TABLE NUMBER 39

Distribution of Sample by Whether Travel Time is Used for Study Purposes

GROUP	WHETHER TRAVEL TIME IS USED FOR STUDY PURPOSES	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	80 (23.0%)	268 (77.0%)
DROP-OUTS	63 (24.5%)	194 (75.5%)
DIFFERENCE	1.5%	1.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 605

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

WHETHER TRAVEL TIME IS USED FOR STUDY PURPOSES

Table 39 illustrates the distribution of the sample by whether travel time is used for study purposes, according to the percentage of students who remained in school for their second academic year.

The data in Table 39, does not produce great differences between the continuing and drop-out group. The data did not reach a level of significance. In view of these observations, it would appear that the use of travel time for study purposes is not related to the student's decision to remain at school beyond the first year.

Findings from Report 2 suggest that students who do use travel time for study purposes attempt significantly more credits than students who don't presumably because they anticipate added time while travelling to devote to studies. However, they do not obtain more credits or higher G.P.A. scores, leading to the inference that students who do use travelling time for study purposes are not necessarily more motivated, academically, but maybe that travelling time circumstances and environment are personally conducive to study. In view of this possible explanation for findings in Report 2 it is conceivable that the use of travel time for study purposes is not related to the decision to continue with or drop-out of school after the first year.

TABLE NUMBER 40

Distribution of Sample by Value of Travel Time for Studies

GROUP	VALUE OF TRAVEL TIME FOR STUDIES	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	52 (15.3%)	287 (84.7%)
DROP-OUTS	40 (15.4%)	220 (84.6%)
DIFFERENCE	0.1%	0.1%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 599

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

VALUE OF TRAVEL TIME FOR STUDY PURPOSES

Table 40 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the value of travel time for study purposes, according to the percentage of students who continued with their studies beyond the first year.

The data in Table 40 gives no indication that the perceived value of travel time for study purposes is related to the decision to remain or leave school. Actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group are slight and the data is not significant.

Findings from Report 2 suggest that students who positively value travel time for study purposes attempted and obtained significantly more credits than the other group who negatively valued travel time. It appears that the variable which may be influencing findings in Report 2 concerned with this item, namely value of time availability, is not related to the student's decision to remain at school for the second year. Clearly, the number of credits attempted and obtained as a result of greater/lesser time availability is not indicative of whether the student will drop-out of school in the second year.

TABLE NUMBER 41

Distribution of Sample by Extent Travel Time Interferes with Study Time

GROUP	EXTENT TRAVEL TIME INTERFERES WITH STUDY TIME				
	EXTREMELY	VERY MUCH	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NOT AT ALL
CONTINUING	10 (2.9%)	17 (4.9%)	70 (20.1%)	69 (19.8%)	182 (52.3%)
DROP-OUTS	8 (3.0%)	19 (7.1%)	52 (19.3%)	37 (13.8%)	153 (56.9%)
DIFFERENCE	.1%	2.2%	.8%	6.0%	4.6%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 617

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

EXTENT TRAVEL TIME INTERFERES WITH STUDY TIME

Table 41 illustrates the distribution of the sample by extent travel time interferes with study time, according to the percentage of students who remained at school for their second academic year.

The data produced in Table 41 does not reveal any consistent trend to suggest there is a relationship between the two variables in concern. Actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group are slight and the data did not reach significance.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that the degree of interference travel time has upon study time is related to the number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A. A general pattern emerges from Table 44.3, Report 2 (Groups Contrasted on Criterion Variables According to Extent Travel Time Interferes With Study Time) whereby groups who claimed study time was extremely or very much affected by travel time, attempted/obtained fewer credits and lower G.P.A. scores than other groups whose travel time did not as seriously affect study time.

In view of the data accumulated from items concerned with travel time and its relationship with study time, both in Report 2 and this Report, certain observations can be made:

(1) Travel time appears to be related to achievement in school in so far as it can either decrease or increase the total amount of available time for academic pursuits.

(2) Students who value travel time for study purposes appear to profit from this added time in that they can afford to get more involved in their studies.

(3) However, the extent of time availability which seemed to be a predictor of academic involvement in the first year was not related to the decision to pursue studies beyond the first year. Thus, it appears that students who enroll in their first year have a fairly accurate estimate of the amount of time they can devote to their university program, and are not so likely to drop-out of school because travel time interferes with their academic pursuits. In short, it seems that students follow

a program which is tailored to the amount of spare time they can afford, but that travel time does not disrupt this program over two years, in so far as the drop-out rate did not significantly exceed the continuing rate.

CHAPTER 7

PARENTAL BACKGROUND

Attention was next turned towards an examination of relationship between persistence of part-time university students and their parental socio-economic and educational backgrounds. Factors studied include father's socio-economic status, country in which parents spent most of their lives, whether parents were living together, whether the student lived with his parents, parental level of education, and attendance of a sibling at a university.

TABLE NUMBER 42

Distribution of Sample by Father's Socio-Economic Status

GROUP	FATHER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS				
	UPPER	UPPER-MIDDLE	MIDDLE	LOWER-MIDDLE	LOWER
CONTINUING	4 (1.3%)	37 (12.1%)	136 (44.6%)	96 (31.5%)	32 (10.5%)
DROP-OUTS	0 (0.0%)	30 (14.0%)	89 (41.6%)	70 (32.7%)	25 (11.7%)
DIFFERENCE	1.3%	1.9%	3.0%	1.2%	1.2%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 519

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

FATHER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Table 42 illustrates the distribution of the sample by father's socio-economic status, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies for a second year.

The data produced in Table 42 reveals slight differences between the drop-out and continuing group for any given socio-economic bracket. In addition, the data was not significant. Table 42 indicates that the level of the father's socio-economic status is not related to the student's decision to continue studies beyond the first year.

Findings from Report 2 complement results obtained from Table 42. On the whole, it was noted that the paternal socio-economic status was not related to the number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A. The 'upper-class' group did achieve and perform at a much greater level than all other groups and in Table 42, this group did not have one drop-out case; however, this finding should not be regarded too seriously as the 'upper-class' group included a very small number of students and thus the data obtained from this group may not be generalizable.

TABLE NUMBER 43

Distribution of Sample by Country Mother Lived in Predominently

GROUP	COUNTRY MOTHER LIVED IN PREDOMINENTLY			
	CANADA	EUROPE	U.S.A.	OTHER
CONTINUING	133 (52.4%)	96 (27.5%)	9 (2.6%)	61 (17.5%)
DROP-OUTS	153 (58.2%)	66 (25.1%)	4 (1.5%)	40 (15.2%)
DIFFERENCE	5.8%	2.4%	1.1%	2.3%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 612

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

COUNTRY MOTHER LIVED IN PREDOMINENTLY

Table 43 illustrates the distribution of the sample by country mother lived in predominently, according to the percentage of students who continued with their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 43 does not reveal great differences between the continuing and drop-out group for any given country bracket. In addition the data was not significant at the five percent level. However, it is interesting to note that, despite the slight differences, the data does present the expected pattern. In this Report, Tables 3., 4., 5., and 6., (Distribution of Sample by: Nationality; Country of Birth; Mother Tongue; Home Language, respectively) complement observations gathered from Table 43. In all cases, Canadian-born students, nationalized Canadian citizens, English speaking or students whose mother-tongue is English and here, in particular, students whose maternal cultural background is primarily Canadian, all have a proportionately higher drop-out rate, as compared with 'Other' groups. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that in all of the Tables previously noted, including Table 43, all groups included except the Canadian had a, proportionately higher continuing than drop-out rate.

It must be mentioned that these observations, noted above, did not all reach a level of significance nor were actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group, all that large. However, in analyzing the data accumulated from items concerned with the student's culture, nationality and language a very definite pattern does emerge.

TABLE NUMBER 44

Distribution of Sample by Country Father Lived in Predominently

GROUP	COUNTRY FATHER LIVED IN PREDOMINENTLY			
	CANADA	EUROPE	U.S.A.	OTHER
CONTINUING	188 (53.9%)	91 (26.1%)	8 (2.3%)	62 (17.8%)
DROP-OUTS	156 (59.8%)	61 (23.4%)	4 (1.5%)	40 (15.3%)
DIFFERENCE	5.9%	2.7%	.8%	2.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 610 SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

COUNTRY FATHER LIVED IN PREDOMINENTLY

Table 44 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the country father lived in predominently, according to the percentage of students who remained in school for their second academic year.

The data produced in Table 44 did not yield cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group and did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. However, a definite and consistent pattern does emerge which reinforces the hypothesis presented in the interpretation for Table 43. Students of Canadian origin and/or cultural background are demonstrating less enthusiasm and perseverence to continue studies as compared with other groups. As has been previously mentioned in this Report and Report 2, English-speaking Canadians with a Canadian culture tend to obtain lower G.P.A. scores than other groups. In addition, this group of students have, proportionately, the highest drop-out rate than any other group of students.

This pattern is in conformity with the well-established dynamics of immigration. People who have emigrated into Canada tend to profit more from facilities which lend themselves to upward social and economical mobility. Hence, the values associated to the educational experience by immigrants are quite different than the values held by established Canadians, who comparatively hold a much less enthusiastic position toward education.

TABLE NUMBER 45

Distribution of Sample by Parental Relationship

GROUP	PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP		
	LIVING TOGETHER	SEPARATED	DIVORCED
CONTINUING	247 (92.2%)	4 (1.5%)	17 (6.3%)
DROP-OUTS	191 (91.4%)	15 (7.2%)	3 (1.4%)
DIFFERENCE	.8%	5.7%	4.9%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 477 SIGNIFICANCE - 1%

PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP

Table 45 illustrates the distribution of the sample by parental relationship, according to the percentage of students who pursued their education beyond the first year of studies.

The data produced in Table 45 was significant at the one percent level of confidence. Actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group were not large. Students whose parents were separated had the, proportionately, highest drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 5.7% in favour of the drop-out group. Students whose parents were divorced, witnessed the, proportionately, highest continuing rate, yielding a difference of 4.9% in favour of the continuing group. However, in view of the small differences, and the absence of any consistent pattern it would seem that the nature of the parental relationship is not strongly related to the student's decision to drop-out of or continue with studies after the first academic year.

Findings from Report 2 complement observations from Table 45, where it was found that the data did not present any type of consistent trend in any specific direction, concluding that the nature of the parental relationship was not related to scholastic performance and achievement.

TABLE NUMBER 46

Distribution of Sample by Presence of Parent(s) at Home

GROUP	PRESENCE OF PARENT(S) AT HOME	
	ONE OR BOTH	ALONE
CONTINUING	89 (34.0%)	173 (66.0%)
DROP-OUTS	64 (34.2%)	123 (65.8%)
DIFFERENCE	.2%	.2%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 449

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

PRESENCE OF PARENT(S) AT HOME

Table 46 illustrates the distribution of the sample by presence of parent(s) at home, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies beyond the first year.

The data produced in Table 46 does not yield cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group, in addition to which the data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. In view of these findings it would appear that the presence of one or both parents in the students' home is not related to his decision to stay on at school for the second academic year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students who live in the absence of one or both parents attempt significantly more credits and attain significantly higher G.P.A. scores than students who live with one or both parents. It would seem that parental influence and/or pressure which may possibly have affected results obtained in Report 2, do not play a role in the student's decision to pursue studies after the first year.

TABLE NUMBER 47

Distribution of Sample by Father's Level of Education

GROUP	FATHER'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	SPECIAL TRAINING
CONTINUING	137 (39.5%)	103 (29.7%)	45 (13.0%)	62 (17.9%)
DROP-OUTS	113 (42.8%)	63 (23.9%)	36 (13.6%)	52 (19.7%)
DIFFERENCE	3.3%	5.8%	.6%	1.8%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 611

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

FATHER'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Table 47 illustrates the distribution of the sample by father's level of education, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies beyond the first year.

The data produced in Table 47 does not yield cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group, nor does the data demonstrate any consistent trend in any direction. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. In view of these observations, it seems that the father's level of education is not related to the student's decision to pursue his education beyond the first year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students whose father had only completed elementary school attempted and obtained significantly fewer credits than most groups and tended to attain lower G.P.A. scores than any other group. Report 2 suggests that fathers, they themselves, having had a limited education may hold a somewhat indifferent or even hostile attitude toward educational experience. In turn, this apathy and/or apprehension may be transmitted to the offspring. However, if indeed the students' value of education is related to the father's appreciation of education, it would be expected that students whose father had completed just the primary level of education, would have less motivation for and/or more apprehension towards continuing their studies and have a much higher drop-out rate. Table 47 does show that the 'elementary school' group had a higher drop-out rate, but the difference is slight and not as large as would be expected.

TABLE NUMBER 48

Distribution of Sample by Mother's Level of Education

GROUP	MOTHER'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	SPECIAL TRAINING
CONTINUING	150 (43.0%)	138 (39.5%)	17 (4.9%)	44 (12.6%)
DROP-OUTS	123 (46.2%)	111 (41.7%)	12 (4.5%)	20 (7.5%)
DIFFERENCE	3.2%	2.2%	.4%	5.1%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 615 SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

MOTHER'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Table 48 illustrates the distribution of the sample by mother's level of education, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies beyond the first year.

The data produced in Table 48 does not reveal a consistent pattern in any direction, in addition to which differences obtained between the continuing and drop-out group were slight. The data did not reach a level of significance. From these observations, it can be concluded that the mother's level of education is not related to the student's decision to remain at or drop-out of school after the first year of studies.

In accordance with findings from Report 2 and results obtained from Table 47, in this Report, Table 48 confirms the assumption that the parental level of education possessed by both the student's father and mother is not related to performance at school in the first year except for students whose father completed elementary school only, and the student's decision to continue with studies into the second year.

TABLE NUMBER 49

Distribution of Sample by Sibling Attendance at University

GROUP	SIBLING ATTENDANCE AT UNIVERSITY	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	105 (38.9%)	165 (61.1%)
DROP-OUTS	73 (35.6%)	132 (64.4%)
DIFFERENCE	3.3%	3.3%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 475

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

SIBLING ATTENDANCE AT UNIVERSITY

Table 49 illustrates the distribution of the sample by sibling attendance at university, according to the percentage of students who remained at school beyond the first year.

The data produced in Table 49 does not yield large differences between the continuing and drop-out groups. The difference was not significant at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations, it would seem reasonable to conclude, that sibling attendance at university is not related to the decision to remain or leave school after the first academic year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students whose siblings did attend university attempted/obtained significantly more credits and attained significantly higher G.P.A. scores than students whose siblings did not attend university. Report 2 suggests that these findings could be accounted for by the fact that the student whose sibling had attended university was better prepared for and more informed about the demands of the university program, having been advised by a brother or sister who was familiar with the academic environment. Another explanation for results offered in Report 2 was that the student may have gained motivation to achieve well at school from a highly enthusiastic sibling who reinforced his academic pursuits.

However, in this Report, Table 49 indicates that there is no relationship between the two variables in question. It may be that a sibling, having attended university is capable of facilitating the initial adaptation process for the student upon entry to university, however, sibling influence may soon dissipate once the student, himself forms his personal ideas about education. Maybe, by the end of the first year, sibling aid, reinforcement, and persuasion is no longer effective as the student has personally experienced the university.

CHAPTER 8

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

This chapter examines the relationship between financial support variables and drop-out among part-time university students. Factors studied include whether the student received any financial support for his courses, the origin and degree of such support, whether the financial assistance was dependent upon successful completion of courses, the nature and amount of financial expenditure necessitated by university attendance, and the degree to which expenses disrupted budget.

TABLE NUMBER 50

Distribution of Sample by Financial Support of Courses

GROUP	FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF COURSES	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	120 (35.1%)	222 (64.9%)
DROP-OUTS	90 (33.5%)	179 (66.5%)
DIFFERENCE	1.6%	1.6%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 611 SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF COURSES

Table 50 illustrates the distribution of the sample by financial support of courses, according to the percentage of students who remained at school for their second academic year.

The data produced in Table 50 does not reveal very large differences between the continuing and drop-out group. In addition, the data was not significant at the five percent level of confidence. Thus, it would seem that whether or not the student is offered financial assistance for courses is not a predictor of whether he will remain at school for the second year of studies.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students who did receive financial assistance for courses did not perform at a higher level in school than students who did not receive financial aid. Presumably, students, prior to registering in a university program, have calculated the financial expenditure for courses and thus the question of finance is not related to achievement at school or continuation of studies.

TABLE NUMBER 51

Distribution of Sample by Origin of Financial Assistance

GROUP	ORIGIN OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE		
	EMPLOYER	GOVERNMENT	OTHER ORGANIZATION
CONTINUING	112 (95.7%)	2 (1.7%)	3 (2.6%)
DROP-OUTS	76 (89.4%)	5 (5.9%)	4 (4.7%)
DIFFERENCE	6.3%	4.2%	2.1%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 202

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

ORIGIN OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Table 51 illustrates the distribution of the sample by origin of financial assistance, according to the percentage of students who attended school for an additional year.

The data produced in Table 51 indicates that students who received financial assistance from their employer obtained a, proportionately lower drop-out rate than either of the other two groups, yielding a difference of 6.3% in favour of the continuing group. Students who received financial assistance from either the government or another organization both had a, proportionately, higher drop-out rate, although actual differences were slight.

Findings from Report 2 do not indicate that the source of financial assistance is related to credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A. However, it may be inferred from Table 54, although the data did not reach significance, that when the source of financial assistance is the student's employer, the student may be subject to more pressure to carry on with studies, if only to impress his employer. Or maybe, employer encouragement and positive reinforcement influence the student's decision to continue with studies.

TABLE NUMBER 52

Distribution of Sample by Degree of Financial Support

GROUP	DEGREE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT				
	NONE	COST OF COURSE	50%	75%	OTHER
CONTINUING	34 (23.8%)	18 (12.6%)	47 (32.9%)	33 (23.1%)	11 (7.7%)
DROP-OUTS	32 (29.1%)	8 (7.3%)	44 (40.0%)	22 (20.0%)	4 (3.6%)
DIFFERENCE	5.3%	5.3%	7.1%	3.1%	4.1%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 253

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

DEGREE OF FINANCIAL-SUPPORT

Table 52 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the degree of financial assistance, according to the percentage of students who pursued their studies beyond the first academic year.

Table 52 reveals findings, which although not statistically significant did produce noticeable differences between the continuing and drop-out group. Students who did not receive financial aid for courses witnessed a, proportionately, higher drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 5.3% in favour of the drop-out group. Students who were supported for the entire cost of course, had a, proportionately, lower drop-out rate yielding a difference of 5.3% in favour of the continuing group. Students who received support for 50% of the course fee had a higher drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 7.1% in favour of the drop-out group. The data indicates that students who were financially aided for the entire course or 75% of the course had a, proportionately, lower drop-out incidence than students who received no assistance or 50% course fee support. In view of these findings it can be suggested that the degree of financial assistance for courses may be related to the decision to remain at school for an additional year.

Findings from Report 2 suggest that the degree of financial assistance is not significantly related to number of courses attempted/obtained and G.P.A. In view of the data obtained from both Reports, it would seem that the degree of financial assistance is not an indicator of how well the student will perform at school or how many courses he will undertake. However, over the long-term period, the question of finance may be an important one and, thus, it could influence the student's decision to continue with studies.

TABLE NUMBER 53

Distribution of Sample by Whether Financial Assistance is Dependent Upon Course Completion

GROUP	WHETHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IS DEPENDENT UPON COURSE COMPLETION	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	107 (89.9%)	12 (10.1%)
DROP-OUTS	82 (92.1%)	7 (7.9%)
DIFFERENCE	2.2%	2.2%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 208

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

WHETHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IS DEPENDENT UPON COURSE COMPLETION

Table 53 illustrates the distribution of the sample by whether financial assistance is dependent upon course completion, according to the percentage of students who pursued their studies beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 53 does not reveal any consistent pattern with slight differences between the continuing and drop-out group. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations it would seem reasonable to conclude that financial assistance's dependence upon course completion is not related to the student's decision to continue with studies after the first year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students who were required to complete courses in order to receive financial assistance attempted significantly fewer credits and tended to achieve at a lower scholastic level than students for whom financial assistance did not depend upon course completion. Pressures to pass a course because financial assistance is contingent upon course completion, may influence scholastic performance but clearly do not affect the decision to pursue academic studies for an additional year.

TABLE NUMBER 54

Distribution of Sample by Yearly Expenditure for Attending University

GROUP	YEARLY EXPENDITURE FOR ATTENDING UNIVERSITY				
	$50 - $150	$151 - $250	$251 - $350	$351 - $490	$490 +
CONTINUING	81 (25.3%)	47 (14.7%)	69 (21.6%)	64 (20.0%)	59 (18.4%)
DROP-OUTS	66 (27.6%)	57 (23.8%)	54 (22.6%)	28 (11.7%)	34 (14.2%)
DIFFERENCE	2.3%	9.1%	1.0%	8.3%	4.2%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 559 SIGNIFICANCE - 1%

YEARLY EXPENDITURE FOR ATTENDING UNIVERSITY

Table 54 illustrates the distribution of the sample by yearly expenditure for attending university, according to the percentage of students who continued with their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 54 presents a consistent pattern with two cases of noticeable difference between the continuing and drop-out group. The smaller the yearly sum of money spent for university attendance, the higher the drop-out rate with the '$151 to $250' group, yielding a difference of 9.1% in favour of the drop-out group. Conversely, the greater the yearly expenditure, the lower the drop-out rate with the '$351 to $490' group, yielding a difference of 8.3% in favour of the continuing group. The data was significant at the one percent level of confidence. In view of the findings, it would appear that there does exist a relationship between the yearly expenditure for attending university and the decision to continue with studies beyond the first year at school.

Findings from Report 2 complement results obtained from Table 54 indicating that students who spend relatively more money for attending university tend to do better at school, maybe because a greater input of finance into school attendance gives the student an added responsibility to do well at school. Students who have a greater yearly expenditure at school are also registered with more courses which might be indicative of their motivation to successfully complete their education.

TABLE NUMBER 55

Distribution of Sample by Financial Support for School Expenditures

GROUP	FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL EXPENDITURES				
	TUITION	TRANSPOR-TATION	TUITION AND TRANSPOR-TATION	BOOKS AND MEALS	ALL OF THE THESE
CONTINUING	3 (1.1%)	31 (11.9%)	16 (6.1%)	61 (23.4%)	150 (57.5%)
DROP-OUTS	3 (1.7%)	14 (7.8%)	10 (5.6%)	46 (25.6%)	107 (59.4%)
DIFFERENCE	.6%	4.1%	.5%	2.2%	1.9%

VALID OBSERVATIONS 441

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

Table 55 illustrates the distribution of the sample by financial support for school expenditures, according to the percentage of students who remained at school beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 55 does not yield cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group, offering no consistent pattern in any direction. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations it can be concluded that financial support for school expenditures is not related to the decision to continue with studies beyond their first academic year.

TABLE NUMBER 56

Distribution of Sample by Whether Expenses Disrupt Budget

GROUP	WHETHER EXPENSES DISRUPT BUDGET				
	EXTREMELY	VERY MUCH	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NOT AT ALL
CONTINUING	51 (15.2%)	83 (24.7%)	98 (29.2%)	69 (20.5%)	35 (10.4%)
DROP-OUTS	28 (10.6%)	60 (22.8%)	87 (33.1%)	66 (25.1%)	22 (8.4%)
DIFFERENCE	4.6%	1.9%	3.9%	4.6%	2.0%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 599

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

WHETHER EXPENSES DISRUPT BUDGET

Table 56 illustrates the distribution of the sample by whether university expenses disrupt budget according to the percentage of students who remained in school beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 56 does not give rise to any consistent trend, in addition to which, actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group were slight. The data was not significant at the five percent level of confidence. In view of these observations, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the degree of budget disruption as a consequence or school expenditure is not related to the student's decision to continue with his studies.

Findings obtained from Report 2 indicate that there is no direct observable relationship between degree of budget disruption and number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A.

CHAPTER 9

MARITAL AND FAMILY STATUS

This chapter examines the relationship between marital and family status variables and drop-out from part-time university studies. Factors examined include number of children in the family, level of education and occupation of the spouse, whether spouse is also taking university courses and her/his attitude towards courses taken by the student. Single student's dating habits, presence or absence of steady boyfriend/girlfriend, and if the student is engaged is studied for its relationship with drop-out.

TABLE NUMBER 57

Distribution of Sample by Number of Children

GROUP	NUMBER OF CHILDREN				
	0 CHILDREN	1 CHILD	2 CHIL-DREN	3 CHIL-DREN	4+ CHILDREN
CONTINUING	74 (47.1%)	36 (22.9%)	32 (20.4%)	10 (6.4%)	5 (3.2%)
DROP-OUTS	72 (49.3%)	28 (19.2%)	35 (24.0%)	9 (6.2%)	2 (1.4%)
DIFFERENCE	2.2%	3.7%	3.6%	.2%	1.8%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 303

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Table 57 illustrates the distribution of the sample by number of children, according to the percentage of married or once married students who continued their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 57 does not reveal any consistent pattern, in addition to which, actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group were slight. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations, it can be concluded that the number of children is not related to the student's decision to continue with studies beyond the first academic year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students who had four or more children did not attempt and obtain as many credits and attained lower G.P.A. scores as compared to all other groups, presumably due to the fact that this group of students had greater family preoccupations which may have afforded them less time and energy to devote to their academic studies. However, from results obtained in Table 57 it would appear that additional family commitment attributed to students with relatively more children is not a predictor of whether the student will choose to remain at school beyond the first year.

TABLE NUMBER 58

Distribution of Sample by Spouse's Occupation

GROUP	SPOUSE'S OCCUPATION				
	PROFESSIONAL	BUSINESS	TECHNICAL	TRADE	OTHER
CONTINUING	38 (25.7%)	66 (44.6%)	14 (9.5%)	5 (3.4%)	25 (16.9%)
DROP-OUTS	22 (17.3%)	60 (47.2%)	12 (9.4%)	2 (1.6%)	31 (24.4%)
DIFFERENCE	8.4%	2.6%	.1%	1.8%	7.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 275

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

SPOUSE'S OCCUPATION

Table 58 illustrates the distribution of the sample by spouse's occupation, according to the percentage of students who continued their education beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 58 presents two cases of fairly large difference between the continuing and drop-out group; (1) students whose spouse was employed in a professional field had, proportionately, the lowest drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 8.4% in favour of the continuing group; (2) students whose spouse was employed in a field other than those stated witnessed, proportionately the highest drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 7.5% in favour of the drop-out group. Aside from these two cases, other differences were slight. The data was not significant at the five percent level of confidence.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that the spouse's occupation is not directly related to the number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A.

TABLE NUMBER 59

Distribution of Sample by Spouse's Level of Education

GROUP	SPOUSE'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	SPECIAL TRAINING
CONTINUING	11 (7.0%)	59 (37.3%)	49 (31.0%)	39 (24.7%)
DROP-OUTS	7 (4.9%)	91 (63.2%)	27 (18.7%)	19 (13.2%)
DIFFERENCE	2.1%	25.9%	12.3%	11.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 302

SIGNIFICANCE - 1%

SPOUSE'S LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Table 59 illustrates the distribution of the sample by spouse's level of education, according to the percentage of students who remained in school beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 59 presents large differences between the continuing and drop-out group with the exception of the 'elementary school' group, where the difference was slight. Students whose spouse had finished their high school level, witnessed the, proportionately highest drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 25.9% in favour of the drop-out group. Students whose spouse had attended university experienced a, proportionately lower drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 12.3% in favour of the continuing group. Students whose spouse had followed some kind of special training course had a, proportionately lower drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 11.5% in favour of the continuing group. The data was significant at the one percent level of confidence. In view of these observations there would appear to exist a relationship between the spouse's level of education and the student's decision to continue with his studies.

Findings from Report 2 indicate the students whose spouse had completed their high school level of education were attaining significantly lower G.P.A. scores than all other groups. However, the 'elementary school' group was not performing at a lower standard than any other group and furthermore, Table 59 does not indicate that the 'elementary school' group had a higher drop-out rate. Hence, it does not seem that the lower the spouse's level of education the greater the student-drop-out-rate. For some reason, which seems difficult to account for in view of the absence of a consistent trend students whose spouse had terminated their education at the secondary level appeared to be less academically motivated to pursue their studies after the first year.

TABLE NUMBER 60

Distribution of Sample by Whether Spouse is Taking University Courses

GROUP	WHETHER SPOUSE IS TAKING UNIVERSITY COURSES	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	53 (35.3%)	101 (64.7%)
DROP-OUTS	35 (25.0%)	105 (75.0%)
DIFFERENCE	10.3%	10.3%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 294 SIGNIFICANCE - 5%

WHETHER SPOUSE IS TAKING UNIVERSITY COURSES

Table 60 illustrates the distribution of the sample by whether spouse is taking university courses, according to the percentage of students who remained at school for their second academic year.

The data produced in Table 60 indicates that students whose spouse was taking university courses witnessed a, proportionately, lower drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 10.3% in favour of the continuing group. Students who spouse were not taking university courses had a, proportionately, higher drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 10.3% in favour of the drop-out group. The size of the difference between the drop-out and continuing group confirms an already well-established pattern and the data did reach significance at the five percent level.

TABLE NUMBER 61

Distribution of Sample by Spouse's Attitude Toward Taking University Courses

GROUP	SPOUSE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD TAKING UNIVERSITY COURSES			
	VERY ENTHU-SIASTIC	ENTHUSIASTIC	DOES NOT CARE	UNHAPPY
CONTINUING	76 (49.4%)	67 (43.5%)	7 (4.5%)	4 (2.6%)
DROP-OUTS	78 (54.5%)	54 (37.8%)	5 (3.5%)	6 (4.2%)
DIFFERENCE	5.1%	5.7%	1.0%	1.6%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 297 SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

SPOUSE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD TAKING UNIVERSITY COURSES

Table 61 illustrates the distribution of the sample by spouse's attitude toward taking university courses, according to the percentage of students who continued with their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 61 does not reveal cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group, in addition to which the data does not present any sort of consistent trend. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations it would seem reasonable to conclude that the spouse's attitude toward taking university courses is not related to the decision to remain at school beyond the first year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that the spouse's attitude toward taking university courses was not related to the number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A. As explained in Report 2, a process of natural selection may be operating whereby the sample consists primarily of students whose spouse held a positive outlook towards academic studies. Students whose spouses did not approve of their studies comprised only 3.4% of the total married or once married sample. Hence, it is difficult to draw any conclusion from a sample which consists of a highly selective portion of the population.

TABLE NUMBER 62

Distribution of Sample by Single Student's Dating Habits

GROUP	SINGLE STUDENT'S DATING HABITS		
	NEVER DATE	OCCASSIONALLY DATE	REGULARLY DATE
CONTINUING	16 (9.1%)	76 (43.2%)	84 (47.7%)
DROP-OUTS	6 (5.3%)	56 (49.6%)	51 (45.1%)
DIFFERENCE	3.8%	6.4%	2.6%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 289

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

SINGLE STUDENT'S DATING HABITS

Table 62 illustrates the distribution of the sample by single students, according to the percentage of students who remained in school beyond their first academic year.

The data produced in Table 62 does not reveal any consistent trend, in addition to which the differences between the continuing and drop-out group were slight. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations it can be concluded that the dating pattern of the single student is not related to the decision to remain at school for an additional year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that the more frequently a student dates, the fewer the credits attempted and obtained. Students who never date or date occasionally, having fewer social commitments than a student who dates regularly may be donating more time to academic studies. However, it does not appear from findings in Table 62 that students who date more regularly have a higher drop-out rate as compared with students who date less frequently.

TABLE NUMBER 63

Distribution of Sample by Presence of Steady Boy/Girl Friend

GROUP	PRESENCE OF STEADY BOY/GIRL FRIEND	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	87 (49.2%)	90 (50.8%)
DROP-OUTS	48 (41.7%)	67 (58.3%)
DIFFERENCE	7.5%	7.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 292

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

PRESENCE OF STEADY BOY/GIRL FRIEND

Table 63 illustrates the distribution of the sample, by presence of steady boy/girl friend, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 63 indicates that students who did have a steady boy/girl friend experienced a, proportionately, lower drop-out rate, as compared with students who did not have a steady companion, yielding a difference of 7.5% in favour of the continuing group. The data did not reach significance at the five percent level of confidence, however, the size of the difference between the continuing and drop-out group is large enough to warrant mention.

Findings from Report 2 do not reveal statistically significant data, however, a trend does emerge to suggest that students who do have steady boy/girl friends tend to attempt and obtain fewer credits than students who do not have steady boy/girl friends. However, Table 63 indicates that students with greater social commitments vis-a-vis their steady companion do not have a proportionately higher drop-out rate. It may be that a steady companion diminishes the amount of free time a student can devote to studies, on the one hand, but that also, a steady boy/girl friend may stabilize the student's dating pattern which in turn adds a certain stability to the student's academic persuit. This is a highly speculative explanation for data which only presents a pattern in the absence of statistical significance, however, it could explain the somewhat unexpected findings in Table 63.

TABLE NUMBER 64

Distribution of Sample by Whether Student is Engaged

GROUP	WHETHER STUDENT IS ENGAGED	
	YES	NO
CONTINUING	10 (5.7%)	166 (94.3%)
DROP-OUTS	19 (16.8%)	94 (83.2%)
DIFFERENCE	11.1%	11.1%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 289

SIGNIFICANCE - 1%

WHETHER STUDENT IS ENGAGED

Table 64 illustrates the distribution of the sample by whether the student is engaged, according to the percentage of students who pursued their education for the second year.

The data produced in Table 64 reveals statistically significant differences between the continuing and drop-out group. Students who were engaged witnessed a, proportionately, higher drop-out rate as compared with students who were not engaged, yielding a difference of 11.1% in favour of the drop-out group. From these observations it would seem reasonable to conclude that whether the student is engaged is related to the decision to remain at school for an additional year.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that students who were engaged tend to attempt and obtain fewer credits than students who were not engaged. The availability of time to devote to studies may be one factor which contributed to the results.

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSIONS

Since this study is one of the first attempts to study factors affecting drop-out specifically among part-time university students, and since Sir George Williams Campus of Concordia University has an unusual academic and organizational set up for part-time education, it would be interesting to contrast the findings of the present study with those reported elsewhere. Other studies have, on the whole, focused upon either full-time students or students enrolled in off-campus extra-mural courses.

A curvilinear relationship between age and drop-out was found in this study with 20-25, 36-40 and 41+ groups showing higher drop-out while 26-30 and 31-35 groups showing higher persistence rate. Of the drop-out group 58.7% came from the 20-25 age group. This points towards an urgent need to investigate causes of drop-out, and remedial measures that could be undertaken, for this very young group. Since age spread among full-time undergraduate students is usually small, age as a variable has not generally been investigated for its relationship with drop-out among full-time students. The results of this study do not support the findings of Ulmer (1960) and Ulmer & Verner (1963) who found no significant age differences between drop-outs and persisters.

Although nationality did not bear a significant relationship with drop-out, country of birth did. Students who were born outside of

North America and Europe had a higher persistence rate while those born in Canada had a higher drop-out rate. The results are in harmony with research literature (Bhatnagar, 1970) which indicates that immigrants, on the whole, have higher motivation for education than the local population.

Two language factors were looked at. Mother-tongue or the language normally spoken by parents, and language normally spoken at home. In a country such as Canada, where large-scale immigration is of relatively recent origin, mother-tongue sometimes differs from language normally spoken at home. For example, Portuguese may be the mother-tongue in the sense that it is normally spoken by parents, English may be the language normally spoken by children at home when communicating with their parents or with each other. As it turned out, students whose mother-tongue or home language was other than English had a higher persistence rate while students whose mother-tongue and home language was English had a higher drop-out rate. It is interesting to note that having a language other than English as mother-tongue or home language is <u>not</u> a factor conducive to dropping-out of an English language university. Greater motivation among non-English speakers may account for these rather unexpected findings which have implications for university admission policies.

A greater proportion of married than single students dropped-out after first year of university studies. The findings are in accordance with previously reported research (Hunt, 1967; Beagle, 1970). Since married students do not obtain lower grades than single students

(Report 2), the greater incidence of drop-out among married students must be due to greater number of voluntary withdrawals rather than academic dismissals.

Students who took the minimum amount of course work (2 half courses or less) had a higher drop-out rate. The optimum course load in terms of persistence appears to be 5-6 half courses. When the data was looked at in terms of required courses taken rather than total course work, a similar pattern emerged. Those who took the minimum amount of required courses (2 half courses or less) had a high drop-out ratio while those who took 3-4 or 5-6 half courses had a higher persistence ratio. A similar pattern was obtained when student plans for the next academic year were examined. Those who anticipated taking between 3 and 6 half courses had a higher persistence rate while those who anticipated taking 2 half courses or less had a high drop-out rate. The findings form a consistent pattern. Drop-outs are characterized by a minimum academic involvement with the university while persisters show a moderate, but not excessive, course load. Although no studies could be traced that examined the relationship between the amount of course work undertaken and anticipated by the student, and drop-out, the general trend of research appears to suggest that integration into academic environment of the university is related to persistence (Bayer, 1968; Medsker & Trent, 1968; Spady, 1971). The results of the present study, thus, are consistent with the research in the area.

Data was produced to study the relationship between academic performance at the high school level and drop-out. Successful completion

of high school and not having repeated any high school grades were found to be positively related to persistence while high school grades and the type of high school attended did not bear any relationship with drop-out behaviour. It would appear that performance at the high school level is predictive of persistence with part-time university studies only at the lower end of the scale. Students who do relatively poorly at high school in the sense of having to repeat a grade or those who fail to graduate are more likely to drop out of the evening university. These findings are dissonant with other studies where it has been reported that grade performance in high school is related to persistence in college. (Chase, 1970; Blanchfield, 1971; Lawhorn, 1971; Astin, 1971). However, the present study partly confirms the results obtained by Eagle (1972) who reported no significant differences between drop-outs and persisters in high school average, high school curriculum, and type of high school attended.

The type of special training received prior to university entry was found to be highly related to drop-out/persistence after the first year. Students involved in technical, trade or electronics training had a high drop-out rate while those with commercial/secretarial and professional training had a high persistence rate. The higher persistence of students with professional training could be explained in terms of both the value of their training for university studies and the value of university degree for their professional careers. The higher persistence rate of commercial/secretarial training group is difficult to account for. It might be that a high proportion of these students were employed as secretaries in the university and were taking courses

on a part-time basis. This might explain their low drop-out rate.

The study found that students who started their part-time university studies immediately on completion of their high school had a relatively high drop-out ratio. The amount and the reasons for delay between high school completion and starting university, however were not found to have any relationship with drop-out. The results demonstrated that a student is more likely to complete his part-time university studies if he were not to embark upon his part-time university career immediately on finishing high school.

Evidence produced in this study indicates that the student's employment status (full-time, part-time or not gainfully employed) had no effect on his decision to continue his studies beyond the first year. An analysis of the nature of occupation revealed a higher persistence rate among those employed in business and commercial organizations and a higher drop-out rate among those employed in technical jobs. This finding is consistent with the one reported earlier where students who had training in commercial/secretarial areas prior to university entry had a higher persistence rate while those with prior training in technical, trade or electronics had a higher drop-out rate.

An examination of the relationship between job demands in terms of hours spent per week, and drop-out showed that only one group of students, those who worked 31-40 hours per week, had a relatively higher proportion of drop-outs. This study, thus, only partially confirms results reported by Willet (1973) who found no relationship between drop-out and the number of hours a student was employed.

Previous research has suggested that there are significant personality and attitudinal differences among college persisters and drop-outs (Pervin, Reik & Dalrymple, 1966). It has been reported that drop-outs tend to be more impulsive than persisters (Vaughan, 1968), lack flexibility in dealing with changing circumstances (Jones, 1955; Lavin, 1965), and are more unstable, more anxious and restless relative to their successful college counterparts (Grace, 1957; Grande & Simmons, 1967; Vaughan, 1968). Since personality and attitudinal variables carry over from one situation to another, one would expect significantly different job history of drop-outs and persisters. On the whole, drop-outs would be expected to have little supervisory responsibilities and would change jobs frequently. Such prediction was not borne out by results obtained in this study. No significant relationship was found between degree of supervisory function of the student's job, the number o firms he worked for, and drop-out. Either academic restlessness does not carry over to job situation, or the personality variables other researchers have commented upon do not carry the same weight in the institutional framework of Sir George.

A relationship between the number of years spent working and drop-out was discovered. Students who had worked 5 years or less had a higher persistence rate while those who worked more than 5 years had a higher drop-out rate. The data suggests that two years appears to be the optimum working experience for persistence with part-time undergraduate studies.

While studying relationship between employment factors and drop-out, an examination was made of the importance of the job held by the student,

and of obtaining the degree, for his future career aspirations. Neither of these variables showed a relationship with drop-out. This finding runs contrary to several reported studies (Spaeth, 1970; Kerbs, 1971; White, 1971) which found that the higher the value placed on college completion for career expectations the more likely the individual to stay in college. However, it must be kept in mind that these studies were dealing with full-time students yet to venture into the field of employment while a vast proportion of students in the present study were already employed for several years.

A rather strange relationship between employer attitude towards taking university courses and drop-out was discovered. If the employer 'did not care' one way or the other, or if he was 'very enthusiastic', the student was likely to persist, but if the employer was simply 'enthusiastic' the student was likely to drop-out. Neither job interference with ability to perform as a student nor interference between studies and occupational performance were found to be related to drop-out. This finding was rather unexpected. One would predict, on common sense grounds, that job-studies interference would be a major factor affecting a student's decision to continue or discontinue studies after the first year. Apparently, it is not.

Eckland (1964) found that college persisters are likely to be more affluent than drop-outs. Astin (1972) suggests that family income alone is increasingly becoming a poor predictor of college persistence. The results produced in this study do not establish any relationship between a student's yearly income and drop-out. The data, however, appears to

have become confused, through presence of a large number of housewives and part-time employees whose income did not reflect their true financial status. Yearly income which was intended here to be a measure of socio-economic and employment status failed to serve that purpose. Yet another indicator of socio-economic status, type and size of residence, was found not to be predictive of drop-out behaviour.

Although no statistically significant differences were obtained, there was, nevertheless, a trend for students who lived five or more miles away from the campus to drop-out more often. The students who used only one method of public transportation (metro, bus or train) had a higher persistence rate while those who used a combination of two such modes of transportation had a higher drop-out rate. Use of car for transportation was found to be unrelated to persistence at college. It would appear that greater amount of travel time and inconvenience involved in using a combination of two modes of public transport might have been the key factor. However, when the length of travel time was examined for its effect on drop-out, no significant relationship emerged. Students who had to travel over an hour to get to school did not drop-out more than those who could get there in less than 30 minutes. Further analysis revealed that neither the use of travel time for study purposes nor the importance attached to availability of such time for study purposes was related to persistence with part-time university studies. The degree of interference between travel and other available study time was also not found to be related to drop-out behaviour. It would appear that students whose travel time seriously interfered with their study time, made the extra effort to

make more study time available. On the whole, then, the various aspects of travel for study purposes were not found to have a significant influence upon the student's decision to continue or not to continue with his studies beyond the first year.

The general trend of research demonstrates that parental socio-economic status, in general terms, is positively related to persistence in college (Tinto, 1975). Specifically children from higher socio-economic families are more likely to persist at college (Sewell & Shah, 1967). The findings of the present study are dissonant with the research reported above. Socio-economic status of the parents was not found to be a factor related to drop-out. Similarly, parental level of education, or country in which they spent most of their lives, and persistence with part-time studies were found to be independent of one another. Not only did parental education not have any effect on persistence, attendance at a university by a sibling was found to be unrelated to drop-out. This, once again, conflicts with studies by Jaffe & Adams (1970) and Spady (1970), which primarily involve full-time students, and which report that college persisters are more likely to come from families whose parents are more educated. The divergence of results may well be the function of different sample characteristics. Parental socio-economic status and other family characteristics might be much more significant factors in case of younger full-time students than appears to be the case for part-time students.

Although parental level of education did not bear a relationship with drop-out, parental marital status did. Students whose parents were divorced had a higher persistence rate while students whose parents were separated had a higher drop-out rate. The total number of individuals in these two categories, however, was small. This conclusion should, therefore, be viewed as only tentative.

Financial support, whether it originated from the employer, government or other sources, whether it comprised less than 50%, 75%, or 100% of the tuition, whether it covered tuition, transportation, books, or all of these, and whether it was conditional upon successful completion of courses or not, was found to be independent of persistence with part-time undergraduate studies. It would appear that though financial assistance might ease the burden of the student somewhat, it could not be considered a major incentive for persisting with part-time studies. There are strong social and pedagogical reasons for vastly expanding the programme for financial assistance to part-time students. The results of this study, however, will not support arguments for expanding such programme because part-time students find it difficult to continue their studies without financial assistance. The results obtained here are somewhat surprising. On common sense grounds one would predict that financial factors would be a major cause of drop-out among part-time students. This is not the case. On the contrary, a strong relationship was found between yearly expenditure for attending university and persistence. More specifically, students who spent less than $150 per annum on university related expenses had the highest drop-out rate while those who spent $350 or more per annum had the highest persistence rate.

This finding is consistent with the finding reported previously where it was found that students who undertake the minimum amount of course work are more likely to drop-out. Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance would predict that higher the level of an individual's investment in an institution, higher the level of that individual's perception of the value of membership in that institution. So if a student has a minimum investment in terms of time and money, he is not likely to value his membership of the university highly and, consequently, is likely to drop out. Conversely, a high investment of time, money, and energy will result in higher evaluation of the worth of membership in the university, and consequently, low drop-out. The findings of this study support such interpretation. It is interesting to note that although the degree to which a student's expenses disrupted his budget was not found to be significantly related to drop-out, the trend, nevertheless, was in the direction that would be predicted by Festinger. Students whose budget was "extremely" or "very much" disrupted, who in other words had to make a serious financial sacrifice in order to attend university, tended to persist while students whose budget was only "moderately" or "slightly" disrupted tended to drop-out.

As discussed earlier, for the part-time student, factors relating to his own spouse and children might be more important than his parental background. The data produced in this study suggests that family size per se, i.e. the number of children, was not related to drop-out from higher education. Students with large families persisted as much as students with small families. The occupation of spouse was also found

to be unrelated to persistence at college. Spouse's level of education, however, was highly related to drop-out. Students whose spouse had some form of post-secondary education were much more likely to persist than others. It is interesting to note that persistence among full-time students is related to parental level of education (Jaffe & Adams, 1970) and to spouse's and not parental level of education among part-time students. The findings are consistent if one looks at them in terms of ' immediate family' concept. For full-time students, parents form their immediate family but for part-time students his spouse and children are his immediate family.

Research had indicated that family attitude is an important variable in college persistence (Hackman & Dysinger, 1970). In light of the above comment about the immediate family, two indices of family attitude towards part-time education were looked at - spouse's attitude towards taking courses and whether he/she was also taking courses. In neither case a statistically significant relationship with college persistence emerged although there was a definite trend for students whose spouses were also taking courses to continue with studies into the second year.

In case of a single student, his dating habits and presence of a steady friend of opposite sex was not found to be related to drop-out. However, if the student was engaged, he was more likely to drop-out. Time and other commitments of the engaged student were perhaps responsible for this.

It is obvious that drop-out is a multidimensional phenomenon. No single factor could explain drop-out from higher education. Most of the research in this area has been conducted on full-time day students and much remains unknown about the nature of drop-out from part-time undergraduate studies. For this reason the present study had to be much more descriptive in orientation than the author would have liked. The need for further multidimensional analysis is apparent.

This study has clearly demonstrated a need for further research with specific focus upon part-time education. The dynamics of drop-out behaviour might well turn out to be different among full and part-time student populations. Results obtained here would tend to suggest that they are. Since recurrent education appears to be gaining momentum, explorations of the special characteristics of this field of endeavour would be well worth the effort. The present study, in many ways, was exploratory in nature. Many of the variables need to be cross-tabulated and examined. For example, the comparison between the drop-out rate of married vs. single students could be cross-tabulated by sex for a finer analysis. Such cross-tabulations, however, would have resulted in a massive final report. One of the purposes of the study was to interest other social scientists in this important field of education. It is hoped that others will follow up this study and will take off from the point this study has brought us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfred, R.L. Student attrition: Antecedant and consequent factors. Report No. MJCD-S-102-72, 1972.

Astin A.W. Predicting academic performance in college. N.Y. Free Press, 1971.

Astin, A.W. College drop-outs: A national profile. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education, 1972.

Bayer, A.E. The college drop-out: Factors affecting senior college completion. Sociology o Education, 1968, 41, 305-316.

Beagle, P. Factors affecting academic achievement of adult students enrolled in Ontario university credit courses. Ph.D. thesis Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1970.

Bhatnagar, J. Immigrants at School. London, Cornmarket Press, 1970.

Boshier, R. Educational participation and drop-out: A theoretical model. Adult Education, 1973, 23, 255-82.

Brown, A.M., Knox, A.B. & Groteluesches, Persistence in university adult education classes. Adult Education, 1966, 16, 101-114.

Chase, C.I. The college drop-out: His high school prologue. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970, 54, 66-71.

Dennison, J. & Jones, G. The mature student and the college transfer program. Continuous Learning, 1969, 8, 189-192.

Eagle, N. Drop-out prediction at an urban college following open admission. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting o American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1972.

Eckland, B. Social class and college graduation: Some misconceptions corrected. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 60-72.

Grace, H. Personality factors and college attrition. Peabody Journal of Education, 1957, 35, 36-40.

Grande, P. & Simmons, J. Personal values and academic performance among engineering students. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 585-588.

Hackman, R. & Dysinger, W. Commitment to college as a factor in student attrition. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 311-324.

Harter, D. Why SUNY students fail to complete independent study courses. State University of New York, 1969.

Haygood, K. Colleges and Universities. In Smith, R.M.,Aher, G.F & Kidd, J.R. (Eds.) Handbook of Adult Education. N.Y. Wiley, 1970.

Hunt, E.B. Characteristics, perceptions, and experiences of married women students at Lansing Community College. Ed. D. thesis Michigan State University, 1967.

Jaffe, A. & Adams, W. Academic and socio-economic factors related to entrance and retention at two- and four year colleges in the late 1960s. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Social Statistics Section, 1970.

Jones, E.S. The probation student: What he is like and what can be done about it. Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 49, 93-102.

Kerbs, R. & Liberty, P.A. A comparative study of three groups of withdrawal students on ten factor variables derived from a 36 problem self-report inventory. Austin, University of Texas, 1971. EDRS No Ed052 690.

Lavin, D. The prediction of academic performance. N.Y. Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Lavin, D.E. & Jacobson, B. Open admissions at the City University of New York: A description of academic outcomes after three semesters. City University of New York, 1973.

Lawhorn, J.A. A study of persisters and drop-outs in secretarial science program at Miami-Dade junior college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Miami, 1971.

Louttit, E.E. A recapitulation of student drop-outs in the division of continuing education. University of Oregon, 1968.

Medsker, L. & Trent J. Beyond high school. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Mehra, N. Retention and withdrawal of university students. University of Alberta, 1973.

Perkins, S.A. Success of mature students in university studies. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 17, 105-112.

Pervin, L., Reik, L., & Dalrymple, W. The college drop-out and the utilization of talent. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1966.

Rootman, I. Voluntary withdrawal from a total adult socialization organization: A model. Sociology of Education, 1972, 45, 258-270.

Sells, L.W. Sex differences in graduate school survival. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association. New York, 1973.

Sewell, W. & Shah, V. Socio-economic status, intelligence, and the attainment of higher education. Sociology of Education, 1967, 40, 1-23.

Spady, W. Drop-outs from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. Interchange, 1970, 1, 64-85

Spady, W. Drop-outs from higher education: Towards an empirical model. Interchange, 1971, 2, 38-62.

Spaeth, J. Occupational attainment among male college graduates. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 4, 632-644.

Statistics Canada. Education in Canada: A Statistical Review for the Period 1960-61 to 1970-71. Ottawa, Information Canada, 1973.

Tinto, V. Drop-out from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45, 89-125

Ulmer, C.R. A study of drop-outs in the evening division of a community college. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Florida State University, 1960.

Ulmer, C.R. & Verner, C. Factors affecting attendance in a junior college adult program. Adult Education, 1963, 13, 153-158.

Vaughan, R. College drop-outs: Dismissed vs. withdrew. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 46, 685-689.

White, J. Individual and environmental factors associated with freshman attrition at a multi-campus community college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1971.

Willet, L.H. Non-persisting student follow-up. Palos Hill, Ill. Moraine Community College, 1973.

Zahn, J.C. & Phillips, L. A study of the drop-out in university adult education. Adult Education, 1961, 11, 88-95.

Zahn, J.C. Drop-out and academic ability in university extension courses. Adult Education, 1964, 15, 35-46.

University Student Questionnaire

This is a scientific investigation concerned with examining the factors that influence the performance of part-time university students. Your responses to the following questions will be strictly confidential; they will serve only as a basis for completing this scientific study concerned with helping university students. We request your name only because a proportion of the students responding to this questionnaire will later be solicited to volunteer for a follow-up study. The return of this questionnaire is essential, in order that proper sampling procedures may be maintained.

Please respond to the following questions either by providing the appropriate answer (PLEASE PRINT) or by placing a tick ✓.

Name or Student Number _____

Age _____

Address _____

Telephone Number _____

Male _____ or Female _____

Nationality: Canadian ☐ Landed Immigrant ☐ Other (Specify) _____

1. What was your country of birth? _____
2. What is your mother tongue? _____
3. What language do you normally speak at home? _____
4. Are you single _____ married _____ divorced _____
   separated _____ widow _____ widower _____
5. How many courses are you currently enrolled in? _____
6. How many of these are required courses? _____
7. How many of these are optional courses? _____
8. What were your reasons for taking optional courses?
   (1) _____
   (2) _____
   (3) _____
   (4) _____
9. How many courses do you anticipate taking in the regular (i.e. fall-winter) session _____ and summer sessions _____ of this year?
10. Did you obtain your high school diploma? Yes _____ No _____

...2

11. If you have obtained your high school diploma, was there any delay (in years) between the time you received your high school diploma and the time you registered for university? Yes _____ No _____

12. If you answered "yes" to the above question, please specify the number of years between the time you received your high school diploma and the time you registered for university _____.

13. If there was a delay (in years) between the time you received your high school diploma and the time you registered for university, could you give any reasons that prevented you from enrolling sooner.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____ _____

14. If you have received your high school diploma, specify your matriculation average mark (in per cent)_____.

15. Did you repeat any grades in high school? Yes _____ No _____

16. If you have obtained a high school diploma, please specify the type of school attended: private school _____ public high school _____ evening high school _____ correspondence _____ other _____

17. Did you take non-university courses or receive any other special training after high school but before entering university (e.g. Montreal Trade Schools, MTS or IBM courses)?

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

18. What type of course or training was this? _____

_____

19. What made you decide to take university courses? Number the factors (that apply to you) in order of importance. (1 indicates the most important, 2 the next most important and so on...)

Desire to learn and get educated _____
Family pressure _____
All your friends are taking courses _____
Desire to meet people _____
Job advancement _____
Job security _____
Increased salary (job) _____

20. List any other factors (not mentioned above) that influenced you or caused you to take university courses (briefly).

(1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____
(5) _____

21. Are you currently employed? Yes _____ No _____

22. What is your occupation (if any)? _____

23. Do you work full-time _____ or part-time_____ ?

24. How many hours a week do you work: less than 10 hours _____ between 10-20 hours _____ 20-30 hours_____ 30-40 hours_____ 40-60 hours _____ 60 or more hours _____.

25. What is the function of your job position _____

_____

26. How long have you been working? _____

...4

27. How many companies or organizations have you worked for? _____

28. How long have you been employed with your present firm, company or organization? _____

29. How important is your present job for your career aspirations?
Extremely _____ Very _____ Moderately _____ Not at all _____

30. How important will the acquisition of a university degree be for your career?
Extremely _____ Very _____ Moderately _____ Not at all _____

31. If you are employed, what is the attitude of your employer toward your taking university courses:
very enthusiastic _____ enthusiastic _____ does not care _____
is unhappy about it _____ is very unhappy about it _____

32. Is your yearly salary (total): less than $3000 _____
between $3000 - 6000 _____ $6000 - 10,000 _____
$10,000 - 15,000 _____ $15,000 - 20,000 _____ $20,000 and up _____

33. To what extent does your job affect your ability to perform as a student?
Very helpful _____ helpful _____ makes no difference _____
interferes _____ interferes badly _____

34. To what extent do your studies affect your occupational performance?
Very helpful _____ helpful _____ makes no difference _____
interferes _____ interferes badly _____

35. In what type of residence do you live: apartment _____
triplex _____ duplex _____ bungalow _____ house _____ other _____

36. How many rooms are there in your place of residence? _____

37. Do you own a car? Yes _____ No _____

38. In what part of Montreal or surrounding suburb do you live? _____

39. What is the approximate distance (in miles) between the area in which you live and the university? _____

40. How do you travel to school (tick more than one if necessary): walk _____ car _____ subway _____ bus _____ train _____ bicycle _____

41. How long does it take you to travel to school: less than 30 minutes _____ 30 minutes to 1 hour _____ 1 to 1 1/2 hours _____ 1 1/2 to 3 hours _____ more than 3 hours _____

42. How many times a week do you have to travel to university to attend lectures? _____

43. In addition, on the average, how many times a week do you travel to university for purposes other than attending lectures? _____

44. Do you use the travelling time for study purposes? Yes _____ No _____

45. Do you find travelling time valuable for your studies? Yes _____ No _____

46. To what extent does travelling to and from the university interfere with your available study time: extremely _____ very much _____ moderately _____ slightly _____ not at all _____

47. What is (was) your father's occupation? _____

48. In what countries did your parents live most of their lives? mother _____ father _____

49. If your parents are alive, are they: living together _____ separated _____ divorced _____

50. Do you live with your mother _____ and/or father _____

51. How much education does (did) your father have: elementary school _____ high school _____ university _____ special training (specify) _____

_____

52. How much education does (did) your mother have: elementary school _____ high school _____ university _____ special training (specify) _____

_____

...6

53. Did any of your siblings attend college? Yes _____ No _____

54. Do you or will you receive any financial assistance for the cost of your courses? Yes _____ No _____

55. If you do receive financial assistance for the cost of your courses, is this given to you by: your employer _____ the government _____ or other organization (specify) _____

56. How much financial assistance do you receive for the cost of your courses? _____

57. (a) If you do receive financial assistance for the cost of your courses, are you required to pass the courses in order to receive this financial assistance? Yes _____ No _____

(b) Would you take courses even if you were not given any financial assistance for the cost of the courses? Yes _____ No _____

58. What kind of expenses do you incur from your own pocket for attending university? _____

59. Approximately how much do you expect to spend per year from your own pocket for attending university? $_____

60. To what extent do these expenses disrupt your budget: extremely _____ very much _____ moderately _____ slightly _____ not at all _____

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE PLEASE COMPLETE THE SECTION THAT APPLIES TO YOU.

MARRIED STUDENTS ONLY

61. Do you have any children? Yes _____ No _____
How many? _____

62. What is your spouse's occupation? _____

63. How much education does your spouse have: elementary school ___
high school _____ university _____ special training (specify)_
_____

64. Is your spouse currently taking any courses? Yes _____ No _____
What type of course is your spouse taking (specify) _____
_____

65. What is your spouse's attitude toward your taking courses. He/she is:
very enthusiastic _____ enthusiastic _____ does not care _____
is unhappy about it _____ is very unhappy about it _____

SINGLE STUDENTS ONLY

66. Do you date: Never _____ Occasionally _____ Regularly _____

67. Do you have a steady (boyfriend/girlfriend)? Yes _____ No _____

68. Are you engaged? Yes _____ No _____

69. How much education does your boyfriend/girlfriend/fiancé(e) have:
elementary school _____ high school _____ university _____.
special training (specify) _____

70. Is your boyfriend/girlfriend/fiancé(e) currently taking any courses?
Yes _____ No _____

71. What is the attitude of your boyfriend/girlfriend/fiancé(e) toward your taking courses: very enthusiastic _____ enthusiastic _____
does not care _____ is unhappy about it _____ is very unhappy about it _____

EXTENT JOB AFFECTS ABILITY TO PERFORM AS STUDENT

Table 31 illustrates the distribution of the sample by extent job affects ability to perform as a student, according to the percentage of students who continued with their education beyond their first year.

The data produced by Table 31 reveals, on the whole, minor differences between the continuing and drop-out group. Students who found their job to be helpful, vis-a-vis, student performance had a difference of six percent in favour of the continuing group. Student who claimed that their ability to perform as a student was not affected by their job had, comparatively, more drop-outs than continuing students yielding a difference of 5.5% in favour of the former group. No clear-cut pattern emerges from the data, in addition to which the data did not reach a level of significance. Hence, it would appear that the student's relationship between job and academic studies does not influence his decision to remain at school for the second year.

TABLE NUMBER 32

Distribution of Sample by Extent Studies Affect Occupational Performance

GROUP	EXTENT STUDIES AFFECT OCCUPATIONAL PERFORMANCE				
	VERY HELP-FULL	HELP-FULL	MAKES NO DIFFERENCE	INTERFERES	INTERFERES BADLY
CONTINUING	30 (9.4%)	79 (24.8%)	170 (53.5%)	39 (12.2%)	0 (0.0%)
DROP-OUTS	17 (6.8%)	68 (27.2%)	140 (56.0%)	24 (9.6%)	1 (0.4%)
DIFFERENCE	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%	2.6%	0.4%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 568 SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

EXTENT STUDIES AFFECT OCCUPATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Table 32 illustrates the distribution of the sample by extent studies affect occupational performance, according to the percentage of students who continued their studies beyond the first academic year.

The data produced in Table 32 does not present any consistent pattern with no cases of great difference between the continuing and drop-out group. In addition, the data was not significant at the five percent level of confidence. From these observations, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the extent which studies affect occupational performance is not related to the student's decision to pursue his education beyond the first academic year.

CHAPTER 6

RESIDENCE AND TRAVEL

This chapter examines housing and travel variables for their possible relationship with drop-out among part-time students. Housing variables studied include type and size of residence and its distance from the university. Travel factors examined include method of travel, the average length of travel time, the number of weekly trips to the university for purposes other than attending lectures, whether travel time could be used for study purposes, and the extent to which travel time interfered with the total amount of time available for study purposes.

TABLE NUMBER 33

Distribution of Sample by Type of Residence

GROUP	TYPE OF RESIDENCE				
	APARTMENT	TRIPLEX/ DUPLEX	BUNGALOW	HOUSE	OTHER
CONTINUING	166 (46.5%)	89 (24.9%)	27 (7.6%)	55 (15.4%)	20 (5.6%)
DROP-OUTS	134 (49.1%)	66 (24.2%)	25 (9.2%)	46 (16.8%)	2 (0.7%)
DIFFERENCE	2.6%	.7%	1.6%	1.4%	4.9%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 630 SIGNIFICANCE - 5%

TYPE OF RESIDENCE

Table 33 illustrates the distribution of the sample by type of residence, according to the percentage of students who remained at school, beyond their first year.

The data reached significance at the five percent level of confidence, however, actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group for any given residence bracket are slight. The data does not create any observable pattern. In view of these observations, it would appear that the student's type of residence does not seriously affect his decision to pursue studies beyond the first year.

Findings from Report 2 complement these observations. The students' type of residence did not appear to influence the number of credits attempted/obtained or G.P.A.

TABLE NUMBER 34

Distribution of Sample by Number of Rooms in Dwelling

GROUP	NUMBER OF ROOMS IN DWELLING				
	1½ ROOMS	2-4 ROOMS	5-7 ROOMS	8-9 ROOMS	10+ ROOMS
CONTINUING	33 (9.4%)	133 (37.8%)	109 (31.0%)	51 (14.5%)	26 (7.4%)
DROP-OUTS	16 (5.9%)	109 (40.1%)	84 (30.9%)	35 (12.9%)	28 (10.3%)
DIFFERENCE	3.5%	2.3%	.1%	1.6%	2.9%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 624

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

NUMBER OF ROOMS IN DWELLING

Table 34 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the number of rooms in the student's dwelling, according to the percentage of students who pursued their studies beyond the first year.

The data produced by Table 34 does not demonstrate any observable pattern. In addition, actual differences between the continuing and drop-out group for any given bracket were slight. The data did not reach a level of significance. These observations suggest that the number of rooms in the student's dwelling is not related to his decision to continue with or drop-out of school.

TABLE NUMBER 35

Distribution of Sample by Distance Between Residence and University

GROUP	DISTANCE BETWEEN RESIDENCE AND UNIVERSITY				
	1 MILE OR LESS	2 MILES	3 MILES	4 MILES	5+ MILES
CONTINUING	43 (13.2%)	24 (7.4%)	36 (11.1%)	25 (7.7%)	197 (60.6%)
DROP-OUTS	28 (10.6%)	15 (5.7%)	27 (10.3%)	14 (5.3%)	179 (68.1%)
DIFFERENCE	2.6%	1.7%	.8%	2.4%	7.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 588

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

DISTANCE BETWEEN RESIDENCE AND UNIVERSITY

Table 35 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the distance between residence and university, according to the percentage of students who pursued their academic studies beyond the first year.

The data presented in Table 35 does not produce a consistent pattern. Actual differences between the continuing and drop out group were slight, with the exception of the difference obtained for the '5+ miles' group, which witnessed a proportionately, higher drop-out rate yielding a difference of 7.5% in favour of drop-outs. In addition, the data did not reach a level of significance.

It is interesting to note that although findings from Report 2 suggest no direct relationship between travelling distance and credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A. It was found that the group who were required to travel over four miles to school, did in fact, attempt significantly fewer credits than three or four other groups contrasted with. Report 2 suggested that this pattern of results could possibly be attributed to the fact that students who do live quite a distance from school are confronted by a time handicap and this has to come out from the total amount of spare time allotted for study purposes. Table 35 does indicate that students living over four miles away from school, have in fact, a proportionately higher drop-out rate. In view of observations from Report 2 and findings in Table 35; it may be tentatively inferred that large travelling distances are related to the decision to continue with studies beyond the first year. It may be that certain students who lived quite a distance from school, realized after their first year that they could not devote the time required to continue their studies.

TABLE NUMBER 36

Distribution of Sample by Method of Travel to School

GROUP	METHOD OF TRAVEL TO SCHOOL				
	BY FOOT	CAR	SUBWAY/ TRAIN/ BUS	COMBINATION OF TWO	COMBINATION OF THREE
CONTINUING	46 (13.0%)	107 (30.3%)	125 (35.4%)	58 (16.4%)	17 (4.8%)
DROP-OUTS	37 (13.7%)	85 (31.4%)	73 (26.9%)	67 (24.7%)	9 (3.3%)
DIFFERENCE	.7%	1.1%	8.5%	8.3%	1.5%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 624 SIGNIFICANCE - 5%

METHOD OF TRAVEL TO SCHOOL

Table 36 illustrates the distribution of the sample by method of travel to school, according to the percentage of students who continued with their schooling for their second year of studies.

The data produced in Table 36 reveals only two cases of noticeable differences between the continuing and drop-out group: (1) those who used a combination of two methods of transport witnessed a proportionately higher drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 8.3% in favour of the drop-out group; (2) those who used either the subway, train or bus witnessed a proportionately, lower drop-out rate, yielding a difference of 8.5% in favour of the continuing group. The data reached significance at the five percent level and there does emerge a pattern from which a tentative relationship can be drawn.

Findings from Report 2 complement observations from Table 36, whereby it was found that the specific method of travel to school was not related to the number of credits attempted/obtained and G.P.A.

TABLE NUMBER 37

Distribution of Sample by Length of Travel Time to School

GROUP	LENGTH OF TRAVEL TIME TO SCHOOL		
	30 MIN. OR LESS	30 MIN. - ONE HOUR	1-1½ HOURS
CONTINUING	158 (44.9%)	161 (45.7%)	33 (9.4%)
DROP-OUTS	115 (42.6%)	136 (50.4%)	19 (7.0%)
DIFFERENCE	2.3%	4.7%	2.4%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 622

SIGNIFICANCE - NONE

LENGTH OF TRAVEL TIME TO SCHOOL

Table 37 illustrates the distribution of the sample by length of travel time to school according to the percentage of students who continued with their studies beyond their first academic year.

The length of travel time does not appear to be related to the decision to remain at or drop-out of school after their first year. The data from Table 37 reveals slight differences between the continuing and drop-out group. In addition, the data did not reach a level of significance.

Findings from Report 2 indicate that travel time is related to the number of credits attempted and obtained in the group contrast between the two extreme travel-time groups, (30 minutes or less to one and a half hours). Hence, it may be that students who must travel long distances to school have less time to devote to studies, but none-the-less, do find the time to continue the relatively smaller course-load work.

TABLE NUMBER 38

Distribution of Sample by Number of Weekly Trips to University for Purposes Other than Attending Lectures

GROUP	NUMBER OF WEEKLY TRIPS TO UNIVERSITY FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN ATTENDING LECTURES				
	0 TRIPS	1 TRIP	2 TRIPS	3 TRIPS	4+ TRIPS
CONTINUING	168 (49.4%)	99 (29.1%)	32 (9.4%)	23 (6.8%)	18 (5.3%)
DROP-OUTS	142 (55.5%)	51 (19.9%)	35 (13.7%)	21 (8.2%)	7 (2.7%)
DIFFERENCE	6.1%	9.2%	4.3%	1.4%	2.6%

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 596

SIGNIFICANCE - 5%

NUMBER OF WEEKLY TRIPS TO UNIVERSITY FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN ATTENDING LECTURES

Table 38 illustrates the distribution of the sample by the number of weekly trips to the university for purposes other than attending lectures, according to the percentage of students who remained at school for their second year of academic studies.

The data produced in Table 38, resulting in significance at the five percent level of confidence, does not present any sort of consistent trend although, in cases, the difference between the continuing and drop-out group is worthy of mention. Students who came to the university only to attend lectures and for no other reason witnessed a proportionately lower continuing student rate, yielding a difference of 6.1% in favour of drop-outs. Students who came to the university, approximately once a week for 'non-lecture' purposes, had a proportionately higher continuing-student rate, yielding a difference of 9.2% in favour of the continuing group. Aside from these two cases, differences between the continuing and drop-out group were not very large.

In Report 2 it was found that, generally, the more the trips to school for 'non-lecture' purposes, the greater the number of credits attempted and obtained. This finding is in accordance with the assumption that the more credits the student attempts and, subsequently obtains, the greater the amount of time needed to devote for study purposes at the university for 'non-lecture' purposes. Since this may reflect how well the student is integrated into the academic environment of the school, it does predict whether a student will choose to stay or leave school after his first year.