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The study was made to determine student reasons for withdrawing from classes. Questionnaires were sent to 3,568 students who had withdrawn from 6,081 courses. Of this number, a total of 1,434 students answered questions about 2,190 courses and gave their reasons for withdrawing. It was found that most students withdraw from one course. A. student's sex and age have no bearing on his withdrawing, nor does his being a part-time or full-time student seem to have any influence. Fultiple causation is often present. Those reasons that seem to be most influential are combinations of personal and academic reasons. The ave mos common reasons given, though, were: job conflict, lack of interest, wrong program, academic difficulty, and conflict with the teacher.

In the spring semester of 1968 , a total of 3,563 students withdrew from 6,081 courses. (In this study withdraw refers to the act of vfficially dropning a course any time after the student officially enrolled in that course.) At the same time the campus enrollment was 10,398 , not including the students in the 1.2 week semester for the Division of Industrial Technology.

The college needs to know why these students withdrew from the courses. The reasons for the withdrawals could point to ways of reducing this withdrawal rate. Reducing this rate can be economical not only in dollars but in human energy. Also, it is not safe to assume that all students who withdrew from courses do not have the ability to succeed in those courses. It is probable, too, that with extra help some of those students who withdrew fiom courses light succeed in courses more basic than the usual introductory courses. Other students may be able to be salvaged if they are given help that is other than academic.

The first objective was to pose all of the questions that the study should try to answer. These questions were then narrowed to five general nuestions:

1. What kind of a student withdraws (age, sex, part-time or full-time)?
2. When do students withdraw?
3. Is there any significance between ACT or SCAT-COOP scores and withdrawals?
4. Are some courses withdrawn from more often than others?
5. Why do students withdraw from courses?

Then a nre-coled questionnaire was designed to answer these questions. The problem was making it as complete as possible yet making it as brief and as simple as possible (see Appendix A). If the student withdrew from one course, he was sent one cony of Form A. If the student withdrew from two courses, he was sent two conies of Form A. If the student withdrew from three or more courses, he was sent one copy of Form B. This last sten was taken because it was felt that the student was actually beginning to withdraw from a significant part of bis rrogram. It was also assumed that few students would be very responsive to receiving six or seven questionnaires, if that many courses had been dronped. Then these questionnaires were returned the responses were then duplicated on copies of Form A. This means, then, that a student who withdrew from six courses now had a questionnaire for each course.

The names of these students were obtained from the Records Office. As the green drop-slips were returned to that office from Data Processing they were sent to the researcher, who made a copy of the name, stident number, date, address, and courses dropped. The drop-slips were then returned to the Records Office.

Railing the questionnaires started when the final date of withdrawal had passed and all of the drop slips- had been processed. This occurred on June 1, 1968. Addressed, stamped envelopes were included. The last of the cuestionnaires were mailed on July 9, 1968. This was a timeconsuming task because only two people did the mailing and questionnaires were sent to all students who officially withdrew from any course at any time after they had officially enrolled.

When the questionnaires were returned the next task was started. Since the students' names were not on the questionnaires, it was necessary to locate them by their student numbers. This was simplified by dating the questionnaires and coding them according to whether the secretary or the researcher sent them out.

This rather intricate device was needed so that the test scores could be added to the questionnaires as they were returned (see Appendix B). The test scores used were those scores that were used by the college for admittance information. These scores were taken from the official records supplied by the Records office.

The questionnaires, with attached test scores, were then key-punched and sent through a card sorter to answer the questions found in Appendix C. Many of these questions were those same auestions asked prior to designing the questionnaires. This was completed by mid-Novemier.

What kind of student withdraws?
During the spring semester of 1968 a total of 3,568 students officially withdrew from 6,081 courses. Questionnaires were sent to all of these students. Out of that number, 1,434 studen $;$ returned auestionnaires that accounted for 2,190 of the courses. This return, then, accounts for $40.19 \%$ of the students and $36.01 \%$ of the courses. This study is based on that return.

Those 1,434 students withdrew from one to eight courses. An analysis of the number of courses dropped can be found below.

Distribution of the Number of Courses Dronped

| number of courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| number of students | 962 | 309 | 86 | 47 | 21 | 7 | 1 | 1 |

Table 1

The chart shows that the greatest number of students who withdrew from courses, withdrew from one course. The mean number of drops was 1.53 courses.

The number of students who responded to the questionnaire can also be analyzed in terms of sex and whether they were full-time or part-time students.

> Distribution by Number of Courses ( in pct.)

| Type of student | Categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| male FT <br> $n=489$ | 65.24 | 18.81 | 5.72 | 5.72 | 3.27 | 1.02 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |
| male PT <br> $n=393$ | 69.72 | 20.36 | 7.63 | 2.04 | 0.25 | - | $\cdots$ | - |  |
| female FT <br> $n=213$ | 64.32 | 24.88 | 5.63 | 2.82 | 0.94 | 0.94 | $\cdots$ | 0.47 |  |
| female PT <br> $n=264$ | 70.06 | 25.000 | 4.17 | 0.76 | - | -- | $\cdots$ | 0.38 |  |

Table 2
Legend
n=number of students
$\mathrm{FT}=$ Full-time student
PT=Part-time student

Also, according to the registration figures, of the total enrollment 9,273 were males and 3,032 were females. (This includes the 12 -week Technical courses.) This gives a total enrollment of 12,305 . Looked at another way, $75.36 \%$ were males, and $24.64 \%$ were females. Of those who responded to the questionnaire 477 , or $35.11 \%$, were females, and 882 , or $64.88 \%$, were males.

In order to put the above figures in a truer perspective, it is necessary to mention the Technical division. Of the 1954 students who enrolled in 12 -week courses, 1942 were males and only 12 were females. This tends to skew the figures. So, for all other divisions, the percents were: $70.80 \%$ were males and $20.20 \%$ were females. of those who responded to the questionnaire $64.88 \%$, or 882 , were males, and $35.11 \%$, or 477 , were females. This shows the withdrawal rate to be within about $6 \%$ of the enrollment figures for each sex.

This same kind of analysis must also te done in terms of those who withdrew from a course or courses and were either part-time or full-time students. In terms of the total enrolment figure of 12,305 (prior to the dates for changing or withdrawing from classes) there were 0,394 who were full-time students and 5,911 who were part-time students. However, in the 12-week Technical courses there were only 106 full-time students out of 1954. This means, then, that 1,848 were part-time students

Again, subtracting these Technical figures may give a clearer picture of what is taking place generally at "acomb. The enrollnent figure for all other divisions was 10,351 . This shows that $62.12 \%$ of the students were full-time students and $37.88 \%$ were part-time students. Now of those who returned the questionnaires 702 or $51.66 \%$ were full-time students and 657 or $48.34 \%$ were part-time students.

As should be expected, most of tie students who returned questionnaires were in the $18-22$ year-old bracket: $78.24 \%$ were in that bracket. The rest of the students' ages ranged from 23 to 54 years of age.
: lost students who withdrew from courses do so according to the significant dates listed in the catalog, The dates ranged from January 2 to :lay 30.

DISTRIBUTION OF NMBER AND DATES ON WHICH STUDENTS WITHDREN

| 01/02-1 | 02/29-36 | 04/11-32 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01/04-8 | 03/01-7 | 04/15-2 |
| 01/10-1 | 03/02-2 | 04/16-2 |
| 01/13-5 | 03/04-10 | 04/18-10 |
| 01/17-1 | 03/05-12 | 04/22-44) |
| 01/19-1 | 03/06-10 | 04/23-34 ) Mid |
| 01/22-8 | 03/07-14 | 04/24-36) term |
| 01/23-1 | 03/08-11 | 04/25-70) week |
| 01/25-1 | 03/03-1 | 04/26-105) |
| 01/26-16 | 03/11-37 | 04/27-2 |
| 01/29-8 | 03/12-8 | 04/29-22 |
| 01/31-1 | 03/13-31 | 04/30-16 |
| 02/01-14 | 03/14-14 | 05/01-5 |
| 02/02-5 | 03/15-2 | 05/02-14 |
| 02/05-5 | 03/18-20 | 05/03-16 |
| 02/06-2 | 03/19-27 | 05/06-9 |
| 02/07-9 | 03/20-7 | 05/07-18 |
| 02/08-6 | 03/21-20 | 05/08-14 |
| 02/09-24 | 03/22-11 | 05/09-15 |
| 02/12-32) | 03/23-1 | 05/10-20 |
| 02/13-46) 1st week | 03/25-14 | 05/13-28 |
| 02/14-44) of | 03/25-8 | 05/14-13 |
| 02/15-586) classes | 03/27-29 | 05/15-16 |
| 02/16-22) | 03/28-17 | 05/16-12 |
| 02/17-9 | 03/29-15 | 05/17-1 |
| 02/18-1 | 03/30-8 | 05/18-1 |
| 02/19-55 ) extension | 04/01-40 | 05/20-25) |
| 02/20-147) of | 04/02-86 | 05/21-22) last week |
| 02/21-15 ) change | 04/03-34 | 05/22-37 ) of |
| 02/22-10) of | 04/04-50 | 05/23-29 ) withdrawals |
| 02/23-11 ) elections | 04/05-28 | 05/24-37) |
| 02/24-5 | 04/08-7 | 05/27-4 |
| 02/26-9 | 04/09-2 | 05/29-2 |
| 02/27-22 | 04/10-23 | 05/30-1 |

Table 3.

Is there any significance between ACT or SCAT-COOP scores and withdrawals?

MEAN SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO DROPPED COURSES
SPPING, 1968

| Entrance Test |  | Categories* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven |
|  |  | $\mathrm{n}=332$ | $\mathrm{n}=106$ | $\mathrm{n}=26$ | $n=13$ | $n=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ |
| $\stackrel{E}{\mathrm{E}}$ | Verb. | 44.36 | 41.79 | 51.65 | 35.85 | 40.33 | 51.50 | 43 |
|  | Quant. | 46.44 | 36.25 | 45.88 | 47.00 | 50.50 | 58.50 | 59 |
|  | Total | 42.14 | 36.82 | 44.81 | 37.54 | 43.17 | 51.00 | 43 |
| 若 | Vocab. | 42.32 | 42,00 | 45.88 | 40.69 | 36.00 | 49.50 | 53 |
|  | Speed | 37.11 | 34.92 | 49.84 | 39.54 | 38.50 | 36.50 | 77 |
|  | Express | 28.86 | 25.65 | 28.04 | 24.54 | 14.33 | 12.50 | 41 |
|  |  | $n=301$ | $\mathrm{n}=96$ | $n=24$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $n=1$ |
| ¢ | Eng. | 31.15 | 26.29 | 27.54 | 33.67 | 21.82 | 12. | . 02 |
|  | Math. | 28.31 | 25.40 | 29.67 | 34.75 | 28.18 | 29. | . 01 |
|  | Soc.St. | 36.51 | 31.28 | 40.75 | 34.92 | 23.00 | 43. | . 01 |
|  | Nat.Sci. | 31.88 | 31.81 | 32.67 | 39.17 | 31.91 | 28. | . 02 |
|  | Comp. | 28.63 | 25.08 | 29.42 | 35.92 | 22.55 | 26. | . 01 |

Table 4
Legend:
n=number of subjects
Categories refers to the number of courses withdrawn from.

Whether a particular student took the SCAT-COOP tests or the ACT test seems to have no bearing on his withdrawal because the mean scores are relatively high.

Are some courses withdrawn from more than others?

CO: PARISON (IN PCT.) OF IITHDRANAL RATES BY COURSES

|  |  | 6081 | 2190 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course * | \% of those who withdrew | \% of total of courses withdrawn from | \% of total of courses in questionnaires |
| ACC 110 | 17.36 | 0.82 | 2.28 |
| ACC 111 | 21.74 | 0.49 | 1.36 |
| ACC 211 | 10.00 | 0.33 | 0.91 |
| ACC 90 | 7.54 | 0.32 | 0.91 |
| ART 101 | 11.11 | 0.28 | 7.78 |
| ART 131 | 2.34 | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| ART 140 | 5.56 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| ART 191 | 2.80 | 0.07 | 0.18 |
| ART 211 | 12.90 | 0.07 | 0.18 |
| ART 231 | 6.66 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| ART 292 | 5.40 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| AST 100 | 5.64 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| AST 101 | 6.25 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| BIO 100 | 8.52 | 0.64 | 1.78 |
| BIO 110 | 7.81 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| BIO 120 | 7.33 | 0.18 | 0.50 |
| BIO 131 | 4.76 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| BL 110 | 5.96 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| BL 111 | 1.94 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| CHEM 103 | 14.56 | 0.24 | 0.68 |
| CHEM 104 | 16.90 | 0.20 | 0.55 |
| CHEM 107 | 17.78 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| CHEM 210 | 11.11 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| CHEM 99 | 9.86 | 0.24 | 0.68 |
| CON 160 | 4.31 | 0.32 | 0.91 |
| DIT 100 | 10.66 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| DP 101 | 4.19 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| DP 102 | 1.88 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| DP 201 | 6.90 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| DP 203 | 6.06 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| ECON 100 | 4.95 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| ECON 101 | 6.24 | 0.56 | 1.55 |
| ECON 102 | 15.88 | 0.72 | 2.01 |

Course*

EDT 100
EDT 101
EDT 105
EDT 110

EGR 110
EGR 111
EGR 120
EGR 121
ENG 104
ENC 105
ENG 110
ENG 120
ENG 190
ENG 210
ENG 231
ENG 232
ENG 240
ENG 244
ENG 245
ENG 246
ENG 257
ENG 50
ENG 60
ENG 70
ENG 90
ENG 91

FR 101
FR 102
FR 202
FR 90
GAT 170
GB 150
GEOG 101
GEOG 211
GEOG 252
GEOL 102
\% of those \% of total who with of courses drew withdrawn from
0.03
0.09
0.18
0.09
0.09
5.00
19.04
2.74
6.45
0.06
0.03
$\%$ of total of courses in questionnaires
.
0.36
0.13
0.23
0.09
0.14
0.13
0.36
14.81
0.12
0.32
2.22
6.16
6.80
0.09
0.09
1.28
1.23
0.04
0.09
0.09
0.91
0.32
1.28
0.32
0.18
1.14
0.68 section)
12.28
13.40
11.76
23.53
0.12
0.32
0.59
0.09
0.18
0.05
2.05
11.36
6.84
.67
1.87
0.23
2.70
3.70
0.02
0.05

|  |  | 6081 | 2190 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course* | \% of those who withdrew | $\%$ of total of courses withdrawn from | \% of total of courses in questionnaires |
| GER 101 | 9.30 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| GER 102 | 7.69 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| GER 90 | 7.14 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| HIS 101 | 12.39 | 0.71 | 1.96 |
| HIS 102 | 3.63 | 0.18 | 0.50 |
| HIS 113 | 4.34 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| HIS 249 | 9.68 | 0.39 | 1.10 |
| HIS 250 | 7.29 | 0.23 | 0.64 |
| HMM 150 | 1.47 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| HMM. 160 | 5.86 | 0.41 | 1.14 |
| ILT 101 | 1.52 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| ILT 102 | 3.70 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| ILT 104 | 11.54 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| MAT 101 | 2.86 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| MAT 102 | 6.98 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| MA 100 | 20.09 | 1.44 | 4.02 |
| MA 101 | 10.60 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| MA 102 | 43.75 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| MA 111 | 16.22 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| MA 115 | 22.94 | 0.41 | 1.14 |
| MA 116 | 6.93 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| MA 118 | 13.90 | 0.85 | 2.37 |
| 1 A 155 | 12.92 | 0.31 | 0.87 |
| MA 156 | 8.82 | 0.14 | 0.41 |
| MA 257 | 5.56 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| MA 258 | 6.25 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| MA 260 | 9.09 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| MA 90 | 11.92 | 0.64 | 1.78 |
| MCMT 101 | 5.30 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| MKTG 101 | 4.27 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| MKTG 102 | 1.28 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| MKTG 202 | 12.82 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| MUS 102 | 20.00 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| MUS 120 | 13.79 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| MUS 121 | 23.80 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| MUS 131 | 6.80 | 0.23 | 0.64 |
| MUS 136 | 5.56 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| MS 137 | 4.76 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| MLS 138 | 28.57 | 0.06 | 0.18 |


|  |  | 6081 | 2190 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course* | \% of those who withdrew | \% of total of courses withdrawn from | \% of total of courses in questionnaires |
| MUS 150 | 25.00 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| MUS 151 | 15.38 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| MUS 180 | 14.28 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| MUS. 235 | 8.83 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| MUS 271 | 21.05 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| MUS 280 | 40.00 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| NAT SCI 150 | 10.39 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| NAT SCI 160 | 5.15 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| NR 210 | 6.25 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| NR 212 | 6.25 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| 00110 | 2.92 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| 00180 | 7.76 | 0.14 | 0.41 |
| 00181 | 7.86 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| 00182 | 8.57 | 0.20 | 0.55 |
| 00183 | 8.59 | 0.18 | 0.50 |
| 00184 | 10.60 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| 00185 | 7.24 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| 00275 | 11. 00 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| 00280 | 1.78 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| 00284 | 2.50 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| 00285 | 12.76 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| 00287 | 14.28 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| 00288 | 7.69 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| 00290 | 7.58 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| 00291 | 14.28 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| 0 291a | 16.00 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| 00294 | 5.00 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| ORI 160 | 8.43 | 0.59 | 1.64 |
| PE 100 M | 7.27 | 0.39 | 1.10 |
| PE 101W | 16.03 | 0.34 | 0.96 |
| PE 114AG | 4.00 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| PE 114AT | 7.41 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| PE 114SM | 9.72 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| PE 114SW | 2.67 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| PE 114M | 9.34 | 0.16 | 0.46 |
| PE 114 MD | 13.46 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| PE 114 W | $\begin{array}{r} 100.00(\mathrm{Ca} \\ \text { led } \\ \text { tio } \end{array}$ | 100.00 | 0.18 |
| PE 114WT | 3.84 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| PE 114RS | 20.78 | 0.25 | 0.73 |
| PE 185 | 9.09 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| PE 200 | $\begin{array}{r} 100.00(\mathrm{Ca} \\ \mathrm{sec} \end{array}$ | $\text { led } 0.04$ <br> (s)) | 0.14 |


| Course* | \% of those who withdrew | \% of total of courses withdrawn from | \% of total of courses in questionnaires |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHIL 201 | 6.99 | 0.16 | 0.46 |
| PHIL 205 | 8.87 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| PH SCI 101 | 10.18 | 0.44 | 1.23 |
| PH SCI 102 | 3.75 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| PHY 125 | 11.11 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| PHY 24.5 | 7.14 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| PHY 99 | 10.16 | 0.10 | 0.27 |
| PSY 101 | 6.38 | 1.52 | 4.25 |
| PSY 210 | 2.17 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| PSY 215 | 6.45 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| PSY 220 | 5.46 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| PSY 230 | 4.83 | 0.31 | 0.86 |
| PSY 240 | 2.27 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| PS 100 | 7.00 | 1.24 | 3.47 |
| PS 140 | 4.22 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| PS 160 | 2.82 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| StT 101 | 21.56 | 0.18 | 0.50 |
| SOC SCI 150 | 1.45 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| SOC SCI 160 | 4.78 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| SOC 100 | 6.68 | 0.80 | 2.24 |
| SOC 103 | 13.45 | 0.49 | 1.37 |
| SOC 245 | 2.56 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| SOC 275 | 9.52 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| SPA 101 | 12.82 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| SPA 102 | 4.42 | 0.41 | 0.23 |
| SPA 90 | 12.90 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| SP 100 | 7.72 | 1.05 | 2.92 |
| SF 210 | 5.68 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| SP 220 | 2.40 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| SP 240 | 15.00 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| SP 280 | 7.69 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| SUM 1012 | 28.57 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| SUR 201 | 3.70 3.33 | 0.02 0.02 | 0.05 0.05 |


| Course* | $\%$ of those <br> who with- <br> drew | \% of total <br> of courses <br> withdrawn <br> from | $\frac{\%}{\%}$ of total <br> of courses <br> in <br> questionnaires |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Al1 12-week <br> Tech classes | 15.25 | 4.90 | 13.61 |
| IEAN | 10.72 | 0.24 | 0.68 |
| RANGE | 1.28 to 100 | 0.01 to 100 | 0.04 to 7.78 |

Table 5

* Course code may be found in the Spring Schedule of Classes for 1968.

Even though the range is very wide, no department seems to have a significantly greater number of students withdrawing from its courses in comparison to the number of students taking courses in that denartment. Invariably when the withdrawal rate is rather high, it is because at least one or more sections were cancelled. These, however, are noted in Table 5. Certain departments do, though, come consistently closer to the mean than others.

Why do students withdraw?
Since the questionnaires allowed students to give as many as four reasons out of 17 reasons (see Appendix A), the four reasons most often given in each of the four positions are in the following table;

HIERARCHY OF REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL

Reason


Table 6A

| Second Jost | Job conflict | $n=217$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Important | Lack of interest in subject | $n=198$ |
| Reason | Wrong program | $n=129$ |
|  | Academic difficulty | $n=122$ |
|  |  | Total= |
|  |  |  |

Table 6B

| Third Most | Lack of interest in subject | $n=1231$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Important | Job conflict | $n=37$ |
| Reason | Conflict with teacher | $n=71$ |
|  | Academic difficulty | $n=59$ |
|  |  | Total= $\quad 340$ |

Table 6C


Table 60
$\mathrm{n}=$ number of questionnaires that had that particular response. This number does not refer to the number of students because some students are represented by more than one questionnaire.

Just by looking at the various numbers and totals of responses in the above four tables, one can begin to see that a student doesn't drop for one reason necessarily, but that he may have several reasons for withdrawing.

By computing the number of responses for any given reason, regardless of whether or not it is in the hierarchy in the various tables, the reasons and their positions change again.

DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL

| Job conflict | $n=777$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Academic difficulty | $n=388$ |
| Wrong program | $n=382$ |
| Lack of interest | $n=336$ |

Table 6E

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{n}= & \text { number of questionnaires that had tinat particular response. This } \\
& \text { number does not refer to the number of students because some students } \\
& \text { are represented by more than one questionnaire. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Of the reasons immediately above, one nay be deemed personal and the other three may be deemed academic. Even though job conflict was the most common of all responses, the other three most common resnonses are other than personal, in fact, academic, and outnumber the most common one by roughly 1.5 to 1.

The fourth most common response is of course indicative of an attitude or attitudes.

When asked what thei r attitudes were toward the course or program, they responded as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDES (in Pct.)

| Pesnonses | Pct. |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| No response | 16.35 |  |
| I liked it very much | 16.51 |  |
| I liked it | 33.26 |  |
| I was indifferent about it | 23.50 |  |
| I disliked it | 7.87 |  |
| I disliked it very much | 2.51 |  |
| Total 100.00 |  |  |

Table 7

This looks admirable when one considers that $49.77 \%$ said they either "liked it very much" or "liked it"; and in terms of those who responded, the percentage for those two responses would be even higler. Other judgments and conclusions can be reached by looking at four pieces of data at one time: the reasons for withdrawal, the student's attitude, his rating of his academic standing, and his rating of his relationship to his teacher or teachers.

COMPARISON OF REASON TO ATTITUDE, CLASS STANDING, AND STUDENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIP.

| Reason | Attitude | Class Standing | Student/Teacl:er Relationshin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Conflict |  |  |  |
| 777* | 251 | 114 |  |
| Lack of Interest 493* | 382 Rated |  | 260 |
| Wrong Program 412*: | 219 as 3, 4 | 7 Rated | Rated |
| Academic Difficulty | 219 oruestion- | 79 as 4 | 165 as 4 , or |
| 392* | 200 naire | 193 | 157 |
| Conflict with Teacher 261*+ | 124. | 57 |  |

Table 8

[^0]Takle 8, as well as Tables 6A-6E, begins to suggest multiple causation for withdrawing. For instance, the student who says he withdrew because of a job conflict could very easily have had an attitude not conducive to college work. He could also have a low academic standing and a weak relationship with his teacher. All of these factors seem to be playing a part in students' reasons for withdrawal.

It is interesting to examine the figures in Taile 8 for Academic difficulty. Of the 392 responses to this item 200 , over $50 \%$, rated their attitude as being that of indifference, dislike or great dislike (see Appendix A Form A p.3.) This seems only logical that they disliked that which they did not understand. But, of those same 392, less than half said their academic standing was poor or failing.

This same kind of discrepancy can be found in the figures for Conflict with teacher. Of the 261 who gave this as a reason for withdrawal, onily 154 responded that their relationship with their teachers was one of three possibilities: The relationship was poor; I wasn't there long enough to judge; There was no relationship at all.

## What kind of student withdraws?

Certain characteristics cannot be deemed as being significant indicators of students who withdraw. Two of these characteristics are sex and age. A third is the stident's status, whether he is part-time or full-time.

## lhen do students withdraw?

Withdrawal rates are related to certain dates on the college calendar. There is a great deal of course-changing during change of elections. The next peak comes during the mid-term week, which is the last week students can withdraw without penalty. The next peak comes during the last week they can officially withdraw from courses.

The only recommendation that can be made at this time concerns dates of regisiration. These dates need to be studied to prevent students from registering before they have been thoroughly counseled. Returning students also need to know prior to registration that they have or have not successfully completed prerequisites.
Is there any significance between ACT or SCAT-COOP scores and withdrawals?
According to the mean scores, no relationship is suggested. The scores do begin to indicate that students do not necessarily withdraw because they lack the ability to succeed academically. Indeed, generally, the scores suggest that many of the students who withdraw could actually succeed in the courses from which they withdraw.

Puch more sophisticated and thorough examination of these tests, especially the ACT, needs to be done immediately. Since the college uses the scores as indicators for entrance into a course or program, it would seem logical to find out if these test scores can be even better indicators of withdrawal.

Are some courses withdrawn from more than others?
Obviously, those courses and departments that serve a large number of students have more students withdrawing from them. Of course, this does not mean that these courses or departments are less successful or doing their jobs less effectively than others. What is important is the withdrawal rate of each course or department. As shown in the table, there is a large range but no department or course seems to stand out.

It is recomended to those departments that do serve large numbers of students in certain courses, that they use the information the researcher has in his office to begin to build profiles of students who most frequently withdraw from their courses.

The study shows that a student often withdravs for more than one reason. This is multiple causation. The reasons may be personal or academic, but the different categories of reasons often become intertwined. Some of those who said they withdrew because of acadenic difficulty ranked themselves as doing average work or better in the class. It may be that they have a difficult time admitting to themselves that they are failing. It may also suggest disagreement with the teachers' judgments. This kind of discrepancy is also suggested by the number of students who said they withdrew because of a conflict with the teacher, yet rated their relationship with teachers rather high. This, of course, may be a question of not being able to respond honestly in interpersonal relationships. All of this taken together points out attitudinal problems related to college experience. This is what all of the data points to. This accounts for certain characteristics not being relevant, it accounts for the mean scores being relatively high, and it also accounts for multiple causation as well as discrepancies between reasons for withdrawal and other related factors.

This conclusion calls for more than one reconmendation. We need to identify students who withdraw before they withdraw. This can only be done b. follow-up studies that will find the more specific characteristics of etuderts who withdraw. This study also needs to be an ongoing study. This is a full-time job for several people. Probably part of this work can and should be done through the individual departments and/or areas.

Changes in the counseling area also need to take place. Realistically much of this work should probably be done by this area. In order for this to occur the college needs people specifically trained to cope with the kinds of problems suggested by conflict in attitudes. This may mean the hiring of more professional staff. It may also mean freeing some of present staff of tasks they now have so that they may work with these students.

## Dear Sutdent:

Macomb County Cormunity College is presently conducting a study to find out why students drop courses. From this study the college hopes to begin to find ways that will allow more students to complete the courses they enroll in.

To do this study, the college needs your assistance. Would you complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them in the self-addressed stamped envelope? Please mail them as soon as possible.

Since the study is designed to look at groups of students rather than individual students, would you please respond as frankly as possible. The information gained from the questionnaires will not become part of your record and the information will be treated wi.th the utmost confidence. This is why we have used only your social security number rather than your name. This nurber will be used only for coding purposes and will not identify you in any way.

If you have any questions about the questionnaires, please call 772-8000, ext. 270.

## DIRECTIOMS

Our records show that you have dropped the following course:


Enclosed you will find one questionnaire for each course you dropped. Answer the questions for each course on the appropriate questionnaire. You will notice that there are boxes adjacent to each cuestion. In general, the number of boxes for each question i.s indicative of the number of digits requested for that question. In most cases you will need to print only one number; if this is the case the directions for doing so are in parentheses after each question. In some cases you will have several choices. Pick the response that best fits your attitude. Also, in items where a number of choices are available, please read all items before printing your answer. : please disregard the numbers in parentheses in front of each question number:
Dage 2



SCAT
$\begin{array}{ll}=\square= & (57-58) \\ =\begin{array}{ll}\text { = } & \text { Ver. } \\ \text { = } & (59-60)\end{array} & \text { Qua. } \\ (61-62) & \text { Total } 1\end{array}$

COOP


ACT


1. How many responded to eac! item?
2. How many students returned questionnaires?
3. Frequency of number of courses dropped.
4. Frequency of males and females.
5. Frequency of ages.
6. Frequency of part-time and full-time students.
7. Frequency of each course dropned.
8. Frequency of dates of drops.
9. Frequency of dates of drops by course.
10. Frequency of responses to item (28-29)
11. Frecuency of responses to item (30-31).
12. Frequency of responses to item (32-33).
13. Frequency of responses to item (34-35).
14. Frequency of drops between January 1 and February 12.
15. Frequency of drops between February 13 and April 26.
16. Frequency of drops between April 27 and "ay 24.
17. Compare responses to 40 and dates and courses, and test scores.
18. Frequency of responses to 47 compared to 30-39.
19. Frequency of responses to 48 compared to 10-13.
20. Frequency of responses to 49 compared to 10-13.
21. Frequency of responses to 50 .
22. Frequency of responses to 51.
23. Frequency of responses to 52.
24. Frequency of responses to 53.
25. Frequency of responses to 54.
26. Frequency of responses to 55 .
27. Frequency of responses to 56 ,
28. Comnare responses to $40,48,49$ of eacì student to each student's reasons for dronping.

[^0]:    *These figures reflect the total number of responses for these particular reasons.
    +This reason was added to the chart because the reason, even though it was not one of the four occurring most often, the number of responses to it did nut it in fifth position. This response helps demonstrate the point in the following paragraphs.

