhancement of different sets of values. Regarding the stated assumption, it was assumed that the persisters' value system is shaped, at least in part, by the institutional forces and influences that act upon them.

It was expected that value patterns for each group would differ. Based on the writer's past experience and observations of student teachers, it was expected that persisters would prefer values which the writer classes as structure-oriented values, compared to dropouts, who would prefer people-oriented values. Values classified as structure-oriented were 'achievement', 'attention', 'being correct', 'cleanliness', 'obedience', 'being organized',

'competition', 'control', 'evaluation', 'order', 'quiet', 'structure', and 'teacher centered'. People-oriented values were 'acceptance', 'empathy', 'happiness', 'independence', 'open-minded', 'self-determination', 'self-respect', 'cooperation', 'discussion', 'encouragement', 'equal opportunity', 'freedom', 'humour', and 'student centered'. Those values in the survey not included in the above could be viewed as either people or structure-oriented values, depending upon the individual value patterns.

In short, this study examined the value differences between dropouts and persisters. Assuming that persisters' values reflected the institution's values, it was expected that persisters' value patterns would indicate that they place more importance on structure-oriented values, whereas dropouts stress people-oriented values.

CHAPTER THREEResearch MethodsDesign

This ex post facto comparison survey examined the differences in stated values, measured by a value survey specially designed for this study, between students who withdrew from their teacher training (dropouts) within the last two years at two of the three major universities in British Columbia, and a randomly selected group of students in teacher training at one of these (university A) who were continuing their studies while this study was undertaken (persisters).

Data on the dropouts were collected using a mail survey, and the persisters completed the survey on campus. Each student was asked to complete the questionnaire, make comments, and rank, in order of importance to him/her, eighteen educationally oriented values. This procedure was followed with two independent sets of values. Participation was voluntary.

The information from the questionnaires was summarized and the data from the surveys were coded in preparation for statistical analysis. After compiling the mean rank on each value for each group, the data were subjected to statistical analysis to determine significant differences between groups and on specific value variables. The results were then interpreted in light of the hypothesis.

### Subjects

#### Persisters

The comparison group was comprised of students enrolled in the teacher training program at University A in the 1978-1979 term. Since students were randomly assigned to seminar groups according to their classification (Regular, Diploma, or Transitional) and program (Primary, Intermediate, or Secondary), one group was randomly selected from each classification for the comparison group. The group totalled seventy students in all.

#### Dropouts

A list of dropouts within the last two university winter terms (up to Feb.15,1979) was compiled from the student

records at the participating universities. Only two of the three major universities in the province participated: university C's administrative policy prohibited access to their student files. The dropouts numbered 150 in all.

### Variables

#### Independent Variable

Students currently, or previously (1977-1978 and 1978-1979 terms), enrolled in a teacher training program in either of the universities participating in this study were classified as dropouts or persisters. Information required for classification was obtained from each university's student files upon the receipt of official approval from the respective authorities.

Students who withdrew from their respective teacher training program within the above-stated time period were classified as dropouts, regardless of whether they withdrew voluntarily or involuntarily. Those students who were continuing in their teacher training were classified as persisters.

### Dropouts

A dropout was defined as any student enrolled in either the 1977-78 or 1978-79 terms in a teacher training program at one of the universities participating in this study who subsequently withdrew from the program, voluntarily or involuntarily. Those who withdrew from teacher training and entered another program, such as one in Arts and Sciences, were included as dropouts from teacher training.

### Persisters

A persister was defined as any student enrolled in the 1978-79 term at University A who fully intended to complete the program in the present school term.

### Dependent Variable

#### Values

For the purposes of this study, the values under consideration were 'Educationally Oriented Values' that were presented to each subject, who was asked to rank them in order of importance to him/her. Educationally oriented values were stressed because the subjects in this study have

had, or were having during the study, direct experience with a teacher training program. As a result, the values measured related succinctly to educational goals and practices. Unlike Rokeach's value survey, they do not have global application; the survey devised for this study cannot be used to examine value differences between groups that are unrelated to education directly.

The values were divided into two sets: end-state values and mode-of-conduct values. The two sets were based on an ends-means concept to examine the relationship between the value patterns of end-state and mode-of-conduct values. The former depict values that are desirable ends, and the latter represent preferred means. Both sets were considered to be separate yet functionally interconnected systems because mode-of-conduct values are instrumental to the attainment of end-state values.

#### The Instrument

The value survey for this study was devised after a thorough review of existing instruments for studying values. The Rokeach Value Survey was the most nearly suited commercial instrument, but it was decided to construct a specifically education oriented survey for a study of this nature. In the planning stages of this study, the Rokeach Value Survey also was prohibitively expensive.

The 'Educationally Oriented Value Survey' was developed through consultation with fellow educators and ideas included in other value instruments. A ranking system was selected over scaled or checklist responses because it is less prone to bias due to social desirability, overuse of the 'true' or 'yes' response, and the selection of the same point in a scale or avoiding extreme answers. All these factors tend to affect the results. Ranking, on the other hand, forces the respondent to discriminate between responses. The major drawback of ranking is that it is difficult to complete, and it is liable to be a frustrating experience for some respondents.

This ordinal ranking survey was comprised of two independent lists with eighteen values in each, presented in alphabetical order. The values were directly related to educational goals and practices. The first list was end-state values such as 'achievement' and 'honesty', and the second list was mode-of-conduct values such as 'cooperation' and 'discussion'. The participant's task was to rank each value from one (the most important value to the ranker) to eighteen (the least important value to the ranker). This procedure was followed in both sets of values.

In addition to the values instrument itself, a brief questionnaire was completed by the participant, to determine

what other factors contribute to the students' decision to withdraw: for example, financial concerns could be related to withdrawal instead of values.

The instrument was pilot tested with a group of twenty-five undergraduate students enrolled in education courses at university A to obtain a test-retest reliability measure, and to make refinements. Test-retest reliability was calculated using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient which resulted in correlations of .94 and .93, respectively, for the two sets of values.

The Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was also calculated using the same data to determine the degree of agreement among rankers. The resulting coefficient was:  $W = .41$  ( $df. = 25$ )  $p < .001$  (averaged over both sets of values for the test and re-test). This result indicated that the group tested was relatively homogeneous in their interpretations of each value.

A sample of the 'Educationally Oriented Value Survey', the questionnaires, and the original letter sent to the dropouts is in Appendix One.

Data Analysis

The rank-order procedure used in this study was an ipsative procedure that actually generated nonindependent data, hence it failed to satisfy the assumption of complete independence when statistical comparisons were made. To illustrate, the independence assumption was not met due to the decreasing number of degrees of freedom relative to each rank being made: after rank number seventeen, the eighteenth rank had no degrees of freedom. However, since there were eighteen variables in question, the violation of the independence assumption was considered to be relatively small. Similarly, in discussing the statistical interpretation of his value survey, Rokeach (36, 42-44) contended that the small amount of ipsativity can be tolerated. Nevertheless, the interpretation of statistical findings should be viewed in light of the ipsativity limitation.

Initially, a correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the dropouts' and persisters' composite rank-order using the Spearman Rank Correlation Method.

To determine whether or not the two groups overall differed statistically, the Hotelling T Square Test (a

multivariate t test) was used. This was followed with a series of univariate t tests to isolate statistically significant differences on each variable between the two groups. This combination approach of utilizing a multivariate analysis of variance followed by univariate analysis of variance tests was recommended for a study using many variables (Hummel, T. and Sligo, J.; 1971)

In addition, the Kendall coefficient of concordance (W) was applied to determine the degree of agreement between participants in each group. The test was repeated treating the dropouts and persisters as if they were a single group.

A post hoc analysis of the data was conducted to examine further the significant difference found between groups. A Stepwise Discriminant Analysis procedure was selected to identify the most discriminating variables, and to reclassify each participant according to his/her responses on the survey. The purpose of applying this test was to determine the number of actual dropouts whose responses of the survey typified persisters, and the number of persisters whose responses typified dropouts.

Procedure

To determine the number of withdrawals from teacher training programs, and to ascertain the feasibility of obtaining access to student files in the three major universities in British Columbia, the appropriate authorities in each education faculty were contacted. With the exception of university C, whose policy regarding confidentiality of student records prohibited access to student files, the authorities at universities A and B permitted access to student files. The dropout group was compiled, therefore, from the students who withdrew from university A and university B in the 1977-1978 term and (up to February 15) the 1978-1979 term.

The survey was conducted in three waves (initial survey information, a follow-up letter, and a telephone call) with students from university A. A single wave (initial survey information) was sent to students from university B. All students were not subjected to the three waves due to the researcher's financial limitations.

The first wave, sent to each member of the dropout group, was conducted between March 15 and April 15. It included a cover letter from the researcher requesting his/her participation, an official acknowledgement from the

university certifying the research, a brief questionnaire, the 'Educationally Oriented Value Survey' constructed for this study, and a machine stamped return-addressed envelope.

University A nonrespondents to the first wave were sent a follow-up letter ten days after the initial wave. Two weeks later, a third wave telephone survey was conducted with the university A dropouts who did not respond to either the first or second wave.

During the third and fourth weeks in March, the randomly selected seminar group members (the persisters sample) completed the value survey and the questionnaire. Participation was voluntary.

When all data had been collected (April 28), the returns were tabulated in preparation for statistical analysis and interpretation.

CHAPTER FOURResultsThe Scope of Withdrawal From Teacher Training

The scope of withdrawal from teacher training institutions in British Columbia supported the writer's rationale for not choosing to examine withdrawal from an enrollment point of view. The average rate of withdrawal for the three universities examined was 4.6%. Table 1 summarizes the scope of withdrawal from the three major universities teacher training programs in British Columbia.

TABLE 1

Enrollment and Withdrawal  
in Teacher Training at the Three Universities in  
British Columbia: 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 (to Feb. 15)

<u>University</u>	<u>Elementary</u>		<u>Secondary</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>W/D</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>W/D</u>	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>W/D</u>	<u>W/D</u>
A	540	32	262	12	802	44	5.5
B	860	46	871	42	1731	88	5.1
C	995	*	308	*	1303	46	3.5

\* It was not possible to differentiate between elementary and secondary dropouts from the figures provided by university C because only the total number was reported.

Survey Return Rate

The survey return rate was below the expected, and desired, rate of return for a study of this nature. The relatively high rate of return from university A dropouts was a reflection of the three waves (two letters and a telephone call) to which the students were subjected in the area surrounding the campus. Dropouts from university B, on the other hand, were subjected to only a single wave in the form of the initial letter and the survey material. In all likelihood, this accounted for the large rate of return difference between the two universities.

As stated previously, university C's administrative policy blocked access to student files, consequently it was not possible to include the dropout population from that university. Following is a summary of the return rate for universities A and B (see Table 2 on next page).

Further analysis of the nonrespondents was conducted to determine the percentage of those who did not receive the survey during the first wave, and the dropouts from university A who were not reached in the second and third waves. This analysis was based upon the number of surveys returned unopened after the first and second waves, and the

TABLE 2

## Overall Survey Return Rate

University	Total Mailed	Total Returned	% Returned
A	38	20	52.6
B	112	25	22.3
Total	150	45	30.0

number of dropouts who were not contacted by telephone. Based on the number of respondents and those not contacted, 14% of the dropouts from university A and 65% from university B failed to respond.

Summary of Demographic Information

The composition of both groups showed a relatively balanced distribution between sexes, and between elementary and secondary program students. Table 3 (on next page) summarizes the composition:

Comparing the average ages, it was found that the dropouts and persisters examined were sampled from a relatively homogeneous age group. Male persisters appear to be an exception, but the age difference was not statistically significant:  $X^2 (1) = 2.55, p < .20$ .

TABLE 3

## Summary of Group Composition

---

	Persisters	Dropouts
Male	21	14
(Elementary)	8	4
(Secondary)	13	10
(Average Age)	34.8	24.5
Female	49	31
(Elementary)	45	27
(Secondary)	4	4
(Average Age)	22.7	25.3
Total	70	45
(Elementary)	53	31
(Secondary)	17	14
(Average Age)	28.7	24.9

---

Questionnaire Results

The questionnaire completed by the dropouts was slightly different from the one completed by the persisters. However, a comparison of the respondents' replies on the list of reasons for either withdrawing (in the case of a dropout), or contemplating withdrawal (in the case of a persister), was conducted. Thirty-three out of the seventy persisters indicated that they had considered withdrawing, but decided to continue.

TABLE 4

Frequency of Reasons \*  
Related to Withdrawal or Contemplated Withdrawal

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Persisters</u>	<u>Dropouts</u>
financial	9	3
health	3	11
marriage	4	5
family difficulties	7	6
low achievement	4	3
travel	1	1
employment	5	6
confused about vocational plans	13	16
needed a time out	14	11
upset and worry	13	9
lonely	3	4
no one seemed to care	1	7
saw it as pointless	7	13
other	10	27

\*

The student was asked to indicate all reasons that were applicable.

Comparing the frequency of concerns on specific reasons, the dropouts indicated less concern over finances than did the persisters, but they indicated more problems related to health. Regarding the latter, it was not possible to ascertain whether the health problems were causes, or symptoms that reflected other anxieties. Nonetheless, both groups experienced feelings of upset and worry, but dropouts indicated that 'no one seemed to care' and 'saw it (i.e. teacher training) as pointless' more often. This supported the concept of incongruency between student and the institution.

At a time when certification is no longer a guarantee of employment, it was apparent that both groups were concerned over employment prospects. The 'other' responses stated by the persisters stressed the frustration of coping with the number of courses within the time constraints, and some questioned the utility of certain courses. The dropouts' 'other' replies tended to be lengthy, and the general tone was one of frustration. They also questioned the usefulness of certain courses. An unsatisfactory college experience was indicated in about 70% dropout replies (i.e., they were disillusioned), while the remainder stated that they had made an inappropriate decision by entering teacher training, or they felt unprepared for teacher training at this time. Many of the latter group indicated a willingness to re-enter a teacher training program at a later date. Some of the dropouts' statements are referred to in the next chapter.

A summary of dropouts' responses to additional questions indicated that thirty had no plans to re-enter teacher training, ten planned to return at a later date, and five were undecided. No one transferred to another institution, and only one student stated that he was dismissed by the university. This indicated that most of the students in the sample left teacher training voluntarily.

Finally, when the dropouts were asked whether or not they perceived the program as being inappropriate to the attainment of their personal goals, 60% answered in the affirmative, 27% in the negative, and 13% were uncertain. In addition, many dropouts made lengthy statements describing their perceptions of the program, and education generally.

In conclusion, the questionnaire results indicated that persisters and dropouts contemplated withdrawal, or withdrew, for similar reasons. An unsatisfactory teacher training experience was not typical of only dropouts, but their comments indicated that they saw the program more negatively than did the persisters. Indications were that dropouts experienced more feelings of alienation (i.e. 'no one seemed to care'; 'saw it as pointless') than did persisters. The question remained, however, were these feelings related to values?

#### Statistical Analysis

Mean ranks and composite rank-orders (i.e., reranked-order) for each variable in both sets were reported. To determine whether or not dropouts and persisters ranked the variables in a similar pattern, the two groups' composite rank-orders on each set of variables were analyzed using the

Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ). Results indicated a high degree of association between the groups on each set of variables: 'end-state values',  $\rho = .94$ ,  $p < .001$ ; 'mode-of-conduct values',  $\rho = .97$ ,  $p < .001$ . Based on these results, it appeared that the null hypothesis (i.e., no relationship between values of dropouts and persisters) could be rejected. Considering this high positive correlation, the next statistical step examined the value differences between dropouts and persisters by examining differences in mean ranks for the two groups.

#### Group Differences on Both Sets of Variables

A combination approach using a multivariate analysis of variance (Hotelling T Square test) followed by a series of univariate analysis of variance tests (t tests) was selected. The purpose of the multivariate test was to determine the degree of difference, if any, across all variables (considered simultaneously) between dropouts and persisters. The univariate tests isolated significant differences on each variable. Results showed a significant difference between groups across all values on both sets; end-state values and mode-of-conduct values:

Hotelling T Square = 38.20 (18,96),  $p < .036$ ; and 56.8 (18,96),  $p < .001$ , respectively.

The multivariate test indicated that the groups were not drawn from the same population. This finding appeared to be contradictory in light of the relationship test results. The Spearman Rank-order Correlation Coefficient showed that the way the groups ranked the values was similar. However, the multivariate test found large enough differences across the set of variables to render the dropouts statistically different from the persisters.

Having found that the two groups differ statistically, a series of univariate t tests was calculated on each set of eighteen variables. In total, thirty-six t tests were calculated to isolate specific differences between dropouts and persisters. Tables 5 and 6 show the end-state and mode-of-conduct value data for the dropouts and persisters. The mean score for all the values is given, as well as the composite rank-orders. Results of significance tests for each value are included for those values where significant differences were found between the two groups using univariate tests. The criterion of significance was set at  $p < .05$ , but, since the exact probability levels were found, they were included in the tables.

TABLE 5

End-state Value Means, Composite Rank-Orders,  
with Significant t Tests for Dropouts and Persisters

<u>Values</u>	<u>Dropouts</u>		<u>Persisters</u>		<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>Means</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Means</u>	<u>Ranks</u>		
1.Acceptance	12.0	13	10.3	12	2.11	.037
2.Achievement	8.4	9	9.4	10		
3.Attention	14.1	16	14.5	16		
4.Being Correct	14.9	17	16.0	18	2.01	.047
5.Cleanliness	13.6	15	12.8	15		
6.Creativity	8.7	10	10.2	11		
7.Discovery	10.8	12	11.9	14		
8.Empathy	9.6	11	8.6	8		
9.Happiness	4.7	2	4.4	1		
10.Honesty	5.4	3	5.1	3		
11.Independence	7.8	8	8.0	7		
12.Obedience	15.5	18	15.7	17		
13.Open-Minded	7.3	4	6.9	6		
14.Politeness	12.2	14	10.6	13	2.11	.037
15.Purposefulness	7.5	7	8.7	9		
16.Responsibility	7.5	5	6.7	5		
17.Self-determination	7.5	6	6.4	4		
18.Self-respect	3.8	1	4.5	2		

\*

d.f. = 113

TABLE 6

Mode-of-Conduct Value Means, Composite Rank-Orders,  
with Significant t Tests for Dropouts and Persisters

Values	Dropouts		Persisters		t	p
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks		
1. Being Organized	7.8	9	5.6	3	3.20	.002
2. Competition	15.2	18	15.9	17		
3. Control	10.9	11	10.5	12		
4. Cooperation	6.2	6	5.5	2		
5. Discussion	8.8	10	9.4	11		
6. Encouragement	4.9	2	5.9	4		
7. Equal Opportunity	6.4	7	7.1	8		
8. Evaluation	13.3	15	13.7	15		
9. Freedom	8.0	8	8.9	10		
10. Humour	5.9	3	6.5	5		
11. Individualization	6.2	5	6.6	6		
12. Order	11.7	12	11.2	13		
13. Self-Discipline	6.2	4	6.6	6		
14. Quiet	13.9	16	15.2	16	2.63	.010
15. Respect for Others	4.8	1	4.1	1		
16. Structure	12.8	14	12.9	14		
17. Student Centered	11.8	13	8.6	9	3.53	.001
18. Teacher Centered	15.9	17	16.0	18		

\*

d.f. = 113

#### Similarities Between Dropouts and Persisters

Attention should first be drawn to the fact that the value systems (i.e. composite rank orders) of the two groups under consideration were, in certain respects, highly similar to one another; possibly reflections of a common interest in educational values held by both groups, even though one group has withdrawn. Both groups placed a relatively high value on such end-state values such as 'self-respect', 'happiness', 'honesty', 'open-minded', 'self-

determination', and 'responsibility'. In contrast, they placed a relatively low value on 'attention', 'being correct', 'cleanliness', and 'obedience'. With the exception of three values ('acceptance', 'being correct', and 'politeness'), the groups did not differ significantly, on the univariate measures, on fourteen of the eighteen variables.

On mode-of-conduct values (Table 6), both groups uniformly placed relatively high importance on 'encouragement', 'humour', and 'respect for others', and less importance on 'competition', 'evaluation', 'quiet', 'structure', and 'teacher centered'. The dropouts and persisters did not differ significantly, on the univariate measures, on fifteen of the eighteen variables. The composite rank-orders were very similar with the exception of 'being organized', 'cooperation', and 'student centered'.

#### Differences in End-state Values

Table 5 shows that dropouts, compared to persisters, preferred two end-state values ('being correct' and 'creativity') and considered two less important - 'acceptance' and 'politeness'. These findings did not suggest that dropouts were more or less people-oriented ( as contrasted to structure-oriented ) than persisters, because

'being correct' and 'creativity' are, in a sense, opposite in meaning. Similarly, the persisters preferred 'acceptance' and 'politeness', which are also opposite in meaning. There was no clear preference for either people or structure-oriented values for those values on which the groups differed significantly. Assuming that persisters would be more structure-oriented, these differences in end-state values did not support the direction of difference expected.

#### Differences in Mode-of-Conduct Values

Turning next to the data on mode-of-conduct values shown in Table 6, only three values showed that dropouts and persisters differed significantly. Compared to persisters, dropouts placed more importance on 'quiet', and less on 'being organized' and 'student centered' values. There was no clear indication that either group tended to be more or less people-oriented. The significant difference on 'student centered' was the only variable that suggested that, contrary to what was expected, persisters may have been slightly less structure-oriented than the dropouts examined in this study. However, this difference viewed within the overall value pattern does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that dropouts are less people-oriented than persisters.

## Differences in General

Regarding the values on which the statistical differences were found, a visual comparison of the means showed that the actual differences were not large compared to the differences on statistically nonsignificant values. With the exception of the mean difference of 3.2 on the 'student centered' variable, no other differences between means on a single variable exceeded 2.3, even though the differences were found to be significant. This observation raised the question of statistical versus educational significance (i.e., practical significance when related to teacher training).

In light of these findings, it was not clear how these results should be interpreted. If it was assumed that the values on which differences between the groups were found were educationally significant, it appeared that neither the dropouts nor the persisters tended to be more or less people-oriented. The correlation test comparing the groups' rank-orders were very similar, and the univariate measures on each variable isolated certain values that were statistically significant. However, the values on which significant differences were found did not indicate that either group was more or less people-oriented.

## Relationship Between End-state and Mode-of-Conduct Values

It was stated previously that end-state and mode-of-conduct values are functionally interconnected because the latter are preferred means and the former are desirable ends. By comparing the composite rank-orders, the patterns for both sets of values for each group were very similar. Dropouts and persisters placed more importance on people-oriented values in both sets of values. This pattern was also supported by the correlation results previously reported. Since no major discrepancy between the two sets of values for either group was found, the relationship between the ends and means were consistent for both dropouts and persisters.

## Degree of Agreement Between Rankers

In regard to the expected differences between dropouts and persisters, it was decided, a priori, that the over-all agreement among rankers would reflect the degree with which members of both groups were applying essentially the same standards in ranking each value. Using the Kendall coefficient of concordance ( $W$ ), dropouts and persisters were examined separately, then they were combined to form one group. The results of the test (Table 7) showed there existed a relatively high degree of agreement among rankers

in each each group, and in the combined group. It was apparent that the groups, both separately and when combined, applied essentially the same standards.

TABLE 7

## Degree of Agreement Among Rankers

<u>Groups</u>	<u>End-state Values</u>	<u>Mode-of-conduct Values</u>
Dropouts	.436 *	.487 *
Persisters	.457 *	.526 *
Combined	.441 *	.499 *

\*

p<.001, d.f.= 17; test:Kendall coefficient of concordance

Post Hoc Statistical Analysis

The results of the statistical tests thus far indicated that dropouts differed significantly from persisters across all variables in end-state and mode-of-conduct values. Subsequent univariate tests on each value revealed differences on specific values resulting in a less clear delineation of the differences than was expected. Consequently, it was decided to subject the data to a discriminant analysis test in search of a more clear understanding of the difference between the groups under examination.

The discriminant analysis provided information on two major questions: "Which variables were the most discriminating between the dropouts and persisters examined?"; and "To what degree of accuracy could the subjects be reclassified into their actual groups by substituting their original responses into the discriminant functions?"

Regarding the first question, Table 8 summarizes, in descending order of discriminative power, the most discriminating variables for both sets of values. Discriminative power is based upon the amount of the total variance accounted for by each value. Those values included in the following list account for approximately ninety-five per cent of the explained variance.

TABLE 8

Summary of the Most Discriminating Values  
(in Descending Order)

<u>End-State Values</u>		<u>Mode-of-Conduct Values</u>	
1. Politeness	(14)	1. Student Centered	(17)
2. Acceptance	(01)	2. Being Organized	(01)
3. Self-determination	(17)	3. Quiet	(14)
4. Empathy	(08)	4. Evaluation	(08)
5. Responsibility	(16)	5. Encouragement	(06)
6. Self-respect	(18)	6. Cooperation	(04)
7. Being Correct	(04)	7. Respect for Others	(15)
8. Obedience	(12)	8. Structure	(16)
		9. Teacher Centered	(18)

(#) indicates number of value on original survey

As shown in Table 8, eight of the eighteen end-state values, and nine of the eighteen mode-of-conduct values were most discriminating. All significantly different variables (shown in Tables 5 and 6) were included in the list.

On the basis of discriminant functions, group membership was predicted using the discriminating variables. This classification was then compared to the original to determine the degree of reclassification accuracy.

TABLE 9

## Reclassification Results

		<u>End-State Values</u>	
<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group</u>	
		Persisters	Dropouts
Persisters	70	49 (70%)	21 (30%)
Dropouts	45	11 (24.4%)	34 (73.6%)
		<u>Mode-of- Conduct Values</u>	
		Persisters	Dropouts
Persisters	70	52 (74.3%)	18 (25.7%)
Dropouts	45	9 (20%)	36 (80%)

The predicted group membership partially clarified the significant difference found across all variables between dropouts and persisters. Reclassification of the subjects on the end-state values showed that 72.17% of the subjects were correctly classified as members of their actual group, and 27.83 % were not. Similarly, reclassification of subjects on the mode-of-conduct values showed that 76.52% of the subjects were correctly classified and 23.26% were not.

This reclassification showed that approximately one quarter of each group's members shared values that were typically held by the other group. Thus there was no clear distinction between dropout or persister in the rankings of 25% of the subjects. This finding indicated that dropouts and persisters have gross differences when considered across all variables, but the differences on specific variables were not particularly clear because of the lack of distinction between groups in some cases.

A final statistic that directly related to the applicability and meaningfulness of the results, was that the end-state and the mode-of-conduct values accounted for only 22% and 31% ,respectively, of the total variance. As a result, the predictive ability of the value survey was questionable. Additional effects of this result will be discussed in the next chapter.

In conclusion, statistical analysis of the data showed that significant differences between dropouts and persisters existed across all variables on end-state and mode-of-conduct values, even though there was a high correlation between the groups' composite rank-orders of values. In addition, there was a high degree of agreement among rankers within each group, and when they were combined. The univariate tests revealed differences on specific values, but the number of significant differences (six in all), and the results of the composite rankings did not delineate meaningful differences between dropouts and persisters. This finding raised the question of educational significance of the statistical differences. Consequently, a post hoc analysis of the data was conducted using a discriminant analysis test. It was found that the ambiguity in interpreting specific differences was partially explained by showing that approximately one quarter of the subject's value ranks did not clearly distinguish between dropouts and persisters.

CHAPTER FIVEDiscussion

## Interpretation of Results

Ignoring, for the moment, the limitations of this study, the statistically significant value differences found between dropouts and persisters supported, but not unequivocally, the original hypothesis that value differences exist between the two groups examined. However, the number and type of specific differences did not clarify the differences. This ambiguity, coupled with the high degree of agreement among subjects, and the high positive correlation between groups' value patterns, cast doubt on the meaningful significance of the differences found between groups. By implication further questions were raised. When interpreted, did the statistically significant results have educational significance (i.e., practical significance to teacher training)? If it is maintained that values were cent decision-making, why did specific value differences not clearly differentiate between dropouts and persisters? Therefore, in light of the original hypothesis it was concluded that value differences between groups were not conclusively tenable. The lack of clear group distinction when the specific value differences were interpreted

resulted in part of the hypothesis regarding the direction of the difference (i.e., dropouts tend to be more people-oriented and less structure-oriented than persisters) being unsupported.

Reviewing the interpretation of the differences between dropouts and persisters on specific values, it was found that the three end-state values, and two of three mode-of-conduct values, on which statistically significant differences between the groups were found, did not support the predicted direction of the value differences. Excepting one value ('student-centered':  $p < .001$ ), the others showed that neither dropouts nor persisters were more or less people-oriented than the other. Interpretation of the 'student-centered' value indicated that persisters leaned slightly more toward people-oriented values than did dropouts. However, the importance of the exception was deflated when both groups' composite rank-orders revealed a relatively uniform pattern in which people-oriented values were ranked consistently higher than structure-oriented values. In connection with this uniformity in composite rankings, the statistically significant difference between groups across all values was not explained by the interpretation placed on specific value differences. It appeared that, contrary to the hypothesis, there was no meaningful difference in the direction of each group's

rank-orders since both groups consistently rank people-oriented values highest.

The desire to explain the statistical differences between groups became a vexing issue nevertheless. The discriminant analysis conducted to examine the differences between groups revealed that approximately one quarter of the subjects' original ranks did not clearly differentiate between dropouts and persisters. It initially appeared that the differences could be explained. The value differences between groups could be artificially widened by removing those subjects who were not classified, according to their actual rankings, into their original group. It was possible that their responses were confounding the explanation of differences between groups. Therefore, hypothetical groups were formed by removing those subjects whose responses on the value survey seemed to be confounding the analysis. The combination statistical procedure was repeated with the reduced groups, and the hypothetical results (see Appendix) analyzed. The hypothetical profiles for both sets of values supported the previous result. The predicted direction in value differences did not exist. Both groups definitely placed more importance on people-oriented values. The number of values on which statistically significant differences were found increased, but the increased number of differences left the value patterns basically unchanged.

It was confirmed that value differences between the groups did not exist in light of the specific values on which significant differences were found. Dropouts and persisters consistently indicated that they placed more importance on people-oriented values than on structure-oriented values. There was a slight tendency for persisters to be more people-oriented than dropouts (see results in Appendix Two). However, the trend was not intense enough to warrant the conclusion that persisters were more people-oriented than dropouts.

Comparing the actual and the hypothetical profiles, it was interesting to note that values such as 'teacher-centered', 'quiet', 'evaluation', 'competition', and other structure-oriented values were not ranked highly by either group, even though the emphasis in education in the preceding four years, at least from a governmental level, has been toward the 'Return to the Three R's'.

In view of this interpretation of value differences between groups, the question of the educational meaningfulness (i.e., practical implications to teacher training) of statistically significant differences was partially examined. The importance of looking beyond statistically significant findings was evidenced in the above discussion. However, this did not imply that dropouts

and persisters simply have no value differences. On the contrary, and accepting that there were differences, it was necessary to look elsewhere for clues. This decision was based on the questionnaire results, which clearly indicated that dropouts were more dissatisfied with their respective teacher training program.

It is widely accepted that student dissatisfaction with the university is a major attitudinal factor related to withdrawal (Hayes, 1974; 1977). Attitudes reflect the student's commitment to the institution and his/her motivation to graduate. Highly motivated and committed individuals tend to succeed and graduate, whereas voluntary dropouts (the group examined in this study) tend to lack motivation, were not committed, or both (Hackman & Dysinger, 1970; Spady, 1971; Rootman, 1970). These explanations for withdrawal are partially supported by the comments from persisters and dropouts. To illustrate, this persister's comment was indicative of a person who was highly committed and motivated: "I have been fully committed to finishing my professional year at all times!" The opposite view was indicated in this dropout's comment: "A teacher should be dedicated to her students and her work. I was not. The challenge involved in teaching was not inspiring." Most of the dropouts' comments indicated dissatisfaction to some degree: "It was the most useless, frustrating, program I

have ever enrolled in!" (See Appendix for additional comments).

Although it was evident in these statements that commitment and motivation are related to withdrawal from university, many dropouts indicated, by their comments, that they withdrew as a result of a felt and observed incongruency, or 'lack of fit' with the program. This concept was examined and found to be significantly related to withdrawal by others (Summerskill, 1962; Rootman, 1972; Hackman & Dysinger, 1970). However, a lack of congruency with the institution was not automatically a reflection of a lack of motivation and/or commitment as these comments imply:

"I feel that a lot of improvements are necessary in elementary education and withdrew from the faculty as I don't feel they will be incorporated."

"A lot had to do with my values compared to those of other students and those I perceived in the faculty members who teach us, to teach as we are taught."

The concept of incongruency implied that there could be value differences between those who feel congruent with the university (i.e., persisters), and those that feel incongruent (i.e., probable dropouts). This dropout's comment states that there were value differences that may have accounted for some of the feelings and thoughts she held:

"The main factor (for withdrawing) was the difficulty I had maintaining my own integrity ... my values which are different than the institution's ... I wanted the ticket, but I didn't want it badly enough to sacrifice a year of my life and my integrity ..."

It became obvious that this dropout observed differences between herself and other students, not to mention some faculty members. However, it should be remembered that the value differences examined did not confirm the part of the hypothesis which predicted the direction of the value differences. This discrepancy between the dropouts' views and the findings of this study reduced the confidence with which one can reject the hypothesis. It became apparent that further consideration must be directed to values, and the instrument devised to measure them. Assuming the centrality of values in decision-making, what was it about values that rendered them a variable not easily understood, and more difficult to assess?

It was difficult to imagine how any decision could be free of values (Dewey, 1939; Rokeach, 1973; Hodgkinson, 1978), but it appeared to be even more difficult to perceive, objectively, the role of values in decision-making. The first limitation of this study centered on this problem of assessing 'true' values.

Interpretation of the statistical results, combined with student comments, pointed out the necessity to consider, from at least one theoretical view, reasons for the problems in assessing and measuring values. Viewed in the context of the valuing process ( a term initially coined by John Dewey) it was theoretically conceivable that the value differences between groups in this study could be explained, in part, by the differences between students in their respective stages of valuing. Simon contended that the following seven requirements must apply before it can be assumed that a person holds a particular value: (1) choosing from alternatives, (2) considering consequences of each alternative, (3) choosing freely, (4) prizing the choice, (5) publicly affirming one's choice, (6) acting upon one's choice, and (7) doing so repeatedly (35, 28-30). In connection with these stages and the instrument devised to assess values, the limitation of the instrument rested on the realization that there was no way of knowing whether a student was making a choice, and acting upon it. The method of assessing values in this study was based essentially on value choice (i.e., stated values). Consequently, it was possible that the average rankings did not reflect values actually held (i.e., acted upon), but values that possibly were socially desirable at the time. Hence, value patterns did not alter drastically, even though differences were found on particular values. A mature dropout's statement,

based on her experiences, gave some credence to this theoretical view of the valuing process, and its possible effects in this study: "Most students entering Professional Year ... have not had much opportunity to formulate their philosophies of education (or of life) ... They are academically oriented, with a strong tendency to accept unquestioningly..."

From the theoretical perspective of different stages in the valuing process, a possible explanation for the meaningful significance of the results evolved. Theoretically, it may have been socially preferable for a student teacher to accept people-oriented values, however these values are not truly held until the individual is prepared to act upon them repeatedly. Therefore, the limitation rests on whether value rankings of each student were simply stated (i.e., the chosen alternative), or actually held (i.e., acted upon).

In concluding this part of the discussion, two major questions were discussed in light of interpreting the results. The first question centered on the meaningful significance of the statistically significant findings, which casted doubt on the actual differences between dropouts and persisters. To seek an explanation for those differences, student responses were considered and related

to theoretical concepts related to withdrawal. It appeared that the concept of incongruency was the most convincing concept based on statements made by students. Since reasons related to incongruency were the purpose of this study, a theoretical review of the valuing process was introduced to account for this ambiguity which could be a reflection of the difficulty in measuring values accurately. Statistical differences between dropouts and persisters were evident, but these differences were not totally clear from the perspective of stated values.

#### Limitations

The limitation introduced by the difficulty of assessing and measuring values may have been a reflection, to some degree, of the general limitations in this study. These limitations stemmed from response-bias and, to a lesser extent, choosing the appropriate statistical tests to examine the data. These limitations are not an attempt to explain away the negative results in respect to the direction of value differences predicted in the hypothesis. However, they were considered in the final interpretation of the results.

## Response - Nonresponse Bias

Most survey research acknowledges that the advantages of mail-back surveys may be offset by low response rates, or by known or unknown sources of bias through selective responses. It is generally agreed that the lower the response rate, the greater the probability that either the presence or the absence of a specified relationship may be spurious. The result may be that systematic response bias occurs, in which persons with particular traits are more likely to respond than those with other characteristics (Filion, F.L., 1976).

Research on nonrespondent traits indicated two major traits that affect the return rate: active involvement and personal success. It has been found that respondents generally are actively involved and interested in the matter surveyed (M. Donald, 1960; Pavalko and Lutterman, 1973). Personal success was found to be positively related to responding to surveys by C.R. Pace (1939). In reference to this study, the nature of dropouts was that many may have been uninterested in, and obviously not involved with, education. Nor would most regard their teacher training as a positive experience. These traits were reflected in the comments obtained from nonrespondents by a telephone inquiry conducted after all the data was collected: "I did not

respond to the survey because I am no longer interested in the teacher training program, since I have started a new profession that interests me"; "I did not want to reveal personal reasons for withdrawing"; and "I am so turned off with the institution that I refuse to take part in any study that originates at the university, regardless of its intent!" It was evident that the nature of dropouts (i.e., uninterested, lack of involvement, and lack of success in teacher training) was a significant factor affecting the rate of return in this study.

Although considered, it was decided not to compare early responses with late responses to speculate upon the direction of difference between respondents and nonrespondents. This procedure recommended by some researchers (Pavalko and Lutterman, 1973) has not been widely accepted. Predicting the amount of bias by investigating early and late responses is limited in its usefulness because it was found that late respondents could not be viewed as being the same as nonrespondents (Ellis, et al., 1970; Kivlin, 1965).

The crucial question in this study revolved around this study's representativeness, considering that only 30% of the dropouts responded. Speculations were made: Can the dropout respondents be considered representative of the whole dropouts population? Are the responding dropouts more

typical of persisters (in terms of values) than nonresponding dropouts? In other words, to what extent did a person's values determine whether he/she would respond? Regardless of nonrespondents' traits, and given that relatively high return rates are required when surveying heterogeneous groups (e.g., dropouts), as opposed to homogeneous groups such as practicing teachers (Leslie, 1972), a second limitation of this study was that response-rate bias could have been a critical factor in determining the representativeness of the dropout population. On the other hand, the persisters, considered a homogeneous group in which lower return rates may be acceptable (Leslie, 1972), were representative of the total population of student teachers. Consequently, the results of this study must be considered within the limitation that a response-rate bias casts doubt on the representativeness of the dropouts. Any conclusions drawn regarding the interpretation of the results should be made cautiously in view of the potential bias, or response/nonresponse parameters, of the response-rate bias.

As a result, little confidence could be placed in accepting the null hypothesis conclusively (i.e., that dropouts and persisters share the same values). It was possible to describe the values of persisters, but this did not apply to the dropouts due to the limitations of this study.

## Statistical Analysis of the Data

A third limitation, that was not dwelt upon, stressed the method of statistical analysis used in studies in which the instrument is affected by its inherent ipsativity. Rokeach's value survey is confronted with the same difficulties. Most researchers using his survey generally conduct tests that are univariate (e.g., median tests; t test), which violate too many assumptions of statistical analysis. The combination approach employed in this study, although not flawless, was a more powerful statistical approach. In reference to Hummel and Sligo's (1971) examination of univariate and multivariate analysis of variance procedures, it was concluded that the absence of multivariate analysis renders univariate results less significant. When measuring many variables, it is possible that significant differences on one or more variables, could occur by chance, even if the groups being examined are not statistically different. Even though the combination approach recommended was used in this study, and the statistical tests were preferred to those commonly used by others (Rokeach), the analysis violated the assumption of independence. This was considered in the interpretation of results and partially accounted for the emphasis placed on value patterns (i.e., composite rank-orders) as well as statistically significant differences found on certain variables.

Related to the statistical analysis procedure, the discriminant analysis conducted revealed that the end-state and mode-of-conduct values accounted for 22 and 31 percent, respectively, of the total variance. No meaningful differences were found between dropouts and persisters within the explained variance (26%, averaged), but 74% of the total variance was unaccounted for by the value variable. This was an important limitation which, while casting further doubt on the meaningfulness of the statistically significant results, emphasized the need to consider to other variables in future studies, as well as values that contribute to incongruency between student and institution.

The total amount of variance accounted for and the response/nonresponse parameters, coupled with the difficulty of assessing and measuring values imposed limitations. Nevertheless, they do not necessarily negate all results.

Conclusions and Implications

Despite the significant difference found across all variables between groups, differences between dropouts and persisters did not clearly differentiate between them. It was apparent that a single global variable, such as values, was insufficient for accounting for reasons related to withdrawal, regardless of the assumed centrality of values to decision-making. However, the implication was not that values failed to contribute relevant information on the process of voluntary withdrawal from teacher training. On the contrary, the complexities and ambiguities of assessing and measuring values stressed the need to extend more energy into investigations by emphasizing personality factors, in lieu of quantitative factors (i.e., enrollment numbers), related to voluntary withdrawal from teacher training. Incongruency generally described what transpires between student and institution from this position, but this concept requires elaboration through re-examining the process of withdrawal in respect to its implications to teacher training. In short, the importance of this study was not in describing the student who withdrew from teacher training, but in beginning the long and arduous task of attempting to comprehend those reasons that contribute to the decision to withdraw voluntarily.

Within the context of this study, what conclusions were drawn in regard to the questions stated in the beginning, and what are the implications to teacher training?

Regarding, first, the scope of withdrawal from teacher training in this province, there exists ample evidence to show that decreasing enrollment was not, and is not, the only reason for examining withdrawal. Without belabouring the alternate rationale further, it was concluded that withdrawal from teacher training should be better understood by evaluating the efficacy and practicality of teacher training programs. Withdrawal, being a transaction between student and institution, reflects upon the selection process and, ultimately, how the teacher training program responds to students' needs and desires. The implication for teacher training was that understanding withdrawal can serve as one of many factors, by which constructive amendments to existing programs could be made.

A central issue in this study was to determine whether or not a group of students with a definable set of values tended to compose the dropout group. In light of the findings, it was not possible to identify, conclusively, a set of values that distinguished between dropouts and

persisters. When interpreted, the significant differences found on specific values did not differentiate between groups, and value patterns of both groups indicated that they uniformly placed primary importance on people-oriented values, and least importance on structure-oriented values. It can be concluded that the differences were too complex for the method used, to identify and interpret differences between dropouts and persisters.

Continuing the focus on the selection process, no evidence was found demonstrating that a particular group of students composed the dropout group. To illustrate, assuming that specific value differences were educationally significant, and thereby depicted one group as more structure-oriented than the other, there was still no clear evidence that students with particular values patterns were singled out through the selection process. The discriminant analysis of the data revealed that approximately one quarter of the subjects could not be correctly classified into their actual group, so it appeared that they held values that did not clearly differentiate between dropout and persister. Based on the sample of students examined, and the limitations previously stated, no conclusive indications were found demonstrating that dropouts represent a group of students whose values differed dramatically from persisters.

The implications of this conclusion to teacher training were viewed with regard to the limitations imposed by the response/nonresponse parameters, and the difficulties inherent in measuring values. It is entirely possible that the selection process operates arbitrarily, with the result that students with particular characteristics are not singled out. On the other hand, those involved in teacher training should be cognizant of the complexities of thoroughly examining the dropout phenomenon. The explained variance also limited the confidence that could be placed in adopting a global explanation of withdrawal.

With regard to the assumption that values of persisters reflect values of the institution, little more could be stated. Assuming that persisters' values reflect the institution's values, and since no meaningful differences between dropouts' and persisters' values were found, it was possible that both groups reflected the institution's values. The issue, not yet resolved, that related to this conclusion paralleled the discussion of the theoretical aspects of the valuing process. Based on the results of this study, and accepting that the institution's values and those of both groups stress people-oriented values first and structure-oriented values last, the unresolved issue centered on the concept of stated values (i.e., chosen

values) versus held values (values acted upon). Comments made by dropouts indicated that this discrepancy was real, and that it was related to feelings and thoughts of incongruency between the student and institution. It became evident that this examination of values did not reveal the discrepancy between stated and held values.

In response to the question on the feasibility of using the values survey devised for this study to distinguish between potential dropouts and persisters, the conclusion was quite clear. The survey's capability of isolating differences between groups and on specific variables was demonstrated. Nevertheless, the survey should be tested using the eight end-state values, and the nine mode-of-conduct values, which were identified as the most discriminating variables. The deletion of certain variables that were highly correlated with the identified discriminating variables could simplify the interpretation.

Another factor to consider in this regard focused upon the amount of variance accounted for by the end-state and mode-of-conduct values. Knowing that this examination accounted for about one quarter (averaged) of the total variance, the implication for using the survey as a possible screening device was that additional information is

definitely required. In addition, the restructured survey using only those discriminating variables identified should be tested. The predictive ability of the survey may be questionable, and the use of values to distinguish potential dropouts needs to be examined further.

In conclusion, the interpretation of specific value differences and value patterns did not clearly support the initial finding that dropouts and persisters differ significantly. This doubt was based on the grounds that statistically significant differences were not necessarily meaningful differences. Delineation of the differences was not possible with the data collected on values. However, student comments indicated that differences between persisters and dropouts existed (see comments on page 102). With regard to the comments, values examined, and limitations of this study, the most conclusive outcome was that withdrawal from teacher training is a complicated issue that reflects upon the selection process, the program, and student perceptions.

In light of the findings that the differences between dropouts and were not interpreted as meaningful differences on the measured variables, the relationship of values to decisions to persist or withdraw from teacher training was

not clear. Initially, it might be concluded that there was no relationship at all, but this initial conclusion was regarded with caution, considering the limitations: difficulty in assessing values, response/nonresponse parameters, and statistical analysis techniques. Therefore, it was concluded that this study did not succeed in describing the relationship between values and decisions to persist or withdraw, nor could any definite conclusion be stated regarding the values of dropouts. In view of this finding, an alternate method aimed at examining the discrepancy between this study's results and the students' comments will be discussed later.

Finally, the implications of examining withdrawal extend not only to the program, but to the individual who left teacher training as well. Withdrawing was not an easy decision, as this dropout stated: "After more than a solid week of soul-searching, I decided to quit."

Recommendations for Further Research

Since actual differences between dropouts and persisters were not clearly delineated in this study, the question remains: What variables are related to feelings and thoughts of incongruency, or 'lack of fit', between the individual and institution? Although the values variable did not clarify the reasons for withdrawal from teacher training, it demonstrated that the process is too complicated to adopt a single variable for purposes of explanation. It is recommended that, in addition to values or any other personality variable, future studies incorporate an ideographic procedure with a small random sample of both dropouts and persisters.

It is not recommended that this study be replicated in its present format, because no meaningful differences were found on the measured variables between dropouts and persisters. This is a result that parallels McLeish's findings. An examination of withdrawal should be considered from the standpoint of how, and to what degree, a person's characteristics (e.g., values) interact with the institution. In lieu of determining an institution's characteristics on a measured variable, a comparison of students' self-perception of their personal values, and

their perceptions of the institution (e.g., stated values compared to values ascribed to institution) should be conducted. Even though, as has been found in this study, dropouts and persisters tended to share stated personal values, they probably perceive the values of the institution differently. This methodological approach stresses a comparison between personal values and those ascribed to the institution. A person's perception conceptualizes the values of a social institution which is, in all probability, the only way that values of an institution can be described. An examination of this process (stating values and ascribing values) has the potential of revealing the discrepancy (i.e., degree of alienation) between the individual and the institution which, subsequently, might reveal the differences between dropouts and persisters.

It is foreseeable that a study of this nature could reflect upon the dichotomy between stated values and those acted upon, but the significance of the type of study recommended would be based upon the examination of the interaction of student and the institution.

#### Survey Methods

In view of the survey procedures used in this study, the response/ nonresponse parameters imposed a major limitation

on the representativeness of the dropout population. It is recommended that further research incorporating a mail survey include a minimum of three waves: (1) the initial letter and survey material; (2) a follow-up letter to nonrespondents; and (3) a telephone call to the remaining nonrespondents. The follow-up letter should emphasize the importance of the individual's reply to the research project. Intervals between waves should range from seven to fourteen days.

This procedure is recommended as a result of comparing the rate of return for the students from universities A and B. It might be recalled that students from university A were subjected to three waves, whereas those from university B were subjected to just one wave. As a result, the return rate from university A students was much higher than those from university B (see Table 2).

Other factors that should be considered are the type of postage (special delivery recommended followed by stamped letters in lieu of machine stamped letters), and a cover letter from a legitimate authority.

## The Value Survey

Further research on the value survey could be conducted using a semantic differential study (Osgood semantic differential technique) to compare the connotative meaning with the rank ordering of values. This procedure would be useful in determining whether or not each value has basically the same meaning to each individual. A study of this nature could be based on the eight and nine discriminating variables identified by the discriminant analysis instead of using all variables. For further explanation, refer to Homant's study (18, 885-89).

REFERENCES

1. Astin, A.W. College Dropouts: A National Profile. American Council on Education: Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Research. 7(1), 1972.
2. Bean, A.G. & Covert, R.W. Prediction of College Persistence, Withdrawal, and Academic Dismissal: A Discriminant Analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1973, 33(2), 407-11.
3. Brooks, W. & Emery, L. College Dropout: A View from Two Schools. Canadian Counsellor, 1974, 8(3), 146-51.
4. Carlson, J. & Koval, C. Values: The First Priority, Counselling and Values, 1974, 17(4), 235-7.
5. Chase, C., et al. Persistence and Conditions Related to It: A Persistent Question. Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing, 1976.
6. Dewey, J. Theory of Valuation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
7. Donald, M.N. Implications of Nonresponse for the Interpretation of Mail Questionnaire Data. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 99-114.
8. Eddy, E. What Happened to Student Values? Educational Record, 1973, 58, 7-17.
9. Ellis, R.A; Erdo, C.M.; & Armer, J.M. The Use of Potential Nonrespondents for Study Nonresponse Bias. Pacific Sociological Review, 1970, 13, 103-109.
10. Farine, A. Demographic and Social Accounting: A Follow-up on the Withdrawals from Quebec Colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1973.
11. Feters, W.B. National Longitudinal Study. Withdrawal from Institutions of Higher Education. An Appraisal with Longitudinal Data Involving Diverse Institutions. National Center for Educational Statistics, 1977.

12. Fillion, F.L. Estimation Bias Due to Nonresponse in Mail Survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1975-76, 39, 482-92.
13. Givens, P.R. Toward a New Emphasis on Human Values in Higher Education. Liberal Education, 1974, 60, 409-17.
14. Hackman, J.R. & Dysinger, W.S. Research Notes: Commitment to College as a Factor in Student Attrition. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 311-24.
15. Hayes, S. Pressures Contributing to the Decision to Drop Out - Comparison Between Dropouts and Persisters. Australian Journal of Education, 1974, 18(2), 138-48.
16. Hayes, S. Dropouts' Dissatisfaction with University. Australian Journal of Education, 1977, 21(2), 141-9.
17. Hodgkinson, C. Toward a Philosophy of Administration, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
18. Homant, R. Semantic Differential Rating and Rank Ordering of Values. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1969, 29 885-89.
19. Hummel, T.J. & Sligo, J.R. Empirical Comparison of Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance Procedures. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 49-71.
20. Kivlin, J.E. Contributions to the study of mail-back bias. Rural Sociology, 1965, 30, 322-26.
21. Kohen, A.Z. et al. Success and Failure in College: A New Approach to Persistence in Undergraduate Programs. Center for Human Resource Research, Feb. 1976.
22. Leslie, L.L. Are High Response Rates Essential to Valid Surveys? Social Science Research, 1972, 1, 323-34.
23. Lueptow, L.B. Need for Achievement and Continuation in College. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33(2), 455-8.
24. Maudal, G.R.; Butcher, J.N.; Manger, P.A. A Multivariate Study of Personality and Academic Factors in College Attrition. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1974, 21(6), 560-7.

25. McIntosh, B.; Wilson, L.W.; Lipinski, B.G. The Extent and Nature of Student Attrition in the First Five Years at Simon Fraser University. Canadian Counsellor, 1974, 8(3), 163-73.
26. McLeish, J. Students' Attitude and College Environments. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1970.
27. McSweeney, R.V. Occupational and Student Values. Educational Research, 1973, 15(2), 106-8.
28. Miller, S.J. The Task of Public Education as Perceived by Teachers With Contrasting Personal Values. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 7110A.
29. Nickens, J. Community College Dropout Redefined. College and University, 1976, 51, 322-9.
30. Pace, C.R. Factors Influencing Questionnaire Returns from Former University Students. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1939, 23, 388-97.
31. Pavalko, R. & Lutterman, K.G. Characteristics of Willing and Reluctant Respondents. Pacific Sociological Review, 1973, 16, 463-76.
32. Peng, S. & Fetters, W.B. College Student Withdrawal: A Motivational Problem. Research Triangle Institute, April, 1977.
33. Penn, R.J. Measuring Intergenerational Value Differences. Social Science Quarterly, 1977, 58(2), 293-301.
34. Privet, n. Student Values and the College Movement. Improving College and University teaching, 1974, 22, 10-11.
35. Raths, L.E.; Harmin, M.; & Simon, S. Values and Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966.
36. Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. London: The Free Press, Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1973.
37. Rootman, Z. Voluntary Withdrawal from a Total Adult Socialization Organization: A Model. Sociology of Education, 1972, 45, 258-70.
38. Schaumburg, G.F. Follow-Up Survey of Students Withdrawing from Cerritos College During the Fall Semester, 1972. ERIC, ED 077496, 1973.

39. Simon, S.B., Howe, L.W., and Kirschenbaum, H. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Teachers. New York: Hart, 1972.
40. Spady, W.G. Dropouts From Higher Education: Toward An Empirical Model. Interchange, 1971, 2(3), 38-62.
41. Smith, D.G. Personality Differences Between Persisters and Withdrawers in a small Women's College. Research in Higher Education, 1976, Research in Higher Education, 1976, 5, 15-25.
42. Starr, A.; Betz, E.L.; & Menne, J. Differences in College Student Satisfaction: Academic Dropouts, Non-academic Dropouts, and Non-Dropouts. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1972, 19, 318-22.
43. Summerskill, J. Dropouts from College, In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College, New York: Wiley, 1962.
44. Thistlethwaite, D. Accentuation of Differences in Values and Exposure to Major Fields of Study. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65(3), 279-93.
45. Tinto, V. Dropouts from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research. Review of Education Research, 1975, 45(1), 89-125.
46. Vander Wells, A. & Sartois, P.C. Study of Withdrawing Students for the University of Alberta 1970-71 Session. Canadian Counsellor, 1973, 7, 40-48.
47. Womsack, F. & McCluskey, J. Characteristics and Perceptions of Non-returning Students at Arkansas State University. Arkansas State University, ERIC, ED 101606, 1973.
48. Wright, J. Research in Brief: The S.V.I.B. Academic Achievement Score and College Attrition. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 1976, 8(4), 258-59.
49. Zahorik, J.A. How to Decide to Teach. Elementary School Journal, 1977, 78(1), 22-30.

APPENDICES

Appendix One

'Educationally Oriented'

VALUE SURVEY

Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

Name (if requested) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Program: Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS

ON the next two pages are two separate sets of eighteen values listed in alphabetical order. Working with each set separately, your task is to arrange them in order of importance to you.

Study the values carefully and rank the the value most important to you as 1 and so on.

Work slowly, feel free to change your mind if you wish. A 'working area' is included to make your initial rankings and changes if you desire.

When you have ranked, from 1 to 18, each value, please write the final rank for each value on the left side of the page.

#1 Your Highest (i.e. most important) Value

#18 Your Lowest (i.e. least important) Value

Page #1

Final Rank

Working Area

_____	ACCEPTANCE	_____
_____	ACHIEVEMENT	_____
_____	ATTENTION	_____
_____	BEING CORRECT	_____
_____	CLEANLINESS	_____
_____	CREATIVITY	_____
_____	DISCOVERY	_____
_____	EMPATHY	_____
_____	HAPPINESS	_____
_____	HONESTY	_____
_____	INDEPENDENCE	_____
_____	OBEDIENCE	_____
_____	OPEN-MINDED	_____
_____	POLITENESS	_____
_____	PURPOSEFULNESS	_____
_____	RESPONSIBILITY	_____
_____	SELF-DETERMINATION	_____
_____	SELF-RESPECT	_____

\* When you have finished, go on to the next page.

Page #2

Final Rank	Working Area
_____	BEING ORGANIZED _____
_____	COMPETITION _____
_____	CONTROL _____
_____	COOPERATION _____
_____	DISCUSSION _____
_____	ENCOURAGEMENT _____
_____	EQUAL OPPORTUNITY _____
_____	EVALUATION _____
_____	FREEDOM _____
_____	HUMOUR _____
_____	INDIVIDUALIZATION _____
_____	ORDER _____
_____	SELF-DISCIPLINE _____
_____	QUIET _____
_____	RESPECT FOR OTHERS _____
_____	STRUCTURE _____
_____	STUDENT CENTERED _____
_____	TEACHER CENTERED _____

Questionnaire enclosed in mail survey sent to dropouts:

-----+-----

^

^ Do you intend to return to this university to complete ^

^ your training? ^

^ Have you transferred to another teacher training ^

^ institution? ^

^ Were you dismissed by the university? ^

^

^ If you withdrew for any of the following reasons, ^

^ please check: ^

^ financial \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ health \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ marriage \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ family difficulties \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ low achievement \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ travel \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ employment \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ confused over vocational plans \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ needed time out \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ upset and worry \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ lonely \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ no one seemed to care \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ saw it as pointless \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ other (please state) \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^

^ Did you perceive the professional year as a means ^

^ unsuitable to the attainment of your personal goals? ^

^

^ Comments: \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^

^

^

^

-----+-----

Questionnaire enclosed in mail survey sent to dropouts:

+-----+

^

^ Do you intend to return to this university to complete ^

^ your training? \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ Have you transferred to another teacher training ^

^ institution? \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ Were you dismissed by the university? \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^

^ If you withdrew for any of the following reasons, ^

^ please check: ^

^ financial \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ health \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ marriage \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ family difficulties \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ low achievement \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ travel \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ employment \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ confused over vocational plans \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ needed time out \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ upset and worry \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ lonely \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ no one seemed to care \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ saw it as pointless \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ other (please state) \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^

^ Did you perceive the professional year as a means ^

^ unsuitable to the attainment of your personal goals? ^

^ \_\_\_\_\_ ^

^ Comments: ^

^

^

^

+-----+

Questionnaire given to the persisters:

During the professional year, it is not unusual for a student to contemplate withdrawing.

Have you seriously considered withdrawing for any of the following reasons?

Please check if any of the following applies to you:

- financial \_\_\_\_\_
- health \_\_\_\_\_
- marriage \_\_\_\_\_
- family difficulties \_\_\_\_\_
- low achievement \_\_\_\_\_
- travel \_\_\_\_\_
- employment \_\_\_\_\_
- confused over vocational plans \_\_\_\_\_
- needed a time out \_\_\_\_\_
- upset and worry \_\_\_\_\_
- lonely \_\_\_\_\_
- no one seems to care \_\_\_\_\_
- saw it as pointless \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:



## UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

P.O. BOX 1700, VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA V8W 2Y2  
TELEPHONE (604) 477-6911, TELEX 049-7222

*Faculty of Education*

Dear Participant:

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in assisting me to compile information regarding your withdrawal from teacher training. This information will be used in a thesis that hypothesizes that the single most important factor, barring physical reasons, related to withdrawal is one's values which are in all probability different than the institution's values. I cannot examine this hypothesis without your help by completing the enclosed value survey and returning it at your earliest convenience. The survey information shall not be used for any other purpose.

Your participation is voluntary and anonymous (you can identify yourself if you want). I have coded each survey to enable me to know who has responded, beyond this names and codes are not necessary. After the data has been compiled, the surveys will be destroyed.

If you are interested in obtaining the results of this study at a later date, a summary will be sent upon your request.

For your information, I am a graduate student at UVic. and employed as a staff associate in which capacity I work directly with student teachers. Their concerns and frustrations coupled with my interest in the relationship between values and decision making have encouraged me to pursue this study.

Since studies such as this are not common, some students who participated in a pilot study using this value instrument found the task fairly difficult at first. However, many commented that it was an interesting experience. Most students completed the survey within 15 to 30 minutes. Survey instructions are enclosed.

I sincerely hope that you will take the time to complete this survey because your cooperation is the backbone to this study. Prompt return of this survey (e.g. by April 1st) will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Larry Strutynski

LS/js

Appendix Two

Hypothetical Profiles of Dropouts and Persisters

Based on the discriminant analysis results used in the post hoc analysis of the data, a hypothetical profile of dropouts and persisters was drawn up by deleting those cases (approximately one quarter) that were not classified into their actual group. The purpose of this exercise was to make a hypothetical profile that typified the actual group with the result that artificially defined groups with more obvious differences could be formed.

TABLE 10

## Hypothetical Profile of End-state Values

Values	Dropouts		Persisters		t	p
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks		
1. Acceptance	12.7	14	9.15	10	3.93	.000
2. Achievement	7.69	6	16.0	17	2.40	.019
3. Attention	14.03	15	14.63	15		
4. Being Correct	14.27	16	16.52	18	3.61	.001
5. Cleanliness	14.27	17	12.83	14		
6. Creativity	8.67	10	11.08	12	2.56	.013
7. Discovery	10.57	12	12.39	13	2.12	.037
8. Empathy	9.94	11	7.71	7	2.04	.045
9. Happiness	4.55	2	4.44	1		
10. Honesty	5.73	3	5.41	3		
11. Independence	7.94	9	8.38	8		
12. Obedience	15.03	18	15.03	16		
13. Open-minded	7.27	4	6.73	6		
14. Politeness	12.39	13	9.96	11	2.21	.008
15. Purposefulness	7.36	5	8.94	9		
16. Responsibility	7.79	7	6.10	5	2.23	.028
17. Self-determination	7.88	8	6.00	4	2.31	.023
18. Self-respect	3.58	1	4.71	2		

Cases = 81 d.f. = 79

Hotelling T Square = 167.83 (17,63),  $p < .000$

Regarding only those values on which statistical differences were found, it appeared that the persisters tended to place more value on people-oriented values. However, the composite rank order of both groups indicate that virtually no difference exists between the groups. Both groups placed more value on people-oriented values.

TABLE 11

## Hypothetical Profile on Mode-of-conduct Values

Values	<u>Dropouts</u>		<u>Persisters</u>		t	p
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks		
1. Being organized	7.97	8	4.92	2	3.90	.000
2. Competition	14.59	17	15.88	17		
3. Control	10.91	11	9.72	12		
4. Cooperation	6.26	6	5.14	3		
5. Discussion	8.68	10	9.62	11		
6. Encouragement	4.91	1	6.40	4	1.87	.065
7. Equal opportunity	6.18	4	7.46	7		
8. Evaluation	12.88	14	13.92	15		
9. Freedom	8.35	9	9.28	10		
10. Humour	6.24	5	6.90	6		
11. Individualization	6.50	7	7.46	8		
12. Order	11.47	12	10.92	13		
13. Self-discipline	5.53	3	6.70	5		
14. Quiet	13.38	16	15.82	16	4.56	.000
15. Respect for others	5.03	2	4.08	1		
16. Structure	12.56	13	13.12	14		
17. Student centered	13.24	15	7.56	9	6.03	.000
18. Teacher centered	16.06	18	16.10	18		

Cases = 84 d.f. = 82

Hotelling T Square = 323.56 (17,96), p < .000

Paralleling the composite rank order in the end-state values, the trend in the mode-of-conduct values continued from people-oriented to structure-oriented values. Considering both sets of values, there was a slight tendency for persisters to be more people-oriented than dropouts.

Appendix Three

Student Comments

Persisters

"My personal feelings are to persevere and never quit anything I begin, a philosophy that works for me."

"I've considered it (withdrawing), out of confusion and frustration at times, but never seriously."

"I have thought of withdrawing, but not seriously, only as a passing whim."

"I have not seriously considered withdrawing, however at times I have doubted my own abilities."

"... overworked for amount of time."

"... pressure of course work."

"I have felt the need for 'time out' but felt that this could wait until I finished this year."

"Just not sure if teaching is for me."

"Frustration with regard to the usefulness of certain courses makes me wonder about whether I'm wasting my time. Also lack of employment opportunities next year may make this year an academic exercise."

"A lot of courses seem to be a waste of time."

"See a lot of frustration because of an archaic system. Don't want to keep feeling useless."

"As a single parent I need a job. When employment figures for teachers look so poor, one wonders why one continues with being broke and never really having enough time for other things beside studies."

### Dropouts

#### Category One: Wrong Occupational Choice

"My goal was to work with the handicapped and the program was not directly related to this. I have, since enrolling in the program, found a suitable teaching position with the mentally retarded."

"I am not a person who is comfortable in social situations as the centre of attention and organizer of others."

"... My exposure to junior high schools and the professional year program convinced me I was in the wrong vocation."

"... I got a job, more in my field than I perceive teaching to be. I do see great potential in teaching - but not as it is in our school system..."

"I needed time out.... There just seemed too much to learn this year."

"Teaching was not what I wanted as a career (I discovered this after my practicum)."

"Did not feel I wanted to teach in the given structure."

"I left the university because I missed my fiance ... also found that I was not personally attuned to classroom teaching and prefer outdoor learning experiences."

"It would have been o.k. if I had wanted to teach. I don't feel I learned too much in the classes."

"I was disinterested in teaching from the start. I don't know why I stayed as long as I did. The only thing I enjoyed about it was the children."

#### Category Two: Disillusioned

"The main reason I withdrew from student training was I saw many contradictions and inconsistencies between methods used in university training and the actual methods taught in elementary school system ..."

"Bored with the manner in which the textbooks present much of the syllabus material."

"I found in most cases the needs of the students were not being met."

"... not enough emphasis on a variety of teaching skills and methods - not enough time to do a proper job."

"My main reason for leaving the university program near the end of my third year was the attitude of the professors. ... one professor that treated us like children we were being taught how to teach. ... I try to do my 'utmost' to finish something I have started, but that year was too much for me."

"... I noticed on my practicum that teachers weren't really interested in teaching, didn't care, were not serious, students didn't give a damn about academic achievement, sports was the main goal!"

"The main reason I withdrew from the program was the negative attitude of the school teachers. Most teachers I spoke with felt their jobs were neither rewarding nor goal-achieving, and all expressed strong doubts about job opportunities for beginning teachers. I withdrew because I was discouraged."

"... 'Teaching should be such that what is offered is perceived as a valuable gift and not as hard duty.' A. Einstein. My thinking about my professional training is that only 10% of it is of any use. ..."

"Disillusioned with the education received and with the system to be entered."

"... The whole atmosphere was totally sterile and frustrating."

"... The program stressed the manipulation of materials, precise planning, etc., to replace instead of assisting human values; to become a store front dummy rather than a living example. ..."

"... A methods teacher exhorts us to be creative in our teaching, use discovery methods, make allowances for the children's individual differences, their differing backgrounds, do exciting projects with the children... but he teaches us by standing behind a lectern at the front of the room, assigning us identical research, making no allowances for our differing backgrounds. I'm sure he was totally unaware of his hypocrisy ..."

'The intention is for the children to develop neat, legible handwriting, and their own style.' She then proceeds to instruct us in the McLean's Method, with its many entirely arbitrary rules. ...

... suggestion to the Phys. Ed. methods teacher that there should be at least some instruction in non-competitive games produced the response that 'in the intermediate grades the curriculum emphasis is on development of skills in sports'--i.e., competitive games ...

In virtually all the courses, the emphasis was on: teaching from the top down (by the lecturer at the students); writing rather than speaking; acceptance rather than questioning, inventing, discovering; busy work (filling in little charts, forms, collecting piles of papers); conformity; administerial trivia.

Where were those winds of change that had blown through education in the past twenty years? ...

The third factor in my decision to quit the professional year was the ... teaching experience. ... The scene could have been my own school days 25 years earlier.

... Why did intelligent responsive human beings have to refrain from speaking to one another, line up in order to leave the room, do the identical thing at the identical time, and obey a written list of 25 school rules all starting with DON'T as well as a myriad of smaller arbitrary requirements? ...

... I'm glad to have an opportunity to let someone know why I really quit. Maybe because of your research project some changes may be made. ..."

## Appendix Four

TABLE 12

End-state Value Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), and Ranges for Dropouts and Persisters

<u>Value</u>	<u>Dropouts/Persisters</u>		
	<u>Means</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
1. Acceptance	12.0/10.3	4.5/4.3	1-18/1-18
2. Achievement	8.4/ 9.4	4.3/4.3	1-18/1-17
3. Attention	14.1/14.5	3.0/3.3	6-18/3-18
4. Being Correct	14.9/16.0	2.9/2.9	8-18/4-18
5. Cleanliness	13.6/12.8	3.8/4.6	4-18/1-18
6. Creativity	8.7/10.2	4.6/4.1	1-18/1-17
7. Discovery	10.8/11.9	4.0/3.6	1-18/1-18
8. Empathy	9.6/ 8.6	4.6/5.2	1-18/1-18
9. Happiness	4.7/ 4.4	4.2/4.1	1-14/1-16
10. Honesty	5.4/ 5.1	3.7/4.0	1-15/1-16
11. Independence	7.8/ 8.0	4.4/3.9	1-18/1-17
12. Obedience	15.5/15.7	3.8/2.6	2-18/5-18
13. Open-Minded	7.3/ 6.9	3.8/3.6	1-16/1-16
14. Politeness	12.2/10.6	4.2/3.8	3-18/2-18
15. Purposefulness	7.5/ 8.7	4.3/3.7	1-15/1-16
16. Responsibility	7.5/ 6.7	3.2/3.6	1-13/1-15
17. Self-determination	7.5/ 6.4	3.7/3.7	1-15/1-17
18. Self-respect	3.8/ 4.5	3.1/3.5	1-16/1-15

\* d.f. = 113

TABLE 13

Mode-of-Conduct Value Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), and Ranges for Dropouts and Persisters

---

<u>Value</u>	<u>Dropouts/Persisters</u>		
	<u>Means</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
1. Being Organized	7.8/ 5.6	2.9/4.0	2-14/1-15
2. Competition	15.2/15.9	3.9/3.3	3-18/4-18
3. Control	10.9/10.5	4.5/4.8	2-18/2-18
4. Cooperation	6.2/ 5.5	3.3/3.1	1-15/1-14
5. Discussion	8.8/ 9.4	3.9/3.4	2/17/3-18
6. Encouragement	4.8/ 5/9	3.9/3.3	1-15/1-13
7. Equal Opportunity	6.4/ 7.1	3.3/4.1	1-16/1-16
8. Evaluation	13.3/13.7	2.6/2.6	7-18/8-18
9. Freedom	8.0/ 8.9	4.8/4.3	1-17/1-17
10. Humour	5.9/ 6.5	3.8/3.7	1-15/1-14
11. Individualization	6.2/ 6.6	6.2/7.0	1-18/1-17
12. Order	11.7/11.2	3.2/4.1	3-17/3-18
13. Self-Discipline	6.2/ 6.6	3.6/3.5	1-15/1-14
14. Quiet	13.9/15.2	3.1/2.4	4-18/6-18
15. Respect for Others	4.8/ 4.1	4.0/2.9	1-17/1-13
16. Structure	12.8/12.9	3.1/3.0	4-17/5-17
17. Student Centered	11.8/ 8.6	4.9/4.5	1-18/1-18
18. Teacher Centered	15.9/16.0	2.9/2.3	5-18/8-18

---

VITA

Surname: STRUPYNSKI Given Names: LAWRENCE HENRY

Place of Birth: VEGREVILLE, ALTA. Date of Birth: AUG. 26, 1946

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

OKANAGAN COLLEGE, VERNON, B.C. 1965 to 1966

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, BURNABY, B.C. 1966 to 1970

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B.C. 1978 to 1979

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

BACHELOR OF ARTS 1971 SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Honors and Awards:

BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS, 1967/68, 1968/69, and 1969/70

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA STAFF ASSOCIATESHIP, 1978/79

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make *single copies only* for cash users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

THE RELATIONSHIP OF VALUES

TO DECISIONS TO PERSIST IN

OR WITHDRAW FROM

TEACHER TRAINING

Author



*Signature*

Lawrence (Larry) Henry Strutynski

*Name (typewritten)*

July 20, 1979

*Date*