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Figure 1: Description of the first figure. It concerns the details of the experimental setup and involves a discussion of the results of the estimated model.
Chapter 1 introduces the problem of university dropouts with a discussion of its size, and of the estimated costs involved. It proceeds to deal with the difficulties associated with the definition of "dropout", and then introduces the concept of socialisation (and in particular of secondary socialisation). Possible applications of the concept to the analysis of professional education are discussed, and in particular the application of the concept to the question of whether students remain in their courses or withdraw from them. Emphasis is placed on the importance to this perspective of both individual and institutional variables.

Chapter 2 contains a summary review of the literature pertaining to university dropouts. The principal theme of this review is the development from descriptive to analytical studies of the problem, from simple to more complex perspectives, and from a concern with student characteristics to a realisation that the interaction between the student and his educational environment is an important factor to be investigated.

Chapter 3 presents a conceptual framework outlining the attributes of both individuals and institutions which are postulated as being involved in the transmission, by the
professional school to the student, of the elements making up the professional role.

Individual attributes are divided into

(1) background factors (father's income, occupation, and education; mother's education; relatives in the legal profession; and age at which the decision to study Law was made)

(2) academic ability

(3) orientation factors (attitudes, reasons for choosing Law, perceived characteristics of a successful lawyer, and expectations of the law course)

(4) situational factors (marital status, full-time or part-time course, scholarship assistance)

Institutional attributes are divided into

(1) orientation factors (academic/vocational emphasis, implicit attitudes and values)

(2) faculty/student interaction

(3) facilities for learning (flexible teaching methods, carefully constructed course organisation, library facilities)

Chapter 4 describes the development of the present study from a large-scale investigation of professional education in Australian universities; the nature of the group studied; the instruments used to collect the information
in the study; and the inadequacies of the available
information with regard to testing the operation of the
conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 3.

The specific hypotheses to be tested in the present
study are presented in both descriptive and formalised
fashion.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the testing of the
hypotheses specified in Chapter 4.

Significant differences between continuing students and
dropouts were discovered in relation to father's education,
age at which the decision to study Law was made, marital
status, type of course (full-time, part-time, and external),
and receipt of scholarship assistance. As well, there
were differences between the two groups at some of the
universities studied in relation to attitudes, perceived
characteristics of a successful lawyer, and the extent to
which the course fulfilled students' expectations.

Chapter 6 puts forward a typological construct of the
dropout based on the hypotheses tested and found to be
supported by the data in Chapter 5.

In an attempt to gain a further understanding of
these relationships, both the continuing students and the
dropouts are subdivided into older and younger groups,
and some of the relationships which were found to hold in
Chapter 5 are re-examined in the light of this breakdown.
Chapter 7 consists of a brief discussion of the implications of the research in relation to the theoretical position outlined earlier in the dissertation; the implications for further research; and the practical implications of the study.
Chapter 1

THE CONCEPTS OF WITHDRAWAL AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIALISATION

Size and Costs of the Problem of Withdrawal

One of the major problems facing many institutions of tertiary education is that of "wastage" which ensues when students withdraw from the courses in which they are enrolled before completing the requirements for graduation from these institutions. The problem has both individual and institutional aspects: with regard to the former, the National Union of Australian University Students (78) has estimated the cost to the student per annum of an Australian Arts degree as being between $1,386 and $1,765; and with regard to the latter aspect, the Martin Committee (77, p.220) in 1964 estimated that by 1975 necessary capital expenditure alone would reach a level of £2,100 per equivalent full-time student (based on 1963 cost levels).

The past ten to fifteen years in the United States have witnessed a considerable increase in interest in the problem (in 1961, Time magazine reported that the Ford Foundation alone gave $1,330,000 for "dropout" research (16)), but in Australia educational research appears as yet to have been limited to questions concerning failure rates, and attempts to develop efficient methods of discriminating between potentially passing and failing students. Yet withdrawal would seem to be a very real problem for Australian educators (as it is for their North American counterparts);
and it is suggested that withdrawals from Australian universities are not limited to cases of academic failure, and that failure itself need not necessarily be viewed as resulting from insufficient ability or aptitude. This latter point was illustrated by Anderson and Western (69, p. 212) in 1966, when they observed in a comparison of two earlier studies that:

In the economics department where the emphasis was academic, the entering students with academic orientations were significantly more successful in examinations and better adjusted. In the Australian medical school where the emphasis was overwhelmingly professional, students with this orientation had significantly better examination results.

The overall rate of graduation from Australian universities (for full-time students, allowing a maximum time in which to complete degrees) has been estimated at between 60% and 65% (19, p. 1). Slightly more than half this percentage graduate in minimum time, and the rate of graduation differs for various categories of students. In an ongoing study of entrants to Australian universities in 1961 being conducted by the Commonwealth Department of Education and Science, first reports indicate (74, p. 10) that 55% of the 8,600 full-time students and 29% of the 1,680 part-time students graduated within minimum time plus one year, and that 31% of the full-time and 62% of the part-time students had discontinued their studies (these discontinuance rates do not include students who transferred to other universities). Rates of discontinuance were found (79) to vary between universities
(for instance, the percentages of medical students discontinuing their course ranged from zero at the University of Tasmania to 32% at Monash University), and between faculties (from 16% in faculties of medicine to 30% in faculties of law and 32% in faculties of veterinary science).

In the United States, on first examination wastage figures would appear to be somewhat higher than in Australia. In a study of 15,535 students entering 25 United States universities in 1931 and 1932, McNeely (66, p. 630) found that 62% of the students left without graduating during the succeeding four years: however, 17% transferred to other colleges or universities, giving a nett loss to tertiary education of 45%. In a survey of 12,667 students who entered 149 institutions of higher learning in 1950, Iffert (66, p. 630) found that a similar rate of 39.5% had graduated within four years from time of entrance. He also remarked that dropout rates varied between different types of institutions, the average rate for public institutions being 67%, and for private institutions only 52%.

In the United Kingdom, student wastage was estimated at 14% by the Robbins Committee in 1963, and at 13% by the University Grants Committee in 1968 (75, p. 7) - both figures reflecting a dropout rate much lower than that pertaining in both the U.S. and Australia. However, once again these rates varied both between universities (from 5% at Oxbridge up to 20% in the new technological universities), and between faculties (from 8% in medicine to 22% in engineering).
Definitions of "Dropouts"

It should be noted, however, that both attempts at national accounting (such as the foregoing) and individual research into the problem of student withdrawal are hampered by a lack of agreement on definition of the subject population. For instance, the attempts at estimation of national wastage figures may be considerably inflated by failure to take account of students transferring from one institution of tertiary education to another - in one study (65, p. 2), 80% of the dropouts from one institution were found to be continuing their education elsewhere. This may be a factor of particular importance in the United States, with its greater diversity of tertiary educational institutions.

Definitional differences in individual research projects introduce considerable difficulty into attempts to construct a coherent, overall picture of dropout research. The contributions thus far made will be discussed in the following chapter - at this point, the intention is simply to illustrate by example that researchers in this area have in some ways exacerbated an already confusing situation. Some investigators have undertaken to study all students enrolling in a particular institution at a particular time, and not enrolled at a later, specified time prior to graduation (65, 39, 27, 34, 18, 35, 62) - these studies do not distinguish between cases where withdrawal was voluntary and those where the student was dismissed. Some studies are concerned with students who
drop out within a specified period (35, 29, 55) - generally the freshman year - whereas others do not distinguish between students leaving at any time over three- or four-year period (34, 39). In some cases, a distinction is made between voluntary withdrawals and dismissals, or between students who withdraw with passing and failing grades (14, 26, 54). In a few instances other, more specialised, distinctions have been made: in one study (48) a dropout was defined as any student who had withdrawn at some stage and not completed four years' course work at a point four years after entry, even if that student was currently enrolled in the institution; another study (55) used a four-fold classification in studying college students, comparing:

(i) **defaulters** (students who withdrew during semester)

(ii) **successful persisters** (students who persisted successfully (academically) through one year)

(iii) **probation persisters** (students who persisted unsuccessfully through one year)

(iv) **dropouts** (students who persisted successfully but voluntarily did not return for the second year).

It is suggested that for most general purposes, the classification which would prove most useful would be one which took account of (i) the stage at which students withdrew, (ii) whether withdrawal was voluntary or mandatory, and (iii) whether students' academic performance was satisfactory prior to withdrawal.
Until such definitional difficulties as have been indicated are resolved, comparisons and aggregations of the available data will be of limited value, of limited use for either research or administrative purposes except as suggestive of trends. This fact should be kept in mind when reviewing the literature presented in the following chapter. Until such time as a standard terminology relating to dropout behaviour is adopted, it is imperative that each researcher should specify precisely the nature of the sample being studied.

The Concept of Professional Socialisation

The study which is the subject of the present report is concerned with the question of why students withdraw from courses of professional education (specifically, from courses in law). These courses are viewed as ongoing processes of adult (or secondary) socialisation, with the professional school conceived as the socialising agency.

The term "socialisation" has been used extensively in sociological literature to mean "the process by which people selectively acquire the attitudes and values, the interests, skills, and knowledge - in short, the culture - current in the groups of which they are, or seek to become, a member" (44, p. 287). Originally, the term was used in a developmental context to describe the induction of the child into a working social system; more recently, however, it has been extended to the analysis of the acquisition of adult roles, especially occupational
roles. In the present context, it is suggested that professional education is a "process by which students selectively acquire the attitudes and values, interests, skills, and knowledge current in the profession of which they seek to become a member." It is suggested that the acquisition of the professional role involves both direct learning through formally organised education programmes, and indirect learning as a byproduct of interaction between the student and his significant others (especially peers and faculty). It is also suggested that the professional role may be defined somewhat differently by the professional school and by the corps of practicing professionals, thus involving the individual in successive role acquisitions as he moves, firstly into the professional school, and then into the milieu of practising professionals.

Merton (44, p. 71) puts forward the thesis that a profession has

... its own normative subculture, a body of shared and transmitted ideas, values and standards toward which members of the profession are expected to orient their behaviour. The norms and standards define technically and morally allowable patterns of behaviour, indicating what is prescribed, preferred, permitted, or proscribed. The subculture, then, refers to more than habitual behaviour; its norms codify the values of the profession. ... and it is the function of the ... professional] school to transmit this subculture to successive generations of neophytes.

The composition of values making up a professional subculture varies between professional schools both in detail and in emphasis, but there appears, nonetheless, to be a substantial consensus concerning those elements which
are essential to the professional role (44, p. 71). Moreover, the social environment constituted by each professional school varies for the individual students and groups of students within it: since the patterns of interaction with significant others are only similar and not identical, the variations result in a variety of socialisation outcomes within the same institution (44, pp. 63, 287). What is more, the admissions policy of the professional school has the consequence of determining, to a large extent, the social environment of the students - thus, such variations as occur fall within limits determined by the socialising agency.

Paraphrasing Merton (44, p. 63), the relevance of this perspective to the analysis of student withdrawal may be expressed as follows:

Students of the same measured degree of intelligence or aptitude vary with respect to their status and social relations with others in the socialising agency (professional faculty), and, as a result, in the extent to which they acquire the attitudes and values, the skills and knowledge of their chosen profession. On this conception, one would expect to find substantial differences in the extent to which they acquire the attitudes and values, the skills and knowledge of their chosen profession. On this conception, one would expect to find substantial differences in the extent and effectiveness of professional learning among students of approximately the same intelligence and aptitude. Learning and performance vary not only as the individual qualities of students vary but also as their social environments vary, with their distinctive value orientations and their distinctive organisation of relations among students, and between students and faculty.
One might add a cautionary note at this stage, to the effect that Merton is referring to the American professional school, a post-graduate institution exclusively concerned with professional training. In Australia, professional schools are undergraduate institutions and are therefore concerned as well with more general educational objectives. The Australian situation, then, in its present state would not seem to constitute as pure a case of professional socialisation as the American case outlined by Merton. This fact may lead to the additional complexity that faculty members within a professional school may vary in the relative emphasis which they give to general educational objectives and specifically professional education, and thereby add to the potential conflicts encountered by the student.

Stanton Wheeler (13, p. 112) has drawn up a framework for the analysis of socialisation in organisations, which could well be used to indicate the preconditions for the most (or least) favourable socialisation outcomes in an institution such as a professional school (see Fig. 1).

Seen in these terms, the optimum condition for successful socialisation would be that where the institution provided clear normative definitions, many opportunities for performance to be demonstrated, and rewards for suitable performance; and where the individual was capable of both performance and learning the norms presented by the institution, and was motivated to perform. Conversely, where any one of these six factors was missing, the
socialisation outcome would be less than ideal. In the extreme case (complete failure in the socialisation process), there would be ambiguity or conflict in the normative structure presented by the institution, it would provide few opportunities for performance, and would not possess the power to reward performances; similarly, the individual would be capable neither of learning the norms nor of performing satisfactorily, and in addition he would be insufficiently motivated to perform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervening Mechanisms</th>
<th>Organisational Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards, Sanctions, Motives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with all typological constructs, it is unlikely that either extreme case would often be encountered in institutions of professional education, but the variety of possible socialisation outcomes resulting from the various combinations of the six organisational and individual
intervening mechanisms support our earlier observation that "learning and performance vary not only as the individual qualities of students vary but also as their social environments vary." Moreover, the conceptualisation of dropouts from courses of professional education as instances of incomplete or unsuccessful socialisation into a professional role, and the emphasis on the relevance to this socialisation process of both individual and institutional characteristics, is congruent with recent developments in research into university dropouts in the United States, to be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON UNIVERSITY DROPOUTS

Much of the earlier literature on dropouts is of a purely descriptive kind: research was generally confined to attempts to isolate those characteristics of dropouts which distinguished them from students who remained to graduate (and, less often, attempts to distinguish between different types of dropouts), and to classification of the reasons given for withdrawal.

The most commonly investigated characteristics are biological and social factors (such as age at matriculation, sex, socioeconomic status, and hometown location and size); academic factors (secondary school preparation, scholastic aptitude, and academic performance at university); and personality factors. A review of the numerous studies of these factors reveals that the findings are equivocal - each factor has been found by some investigator to have some relationship to some particular group of dropouts, but the relationships vary in nature and extent according to the group under study and the methods used in obtaining the information.

Similarly, the reasons given by students themselves for dropping out cover a wide range of factors and show little consistency between studies: perhaps the most frequently cited reasons have been poor grades, financial difficulty, illness, and dissatisfaction with the particular university attended.
BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS

(1) Age at matriculation. In his review of dropout research, Summerskill (66, p. 631) draws the general conclusion that age per se does not affect attrition, although older students may encounter more obstacles to graduation. In the group of withdrawees investigated by Koelsche (37), the median age at time of enrolment was between 18 and 19 years, which is normal for the overall college population; Bragg (12) found no significant difference in the ages of continuing students and withdrawees in her study; and Goble (24) reported that in his sample graduates matriculated at an older age than dropouts.

(2) Sex. Little difference has been found between the attrition rates for male and female students (12, 35, 64). Most studies, however, have been concerned with the rate of withdrawal during the first year; Slocum (62) found that after one year the proportions of male (67%) and female (66%) students who remained in college were very similar, but that these proportions diverged in succeeding years - 51% for male students and 41% for female students after two years, and 44% and 33% respectively after three years. It has been emphasised that even if male and female students withdraw at similar rates, this would not imply that they withdraw for similar reasons: since female students are generally more highly selected academically than male students.

The terms, 'dropout' and 'withdrawee', are used synonymously in the present report.
students, nonacademic factors may play a more important part in their decision to withdraw (2, 34, 62, 63, 59). The 1961 Australian study found that, while equivalent proportions of male and female full-time students have discontinued (about one-third of both groups), among part-time students approximately 60% of the males and 75% of the females have discontinued [personal communication].

(3) Socioeconomic factors. The findings in this area are equivocal, and suggest that more attention should be paid to the role of such factors in determining the individual student's adjustment to a given environment. The issue is a complex one, involving the interaction of many variables, and further mention will be made of attempts to understand the problem from this point of view.

The relationship between parents' education and rates of withdrawal has received careful attention: Snyder (64) found no significant difference on this variable between students who withdrew and the college population as a whole, although there was a small difference in favour of the withdrawal group. Slocum (62) and Goble (24), however, concluded from their investigations that a higher level of parental education was associated with a greater chance of survival at college; Goetz and Leach (25) found no significant difference between the education of fathers of continuers and withdrawees, but the level of mothers' education was significantly higher for continuers than for withdrawees.
With regard to the relationship between parents' occupational status and rates of withdrawal, the findings are no less ambiguous. Both Little (38) and Snyder (64) found no association between father's occupation and withdrawal; Caskey (41) found that a smaller percentage of dropouts' parents were in the professional group, and Slocum (62) found a significantly higher survival rate for children of fathers in professional and technical occupations, with the highest withdrawal rate among children of manual labourers and those in service occupations. Slater (60) found that the rate of withdrawal fell markedly when students were enrolled in colleges which prepared them to enter occupations similar to those in which their fathers were employed.

Slocum (62) also cited family attitudes as an important factor, claiming that parental interest as perceived by the student is influential in his decision whether to withdraw or remain; Murray (46) similarly reported a favourable parental attitude toward college as being related to persistence in college.

In addition, Brown (14) found that the factor of siblings who attended and/or graduated from college made a contribution to the prediction of continuation or noncontinuation in college, and Goble (24) reported a higher incidence of relatives having attended university among graduates than among dropouts.

(4) Hometown location and size. Summerskill (66, p. 633) summarises the data on this variable as being "sometimes
and somehow related to success or failure at college. Some attention has also been given to size and type of high school attended as a factor associated with withdrawal. Slocum (62) found that size of high school was not associated either with academic survival or with academic performance at college; but Summerskill states that there is some evidence that students from larger high schools have significantly better chances of graduating from college, a statement which is supported in the findings reported by Goble (24).

ACADEMIC FACTORS

(1) **Secondary school preparation.** Studies of the relationship between academic achievement in high school and college withdrawal rates have generally indicated a positive correlation between high school rank and college survival (12, 24, 37, 62).

(2) **Scholastic aptitude.** The findings with regard to the relationship between scholastic aptitude and withdrawal are generally in agreement - Summerskill (66) found that average scholastic aptitude scores were lower for dropouts than for graduates in 16 of the 19 studies he reviewed. A similar finding was reported amongst British students by Lucas et al (40). The position with regard to the role of academic ability in student withdrawals is clearly expressed by Marsh (41, p. 479), who suggests that
AbJility and achievement ratings seem to be useful primarily for spotting only those students on the low end of the scale who will clearly drop out due to academic failure alone, ... 

Supporting this conclusion is the finding by Anderson and Riches (2) that among a sample of medical students, those dropping out for academic reasons scored significantly lower on an aptitude test than other students, but that those dropping out for nonacademic reasons recorded higher aptitude scores than any other group of students.

(3) Academic performance at college. Before reviewing the evidence concerning the relationship between academic performance and withdrawal, it should be emphasised that poor performance in itself does not necessarily indicate a low level of ability, nor does the fact that a student with low grades subsequently withdraws from the university imply that he withdraws because of his low grades - the decision to withdraw may have been made at an earlier stage, resulting in lack of interest and poor examination performance. Goetz and Leach (25), while compiling data on the college performance of withdrawees, discovered that some of these students had discontinued attendance at classes without informing the university. In these instances, the students' grades were recorded as failures, which would result in a lowering of their academic averages, and of the academic performance of the group considered as a whole. Clearly, in such cases, the reason for withdrawal preceded the low grades.

Grade-point averages of withdrawal groups have been investigated in a number of studies: Johnson (35) found
that the GPA's of male students who continued were significantly higher than those of male students who withdrew, but there was no similar difference between female students; Goetz and Leach (25), Goble (24), and Bragg (12) also found that continuing students had higher GPA's than those who withdrew.

A second approach has been to use grade-point averages in determining a level of satisfactory academic performance, and then to estimate the proportions of students progressing satisfactorily and unsatisfactorily at the time of withdrawal. Koelsche (37) found that 62% of the dropouts in his sample were progressing unsatisfactorily at the time of withdrawal; Halladay and Andrew (27) estimated this proportion at 64%; and Slocum (62) found that 51% of those studied were in scholastic difficulties at the time of withdrawal. The variations in percentages reported may be in part due to differences in the definition of "satisfactory performance".

SUBJECTIVE REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL.

A number of studies have included an attempt to ascertain withdrawees' perceptions of the causes contributing to their withdrawal. The technique of asking students why they withdrew suffers from a number of fairly obvious inadequacies, but while it may not be advisable to rely solely on the subjective reports of withdrawees, nor would it be satisfactory to rely on faculty reports or official records as the only source of information on this group of students.
In assessing the importance attributed to various factors by students who have withdrawn from their course of study, it should be noted that some factors may be more acceptable to themselves, to parents, and to the institution concerned, and thus be given an emphasis in subjective reports which is disproportionate to the role which they play in the decision to withdraw. This is perhaps an inevitable disadvantage of the questionnaire technique, especially if the information is obtained some time after withdrawal, and it may be that this difficulty will only be surmounted by the use of counselling interviews at the time of withdrawal. Nevertheless, even if the subjective reports of students who have withdrawn are not an entirely accurate reflection of the factors involved in the decision to withdraw, they may serve an additional purpose in telling us something about the evaluative standards imposed by the societies in which these students live and study.

Table 1 shows the percentages of students giving a variety of reasons for withdrawal, obtained in five different studies (23, 32, 35, 37, 64).

Some of the factors designated by different titles may in fact cover the same set of circumstances, either from the investigator's point of view or from that of the student. For example, "changed objectives" (23, 32) may be interpreted as similar in meaning to "unsuitable choice of course" (64). It should be remembered that the studies referred to were carried out in American universities, and that the differences between the American and the Australian
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Contributing to Withdrawal</th>
<th>Iffert &amp; Johnson Clarke (23)</th>
<th>Koelsche (37)</th>
<th>Snyder (64)</th>
<th>Gekowski &amp; Schwartz (32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor grades</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>primary 9% secondary 11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in courses</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>secondary 6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor high school preparation</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed objectives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulty</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>primary 17% secondary 7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to work</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>primary 7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get married</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>primary 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>primary 7% secondary 6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the particular college</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>curriculum 6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>instruction 2%</td>
<td>administration 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality adjustment difficulty</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family problems</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Contributing to Withdrawal</th>
<th>Iffert &amp; Johnson Clarke (23) (35)</th>
<th>Koelsche (37)</th>
<th>Snyder (64)</th>
<th>Gekowski &amp; Schwartz (32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military service</td>
<td>primary 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of residence</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable choice of course</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting problems</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education systems most probably entail differences in the importance attributed to various factors in withdrawal. The greater diversity in American institutions of tertiary education gives students a wider choice, both of courses and of institutions, than is presently the case in Australia, and may thus lead to factors such as "dissatisfaction within the particular college [university]", and "unsuitable choice of course" playing a greater part in withdrawals in the American context.

In reviewing the literature on students' reasons for withdrawal, Summerskill (66) found that the most frequently mentioned reasons were lack of interest in college, lack of interest in studies, marriage or marriage plans, military service, and illness (both personal and in immediate family). Summerskill adds a cautionary note, which seems particularly appropriate when reviewing the
factors listed in Table I, concerning the lack of distinction between reason and outcome.

Even assuming that the subjective reports of withdrawees can be accepted at face value, it seems unlikely that those students who continue with their courses of study encounter none of the problems contributing to withdrawal. The studies by Slocum (62) and by Gekowski and Schwartz (23) found that continuing students experienced similar difficulties to those reported by withdrawees as factors in the decision to withdraw; and Goetz and Leach (25) found that

only three factors generally related to attrition differentiated the groups: withdrawees felt that problems of marriage, family finance, and general unhappiness were somewhat more important than continuers.

Note that even in the latter studies, the findings indicate that withdrawees perceived a number of problems as being more important than did continuers, but no evidence is given that the incidence of such problems is higher for students who withdraw.

PERSONALITY FACTORS.

The fact that one person with problems withdraws while another person with problems continues leads to the question of whether certain personality variables can be found which differentiate the two groups. A large number of studies have been concerned with this problem, producing a sizeable and confusing agglomerate of findings. Marsh (41)
summarises the literature on personality variables as follows: dropouts are more rigid and fearful of change, less willing to accept the responsibility of adult independence, lacking in internalised goals and values, tend to feel easily and perhaps hopelessly defeated when faced with the prospect of possible failure or disappointment, and tend to rationalise their failures in an unrealistic manner.

Rose and Elton (55), whose unusually detailed classification of withdrawees and continuing students has already been mentioned, have made one of the most thorough investigations of personality characteristics, starting from the hypothesis that

Withdrawal within semester would seem to constitute a psychologically different kind of act than the successful or unsuccessful completion of a semester after which the student does not return to college.

Their findings indicate that personality characteristics significantly differentiate between types of persistence (successful and unsuccessful), between types of withdrawal (dropout or default), and between withdrawing and continuing students.

Suczek (65) reported that personality factors appeared to be related both to dropping out and to the student's activity after dropping out. He found that

Students who return to the original campus are an unusually mature group with a high level of complexity at the time they first enter the University. Students who are "true" dropouts are somewhat less mature, less complex, and less flexible. Students who drop out from...
institution] and continue their higher education elsewhere resemble the students who continue without interruption at ... [the institution of first enrolment], in relatively greater conventionality; control and compliance to authority. ... (65, p. 35)

and Lucas et al (40) found that in a sample of British students, severe personality disturbances occurred with disproportionate frequency among dropouts when compared with students who continued.

CONTEXTUAL FACTORS.

A number of studies have examined the importance of the student's vocational orientation to his educational environment. Slater (60) found that the rate of withdrawal was highest where the decision to attend college was made by someone other than the student, followed by those students who had a desire to attend college but were indifferent to their chosen course. The highest survival rates were found amongst those whose objectives in attending college were intellectual pursuit and vocational ambition. Goetz and Leach (25) found, however, that a greater proportion of withdrawees than of continuers had enrolled in courses which were related to career or vocational goals.

Slocum (62) found no difference between the proportions of continuing students and withdrawees who had indicated at the time of enrolment that they planned to complete the bachelor's degree; but he reported that occupational uncertainty at time of entry appeared to be common among male withdrawees and those who withdrew because of scholastic difficulty.
In looking at students’ reactions to the courses and facilities offered by their college, Goetz and Leach (25) reported a number of findings which indicate that students do not simply remain at college because their requirements are more readily fulfilled than those of students who leave college. Withdrawees in their study gave more favourable reports than continuing students when considering both the enthusiasm of the teaching staff and the number of courses offered by the college in their major field of interest. However, continuing students were more inclined to view the college as emphasising intellectual and cultural pursuits outside the classroom. Brown (14) also found that students continuing in college reported less satisfaction with several of the programmes, services, and facilities offered. On the other hand, Gekowski and Schwartz (23) found that more withdrawees than continuing students felt that their courses were poor preparation for their vocational objectives, and that withdrawees gave a less favourable overall evaluation of their faculty than did continuing students.

Contact with staff members has received a certain amount of attention: in Slocum’s study (62), continuing students felt freer to talk over their personal problems with faculty members, and Gekowski and Schwartz (23) found that a greater number of continuing students could name and had had contact with their faculty advisers. Several studies (14, 23, 24, 62) have shown a greater amount of participation in extracurricular activities by continuing
students, although Slocum (62) did not find any difference in the number of friends at college reported by the two groups. Goble (24), however, reported a greater perceived ability to make friends among continuing students than among dropouts.

INTERACTION HYPOTHESES.

The confusing picture presented by the search for single factors related to withdrawal from institutions of tertiary education has led to recent attempts to view the problem from a more analytical perspective postulating an interaction process between students and the learning environment, a perspective lending itself to the analysis of a wide range of institutions rather than an attempt to explain, or merely to present, data collected from a single institution or relating to a single variable (or limited complex of variables). Williams (71) suggested the need for such an approach in his observation that:

Correlates of dropout behaviour identified in past studies include the personality variables of dependency, unreflectiveness, rigidity, anxiety, irresponsibility, impulsiveness, need for change, conformity, social discomfort, and values holding that education should have vocational utility and that hard work is good in and of itself. In addition to their negative flavour, several of these traits are seemingly contradictory. The element that seems to be missing from this picture of the dropout is the nature of the environments in which these traits have been manifested.

A recent approximation to this suggested approach is found in the work of Pervin (49, 50, 51, 52, 53), which examines the interaction of students' perceptions of
themselves and their perception of the college atmosphere with regard to both academic and nonacademic aspects, and the relationship of these perceptions to student dissatisfaction and dropout. The framework of this research is broad enough to include not only the interaction of a wide range of college atmospheres and student attitudes, but also a wide range of student responses - that is, satisfaction/dissatisfaction and persistence/dropout - as well.

Pervin's work is based on the view that (50, p. 281) the college is a system in the sense that it is composed of a number of interdependent parts (students, faculty, and administration) which share, to one degree or another, certain values and characteristics. Furthermore, the college is viewed as a social system in the sense that the parts and goals involve people - there are individual and group needs to be satisfied.

He has developed an instrument for institutional research (TAPE - Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment), and using it he has collected data from students in a wide range of fields of study at a large number of universities. He envisages the complete analysis of the college as a social system as entailing administration of TAPE to all elements in the system (students, faculty, and administration), the resultant data providing information about where and to what extent these elements agree and disagree in their perceptions.

Pervin's approach to the fact that some students withdraw from the courses in which they are enrolled, while others remain, is expressed as follows (51, p. 285):
Beyond some few common characteristics, colleges are vastly different from one another. Furthermore, there is evidence that students generally select a college whose image fits their own needs, providing for a match between student and college environment. In many cases, however, students are forced to choose on some other basis, have a distorted image of their preferred college or have an unrealistic image of their own needs. Each of these means a lack of fit between the needs of the individual and the press or sources of reward and frustration in the college environment.

A lack of fit between student and college characteristics should ... lead to some kinds of dissatisfaction with the college experience, which ultimately may lead to dropping out of college.

In conceptualising dropout behaviour thus, Pervin sees as necessary a distinction between withdrawal for academic and nonacademic reasons. The data so far obtained in his studies of the college as a social system (51) indicate that there is a high correlation between perceived self/college discrepancies and dropping out for nonacademic reasons, but that this relationship does not hold in the case of withdrawal due to academic factors.

Following on from this analysis, one could ask, in addition to whether there are discrepancies between the student's perception of himself and his educational environment,

1) what is the nature and the source of these discrepancies?
2) if the student is forced to select a course of study on grounds other than his perceived needs, what are the factors which influence
him in his decision and how will these lead to perceived discrepancies between self and environment?

3) in what way is the student's image of his preferred course of study distorted?

4) in what way is the student's perception of his own needs distorted?

In addition, one may recognise that the student is not a fixed and unchanging entity, and ask whether changes occurring during the course of study may lead to the perceived discrepancies which Pervin conceives as being involved in dropping out.

A less theoretical approach to the problem has been taken by Panos and Astin (48), who have undertaken to examine how a large number of student characteristics and features of the college environment are related to dropping out of college. Using multiple regression techniques, they have examined data collected from 60,000 students enrolled in 246 institutions of higher learning and have concluded that their results support the hypothesis that educational outcomes are determined both by the individual's personal characteristics and by the environmental context.

Panos and Astin suggest, on the basis of their analysis, that (48, p. 68)

at least two conceptually distinct, though perhaps related, patterns of environmental effects increase the students' chances of dropping out of college. The first pattern is concerned primarily with interpersonal relationships ...
The second pattern ... appears to involve influences that are administratively determined.
Environmental characteristics, however, make a considerably smaller contribution to the variance in the criterion variable than do student characteristics, suggesting that differences in the attrition rates at different institutions may be more a function of differences in their entering students than of differences in environmental characteristics.

Panos and Astin do, however, conclude by advising that future research take into account both individual and institutional factors when considering dropout behaviour.

Wegner and Sewell (68) have also addressed themselves to studying the relationship between student input and institutional characteristics as determinants of educational outcomes. Specifically, they have investigated four questions (68, p. 4):

1. Do different types of colleges recruit students with different characteristics and are these characteristics related to the probability of graduating from college?

2. Are there institutional differences in graduation rates which cannot be accounted for by the background characteristics of students ...?

3. From what types of schools do students of different intelligence and socioeconomic status levels experience the greatest probability of graduating?

4. Are students of different intelligence and socioeconomic status distributed among institutions in accordance with their chances of graduating from them?

In answer to their first question, the data suggest (68, pp.8-12) that the student characteristics of rank in high school class, intelligence, occupational aspiration, and
socioeconomic status are related to probability of graduation, and that differences in institutional graduation rates correspond to the type of students recruited by the institution.

In answer to the second question, Wegner and Sewell (68, pp. 12-14) report findings of notable similarity to those reported by Panos and Astin. They state that the type of college attended has an independent effect on the students' chances of graduating: student input factors contribute most (25%) to the variance in graduation rates, but type of college attended accounts for 3% of the variance beyond what can be explained by student characteristics.

Finally, in answer to the remaining two questions, it was found (68, pp. 14-16) that students of different socioeconomic and intelligence levels display varying probabilities of graduating from the different types of colleges; and that although the distribution of students among the various types of institutions is sometimes in accordance with their probability of graduation from these institutions, students with high socioeconomic status are distributed in a manner more favourable to completion of their college education.

This review of recent and more complex approaches to the problem of dropout behaviour brings us back to the point at which we concluded the preceding chapter: the observation that in the process of socialisation into a professional role, "learning and performance vary not only as the individual qualities of students vary but also as their social environments vary".
While the contents of the previous two chapters have suggested that an exceedingly complex behavioural model would be necessary to account for any individual's decision to withdraw from a course of professional education, it is now proposed to discuss a simplified conceptual framework based on both the theoretical concepts discussed in Chapter 1, and the empirical evidence presented in Chapter 2. Many of the core ideas of the framework owe their origins to the analysis by Western and Anderson (70) of education and professional socialisation.

To begin with, this study is based on the premise that professional education involves a process of socialisation into a particular role, and that this socialisation process involves not only the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills, but also of the attitudes and values which facilitate performance of this role in a manner acceptable to the social system in which it is located. Moreover, role learning occurs not only in circumstances defined by the professional school as formal learning situations, but in informal situations arising from contact with other students and with faculty members. A second, related, premise is that complete comprehension of the socialisation process will only be made possible by an examination of the
characteristics both of individuals and of institutions, and the interaction of these.

Generally stated, the hypothesis which underlies the present study is that there are a number of individual attributes and institutional characteristics which are relevant to the successful acquisition of the skills and knowledge, attitudes and values which define the role of a member of a given profession, and that where there is lack of congruence between these individual attributes and institutional characteristics, there is a high probability that the individual will withdraw from the course of professional education (or process of induction into the professional role).

It is important to note here that professional schools vary, at least to some extent, in their definitions of both the cognitive and the evaluative aspects of the professional role. Consequently, when we refer to the process of professional socialisation in a professional school we are speaking of socialisation into a particular definition of the professional role. As noted in an earlier chapter, role definitions not only vary somewhat between socialising agencies, but it is also probable that the corps of practising professionals may differ from the schools in its role definition, thus requiring a process of readjustment following on graduation from the professional school. It is, however, the phase of socialisation which takes place in the professional school with which we are concerned in the present study.
It now remains to specify in greater detail those attributes of the individual which are conceived as having relevance to his acquisition of the professional role, and those attributes of the socialising institution which affect the transmission of its definition of the professional role.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Those attributes of the individual which are suggested as important factors in professional socialisation are divided into four categories:

(1) background factors
(2) academic ability
(3) orientation factors
(4) situational factors

**Background Factors.**

It is suggested that the amount of congruence between the image of his chosen profession with which the recruit enters the professional school, and the image of the profession which is propagated by the professional school, will be an important factor in facilitating the learning of the professional role as defined by the school. The concept of anticipatory socialisation is important here - if, during the pre-training phase (70, p. 96), the individual has had many opportunities to construct an accurate assessment of the skills and knowledge, attitudes and values which make up the professional role, then we
would hypothesise that his accurate assessment would lead
to less conflict and a more ready acquisition of the elements
of the professional culture. Western and Anderson (70,
pp. 96-97) make the two points that the extent of
anticipatory socialisation taking place is in part
dependent upon the "visibility" of the professional role
(they suggest, for instance, that the role of a doctor is
more "visible" than the role of an economist), and that the
image of the profession formed during the pre-training
phase may be based on lay concepts of the profession and not
on role definitions operating within the profession itself.

The background factors put forward as important in the
formation of an accurate image of the profession are:

(a) father's income: it is suggested that since, despite
scholarship assistance, in Australia at least a professional
education is expensive, the economic status of the family
will be important in determining the proximity or
remoteness of such a possibility for the child, and hence
in determining the amount of consideration given to a
professional career. This factor may be more important
in terms of ruling out any consideration of professional
careers in general, rather than in directing attention to
a particular career.

(b) parents' education: the educational level of the
parents is seen as being important in two ways - firstly,
in determining the amount of accurate information regarding
the profession which parents are able to supply; and
secondly, in determining the educational aspirations of the parents for the child, and ultimately of the individual for himself.

(c) father's occupation, while not independent of the factors mentioned above, is seen as contributing in an additional manner — it is suggested that individuals with fathers in the profession, or in occupations involving close contact with members of the profession, would have a greater stock of experiences from which to derive accurate information concerning professional roles.

(d) family members and close friends involved in the profession: similarly, those individuals with members of the family and close friends in the profession would have more information available in forming their image of the profession. In both this and the preceding factor, the relevance of Western and Anderson's point concerning lay images of the profession is clear, in that the children of non-professional families (and also, but perhaps to a lesser degree, of families in other professional groups) are more likely to form their images of the profession from lay notions rather than from information provided directly by practising professionals.

(e) age at decision: finally, it is suggested that the age at which the individual decides to enter the profession will be important, in that a decision at an earlier age would indicate a longer period of anticipatory socialisation, during which time attention is directed towards the
profession. There is, however, a possibility that there exists an optimum age of decision, prior to which decisions may be based on unrealistic conceptions of the professional role and of the individual's ability to satisfy role requirements.

There are obvious interrelationships between a number of these background factors - the above paragraphs represent, however, an attempt to examine the unique contribution of each factor. It is also recognised that in addition to the more-or-less direct relationships described above, background factors are also influential through the orientation factors to be discussed in a later section. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, a comprehensive model of the phenomenon under consideration would be extremely complex - the objective of the present study is simply to examine some of the basic structures underlying the more complex interactive networks.

**Academic Ability.**

It has already been noted that the components of the professional role as defined by the socialising agency can be divided into two categories -

(a) specialised knowledge and skills (cognitive)

(b) characteristic attitudes and values (evaluative).

It is suggested that the academic ability of the individual is a factor in the acquisition of the specialised knowledge and skills of the profession - in terms of the paradigm
drawn up by Wheeler (see Chapter One), it enters into the intervening individual mechanism of "capacity to perform", and as such is one of the determinants of the range of possible socialisation outcomes. This is not, however, an assertion that individuals whose performance in this area (as evaluated by the professional school in formal assessment procedures) is unsatisfactory are necessarily lacking in academic ability - it has already been emphasised that unsatisfactory performance may be the result of motivational and situational rather than ability factors. It is worth noting here that in speaking of entrants into courses of professional education (in Australian universities, at least), we are dealing with a highly-selected and fairly homogeneous group as far as academic ability is concerned: it is possible that the other elements which the present discussion points to as being also involved in the picture, while interrelated with academic ability, are more variable and less highly selected.

Orientation Factors.

It is suggested that the individual's orientation to his course of professional education, and to the definition of the professional role implied by the course emphases, will work to either inhibit or facilitate his acquisition of the various components of the professional role. If

(a) his reasons for entering the course,

(b) his image of the practising professional,
(c) his expectation of course content and emphases, and
(d) his more general attitudes and values,

are congruent with the role
definition offered by the socialising agency, then it is postulated that the acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge, attitudes and values will be facilitated. Conversely, it is suggested that the process of role learning will be inhibited by conflict in any of these areas.

Situational Factors.

So far, in the discussion of the attributes of the individual and their relationship to socialisation outcomes, no consideration has been given to the fact that pressures arising from the individual's circumstances outside of the institutional environment may be important in determining whether the process of socialisation is satisfactorily concluded from the point of view of the socialising agency (i.e., by graduation).

The situational factors which are seen as most important in this respect are -

(a) marital status,
(b) involvement in extra-socialisation activities (most importantly, employment obligations), and
(c) scholarship (financial) assistance.
These factors are seen as involving obligations and responsibilities for the individual which may be in conflict with the requirements of the professional school. The most notable examples of such conflicts are those involved in the allocation of time and of financial resources.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTITUTION

It is suggested that there are three main types of institutional characteristics which are important in the institution's functioning as a socialising agency:

1. orientation factors
2. faculty/student interaction
3. facilities for learning

It will be remembered that the task of the professional school is seen as being one of transmission to students of

(a) the skills and knowledge
(b) the attitudes and values

which define the professional role. The characteristics referred to above are seen as important factors in this transmission process.

Orientation Factors.

It is suggested that professional schools will vary along an academic/vocational continuum with regard to their educational objectives. The fact of whether their emphasis in transmission of the cognitive components of the
professional role is on the acquisition of skills or of knowledge will be important insofar as it meets with the student's expectations in this area.

It is also suggested that implicit in the education offered by the professional school are certain attitudes and values central to the professional role, and that where the emphases of the school are congruent with the attitudes and values held by the individual, the acquisition of the professional role will be facilitated.

Faculty/Student Interaction.

Similarly, in the acquisition of the evaluative components of the role in particular, the amount and nature of interaction between faculty and students of the professional school will be important. It is suggested that where there is little contact between faculty and students outside of formal learning situations, there will be little opportunity for the development of role models, and consequently minimal transmission of the attitude and value components of the professional role.

Facilities for Learning.

Learning of the special skills and knowledge of the profession will be facilitated by the provision of suitable facilities for learning within the professional school. Most importantly, these include flexible teaching methods which can be modified to meet the requirements of different
kinds of students; carefully structured course organisation, in which the course material follows a meaningful sequence and is seen as being relevant to the students' concepts of the profession; and library facilities which cover all aspects of the professional education and are available for use by all students.
Chapter 4

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

The present study constitutes a supplement to an ongoing survey of professional education in a number of Australian universities being carried out under the direction of D.S. Anderson (Australian National University) and J.S. Western (University of Queensland). Although this study is confined to the investigation of law students, the entire project includes students in faculties of engineering, medicine, and teaching.

The project began in early 1965, when students enrolled in first year law courses at the Australian National University and the Universities of Queensland, Western Australia, Melbourne and Monash were requested to complete a questionnaire and an attitude inventory (see Appendix I). The respondents (205 at the University of Queensland, 191 at Melbourne, 133 at Monash, 73 at A.N.U., and 39 at Western Australia) represented almost the entire enrolments at A.N.U., Queensland, and Monash, about 90% of the Melbourne total, and 50% of the enrolment at Western Australia.

The questionnaire which was administered to these students sought answers to questions concerning:

Background information (father's income and occupation, parents' education, secondary school attended, subject preferences and performance, and
family associations with the legal profession).
Relations with peers in the course.
Career choice and intentions.
Study plans.
Opinions concerning actual and desired features of the law course.
Opinions concerning the objectives of the course.
Perceptions of practising members of the legal profession.
Opinions concerning the prestige or status of a number of professions.

The attitude inventory consisted of seven scales measuring attitudes defined as:

**Political and Economic Liberalism:** Support for community rather than personal interests in politics; opposition to privilege and tradition; internationalist outlook; support for planned economic development, expansion of the public sector of the economy, and government regulation of the private sector.

**Social Liberalism:** Belief that individuals should be subject to minimum constraint by society, value of variety in human experience, questioning of conventional social mores.

**Pragmatism:** Preference for an empirical and pragmatic rather than a theoretical approach, dislike of theories and theorising, evaluation of ideas according to their usefulness, preference
for a trial and error approach in solving problems.

**Dogmatism**: Closed-mindedness in the face of new conceptions; interpretation of events in terms of pre-conceived ideas; assertion of conclusions without reference to the evidence.

**Cynicism**: Disposition to account for men's behaviour in terms of their personal satisfactions and interests; actions of persons not taken at their face value; denial of altruism and responsibility as motives.

**Intellectual Interests**: An appreciation and enjoyment of cultural pursuits, interest in philosophical discussion and discourse.

**Academic Activities**: Preference for an academic way of life, liking for intellectual problems, sustained thought and research.

A second questionnaire, which was administered at the end of 1965, asked questions concerning changes in motivation, opinions, or intentions which had occurred during the course of the year; reactions to the university (teaching, faculty members, and extracurricular activities); social relations with peers, faculty, and members of the legal profession; and information concerning the profession gained from informal sources.

With a single exception, however, the data used in the present study was derived from the first questionnaire and the attitude inventory.
For the purpose of this study, a **dropout** was defined as a student who completed the first questionnaire and the attitude inventory in March, 1965, but was not enrolled in the course in July, 1967, and had not re-enrolled at the time the study was commenced in July, 1968. The numbers of students thus classified are as follows: A.N.U. - 27 (37% of the 1965 respondents), Melbourne - 40 (21%), Monash - 39 (29%), Queensland - 58 (28%), and Western Australia - 12 (31%). The total dropout group numbered 176, or 27% of the group under study in 1965.

Conversely, students continuing in their courses in July, 1967, numbered: A.N.U. - 46 (63% of the 1965 respondents), Melbourne - 151 (79%), Monash - 94 (71%), Queensland - 147 (72%), and Western Australia - 27 (69%). The total continuing group numbered 465, or 73% of the group under study in 1965. By 1968, the percentages still enrolled had fallen to 36% at A.N.U., 75% at Melbourne, 60% at Monash, 59% at Queensland, and 62% at Western Australia. These latter figures emphasise the point that, by selecting July, 1967, as the date for determining the dropout status of an individual, we are in fact not studying "dropouts", but rather "students who drop out within the first 2½ years of their courses". It is unavoidable that such a dividing line be drawn at some point, that point being at an earlier or later stage depending on the particular interests and circumstances of the research worker, but it would be advisable to note, when examining the ensuing data, that the group referred to as "continuing
students" in fact contains some students who withdrew after July, 1967.

The present study is based on secondary analysis of the information collected from students on entering their courses of study in 1965. This technique has the advantage over many of the studies reviewed in Chapter Two, that the information utilised was collected at the very beginning of the course and hence the experience of dropping out itself has not contributed in any way to the responses obtained. On the other hand, however, secondary analysis of data collected for a less specific problem involves the disadvantage that the information is not always collected in the manner most relevant to one's own conceptual framework. What is more, some of the information pertaining to this conceptual framework is not available by this method, thus leading to an incomplete empirical test of the framework.

The study includes, for instance, no direct information concerning institutional characteristics, which are postulated as essential elements in the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter Three. These data were not collected in the original survey, and the fact of changes in the faculties concerned during the period from March, 1965 to July, 1968 (when the study was begun) casts doubt on the potential usefulness of information collected at the later date.

Similarly, although academic ability enters into the conceptual framework as a relevant characteristic of the
individual in the professional socialisation situation, no suitable measure of this variable was available. The 1965 questionnaire included a question concerning whether students were in receipt of a scholarship, but this is at best a fairly indirect index of academic ability, being in general based on examination performance. The use of this measure would also involve the problem of students ineligible to apply for scholarships, or whose circumstances (e.g., financial responsibilities) precluded the possibility of a scholarship.

Similarly, if matriculation results were taken to be an acceptable index of academic ability, and assuming that these were made available for analysis, there would remain the problem of translating the various State assessment schemes into a standard scale. Even if this were possible, it would still be necessary to deal separately with cases of overseas matriculation, provisional matriculants, and older students who matriculated under different systems. Probably the best procedure would have been to administer aptitude tests at the same time as the first questionnaire and attitude inventory.

Finally, in all cases where the hypotheses of the study require that each university be considered as a separate case, the data concerning the University of Western Australia have been dropped from the analysis on the grounds that the numbers of students involved (12 dropouts, 27 continuing) are too small to allow inferences to be made about dropouts and continuing students in general,
and that the respondents represented only 50% of the total 1965 enrolment in first-year law courses at that university.

Having mentioned those parts of the conceptual framework to which the present analysis cannot be extended, it now remains to present in more precise detail those hypotheses concerning dropouts from law courses generated by the conceptual framework, and to give an account of the indices utilised in examining these hypotheses.

**Background Factors**

(a) **father's income**: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 3) to nominate a category, lying between "less than £1,000 per year" and "over £6,000", in which the income of their father or male guardian fell in the previous year.

* Hypothesis: that continuing students come from families with higher income levels than dropouts.

H₀: The variable, "dropout/continuing", is independent of level of father's income.

H₁: The variable, "dropout/continuing", is not independent of level of father's income.¹

¹ Only the magnitude of differences, and not their direction, can be examined by means of the chi-square test. However, when χ² has only one degree of freedom it can be converted to a z value and used in the test of a directional hypothesis (26, p. 200).

Hence, in all cases where χ² is used and has more than one degree of freedom, non-directional hypotheses will be tested. In cases where a relationship is found to exist between two variables, the relevant contingency table will be examined to determine where possible the nature of this relationship.
(b) **parents' education**: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 3) to indicate the level of education attained by both their father and their mother. Responses were assigned to categories ranging from "no formal education" to "completed university degree".

*Hypothesis:* that continuing students have parents with higher levels of educational attainment than do dropouts. In particular, it is hypothesised that more continuing students than dropouts have parents who have received some post-secondary education.

\[H_0: P_1 \leq P_2\] \[H_1: P_1 > P_2\]

\[P_1\] - the proportion of continuing students with fathers who have received some post-secondary education

\[P_2\] - the proportion of dropouts with fathers who have received some post-secondary education

\[H_0: P_3 \leq P_4\] \[H_1: P_3 > P_4\]

\[P_3\] - the proportion of continuing students with mothers who have received some post-secondary education

\[P_4\] - the proportion of dropouts with mothers who have received some post-secondary education

(c) **father's occupation**: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 5) to describe the present or last main occupation of their father or male guardian. These descriptions were classified according to Broom, Jones & Zubrzycki's 100-category occupational classification, based on the
Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics' Classification and Classified List of Occupations, 1961 (13a). For the purposes of the present study, these were simply divided into two groups:

(1) **Professional and Managerial**, consisting of the following -

(a) employers and managers in commonwealth and state government, industry, commerce, etc. - large establishments

(b) employers and managers in industry, commerce, etc. - small establishments

(c) professional workers - self employed

(d) professional workers - employees

(2) **Others**, consisting of -

(a) intermediate non-manual workers
(b) junior non-manual workers
(c) foremen and supervisors - manual; skilled manual workers
(d) semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers
(e) own account workers
(f) farmers

*Hypothesis: more continuing students than dropouts come from professional and managerial backgrounds.*

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]  
\[ P_1 - the proportion of continuing students with fathers in the professional and managerial groups \]

\[ H_1: P_1 > P_2 \]

\[ P_2 - the proportion of continuing students with fathers in other groups \]
P₂ - the proportion of dropouts with fathers in the professional and managerial groups

(d) family members and close friends involved in the profession:

students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 4) to report whether their parents, relatives, and/or close family friends were or had ever been engaged in the occupations of barrister, solicitor, judge, or other law-related occupations.

* Hypothesis: for each of the four professional groups, more continuing students than dropouts have a relative or close family friend engaged in that professional activity.

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]
\[ H_1: P_1 > P_2 \]

P₁ - the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of barrister

P₂ - the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of barrister

\[ H_0: P_3 \leq P_4 \]
\[ H_1: P_3 > P_4 \]

P₃ - the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of solicitor

P₄ - the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of solicitor
(e) **age at decision**: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 7) how old they were when they first decided to study Law at the university, with response categories ranging from "younger than 12" to "26 and over".

* **Hypothesis**: the age at which continuing students decide to study Law will differ from the age at which students who drop out decide to study Law. It is suggested that in general continuing students make this decision when younger than dropouts, but that there may be an optimum age of decision, at less than which more dropouts than continuing students decide to study Law.

H₀: The variable, "dropout/continuing", is independent of the age at which the decision to study Law is made.
$H_1$: The variable, "dropout/continuing", is not independent of the age at which the decision to study Law is made.

Orientation Factors

(a) reasons for entering the course: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, pp. 8-9) to rate the importance of each of 19 considerations in their decision to study Law. The rating scales ranged from a score of 1 for "very important" to a score of 4 for "not at all important". By means of hierarchical linkage analysis (43), these 19 reasons were reduced to four clusters (see Appendix II), which were designated as follows:

1. Interest
2. Prestige
3. Negative Orientation
4. Interpersonal Influence

For each individual, a score was calculated for each of the four clusters (see Appendix II). The possible range of cluster scores was from 1 for "very important" to 4 for "not at all important".

* Hypothesis: in each university, continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to the following reasons for studying Law -

1. Interest
2. Prestige
3. Negative Orientation
4. Interpersonal Influence.
In the absence of relevant data regarding the faculties concerned, no prediction can be made concerning the direction of the hypothesised differences.

**Interest**

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \]

\( \mu_1 \) - mean cluster score of continuing students

\( \mu_2 \) - mean cluster score of dropouts

**Prestige**

\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ H_1: \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \]

\( \mu_3 \) - mean cluster score of continuing students

\( \mu_4 \) - mean cluster score of dropouts

**Negative Orientation**

\[ H_0: \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]

\[ H_1: \mu_5 \neq \mu_6 \]

\( \mu_5 \) - mean cluster score of continuing students

\( \mu_6 \) - mean cluster score of dropouts

**Interpersonal Influence**

\[ H_0: \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ H_1: \mu_7 \neq \mu_8 \]

\( \mu_7 \) - mean cluster score of continuing students

\( \mu_8 \) - mean cluster score of dropouts

(b) characteristics of a successful lawyer: students were asked (Appendix I, 1, pp. 11-14) to rate the importance of each of 33 characteristics for success as a judge, a solicitor, and a barrister. The rating scales ranged
from a score of 1 for "very important" to a score of 5 for "not at all important". By means of hierarchical linkage analysis (43), these 33 characteristics were reduced to two clusters (see Appendix II), which were designated as follows:

(1) Social Background
(2) Personality Traits and Abilities.

For each individual, a score was calculated for each of the two clusters, for judge, solicitor, and barrister separately (see Appendix II). The possible range of cluster scores was from 1 for "very important" to 5 for "not at all important".

* Hypothesis: in each university, continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to the following characteristics for success as a judge, barrister, or solicitor -

(a) social background
(b) personality traits and abilities.

In the absence of relevant data regarding the faculties concerned, no prediction can be made concerning the direction of the hypothesised differences.

**Social Background**

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]  
\[ H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \]  
(i) Judge.

\( \mu_1 \) - mean cluster score of continuing students
\( \mu_2 \) - mean cluster score of dropouts
(ii) Barrister.
\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ H_1: \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \]
\[ \mu_3 \text{ - mean cluster score of continuing students} \]
\[ \mu_4 \text{ - mean cluster score of dropouts} \]

(iii) Solicitor.
\[ H_0: \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]
\[ H_1: \mu_5 \neq \mu_6 \]
\[ \mu_5 \text{ - mean cluster score of continuing students} \]
\[ \mu_6 \text{ - mean cluster score of dropouts} \]

**Personality Traits and Abilities**

(i) Judge.
\[ H_0: \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]
\[ H_1: \mu_7 \neq \mu_8 \]
\[ \mu_7 \text{ - mean cluster score of continuing students} \]
\[ \mu_8 \text{ - mean cluster score of dropouts} \]

(ii) Barrister.
\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]
\[ H_1: \mu_9 \neq \mu_{10} \]
\[ \mu_9 \text{ - mean cluster score of continuing students} \]
\[ \mu_{10} \text{ - mean cluster score of dropouts} \]

(iii) Solicitor.
\[ H_0: \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]
\[ H_1: \mu_{11} \neq \mu_{12} \]
\[ \mu_{11} \text{ - mean cluster score of continuing students} \]
\[ \mu_{12} \text{ - mean cluster score of dropouts} \]
(c) **expectations of course content and emphases:** students were asked (Appendix I, 1, p. 15) to rate (i) the amount of emphasis they thought the Law school should give to a number of issues, and (ii) the amount of emphasis they thought the Law school did give to these issues. Ratings ranged from 1 for "a great deal" to 5 for "little or none", with a separate category for those respondents who were uncertain concerning these issues.

For each issue, a difference score was obtained by subtracting the rating for the ideal from the rating for the perceived amount of emphasis on that issue. A difference score of zero indicates that there is no difference between the amount of emphasis an individual would like to be given to an issue, and the amount which he perceives as being given; a positive score indicates that the emphasis which is perceived is greater than that which is desired; and a negative score indicates that the emphasis which is perceived is less than that which is desired. Students who did not respond to these questions, or who indicated their uncertainty regarding the issues in question, were assigned to a separate category.

It should be noted that these data were collected during the first week of the students' enrolment, at which time they would scarcely have had time to construct a very informed picture of the course content. The discrepancies noted, then, are perceived rather than actual; however, in terms of our conceptual framework, these are posited as being of equal importance in inhibiting the acquisition of the elements of the professional role.
Hypothesis: differences between desired and perceived course emphases occur less frequently among continuing students than among those students who drop out.

Issue: Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives.

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]
\[ H_1: P_1 > P_2 \]

\[ P_1 \] - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ P_2 \] - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

Issue: Skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law.

\[ H_0: P_3 \leq P_4 \]
\[ H_1: P_3 > P_4 \]

\[ P_3 \] - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ P_4 \] - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

Issue: Logic and clear thinking.

\[ H_0: P_5 \leq P_6 \]
\[ H_1: P_5 > P_6 \]

\[ P_5 \] - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.
\[ \begin{align*}
H_0 & : P_7 \leq P_8 \\
H_1 & : P_7 > P_8 \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
H_0 & : P_9 \leq P_{10} \\
H_1 & : P_9 > P_{10} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
P_6 & - \text{the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \\
\textbf{Issue:} \text{ A knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society.} \\
P_7 & - \text{the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \\
P_8 & - \text{the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \\
\textbf{Issue:} \text{ A liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society.} \\
P_9 & - \text{the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \\
P_{10} & - \text{the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \\
\textbf{Issue:} \text{ Knowledge of the various branches of Law.} \\
\end{align*} \]
The proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

The proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

In the second questionnaire, administered in November, 1965, students were again asked the same questions concerning desired and actual course emphases (Appendix II, 3, p. 4). In lieu of any more direct information concerning the characteristics of the institutions concerned, the reports of the entire group still enrolled in each institution at the end of 1965 have been used as indices of the course emphases in that institution. These have been compared with the ideals reported on entrance to the course in March, 1965, to examine the extent to which the expectations of students are met by the institutions.

* Hypothesis: in each university, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphases of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphases of the faculty.

The procedure involved in determining whether the available evidence offers support for this hypothesis is not as straightforward as could be desired and the conclusions.
thereby derived are regarded as being tenuous at best. They are, however, offered for consideration in the absence of any more direct information relating to the way in which the institution meets the expectations of the students.

The basic data involved in the procedure are

(i) the percentage of students reporting in November, 1965, that the faculty placed a great deal of emphasis on a specified issue - this measure is taken as an index of the course emphasis of individual faculties. [Ratings of 1 and 2 on the rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 were classified in this instance as meaning "a great deal", and ratings of 4 and 5 were classified as meaning "little or none".]

(ii) the percentage of continuing students who reported on entry to the course (March, 1965) that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue.

(iii) the percentage of dropouts who reported on entry to the course that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue.

On the basis of these data, two comparable indices of discrepancy can be derived by

(1) subtracting (i) from (ii)

(2) subtracting (i) from (iii)

The general hypothesis stated above can now be reduced to two more specific hypotheses:

The magnitude of discrepancy index (2) is greater than that of discrepancy index (1). (Determined by reference to Table 16.)
\[ H_0 : P_1 = P_2 \quad P_1 \] - the proportion of continuing students who reported on entry to the course that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue

\[ H_1 : P_1 \neq P_2 \] - the proportion of dropouts who reported on entry to the course that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue

[By implication, if (ii), or \( P_1 \), differs significantly from (iii), or \( P_2 \), then (1) differs significantly from (2)]

These dual hypotheses are to be tested, for each University separately, with relation to the six issues,

(1) Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives.

(2) Skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law.

(3) Logic and clear thinking.

(4) A knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society.

(5) A liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society.

(6) Knowledge of the various branches of Law.

(d) attitudes: on the basis of their responses to the questions contained in the attitude inventory (Appendix II, 2), students were assigned scores on each of seven attitude scales.
The ranges of scores for these scales were as follows:

(a) political-economic liberalism: 10 (low) - 50 (high)
(b) social liberalism: 7 (low) - 35 (high)
(c) pragmatism: 5 (low) - 25 (high)
(d) dogmatism: 9 (low) - 45 (high)
(e) cynicism: 9 (low) - 45 (high)
(f) academic activities: 8 (low) - 40 (high)
(g) intellectual interests: 9 (low) - 45 (high).

* Hypothesis: in each university, continuing students and dropouts will differ with respect to their scores on the following attitude scales -

(a) political-economic liberalism
(b) social liberalism
(c) pragmatism
(d) dogmatism
(e) cynicism
(f) academic activities
(g) intellectual interests.

In the absence of more detailed information relating to the characteristics of the faculties concerned, no prediction can be made concerning the direction of these differences.

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]
\[ H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \]

\( \mu_1 \) - mean score of continuing students on political-economic liberalism scale
\( \mu_2 \) - mean score of dropouts on political-economic liberalism scale
\( H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \)  
\( H_1: \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \)  
\( \mu_3 \) - mean score of continuing students on social liberalism scale  
\( \mu_4 \) - mean score of dropouts on social liberalism scale  

\( H_0: \mu_5 = \mu_6 \)  
\( H_1: \mu_5 \neq \mu_6 \)  
\( \mu_5 \) - mean score of continuing students on pragmatism scale  
\( \mu_6 \) - mean score of dropouts on pragmatism scale  

\( H_0: \mu_7 = \mu_8 \)  
\( H_1: \mu_7 \neq \mu_8 \)  
\( \mu_7 \) - mean score of continuing students on dogmatism scale  
\( \mu_8 \) - mean score of dropouts on dogmatism scale  

\( H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \)  
\( H_1: \mu_9 \neq \mu_{10} \)  
\( \mu_9 \) - mean score of continuing students on cynicism scale  
\( \mu_{10} \) - mean score of dropouts on cynicism scale  

\( H_0: \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \)  
\( H_1: \mu_{11} \neq \mu_{12} \)  
\( \mu_{11} \) - mean score of continuing students on academic activities scale  
\( \mu_{12} \) - mean score of dropouts on academic activities scale  

\( H_0: \mu_{13} = \mu_{14} \)  
\( H_1: \mu_{13} \neq \mu_{14} \)  
\( \mu_{13} \) - mean score of continuing students on intellectual interests scale  
\( \mu_{14} \) - mean score of dropouts on intellectual interests scale
Situational Factors

(a) marital status: students were asked (Appendix II, 1, p. 2) to indicate which one of a number of categories (single, married (with or without children), divorced or separated, other) described their marital status.

* Hypothesis: a greater proportion of continuing students than of dropouts are unmarried.

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \quad \text{P}_1 \text{ - the proportion of continuing students who are unmarried} \]

\[ H_1: P_1 > P_2 \quad \text{P}_2 \text{ - the proportion of dropouts who are unmarried} \]

(b) type of course: students were asked (Appendix II, 1, p. 1) whether they were enrolled in a full-time, part-time, or other type of course.

* Hypothesis: a greater proportion of continuing students than of dropouts are enrolled in full-time courses of study.

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \quad \text{P}_1 \text{ - the proportion of continuing students enrolled in full-time courses} \]

\[ H_1: P_1 > P_2 \quad \text{P}_2 \text{ - the proportion of dropouts enrolled in full-time courses} \]

(c) scholarship assistance: students were asked (Appendix II, 1, p. 7) to indicate whether they held a scholarship, and if so, to specify the type held. Although this variable is classified under the heading of "situational factors", ...
and as such is posited as being involved in the allocation of time and of financial resources and the conflicts arising therefrom, it is recognised that it is also related to academic ability. Hence any relationship which is found between scholarship assistance and continuing or dropping out could not be attributed solely to the situational advantages thereby gained, but must also take account of the possible influence of academic ability.

* Hypothesis: a greater proportion of continuing students than of dropouts are in receipt of scholarship assistance.

\[ H_0 : P_1 \leq P_2 \]
\[ H_1 : P_1 > P_2 \]

\( P_1 \) - the proportion of continuing students in receipt of scholarship assistance

\( P_2 \) - the proportion of dropouts in receipt of scholarship assistance
Chapter 5

RESULTS I: HYPOTHESIS TESTING

General Points Concerning Testing of Hypotheses

1. The first point to be made concerns the use of inferential statistics for the purpose of estimation of population parameters. This procedure is based on the assumption that the group under study - entrants to first-year law courses in 1965 - is representative of entrants to first-year law courses in general. There is, however, at least no immediately apparent reason to suggest that 1965 was in any relevant sense a unique or unrepresentative year. Similarly, it should be noted that the study was restricted to five Australian universities, and to extend the conclusions to universities in general, or even to Australian universities, likewise involves an assumption of representativeness for which no evidence is provided. And lastly, it should be noted that law courses have been taken as an instance of professional education (that is, that the study is concerned with professional education rather than with law courses as such), and that hence any reference from the results to the general conceptual framework involves a similar assumption that an education in law is representative of professional education in general.

If these assumptions can be accepted, then the remaining sections of the dissertation can be construed as reflecting on the thesis put forward in the previous chapters.
2. The five per cent level of significance has been adopted as the minimum acceptable standard in the testing of all hypotheses. Since there are a large number of hypotheses to be tested, it should be noted that, with the adoption of this level of significance, five per cent of all hypotheses tested would be expected, on the basis of chance alone, to reach significance. In the present chapter, the testing of all hypotheses formulated in Chapter 4 is reported, regardless of whether the hypotheses were supported by the data.

3. In the case of contingency tables with one degree of freedom and expected cell frequencies of less than 10, Yates' correction for continuity (22a, p. 171) was applied.

4. In the calculation of \( \chi^2 \) values, individuals falling into the "no response" category have been dropped from the analysis. This procedure implies the assumption that these individuals are distributed over the values of the variable under discussion in a manner similar to the distribution of the respondents. For most of the variables studied, the numbers of non-respondents are very small and there does not appear to be any strong reason for rejecting this assumption. In one or two instances, however, the numbers of non-respondents are large and the assumption of similar distribution may be unjustified: these cases will be discussed in conjunction with the relevant tables.
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

Owing to the length of the present chapter and the large number of hypotheses tested, the following summary of hypotheses supported by the data has been included for rapid reference.

BACKGROUND FACTORS

Of the eight hypotheses concerning background factors which were tested, two (25%) were supported by the data from the study.

Father’s Education: the data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have fathers who have received some post-secondary education.

Age at Decision: the data support the hypothesis that withdrawal is related to the age at which the decision to study Law is made - continuing students tend to make the decision at an earlier age than dropouts.

ORIENTATION FACTORS

Of the 98 hypotheses concerning background factors which were tested, eleven (11%) were supported by the data from the study.

Characteristics of a Successful Lawyer

(i) Social background: the data from Monash University support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to social
background as a factor in success as a judge, barrister, or solicitor - dropouts in this university attribute less importance to social background than continuing students.

(ii) Personality traits and abilities: the data from the Universities of Melbourne and Queensland support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to personality traits and abilities as factors in success as a solicitor - in these universities, dropouts attribute less importance to personality traits than do continuing students.

Meeting of Students' Expectations of Courses

(i) Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives: the data from the A.N.U. support the hypothesis that the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.

(ii) Skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law: the data from Monash University support the hypothesis that the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.

(iii) A liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society: the data from Monash University support the hypothesis that the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.
Attitudes

(i) Political-Economic Liberalism: the data from the University of Queensland support the hypothesis that continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their political-economic liberalism scores - dropouts in this university score higher on political-economic liberalism than continuing students.

(ii) Social Liberalism: the data from Monash University support the hypothesis that continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their social liberalism scores - in this university, dropouts score higher on social liberalism than do continuing students.

(iii) Intellectual Interests: the data from the University of Queensland support the hypothesis that continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their intellectual interests scores - in this university, dropouts score higher on intellectual interests than do continuing students.

SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Of the three hypotheses concerning situational factors which were tested, all three were supported by the data from the study.

Marital Status: the data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts are enrolled in full-time courses of study.

Type of Course: the data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts are enrolled in full-time courses of study.
Scholarship Assistance: the data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts are in receipt of scholarship assistance.

BACKGROUND FACTORS

(1) Father's Income

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Income</th>
<th>Continuing Students N=465</th>
<th>Dropouts N=176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ p.a.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 2,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 - 3,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 4,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001 - 5,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the numbers in the non-response ("N.A.") category are large, and that if the assumption of similar distribution is unjustified the results may be seriously biased.

H₀: The variable, "dropout/continuing," is independent of level of father's income.
\[ \chi^2 = 12.07 \]  
\text{degrees of freedom} = 6

\[ \therefore \] H cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students come from families with higher income levels than dropouts.

(2) Father's Education

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Education</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary (other than University)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - no degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the category "Don't know" was treated similarly to the no-response category in the calculation of the value of \( \chi^2 \).

---

1 Formula used for calculation of \( \chi^2 \): \[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(f - E)^2}{E} \]

(26, p. 200) where \( f \) is the observed frequency for a given category or cell, and \( E \) is the corresponding expected frequency for that category or cell.
\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]

- \( P_1 \) - the proportion of continuing students with fathers who have received some post-secondary education

- \( P_2 \) - the proportion of dropouts with fathers who have received some post-secondary education

\[ \chi^2 = 3.87 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +1.97 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \] can be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

The data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have fathers who have received some post-secondary education.

(3) **Mother's Education**

**Table 4**

Mother's Education x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's Education</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=465</td>
<td>N=176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post-secondary (other than University) | 11 | 21 | 5
| University-no degree | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| University degree | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Don't know         | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Footnote 1 on page 77)
Note that the category "Don't know" was treated similarly to the non-response category in the calculation of the value of $\chi^2$.

$$H_0 : P_3 \leq P_4$$

$P_3$ - the proportion of continuing students with mothers who have received some post-secondary education

$P_4$ - the proportion of dropouts with mothers who have received some post-secondary education

$$\chi^2 = 1.31 \quad d.f. = 1$$

$\therefore z = +1.14$

$\therefore H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have mothers with some post-secondary education.

(4) Father's Occupation

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=465</td>
<td>N=176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A./no occupation/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclassifiable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers &amp; managers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional workers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; sales</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers - skilled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-skilled, unskilled</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own account workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \quad \text{P}_1 - \text{the proportion of continuing students with fathers in the professional and managerial groups} \]

\[ P_2 - \text{the proportion of dropouts with fathers in the professional and managerial groups} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 1.85 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +1.36 \]

\[ \therefore \quad H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts come from professional and managerial backgrounds.

(5) Family Members and Close Family Friends Involved in the Profession.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Members and Close Family Friends Involved in the Profession</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=465</td>
<td>N=176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(footnote 1 from page 75)

\[ z = \sqrt{\chi^2} \quad (26, \text{ p. 200}) \]
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Members and Close Family Friends Involved in the Profession</th>
<th>Continuing Students N=465</th>
<th>Dropouts N=176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Judge</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Other</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the numbers in the non-response category, especially in the dropout group, are fairly large. It is suggested that this may be due to the fact that students with no relatives or friends in the legal profession gave no response to the question instead of indicating the appropriate answer. If this were the case, the findings would strengthen support for the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have relatives and friends in the legal profession. However, there is no means of checking this suggestion, and hence the non-response category has been treated in the manner described in the introduction to the chapter.

(i) Barrister

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]

\[ P_1 \] - the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of barrister

\[ P_2 \] - the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of barrister
\[ \chi^2 = 0.34 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +0.58 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have relatives or close family friends engaged in the profession of barrister.

(ii) Solicitor

\[ H_0 : P_3 \leq P_4 \quad P_3 \text{ - the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of solicitor} \]

\[ P_4 \text{ - the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of solicitor} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.02 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +0.14 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have relatives or close family friends engaged in the profession of solicitor.

(iii) Judge

\[ H_0 : P_5 \leq P_6 \quad P_5 \text{ - the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of judge} \]

\[ P_6 \text{ - the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in the profession of judge} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 1.43 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +1.20 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have relatives or close family friends engaged in the profession of judge.

(iv) Other law-related occupations

\[ H_0 : P_7 \leq P_8 \]

\[ P_7 - \text{the proportion of continuing students with a relative or close family friend engaged in other law-related occupations} \]

\[ P_8 - \text{the proportion of dropouts with a relative or close family friend engaged in other law-related occupations} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 2.06 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +1.44 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts have relatives or close family friends engaged in other law-related occupations.
(6) Age at Decision

Table 7
Age at Decision x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Decision</th>
<th>Continuing Students N=465</th>
<th>Dropouts N=176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 12 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14 yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 yrs.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 yrs.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 20 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 yrs. and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_o$: The variable, "dropout/continuing", is independent of the age at which the decision to study Law is made.

$\chi^2 = 26.3 \quad d.f. = 8$

$\therefore H_o$ can be rejected at the .01% level of significance.

The data support the hypothesis that withdrawal is related to the age at which the decision to study Law is made. An examination of Table 7 indicates that continuing students tend to make the decision at an earlier age than dropouts. The critical age seems to be around seventeen years: when the decision is made at less than seventeen years,
the majority of students are continuing while the majority of those who decide at a later age are dropouts.

There does not appear to be, as was suggested, an optimum age prior to which decisions are based on unrealistic conceptions of the professional role and hence there are more dropouts than continuing students. This could, however, be due to the fact that the earliest category - "younger than 12 years" - does not discriminate out this group.

ORIENTATION FACTORS

(1) Reasons for Choosing Law

Table 8

Reasons for Choosing Law x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Choosing</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prestige**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal Influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Interest

A.N.U.  

\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ \mu_1 \] - mean interest cluster score of continuing students

\[ \mu_2 \] - mean interest cluster score of dropouts

\[ t = 0.580 \]  \[\text{d.f.} = 71\]

'. \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Melbourne  

\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = -1.461 \]  \[\text{d.f.} = 189\]

'. \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Queensland  

\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = -0.415 \]  \[\text{d.f.} = 203\]

'. \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Monash  

\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = -0.567 \]  \[\text{d.f.} = 131\]

'. \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

---

Formula used for calculation of \( t \):  

\[
t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\text{S.D.}_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\text{S.D.}_2^2}{N_2}}}\]

where \( \text{S.D.}_1 \) and \( \text{S.D.}_2 \) are the standard deviations of the first and second groups, respectively; \( \bar{X}_1 \) and \( \bar{X}_2 \) are the mean values of the first and second groups, respectively; and \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) are the number of cases in the first and second groups, respectively.
In all four universities, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to interest as a factor in deciding to study Law.

(ii) Prestige

A.N.U. \[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ \mu_3 \] - mean prestige cluster score of continuing students
\[ \mu_4 \] - mean prestige cluster score of dropouts

\[ t = -1.264 \quad d.f. = 71 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne \[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = -0.316 \quad d.f. = 189 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Queensland \[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = -0.889 \quad d.f. = 203 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash \[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = 0.238 \quad d.f. = 131 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]
the importance which they attribute to prestige as a factor in deciding to study Law.

(iii) Negative Orientation

A.N.U. \( H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \) \( \mu_5 \) - mean negative orientation cluster score of continuing students
\( \mu_6 \) - mean negative orientation cluster score of dropouts

\[ t = -1.202 \text{ d.f. = 71} \]

\( \therefore \) \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Melbourne \( H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \)

\[ t = 0.671 \text{ d.f. = 189} \]

\( \therefore \) \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Queensland \( H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \)

\[ t = -0.106 \text{ d.f. = 203} \]

\( \therefore \) \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Monash \( H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \)

\[ t = -0.020 \text{ d.f. = 131} \]

\( \therefore \) \( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

In all four universities, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to a negative orientation in the decision to study Law.
(iv) **Interpersonal Influence**

**A.N.U.**

$H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8$

$\mu_7$ - mean interpersonal influence cluster score of continuing students

$\mu_8$ - mean interpersonal influence cluster score of dropouts

$t = -0.652 \quad d.f. = 71$

"... $H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance."

**Melbourne**

$H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8$

$t = 1.458 \quad d.f. = 189$

"... $H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance."

**Queensland**

$H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8$

$t = 0.146 \quad d.f. = 203$

"... $H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance."

**Monash**

$H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8$

$t = -0.948 \quad d.f. = 131$

"... $H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance."

In all four universities, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to interpersonal influence as a factor in deciding to study Law.
(2) Characteristics of a Successful Lawyer

Table 9
Characteristics of a Successful Lawyer x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a Successful Lawyer</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N=47</td>
<td>N=58</td>
<td>N=94</td>
<td>N=39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge: Social Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barrister: Social Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solicitor: Social Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge: Traits & Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barrister: Traits & Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solicitor: Traits & Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) **Judge : Social Background**

**A.N.U.**  
\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]  
\( \mu_1 \) - mean social background (judge) cluster score of continuing students  
\( \mu_2 \) - mean social background (judge) cluster score of dropouts  
\[ t = 0.634 \quad d.f. = 71 \]  
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.} \]

**Melbourne**  
\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]  
\[ t = -1.518 \quad d.f. = 189 \]  
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.} \]

**Queensland**  
\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]  
\[ t = -1.174 \quad d.f. = 203 \]  
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.} \]

**Monash**  
\[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]  
\[ t = -2.854 \quad d.f. = 131 \]  
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the 1% level of significance.} \]

In the A.N.U., University of Melbourne, and University of Queensland, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to social background as a factor in success as a judge. This hypothesis is, however, supported by the data for Monash University, where dropouts attribute less importance to social background than do continuing students.
(ii) Barrister: Social Background

\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ t = 0.091 \quad d.f. = 71 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne

\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ t = -0.949 \quad d.f. = 189 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Queensland

\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ t = -0.865 \quad d.f. = 203 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash

\[ H_0: \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]
\[ t = -3.014 \quad d.f. = 131 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the } 1\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

In the A.N.U., the University of Melbourne, and the University of Queensland, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to social background as a factor in success as a barrister. This hypothesis is,
however, supported by the data from Monash University - dropouts in this university attribute less importance than continuing students to this factor.

(iii) **Solicitor: Social Background**

A.N.U.  
\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]  
\[ \mu_5 \] - mean social background (solicitor) cluster score of continuing students  
\[ \mu_6 \] - mean social background (solicitor) cluster score of dropouts

\[ t = -0.473 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]  
\[ .'. H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne  
\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]  
\[ t = -0.822 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]  
\[ .'. H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Queensland  
\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]  
\[ t = -1.521 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]  
\[ .'. H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash  
\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]  
\[ t = -2.738 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]  
\[ .'. H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the } 1\% \text{ level of significance.} \]
In the A.N.U., the University of Melbourne, and the University of Queensland, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to social background as a factor in success as a solicitor. The data from Monash University, however, support this hypothesis - dropouts attribute less importance than continuing students to social background.

(iv) Judge: Traits and Abilities

A.N.U. \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]  
\[ \mu_7 \] - mean traits and abilities (judge) cluster score of continuing students  
\[ \mu_8 \] - mean traits and abilities (judge) cluster score of dropouts  
\[ t = -1.296 \quad d.f. = 71 \]

\[ '.' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]  
\[ t = -0.100 \quad d.f. = 189 \]

\[ '.' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Queensland \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]  
\[ t = -1.568 \quad d.f. = 203 \]

\[ '.' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]
Monash

\[ H_0: \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ t = -1.428 \quad d.f. = 131 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance} \]

In all four universities, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to personality traits and abilities in success as a judge.

(v) Barrister: Traits and Abilities

A.N.U.

\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]

\[ \mu_9 \text{ - mean traits and abilities (barrister)} \]

\[ \mu_{10} \text{ - mean traits and abilities (barrister)} \]

\[ t = 1.050 \quad d.f. = 71 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Melbourne

\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]

\[ t = -1.914 \quad d.f. = 189 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Queensland

\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]

\[ t = -1.214 \quad d.f. = 203 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]
In all four universities, the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance they attribute to personality traits and abilities as factors in success as a barrister.

(vi) Solicitor: Traits and Abilities

A.N.U.  
\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]
\[ t = 0.606 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]
\[ \therefore \text{Ho cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Melbourne  
\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]
\[ t = -2.019 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]
\[ \therefore \text{Ho can be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Queensland  
\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]
\[ t = -2.181 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]
\[ \therefore \text{Ho can be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]
Monash

$H_0: \mu_{11} = \mu_{12}$

$t = -0.975 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

In two universities - the A.N.U. and Monash - the data do not support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts in the importance which they attribute to personality traits and abilities as factors in success as a solicitor. The data from the Universities of Melbourne and Queensland, however, support the hypothesis - in both instances, continuing students attribute more importance than dropouts to personality traits and abilities.

(3) Perceived and Ideal Course Emphases

(i) Issue: Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives.

Table 10

Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference Between</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
<th>TOTAL W.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=46 N=27 N=151 N=147 N=58 N=94 N=39 N=465 N=176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A./Not Sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note the large numbers in the "N.A./Not Sure" category: this is principally due to the fact that many students, when asked at the beginning of their course to describe the emphasis given by their faculty to a number of issues, indicated their uncertainty in this respect. The comparison of the difference scores of the continuing and dropout groups is weakened by the necessity of discarding such large numbers of respondents.

Since the hypothesised relationship is postulated as working in the same manner in each university, the data for the total continuing and dropout groups are tested. The corresponding tests for individual universities are, however, included in Appendix III.

\[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]

\[ P_1 \] - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ P_2 \] - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = 0.00 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \quad \text{cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives, there are fewer differences between ideal and
perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.

(ii) Issue: Skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practice of Law.

Table 11
Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
<th>TOTAL W.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Drop.</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
H_0: P_3 \leq P_4
\]

- the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

\[
P_4 - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 0.66 \quad d.f. = 1
\]

\[
\therefore z = +0.81
\]

\[
\therefore H_0 cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.
\]
The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practice of Law, there are fewer differences between ideal and perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.

(iii) Issue: Logic and clear thinking.

Table 12

Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A./Not Sure</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : P_5 \leq P_6 \]

- the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

\[ P_5 \]

- the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue
\[ \chi^2 = 0.06 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]
\[ \therefore z = +0.24 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of logic and clear thinking, there are fewer differences between ideal and perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.

(iv) Issue: A knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society.

Table 13
Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis</th>
<th>A.N.U. Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
<th>TOTAL W.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A./Not Sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ H_0: P_7 \leq P_8 \]

\[ P_7 - \text{the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \]

\[ P_8 - \text{the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.19 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +0.44 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of a knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society, there are fewer differences between ideal and perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.

(v) Issue: A liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
<th>TOTAL W.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=147</td>
<td>N=58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A./Not Sure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of a liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society, there are fewer differences between ideal and perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.

(vi) Issue: Knowledge of the various branches of Law,

Table 15

Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Emphasis x University x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A./Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal &gt; Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived &gt; Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.17 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = -0.41 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

\[ H_0: P_9 \leq P_{10} \]

\[ P_9 - \text{the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \]

\[ P_{10} - \text{the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \]
\[ H_0: P_{11} \leq P_{12} \]

- The proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ P_{12} \] - The proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ \chi^2 = 1.91 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +1.38 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of knowledge of the various branches of Law, there are fewer differences between ideal and perceived course emphases among continuing students than among dropouts.
### Meeting of Students' Expectations of Courses

#### Table 16

Faculty's Emphasis, Compared with Ideals of Continuing & Dropout Groups x Issue x University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=60</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=167</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=153</td>
<td>N=58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>b**</td>
<td>c***</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>b**</td>
<td>c***</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>b**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of self-confidence, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3 2 0</td>
<td>3 3 5</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>7 82 96</td>
<td>17 88 85</td>
<td>6 83 88</td>
<td>17 82 88</td>
<td>6 83 88</td>
<td>17 82 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Skills, knowledge &amp; techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>61 94 100</td>
<td>61 93 91</td>
<td>38 91 92</td>
<td>62 90 98</td>
<td>62 90 98</td>
<td>51 89 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Logic &amp; clear thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>7 2 0</td>
<td>3 3 5</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>48 91 89</td>
<td>57 95 85</td>
<td>43 92 92</td>
<td>51 89 96</td>
<td>51 89 96</td>
<td>51 89 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of historical development, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>3 4 0</td>
<td>2 3 0</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3 2 0</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>60 69 74</td>
<td>47 69 55</td>
<td>64 55 62</td>
<td>67 54 73</td>
<td>67 54 73</td>
<td>67 54 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liberal education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 5</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>2 4 0</td>
<td>2 4 0</td>
<td>2 4 0</td>
<td>2 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>6 2 0</td>
<td>4 7 10 4 6 2</td>
<td>5 2 0</td>
<td>5 2 0</td>
<td>5 2 0</td>
<td>5 2 0</td>
<td>5 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>0 52 66</td>
<td>9 52 33</td>
<td>8 40 46</td>
<td>19 43 61</td>
<td>19 43 61</td>
<td>19 43 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of various branches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>1 3 8</td>
<td>3 6 3</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5 0 0</td>
<td>3 3 8</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>3 2 10</td>
<td>3 2 10</td>
<td>3 2 10</td>
<td>3 2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal of emphasis</td>
<td>40 93 100</td>
<td>32 84 75</td>
<td>34 83 87</td>
<td>25 74 80</td>
<td>25 74 80</td>
<td>25 74 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - students answering second questionnaire November, 1965

** - continuing students

*** - dropouts
(i) Issue: Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives.

A.N.U.

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)
[definition: see Chapter 4, p. 62]

\[ H_0: P_1 = P_2 \]

\( P_1 \) - the proportion of continuing students who reported on entry to the course that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue

\( P_2 \) - the proportion of continuing students who reported on entry to the course that they would like a great deal of emphasis to be given to a specified issue

\( H_0 \) can be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Melbourne

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

Queensland

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0: P_1 = P_2 \]

\( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Monash

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0: P_1 = P_2 \]

\( H_0 \) cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Oppenheim's nomograph for the testing of statistical significance of differences between percentages (47, Appendix III) was used in testing the large number of null hypotheses derived from Table 16.
In only one of the four universities - A.N.U. - do the data support the hypothesis that with respect to the issue of development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.

(ii) Issue: Skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law.

A.N.U.

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : \pi_1 = \pi_2 \]

\[ H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

Queensland

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : \pi_1 = \pi_2 \]

\[ H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : \pi_1 = \pi_2 \]

\[ H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]
In only one university - Monash - do the data support the hypothesis that, with respect to the issue of skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.

(iii) Issue: Logic and clear thinking.

A.N.U.

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

Melbourne

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

Queensland

Discrepancy index (2) = Discrepancy index (1)

Monash

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

Ho: P1 = P2

Ho cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with regard to the issue of logic and clear thinking, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.
(iv) Issue: A knowledge of the historical development of
the legal system and of its present function in society.

**A.N.U.**

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ H_o \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of
significance.

**Melbourne**

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

**Queensland**

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

**Monash**

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with regard
to the issue of a knowledge of the historical development
of the legal system and of its present function in society,
the difference between the ideals of continuing students
and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the
difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis
of the faculty.

(v) Issue: A liberal education in philosophy, history, and
the nature of contemporary society.

**A.N.U.**

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ H_o \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of
significance.
Melbourne

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)

Queensland

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

$H_0: P_1 = P_2$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Monash

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

$H_0: P_1 = P_2$

$H_0$ can be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

In only one university - Monash - do the data support the hypothesis that, with regard to the issue of a liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.

(vi) Issue: Knowledge of the various branches of Law.

A.N.U.

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

$H_0: P_1 = P_2$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Melbourne

Discrepancy index (2) < Discrepancy index (1)
Queensland

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Monash

Discrepancy index (2) > Discrepancy index (1)

\[ H_0 : P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that, with regard to the issue of knowledge of the various branches of Law, the difference between the ideals of continuing students and the emphasis of the faculty is smaller than the difference between the ideals of dropouts and the emphasis of the faculty.
(4) **Attitudes**

### Table 17

**Attitudes x University x Continuing/Dropout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>A.N.U.</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Monash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>N=151</td>
<td>N=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Political-Economic Liberalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>32.57</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>31.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Social Liberalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>20.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Pragmatism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Dogmatism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>24.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Academic Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Intellectual Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>28.58</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Political-Economic Liberalism

A.N.U.  \[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ \mu_1 \] - mean score of continuing students on political-economic liberalism scale

\[ \mu_2 \] - mean score of dropouts on political-economic liberalism scale

\[ t = -0.659 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Melbourne  \[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = 0.138 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Queensland  \[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = -2.542 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]

\[ H_0 \] can be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Monash  \[ H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

\[ t = -1.295 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

In only one university - Queensland - do the data support the hypothesis that continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their political-economic liberalism scores. In this university, dropouts score higher on political-economic liberalism than do continuing students.
(ii) Social Liberalism

A.N.U.  
\[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]  
\[ \mu_3 \] - mean score of continuing students on social liberalism scale  
\[ \mu_4 \] - mean score of dropouts on social liberalism scale

\[ t = -0.586 \quad d.f. = 71 \]

\[ ' ' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Melbourne  
\[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = 1.081 \quad d.f. = 189 \]

\[ ' ' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Queensland  
\[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = -1.648 \quad d.f. = 203 \]

\[ ' ' H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash  
\[ H_0 : \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

\[ t = -2.161 \quad d.f. = 131 \]

\[ ' ' H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

In only one university - Monash - do the data support the hypothesis that continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their social liberalism scores. In this university, dropouts score higher on social liberalism than do continuing students.
(iii) Pragmatism

**A.N.U.**

\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]

\[ \mu_5 - \text{mean score of continuing students on pragmatism scale} \]

\[ \mu_6 - \text{mean score of dropouts on pragmatism scale} \]

\[ t = -0.478 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance}. \]

**Melbourne**

\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]

\[ t = -0.303 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance}. \]

**Queensland**

\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]

\[ t = -1.433 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance}. \]

**Monash**

\[ H_0 : \mu_5 = \mu_6 \]

\[ t = -0.009 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance}. \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that in each university continuing students and dropouts differ with respect to their pragmatism scores.
(iv) Dogmatism

A.N.U.  \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ \mu_7 \] - mean score of continuing students on dogmatism scale

\[ \mu_8 \] - mean score of dropouts on dogmatism scale

\[ t = -1.280 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]

\[ t \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Melbourne  \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ t = -0.397 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]

\[ t \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Queensland  \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ t = -0.573 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]

\[ t \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

Monash  \[ H_0 : \mu_7 = \mu_8 \]

\[ t = 0.444 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]

\[ t \] cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.

The data do not support the hypothesis that in each university continuing students differ from dropouts with respect to their dogmatism scores.

(v) Cynicism

A.N.U.  \[ H_0 : \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]

\[ \mu_9 \] - mean score of continuing group on cynicism scale
Melbourne  
\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]
\[ t = -0.132 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Queensland  
\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]
\[ t = -0.116 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Monash  
\[ H_0: \mu_9 = \mu_{10} \]
\[ t = -1.477 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]
\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that in each university continuing students differ from dropouts with regard to their cynicism score.

(vi) Academic Activities

A.N.U.  
\[ H_0: \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]
\[ \mu_{11} - \text{mean score of continuing students on academic activities scale} \]
\[ \mu_{12} - \text{mean score of dropouts on academic activities scale} \]
\[ t = 1.447 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Melbourne**

\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]

\[ t = -0.277 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Queensland**

\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]

\[ t = -1.560 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Monash**

\[ H_0 : \mu_{11} = \mu_{12} \]

\[ t = -1.103 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

The data do not support the hypothesis that, in each university, continuing students differ from dropouts with respect to their academic activities score.

(vii) Intellectual Interests

**A.N.U.**

\[ H_0 : \mu_{13} = \mu_{14} \]

\[ \mu_{13} \text{ - mean score of continuing students on intellectual interests scale} \]

\[ \mu_{14} \text{ - mean score of dropouts on intellectual interests scale} \]

\[ t = 0.539 \quad \text{d.f.} = 71 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]
Melbourne

\[ H_0: \mu_{13} = \mu_{14} \]

\[ t = -0.098 \quad \text{d.f.} = 189 \]

\[ \cdot \cdot \cdot H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Queensland

\[ H_0: \mu_{13} = \mu_{14} \]

\[ t = -2.007 \quad \text{d.f.} = 203 \]

\[ \cdot \cdot \cdot H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Monash

\[ H_0: \mu_{13} = \mu_{14} \]

\[ t = -1.763 \quad \text{d.f.} = 131 \]

\[ \cdot \cdot \cdot H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

In only one university - Queensland - do the data support the hypothesis that continuing students differ from dropouts with respect to their intellectual interests score. In this university, dropouts have a higher intellectual interests score than do continuing students.

**SITUATIONAL FACTORS**

(1) Marital Status

Table 18

Marital Status x Continuing/Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=465</td>
<td>N=176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$H_0: P_1 \leq P_2$

$P_1$ - the proportion of continuing students who are unmarried

$P_2$ - the proportion of dropouts who are unmarried

$\chi^2 = 8.61$  
$d.f. = 1$

$\therefore z = +2.93$

$\therefore H_0$ can be rejected at the .01\% level of significance.

The data support the hypothesis that a greater proportion of continuing students than of dropouts are unmarried.

(2) Type of Course

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course x Continuing/Dropout</th>
<th>Continuing Students N=465</th>
<th>Dropouts N=176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/External</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_0: P_1 \leq P_2$

$P_1$ - the proportion of continuing students enrolled in full-time courses

$P_2$ - the proportion of dropouts enrolled in full-time courses

$\chi^2 = 6.70$  
$d.f. = 1$

$\therefore z = +2.59$

$\therefore H_0$ can be rejected at the .01\% level of significance.

The data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts are enrolled in full-time courses of study.
(3) Scholarship Assistance

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarship</th>
<th>Continuing Students N=465</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dropouts N=176</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth without living allowance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth with living allowance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship with bond (Govt.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship with bond (private firm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships from other organisations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth &amp; Senior Govt. and/or College scholarship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : P_1 \leq P_2 \]

\( P_1 \) - the proportion of continuing students in receipt of scholarship assistance

\( P_2 \) - the proportion of dropouts in receipt of scholarship assistance

\[ \chi^2 = 27.01 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +5.2 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ can be rejected at the } 0.01\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

The data support the hypothesis that more continuing students than dropouts are in receipt of scholarship assistance.
In terms of the conceptual model outlined in Chapter 3, only a few of the postulated relationships were found to be present in the analyses outlined in Chapter 5. A number of possible explanations could be put forward to account for this: firstly, the relationships outlined in the model may simply not be operative in the groups studied; secondly, the measures used may be unsatisfactory indices of the variables under study; and thirdly, the procedure of examining each of the variables separately in relation to the criterion variable of continuing or dropping out may be too simple a mode of analysis to develop an understanding of a complex behavioural phenomenon.

Nonetheless, while the various orientation factors which were found to be related to the criterion variable are too diversely related to specific institutions to be more thoroughly comprehended in the absence of additional information concerning the institutions themselves, there appears to be a complex of background and situational factors which is related to whether an individual continues in the process of socialisation into the role of lawyer, or withdraws from this process. Before investigating further the interrelationships of these variables, a typological construct of the dropout, vis-a-vis his colleague who continues, will be developed on the basis of the data presented in Chapter 5.
Typological Construct of the Dropout

The individual who drops out of his Law course is less likely than his continuing colleague to have a father who has received some form of post-secondary education.

[The use of the masculine pronoun in the present context is not intended to imply that male students are more likely to drop out than female students. There is no difference between the sexes in the group studied: 22% of male students and 21% of female students discontinued their courses.]

He is also likely to have made the decision to study Law at a later age; he is more likely to be married, and to be enrolled in a part-time or external course; and he is less likely to be in receipt of scholarship assistance.

In addition, at Monash University, in response to the question of which characteristics are important for success as a judge, barrister, or solicitor, he attributes less importance to social background factors (such as being Australian born, having a family background in Law, being a Protestant, having been to a good private school, and being active in community affairs) than do his continuing colleagues.

At the Universities of Melbourne and Queensland, he attributes less importance to personality traits and abilities (such as high standards of honesty and integrity, wisdom and maturity of outlook, a sound knowledge of current interpretations of the Law, ability to identify the crucial elements of a case, and an interest in people) as factors in success as a solicitor.
At the A.N.U., his ideals concerning the amount of emphasis which the course should place on the development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives differ more widely from the emphasis which students say the faculty actually places on this issue than do the ideals of continuing students. In terms of the difference between the perceived and the ideal emphasis on this issue reported by A.N.U. students on entering the course, both dropouts and continuing students reported less satisfaction than with any of the other issues discussed. Both groups desired a greater emphasis on the development of self-confidence than was given by the faculty - the dropout group desiring an even greater emphasis than the continuing group. It is possible that, in addition to the background and situational factors which were found to distinguish between the two groups, the generally greater dissatisfaction of the dropout group with regard to an issue seen by the students in general as unsatisfactory may have been a significant factor in their decision to withdraw.

At Monash University, the dropout says more emphasis should be placed on the development of skills, knowledge, and techniques for the practise of Law, and on a liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society, than the faculty is reported as placing on these issues. Among continuing students there is also a preference for greater emphasis on the two issues, but the difference between ideal and reported emphasis is not as great as in the case of the dropouts.
It is interesting to note that these two issues are seen by both groups as being the most and least important, respectively, of the issues discussed (that is, in terms of amount of emphasis desired).

Also at Monash University, the dropout shows more social liberalism than his continuing colleagues.

And at the University of Queensland he is more politically and economically liberal and has more intellectual interests than the continuing student.

One might expect that, since in only three out of 28 cases were dropouts and continuing students differentiated with respect to attitudes which "touch objectives of university education which are not the subject of formal examination" (4a, p.291), those attitudes which do differentiate between the two groups in particular universities are attitudes which are distinctive of the universities concerned, and that the attitudes of the dropouts in these universities deviate from this distinctive pattern. This suggestion is, however, supported in only one of the three cases referred to above - law students at the University of Queensland obtain lower scores on political-economic liberalism than law students from any of the other universities studied (4a, p.293; personal communication re A.N.U. students), and the dropouts from Law at this university obtain significantly higher scores on this attitude scale than the continuing students.

The hypotheses concerning the relationship between the various orientation factors and continuing or withdrawing
receive such scattered support among the different universities studied that there is little which can be said concerning the general issue of the congruence between the student's orientation and the socialisation task as defined by the professional school. Possibly the specific questions asked in the study were not on the whole crucial to the interaction between individual and environment; certainly the absence of information concerning the universities adds considerably to the difficulty of discussing the question of congruence between the recruits and the socialising agencies.

Additional consideration should, however, be given to Table 16: although only three of the 24 hypotheses generated by this table were supported by the data, it is interesting to note that (with only two exceptions) there is a trend for dropouts in the A.N.U., University of Queensland, and Monash University to desire greater emphasis on every issue (regardless of whether the issue is concerned with academic or vocational aspects of the course) than do continuing students. This may perhaps suggest that the dropouts are generally more demanding as a group, that their higher demands are less readily met than those of the continuing students, and that the consequent disillusionment is a factor in their decision to withdraw.

The case of Melbourne University is interesting in this respect, that for every issue the trend is for continuing students to make greater demands of the course than the dropouts. The only other variables on which Melbourne differs markedly from the other universities
studied are scholarship assistance (68% of the Melbourne students have scholarships, 22% of the Queensland students, 15% of the A.N.U. students, and 26% of the Monash students) and the students' predictions of their examination performance (20% of the Melbourne students predict that they will obtain a top pass, while the corresponding percentages are 7% at Queensland, 8% at Monash, and 10% at A.N.U.). This suggests that possibly the inverse relationship between the demands of continuing students and dropouts which pertains at Melbourne University may be in some way related to a higher level of confidence among students concerning academic ability. Another possible explanation is that the inversion is due to some specific institutional characteristic or characteristics of Melbourne University (for example, course standards may be of an exceptionally high level, so that students' demands are more likely to be exceeded than disappointed, and hence it is the students with the highest expectations whose demands are most closely approximated) - unfortunately, in the absence of institutional data, it is not possible to pursue this suggested line of analysis.

In the case, however, of the background and situational factors investigated, the findings of the study indicate a need for further analysis in order to untangle the interrelationships between those variables which are related to the criterion variable of continuing or dropping out. As indicated in the typological construct above, dropouts are more likely to be married, to be enrolled in part-time or external courses, and to have decided to study Law at a later age than continuing students. They are also
less likely to be in receipt of scholarship assistance and to have fathers who have received some form of post-secondary education. This complex of relationships suggests that the age of the student may also be related to the likelihood of his continuing or dropping out. Table 21 shows the distribution of the two groups, continuing students and dropouts, with regard to age.

### Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=465</td>
<td>N=176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 yrs. &amp; under</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 yrs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 22 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 24 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 26 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis that the variable, "continuing/dropout", is independent of student's age can be rejected at the 1% level of significance ($X^2 = 21.3$, d.f. = 6) - dropouts tend to be older than continuing students.

Table 21 shows, however, that while dropouts tend to be older than continuing students, a large majority are still aged twenty years or less. It is suggested that the processes outlined in the conceptual framework may vary in importance or in the nature of their interaction for
younger and older recruits to the socialising agency (professional school), and that those background and situational factors whose significant relationship to the criterion variable has already been discussed may be profitably re-examined for older and younger students separately. Younger students have been defined for this purpose as students aged twenty years or less, and older students as students aged more than twenty years.

Scholarship Assistance

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Assistance</th>
<th>Younger Students</th>
<th>Older Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cont. N=415</td>
<td>Cont. N=44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop. N=177</td>
<td>Drop. N=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scholarship</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between scholarship assistance and persistence remains in the younger group \( (z = 4.76) \), but disappears in the older group \( (z = 0.49) \).

It should, however, be noted when considering the disappearance of this relationship in the older group that this group is small, and that the great majority of older students are not in receipt of scholarship assistance.

Neither of these restrictions apply in considering the younger group. The fact that the relationship between scholarship assistance and continuing or dropping out still
holds for this group does not resolve the question of whether the influence of scholarship assistance is due to its role as a situational factor (financial) or as an index of academic ability, to some combination of these, or to entirely different mechanisms.

Table 23
Younger Students: Father's Income x Continuing/Dropout x Scholarship Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Income</th>
<th>Non-scholarship</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (less than £2,000 p.a.)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=89</td>
<td>N=74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (over £2,000 p.a.)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=195</td>
<td>N=114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By examining younger students alone some of the objections to scholarship assistance as an index of academic ability are removed (ineligibility for scholarship assistance, or inability to accept assistance owing to factors such as family responsibilities). Hence, by controlling for scholarship assistance as in Table 23, we might expect to find that if scholarship assistance were influential as a source of financial aid, there would be no difference between the proportions of dropouts from high and low income groups in receipt of scholarship assistance, but that in the group with no scholarship assistance a larger proportion of the low income than of the high income group would drop out.
We find, however, that with no scholarship assistance there is no difference between the proportions of high- and low-income students who drop out \((z = 0.48)\). On the other hand, in the group receiving scholarship assistance a higher percentage of high-income than of low-income students is continuing \((z = 1.71)\).

With income level held constant, there is no relationship in the low income group between scholarship assistance and continuing or dropping out \((z = 1.42)\). In the high income group, however, a higher percentage of scholarship holders than of non-scholarship holders is continuing \((z = 4.26)\). Were scholarship assistance influential solely as an index of academic ability, we would expect to find the same relationship between scholarship assistance and persistence in both income groups.

Table 2J indicates that the proportions of students who continue and drop out remain fairly stable for all combinations of level of father's income and scholarship assistance except in the case of scholarship holders from high-income backgrounds, where the proportion of students who continue is significantly increased. There are at least two possible explanations of this finding.

Firstly, it may be the case that such scholarship assistance as is available to law students is inadequate as a financial aid, and that among students from low-income backgrounds any differences in ability which may exist are counteracted by financial difficulties or by the circumstances (for example, part-time employment, living
arrangements) arising therefrom. For students from high-income backgrounds, these financial disabilities are generally absent, and level of ability (as reflected by scholarship assistance) becomes important in determining whether the student continues in his course or withdraws.

A second possible explanation involves the suggestion, put forward in outlining the conceptual framework of the study, that the economic status of the family will be important in determining the proximity or remoteness of the possibility of professional education for the child and hence in determining, through the amount of consideration given to a professional career, the possibilities for anticipatory socialisation. For students from low-income backgrounds, with fewer opportunities for anticipatory socialisation, potential advantages accruing from higher ability levels may not be utilisable because of this socialisation deficit. Whereas for students from high-income backgrounds the combination of high ability with more adequate preparation through anticipatory socialisation results in a significant decrease in the number of students who drop out. [It should be noted that this analysis has, for reasons outlined above, been confined to younger students; for older students the role of anticipatory socialisation in the professional socialisation process may differ considerably.]
Type of Course

Table 24
Type of Course x Continuing/Dropout x Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Younger Students</th>
<th>Older Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cont. N=415</td>
<td>Cont. N=444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop. N=137</td>
<td>Drop. N=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/External</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between type of course and continuing or dropping out disappears in the younger group (z = 0.46), in which the majority of students are enrolled in full-time courses.

In the older group, where the majority of the students are enrolled in part-time courses, the relationship between persistence and enrolment in full-time courses remains (z = 1.87).

The fact that part-time enrolment is related to dropping out in the older but not in the younger group may be due to the fact of its interaction with other factors which characterise the older group - fewer older students receive scholarship assistance, more are married, fewer have fathers with post-secondary education, and older students make the decision to study Law at a later age than younger students (all characteristics which in Chapter 5 were shown to be related to dropping out). Added to this complex of disadvantageous factors, the disadvantages of
part-time enrolment may be too great for the older student to be able to continue, while for his younger counterpart, in the absence of these additional disadvantages, the difficulties inherent in part-time enrolment are not sufficient to lead to withdrawal from the course.

Marital Status

Table 25
Marital Status x Continuing/Dropout x Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Younger Students</th>
<th>Older Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=415</td>
<td>N=137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between marital status and continuing or dropping out disappears when age is held constant: the entire younger group is unmarried, and amongst the older students, a slight majority of whom are unmarried, there is no relationship between marital status and persistence.

The observed relationship (Chapter 5, Table 18) between marital status and continuing or dropping out seems to emerge as the product of the fact that in the older group there are more married students, and in the older group, for reasons which the present discussion is intended to elucidate, the dropout rate is higher.
In the group of younger students, slightly less than half of whom have fathers who have received some post-secondary education, the relationship between level of father's education and the variable, "continuing/dropout", remains \((z = 1.72)\). In the older group, however, where only about a quarter of the students have fathers who have received some post-secondary education, this relationship disappears \((z = 0.30)\).

It is suggested that, while among younger students father's education operates as a factor in the socialisation process in the manner described in Chapter 3, older students are less dependent on parents as sources of information about the profession and also less influenced by parental aspirations and more influenced by their own attitudes and opinions concerning the profession. Hence, while among younger students probability of dropping out is related to level of father's income, this factor does not have a significant role in the older student's decision to withdraw.
Age at Decision

Table 27
Age at Decision x Continuing/Dropout x Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Decision</th>
<th>Younger Students</th>
<th>Older Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 yrs. or less</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14 yrs.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 yrs.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 yrs.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 20 yrs.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 yrs.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26 yrs.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between age at decision and continuing or dropping out disappears when age is held constant. In the younger group, the majority of whom made the decision to study Law at 17 years of age or younger, there is no relationship between the variable, "continuing/dropout", and age at decision ($\chi^2 = 10.37$, d.f. = 6); nor is this relationship displayed among the older group of students, the majority of whom made the decision to study Law at 21 years of age or older ($\chi^2 = 1.43$, d.f. = 2).

The observed relationship (Chapter 5, Table 7) between age at decision and continuing or dropping out seems to emerge as the product of the fact that in the older group students made the decision at a later age, and in the older group the dropout rate is higher.
Although the earlier decision to take the five per cent level of significance as the minimum acceptable level of significance necessitates the above conclusions, it is felt that the data presented in Table 27, for the younger group at least, suggest that with a larger number of cases it may be possible to establish that a relationship between age at decision and "continuing/dropout", which is independent of student's age, does exist.

This would suggest that in the case of older students, very few of whom decide to study Law during the period of childhood and adolescence, the age at which the decision is made is not relevant in terms of opportunities for anticipatory socialisation, and hence does not distinguish between students entering the course with more or less accurate conceptions of the professional role. But for younger students, those who make the decision at an earlier age enjoy greater opportunities for anticipatory socialisation into the professional role and enter the course with more accurate conceptions concerning what is entailed in the socialisation process (and hence are less likely to drop out).

Ideally, in order to obtain a more complete picture of the different interrelationships pertaining between the concepts outlined in Chapter 3 in the cases of older and younger recruits into professional socialisation agencies,
it would be necessary to extend the separate analysis of these two groups to cover all variables investigated in the hypotheses of the study. The limitations imposed upon the present study have, however, required that simple multivariate analysis be restricted to further examination of those variables which were found in Chapter 5 to be related to persistence and withdrawal.

Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg (37a, p. 113) make the point that

Any multivariate analysis reaches a barrier for one of two reasons. Either the available variables have been exhausted or so many cross-tabulations have been made that the number of cases in many cells have become too small.

From the preceding paragraph and, indeed, from the entire preceding discussion, it should be clear that in the present study the first barrier referred to by Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg has in no sense been approached. However, the rather small sample size has presented a problem of the second kind, especially in the case of those variables for which it is necessary to examine each university independently.

In addition, it is acknowledged that there are numerous distinctions, such as that between older and younger students, which could have been made, and the implications of which could have been followed in similar manner. Once again, limitations of time and length have dictated that only a limited number of paths of analysis be followed. In the final and following chapter, some suggestions will be made concerning the possible directions of future research into the problem.
Chapter 7

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Implications of the Study in Relation to the Theoretical Framework

The implications of the present study for the theoretical position implied in Chapter 2 and outlined in Chapter 3 have been extensively discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. Furthermore, in Chapter 4 it was pointed out that deficiencies in the available data left parts of the conceptual framework untested.

The bulk of the data examined proved to be fairly inconclusive in its bearings on the theoretical framework under consideration. This fact is not surprising, in view of the complexity of the behavioural phenomenon under study: the analyses conducted have been of a very simple, preliminary nature, and are seen as being principally useful in providing guide-lines for further, more complex analyses in studies which are designed specifically to investigate dropping out conceptualised as withdrawal from a process of secondary socialisation.

Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (35a, p. 301) express the approach which has been followed in the present study as follows:

the use of concrete data for the explanation of relationships between variables formulated at a higher level of abstraction will not satisfy one who wishes to establish final theories by means of one study. But if research is regarded as a never-ending search for interrelationships, in which one
study provides the basis on which another can build, the suggestion of plausible intervening variables becomes as important a step as the statistical demonstration of relationships.

Perhaps the clearest implication of the present findings is that the nature of the interrelationships between the variables studied vary for different types of students. In Chapter 6, some of these different interrelationships were pursued in the cases of younger and older students; in Chapter 2, reference was made to the fact that the data obtained by Lawrence Pervin (51), who has used a similar interaction model in his study of dropouts, indicate that there is a high correlation between perceived self/college discrepancies and dropping out for nonacademic reasons, but that this relationship does not hold in the case of withdrawal due to academic factors.

In any case, it seems fairly clear that the major implication of the present research in relation to the theoretical position previously expounded is that the latter will need to be substantially modified to take account of the different interrelationships operating among different types of dropouts.

Implications for Further Research

The first implication for further research, which arises out of the inconclusiveness referred to above, is that the data used should be obtained by means of instruments designed with specific reference to the theory to be tested, and that these data should cover all aspects of the theoretical framework. Furthermore, the extension
of knowledge concerning the complex behavioural phenomenon of withdrawal from the professional socialisation process would be aided considerably if both the definition of the subject population and the type of data collected were in line with at least those of one other researcher in the field, for comparative purposes. As was suggested in Chapter 1, for most general purposes the classification which is seen as possibly proving to be most useful would be one which takes account of the stage at which students withdrew, whether withdrawal was voluntary or mandatory, and whether students' academic performance was satisfactory prior to withdrawal.

A further distinction which could be introduced into future research on withdrawal from courses of professional education is that of whether the student withdraws entirely from the profession, or whether he selects an alternative means of recruitment into the profession: the processes involved in the decision to drop out of a particular course may be very different for these two groups.

In considering implications for further research, it is necessary to examine the possible objectives of such research. These objectives are seen as being of two kinds: firstly, the administrator's interest in obtaining, either for selection or for remedial purposes, an equation which gives maximum efficiency in predicting those students who are most likely to drop out. And secondly, the objective of understanding why a particular piece of behaviour occurs - the present study has been directed solely towards this end.
In regard to the former objective, studies such as the present example should be useful in indicating variables which are related to the criterion variable. Future research could then be directed towards the end of obtaining, by means of multiple regression analysis, that equation which accounts best for the variation in the criterion variable. This approach is implied in conclusions such as the following (48, p. 69):

The results of the multiple regression analysis document once again our inability to predict accurately whether or not a given student will drop out of college. A possible explanation for this result is that we failed to include other important input variables. ... A second possible interpretation is that the criterion, as defined, is too heterogeneous. Finally, it may be that a different type of analysis involving, for example, a variety of possible interaction effects among the variables studied would substantially improve our prediction.

It should be recognised, however, that while theoretically an equation which maximises predictive efficiency may be forthcoming, its components may be of a kind which is unacceptable in the social context of the institution or institutions concerned (for example, it is doubtful that socioeconomic variables, while perhaps theoretically constituting major components of the prediction equation, would be acceptable as selection devices in our present social context).

In regard to the second possible objective of future research - that of understanding why a particular piece of behaviour takes place - the present study is also seen as being useful in providing suggested directions on which future research may build. Once again, multiple
Regression analysis is seen as being a useful tool for future research, but in this instance through its ability to show how each variable under study is related to the criterion variable, both before and after adjusting for the effects of the other variables under study.

In the study by Wegner and Sewell (68), referred to in Chapter 2, regression analysis has been used to unravel some of the complexities which have been observed in the interaction of student and institutional characteristics. Through a step-wise regression analysis it was found that the type of college an individual attends has an effect which is independent of his personal characteristics on his chances of completing his degree. Wegner and Sewell note that the explanation for the differences in graduation rates between types of colleges is beyond the scope of their data, but proceed to a speculative analysis of the factors involved. These speculative propositions are themselves capable of being subjected to further empirical analysis - in a process similar to that suggested by Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook in the extract cited earlier in this chapter.

Finally, studies such as the present investigation are seen as constituting constructive preliminaries to causal path analysis.

While correlation coefficients do not imply causal direction or patterning they can be used to test inferences. A model set up to describe the interrelation between variables can be accepted or rejected on the basis of consistency with the correlation coefficients. This is the function of path analysis. (28, p.375)
The generation of a conceptual framework, and an insight into those variables which are relevant to the phenomenon under investigation as well as the development of some hypotheses concerning the interrelationships between these variables, are seen as being, firstly, the objective of the present study and, secondly, essential in the process of setting up a model for path analysis.
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APPENDIX I

(1) First Questionnaire (March, 1965)

(2) Attitude Inventory

(3) Second Questionnaire (November, 1965)
Questionnaires similar to this are being answered by university students in several professional faculties in a number of Australian Universities.

The questions ask about your background, reasons for entering engineering, interests, occupational plans and so on.

Nearly all the questions can be answered by placing a circle around a number corresponding to one of several alternative answers. If the alternatives given do not always exactly provide for your opinion circle the one closest to your view.

The questionnaire is completely confidential. The information you provide will be reported only in the form of statistical summaries and your individual identity will not be revealed in any way.

Australian National University.
University of Melbourne.

March 1965.
I  Biographical Information

For each question please circle the number which corresponds to the category most appropriate to you, and where necessary supply the details requested.

e.g. If you are a part-time student you would answer Q2 as follows:

Full-time                  1
Part-time                 2
Other (please specify _______ ) 3

1. Which course are you enrolled for?

Engineering degree only                             1
Engineering degree and other course
(please specify __________________ ) ... 2
Other (please specify __________________ ) ... 3

2. What type of course are you doing?

Full-time                             1
Part-time                             2
Other (please specify __________________ ) ... 3

3. Is this your first year at University?

Yes                                              1
No                                               2

If No: please indicate your previous academic history:

Newly enrolled in Engineering, transferred from another course                             2
Repeating some or all 1st year subjects                                                   3
Newly enrolled in Engineering with degree in other field                                  4
Other (please specify __________________ ) ... 5

4. Have you had any previous engineering training?

No                                              1
Technical college training                       2
Apprenticeship                                     3
Worked in engineering field but with no special training         4
Vacation work in engineering                      5
Other (please specify __________________ ) ... 6

Disregard this column; it will be used for the transfer of information to punched cards.
5. **What is your age?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 or under</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Sex:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **What is your marital status?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children (specify number ___)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify _______________)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Where is the location of your home?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same city as this university</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same state or territory as university but outside city</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australian state or territory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Australian territory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other area (please specify _________________)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Where are you now living?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With other relatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University college</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other college or hostel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own domicile</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify ________________________)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Is your Father:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully employed and not yet retired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired from main occupation but fully or partly re-employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully retired</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 1, please indicate his income in the following Question (Q.11).
If 2, 3, 4, or 5, please indicate his income for last year of full employment and state year alongside the relevant category in the next Question. (Q.11)

11. In which of these categories did your father's (or male guardian's) income fall last year (before taxation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than £1,000 per year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £1,001 and £2,000 per year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £2,001 and £3,000 per year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £3,001 and £4,000 per year</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £4,001 and £5,000 per year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £5,001 and £6,000 per year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £6,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Father's educational background:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some secondary education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed secondary school</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed other post-secondary diploma or certificate training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended university, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed university degree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Mother's educational background:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some secondary education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed secondary school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed other post-secondary diploma or certificate training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended university, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed university degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Have any of your relations attended this or another university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunts, uncles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers, sisters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Which of the persons listed below are, or have been, professional engineers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunts, uncles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers, sisters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are you active in any of these community organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts or Guides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old school club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Describe the present or last main occupation of your father (or male guardian). Please be as precise and detailed as possible, stating both the grade and nature of the occupation - e.g. senior clerk in bank; head teacher in primary school; barrister; motor mechanic employed in a garage; owner of one-man mixed business. Please do not use vague terms such as civil servant, clerk, teacher, wholesaler etc.
II Background to Engineering

18. In which year did you first pass the exams qualifying you for entrance to the university?
   1964 ...............1
   1963 ...............2
   1962 ...............3
   before 1962 ........4

19.a. List all subjects taken in your final year at school. (Please print.)

b. During your final year at school which subject were you most interested in? (Please print.)

c. During your final year at school which subject did you do best in? (Please print.)

20.a. Which school did you last attend? (Please write full name.)

b. Was this a:

   State school in a capital city .......................1
   State school in a rural or provincial area ...............2
   Roman Catholic school in a capital city ................3
   Roman Catholic school in a rural or provincial area ........4
   Independent school in a capital city ......................5
   Independent school in a rural or provincial area ...........6
   Coaching College ........................................7
   School outside Australia ..............................8
21. At which school did you receive most of your secondary education? (Please write full name.)

____________________________________

22. What scholarships, cadetships etc. do you hold?

None .................................................................1
Commonwealth without living allowance ..........................2
Commonwealth with living allowance ..............................3
Scholarship with bond (Government) ..............................4
Scholarship with bond (Private firm) .............................5
Other (please specify ______________________) ..................6

23.a. How old were you when you first decided to study Engineering at the university?

Younger than 12 ..........1 18 ......................6
13 - 14 ......................2 19 - 20 ......................7
15 ......................3 21 - 25 ......................8
16 ......................4 26 and over ......................9
17 ......................5

b. Was this decision made:

While in Primary School ...........................................1
In the first few years of secondary school ......................2
In the last year or two of secondary school ....................3
After being unable to get into field of first choice ..........4
Not until after a year or two of another university course ...5
Not until after one or more year's working .................6
24. In your decision to study Engineering how important were the following considerations?

Rate each item by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An interest in some aspects of the subject matter of Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A desire to be independent of bosses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The financial attractiveness of Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An interest in developmental works of national and social import</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engineering as a stepping-stone to administrative or executive positions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A desire for a professional career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of qualifications for other courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The relatively high social standing of the Engineering profession in the community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Good performance in appropriate school subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Failure to gain admission to course of first choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A desire to go to the university and no strong preference for any one course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Relatives other than parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.

Rate each item by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Interest in making things</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A close family friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A particular teacher at school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Admiration for a person or persons in the Engineering profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A careers adviser or vocational guidance officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Attraction to outdoor life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A desire to practice engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the above which were the **three most important** in your decision to study Engineering? (Record the appropriate numbers.)
III Engineering and Engineering Training

25. What further study are you likely to engage in, in the five years following the completion of the degree(s) for which you are now enrolled. (Circle one of the following.)

No study contemplated ...........................................1
Postgraduate engineering degree (Australia) .....................2
Postgraduate engineering degree (overseas) .....................3
Other degree (please specify ________________________________).4
Other (please specify ______________________________________).5
Undecided about further study .......................................6

26.a. As far as your career plans are concerned, what work do you expect to be doing five years after you have completed your degree? (Circle one of the following.)

Teaching in an Engineering school ................................1
Engineer in national development scheme .........................2
(Both government and private e.g. Snowy scheme, oil exploration)
Engineer in government or semi-government body e.g. P.M.G. Dept. 3
Engineer in private firm or industry ..............................4
Working independently (e.g. consulting engineer) ...............5
Administrative work in government or business ..................6
Not yet decided on the field in which I want to work ...........7
Other (please specify ______________________________________)

26.b. Would you prefer your life's work as an engineer to be concerned mainly with:

Teaching .........................................................1
Professional practice ............................................2
Research ..........................................................3
Administration ...............................................4
27. How important for success in the engineering profession is each of the following characteristics?

Rate the importance of each characteristic by circling the appropriate number opposite each statement. If you think the characteristic is Very Important circle 1, if you think it is Not at all Important circle 5, if you think its importance is somewhere between these extremes circle the appropriate intermediate number. If you are not sure circle 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Having been to a good private school ..................1
- Being able to communicate ideas ......................1
- Creative ability ......................................1
- Being a male ..........................................1
- High standards of honesty and integrity ...............1
- Thorough knowledge of the subject matter of his specialty ..........1
- A capacity for meticulous attention to detail ............1
- Broad knowledge of the main fields of engineering ..........1
- Being Australian born ..................................1
- A capacity for sustained hard work ......................1
- Ability to analyze a situation or problem logically ..........1
- Being active in community activities ....................1
- Wisdom and maturity of outlook ........................1
- A pleasing manner and appearance, well spoken and well dressed ..........1
12.

Rate the importance of each characteristic by circling the appropriate number opposite each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to gain the respect and confidence of the public with whom he deals</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>At all Important</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being married</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many contacts within the engineering profession and associated occupations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interest in people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get on well with colleagues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appearance of confidence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concern for the interests and well being of the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family background in Engineering</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A broad cultural knowledge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High administrative ability</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very good academic record</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to transform ideas into practice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to control and lead men</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sound knowledge in the pure sciences which are basic to engineering</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Not all students have the same reason for choosing a particular university course, or the same views about what should be emphasized in their training.

In this question you are asked to indicate:

(i) How much emphasis you think the Engineering School should give to a number of issues, and

(ii) how much emphasis you think it does give the same issues.

Indicate your answer by circling the appropriate numbers opposite each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Emphasis</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Little or none</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emphasis on:

**Development of self-awareness, self-confidence, and an understanding of other people and their motives**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 39

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 40

**Skills, knowledge and techniques for the practice of Engineering**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 41

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 42

**Logic and clear thinking**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 43

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 44

**An understanding of the sciences basic to Engineering**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 45

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 46

**A liberal education in philosophy, history and the nature of contemporary society**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 47

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 48

**Knowledge of the various branches of Engineering**

Should be ... 1  2  3  4  5  6 49

Is ........... 1  2  3  4  5  6 50

Please read through the above list again and underline the one issue to which you would like to see greatest emphasis given. 51
29.a. What are your opinions on the following issues?

Please indicate by circling the appropriate number opposite each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training for the engineering profession could be carried out better by an institute controlled by the engineering profession than by a University .............................................. 1

An engineer should always aim to achieve the utmost reliability of his work, irrespective of the cost .............................................. 1

Irrespective of a client's wishes, a contracting engineer must be the ultimate determiner of quality .............................................. 1

The professional Institution of Engineers should have strong powers to enable it to maintain high standards among its members .............................................. 1

The engineer need not be concerned with the social implications of his work other than maintaining adequate technical standards .............................................. 1

I am more interested in contact with people than in abstract engineering problems .............................................. 1

An engineer should feel free to criticize publicly the work of another engineer if he believes this to be incompetent .............................................. 1

Any engineer should feel free to take over work for a client who is dissatisfied with the handling of the job by another engineer .............................................. 1

Graduating engineers are well equipped to practice engineering .............................................. 1
15.

Indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate number for each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the rare engineer whose behaviour is always consistent with the ethics of his profession ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

An engineer should refrain from mixing socially with his clients ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

In handling jobs an engineer should see that his client's or employer's interests take precedence over any matter of public interest ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

An engineer in private practice should always pay meticulous attention to detail even though this might reduce the number of jobs he can take on ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

There is much in the curriculum of a university engineering course that is not needed by a practising engineer ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

The best training for engineering is to work under the supervision of a practising engineer ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

In cases of conflict, a salaried engineer should take more notice of his employer's demands than he does of professional standards ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6

29.b. It is possible that you have really thought about only some of the issues referred to in part "a" of this question; please go back over the statements and underline those that you have really thought about before.
30. If an engineer has reason to believe that one of his professional colleagues is seriously incompetent in his work, he should:

(Circle the number of the statement closest to your own view.)

Attempt to demonstrate this colleague's shortcomings ........1 to him
Alert the public to this fact so that the profession ........2 should not come into disrepute
Take little or no action, since variations in competence among the members of any professional group is one of the features of professional life ........3
Attempt to handle the matter through his professional ........4 association so that the public does not learn of this state of affairs
Take little or no action since independence of action ........5 is one of the features of professional life.

31. What in your opinion is the relative status or prestige of the following professional groups? Rank the groups by placing 1 against that with highest status, 2 against the next highest and so on. Please read the entire list before commencing your rankings.

Scientists
Engineers
Lawyers
Dentists
Architects
School Teachers
University Teachers
Diplomats
Doctors

25
26 - 35
32. Would you like to see the title "engineer" legally restricted to mean qualified professional practitioner as with "doctor" and "dentist"?

- Yes ............1
- No .............2
- Not sure .......3

33. About how many of your friends are beginning Engineering this year?

- None ............1
- One .............2
- Two .............3
- Three ...........4
- Four ............5
- Five ............6
- Six or more ......7

34. About how many students do you know in other years of the Engineering course?

- None ............1
- One .............2
- Two .............3
- Three ...........4
- Four ............5
- Five ............6
- Six or more ......7

35.a. How active are you likely to be in:

- (a) your faculty club
- (b) any other student club or society

during your course. (Indicate your likely maximum participation no matter when this may be.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty club</th>
<th>Any other club or society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I expect to be very active ............1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may be active .....................2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will possibly attend most activities ....3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will possibly attend some activities ....4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may go to a few activities ...........5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unlikely to attend any activities at all. ...6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35.b. In which club or clubs are you likely to be most active?

36. How well do you think you will do in the exams at the end of this year?

Indicate your estimate of overall performance by placing a tick in the appropriate square.

- Top pass
- Middle pass
- Low pass
- Just fail
- Clear fail

Thank you for your co-operation. When you have finished this and the accompanying inventory place them both in the envelope provided and seal it. So that we may contact you later please print your name in the space provided on the face of the envelope.
ATTITUDE INVENTORY

This is a brief inventory for reporting some of your own opinions and feelings on a wide variety of subjects.

Read each of the numbered statements and indicate your opinion about it by placing a tick [✓] in the appropriate square after each statement.

Work rapidly. Do not leave any question unanswered.

University of Melbourne
University of Queensland

1967
What are your opinions on the following issues? Please indicate by checking the appropriate square for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There is too much emphasis in the university on intellectual and theoretical topics and not enough on the application of theory to practical matters.
2. The social unrest found in the underdeveloped parts of the world today is due more to the enormous differences in living standards among the people concerned than it is to the work of communist agitators.
3. Of all the different philosophies that exist in the world there is probably one which is more in accord with reality than any of the others.
4. In illegitimate pregnancies abortion is in many cases the most reasonable alternative.
5. In disarmament negotiations the West should take the initiative by making concessions since such a procedure could produce concessions from the Soviet block.
6. We need a system of price controls on most goods used by consumers and industry in order to prevent unjustified price increases.
7. Young people should not have too easy access to books which are likely to confuse them.
8. While not condoning censorship of the press, radio or television it seems clear that the mass media must be subject to some form of government supervision otherwise the national security may be endangered or our allies misrepresented.
9. Mutual incompatibility should be sufficient grounds for a divorce.
10. In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
11. It is a good rule to accept nothing as certain or proved.
12. No matter what the modern trend is, young people should be discouraged from having sexual relations before marriage.
13. Industrial stoppages at the present time generally result from the genuine grievances of workers; communists and other radical elements play a relatively minor role in provoking stoppages.
14. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
15. No matter how they seem to act men are interested in women for only one reason.
16. It is the responsibility of the government to ensure everyone a secure job and a good standard of living.
17. The person who is extremely tolerant of widely different and even conflicting viewpoints probably has few opinions of his own.

18. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

19. The best way to provide adequate medical care for the entire population is through a government run national health scheme.

20. University subjects which deal with theoretical principles are generally of greater value to the student than those which provide information which has a direct practical application.

21. It is only natural that a person will have a better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with the ideas he opposes.

22. While internal censorship may not be desirable there should be government regulations prohibiting the importation of obscene and pornographic books and materials.

23. The fact that people do act altruistically suggests that it is not only self interest that governs their behaviour.

24. The danger of communist infiltration into the union movement is great and the government should take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that it does not become widespread.

25. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is in your interests to do so.

26. It is a fallacy to suggest that large scale government planning will result in any real loss of individual liberties and freedom.

27. There are irreconcilable differences between the West and the Soviet Union which makes it virtually impossible for the two sides to co-exist for long.

28. Our thinking would be a lot better if we would just forget about words like 'probably', 'approximately', 'perhaps'.

29. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own profit.

30. There is seldom any excuse for lying to someone else.

31. A person should be free to take his own life if he wishes to without any interference from society.

32. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.

33. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who seems unable to make up his mind about what he really believes.

34. It is quite untrue to suggest that the nationalization of industries such as steel would lead to inefficiency, bureaucracy, and stagnation.

Please turn over
How do you feel about the following issues? Please indicate by checking the appropriate square for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely true</th>
<th>More true than false</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>More false than true</th>
<th>Definitely false</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I prefer to engage in activities from which I can see definite results rather than those from which no tangible or objective results are apparent.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I enjoy tackling problems of the type found in mathematics, philosophy or logic.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I don't like to work on a problem unless there is a good possibility of coming out with a clear cut and unambiguous answer.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I am more interested in the critical consideration of principles and theories than in their practical application.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I don't have much inclination to get to know people who hold views that are completely contrary to my own.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I would enjoy writing a paper on the possible long term effects or outcomes of a significant discovery or contribution in my field of specialization.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I like people to be definite about things.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I would like to learn more about the history of human thought.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I prefer the practical man any time to the man of ideas.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I often find myself questioning the statements and ideas expressed by my teachers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I enjoy reading essays on serious or philosophical subjects.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I prefer subjects which present a body of factual material to those which elaborate a particular point of view.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I enjoy reading about artistic or literary achievements.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I dislike spending a lot of time on any one problem.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I am interested in discussions about such topics as the ideal society, freedom, etc.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I have spent a lot of time listening to serious music.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Although many details still remain to be worked out, we now have definite answers to the major problems in my field.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I like to read poetry.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>The idea of engaging in research for any lengthy period of time does not appeal to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I have frequent discussions with friends about the causes and possible solutions of various national and international problems.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>All things considered I would prefer to have a principle or theory explained to me than attempt to understand it on my own.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>For most questions there is only one right answer once a person is able to get all the facts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study of Professional Education

University of Melbourne
Victoria

Australian National University
A.C.T.

Dear Student,

At the beginning of the year you were good enough to participate in a study of professional education that is being carried out by the University of Melbourne and the Australian National University.

The study is a longitudinal one, and periodically through your course we will seek your opinions about the Law, the legal profession and your training. At the present time we are most anxious to obtain your reactions to the first year of your course and you will find that the questions contained in the questionnaire are concerned very largely with this.

You will find, also, that nearly all the questions can be answered by marking one of a number of given alternatives. If the alternatives do not provide exactly for your opinion mark the one which most closely approximates your view. You may, of course, elaborate your answers whenever you wish.

We can assure you, as before, that your answers are completely confidential. They will be reported in the form of statistical summaries only, and no individual's identity will be revealed in any way. When you have finished the questionnaire please use the stamped addressed envelope to mail it back to us.

We would urge you to complete the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. We would like to have your replies before this year's examination results are published. As you will realise, the success of the study, and its practical significance in providing information about success and failure at university, depends very largely on your willingness to complete the questionnaire.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

D.S. Anderson, J.S. Western,
Education Research Officer, School of General Studies,
University of Melbourne, Australian National University.


P.S. The code number on the questionnaire and envelope is to enable us to check returns, while at the same time assuring your anonymity.
I. Background Information

For each question please circle the number which corresponds to the category most appropriate to you, and where necessary supply the details requested.

e.g. If you think you will be doing law next year you would answer Q.2 as follows:

- Yes .................................................. 1
- No .................................................... 2
- Not sure ............................................. 3
- Other (please specify _____________) ...... 4

1. Did you sit for all your examinations this year?

- Yes .................................................. 1
- Sat for some only ................................... 2
- No, because of illness at examination period ...... 3
- No, gave up course sometime through the year ...... 4
- Other (please specify _____________) ...... 5

2. Do you think you will be doing Law next year?

- Yes .................................................. 1
- No .................................................... 2
- Not sure ............................................. 3
- Other (please specify _____________) ...... 4

3. Where are you now living?

- With parents ........................................... 1
- With other relatives ................................... 2
- University college ...................................... 3
- Other college or hostel ................................ 4
- Lodgings ................................................ 5
- Own domicile .......................................... 6
- Other (please specify _____________) ......... 7

4. Are you active in any of these community organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts or Guides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old school club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disregard this column: it will be used for the transfer of information to punched cards.
II. Reactions to Training

5a. A number of reasons that students have given for finding law attractive are shown below. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with each of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in some aspects of its subject matter.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be independent of bosses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The financial rewards from legal practice appeal to me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in the maintenance of individual liberties and civil rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see it as a stepping stone to politics, business or government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire a professional career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The legal profession has a relatively high social standing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a desire to practice law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one of the above do you find the most attractive? (Record the appropriate number.)

b. Which one of the above do you find the most attractive? (Record the appropriate number.)

24

c. Is there anything about law that you find more attractive than the items listed? (Give brief details.)

25-26
6. What further study are you likely to engage in, in the five years following the completion of the degree(s) for which you are now enrolled? (Circle one of the following.)

No study contemplated .............................................. 1
Articles ........................................................................... 2
Post-graduate law degree (Australia) ................................. 3
Post-graduate law degree (Overseas) ................................. 4
Other degree (please specify _________________________) .... 5
Other (please specify _________________________) ............... 6
Undecided about further study ........................................ 7

7a. As far as your career plans are concerned, what work do you expect to be doing five years after you have completed your degree? (Circle one of the following.)

Teaching in a Law School ............................................. 1
Legal work in the public service ...................................... 2
Working independently as a solicitor ............................... 3
Employed in a firm of solicitors ...................................... 4
A partner in a firm of solicitors ....................................... 5
Legal work in private business or industry ...................... 6
Working independently as a barrister ............................... 7
Not yet decided on the field in which I want to work .......... 8
Other (please specify _________________________) ............ 9

b. Would you prefer your life's work as a lawyer to be concerned mainly with:

Teaching ................................................................. 1
Professional practice .................................................... 2
Administration - private .............................................. 3
Administration - government ......................................... 4
Politics ......................................................................... 5
External affairs ........................................................... 6
4. A series of issues are listed below.

For each issue you are asked to indicate:

(i) How much emphasis the Law School has given to it this year, and

(ii) How much emphasis, in your opinion, the Law School should have given it this year.

Indicate your answer by circling the appropriate numbers opposite each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Emphasis</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Little or none</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emphasis on:**

**Development of self-awareness, self-confidence, and an understanding of other people and their motives**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**Skills, knowledge and techniques for the practice of Law**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**Logic and clear thinking**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**A knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**A liberal education in philosophy, history and the nature of contemporary society**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**Knowledge of the various branches of Law**

Has been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Should have been ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Please read through the above list again:

(i) underline the issue which has received the greatest emphasis

(ii) circle the issue which should have received the greatest emphasis

---

*Note: The numbers in the table and the text correspond to the options for emphasizing issues.*
5.

9a. A series of statements are given below. How accurately do these describe your experiences this year? For each statement circle the number in the appropriate column to the left of the double line.

b. Now read through the list a second time and indicate whether your response describes a satisfactory or unsatisfactory state of affairs. For each statement circle the number in the appropriate column to the right of the double line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairly accurate</td>
<td>Rather inaccurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Law School placed considerable emphasis on tutorials.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written work was always carefully evaluated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, library facilities were adequate.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case method was used quite extensively in one or two subjects this year.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were given few opportunities to organize their own work.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some subjects required much more work than others.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most staff members were helpful if approached about subject or course difficulties.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was considerable informal discussion about course matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty was often experienced in obtaining set references.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying in the Law School was a stimulating experience intellectually.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture classes were typically large.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were encouraged to participate actively in tutorials.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount of time was spent on work not directly relevant to the course as a whole.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers were generally successful in arousing interest in their subjects.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(remember to read through the list a second time and answer part "b" of the question.)
10. In classes dealing with case book material which students have been asked to prepare for in advance did you prefer: (Circle the appropriate number)

(i) exposition of the cases by the lecturer with little opportunity for the class to comment or be questioned ........................................ 1

(ii) the lecturer to wait for volunteers to answer questions or to ask them ........................................ 2

(iii) to be questioned by name on the material ......................... 3

OR is

(iv) case method not used in this Law School ................................. 4

11. In classes where discussion was to be on material which in fact you had not prepared did you tend to: (Circle the appropriate number)

(i) absent yourself from the class ........................................ 1

(ii) admit unpreparedness if questioned ........................................ 2

(iii) ask the lecturer or tutor before the class not to question you ........................................ 3

12. Does being required to prepare material in advance of a lecture generally aid your learning: (Circle the appropriate number)

a great deal ........................................ 1

a little ............................................... 2

not at all .......................................... 3

OR is this a distraction to learning ........................................ 4

13. What recommendations have you got for changes in the first year Law Course?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14a. Since the beginning of the year have you ever considered withdrawing from the Law course? (Circle the appropriate number)

Never ........................................ 1

Yes, but not seriously ......................... 2

Quite seriously ................................ 3

Will probably withdraw ..................... 4

b. What alternative course or occupation have you considered?

________________________________________________________________________
III. Aspects of Law

15. Do you read any law journals regularly? (i.e. read most issues)
   Yes ...................... 1
   No ...................... 2
   If Yes: Please list those you read regularly
   ___________________________________
   ___________________________________

16. Do you subscribe to any law journals?
   Yes ...................... 1
   No ...................... 2
   If Yes: Please list those to which you subscribe
   ___________________________________
   ___________________________________

17. During the last year have you visited a court to observe a court case?
   Yes ...................... 1
   No ...................... 2
   If Yes: How many courts have you visited? ____________
   Which courts were they (i.e. Petty Sessions, High Court, etc.)
   ___________________________________
   ___________________________________

18. Have you taken part in a moot court this year?
   Yes ...................... 1
   No ...................... 2
   If Yes: What part did you play? _______________________
   ___________________________________
   ___________________________________

19. Have you done any work for the school Law Review this year?
   Yes ...................... 1
   No ...................... 2
   School has no Law Review ....3
   If Yes: Please give brief details of work __________________________
   ___________________________________
20. Law functions in our society to:

(Circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish law breakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve disputes according to the merits of the case</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve disputes according to fixed rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the rights of the individual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The common law is:
(Circle the number which most nearly approximates your opinion)

- An absolute set of principles which stand in their own right ......... 1
- A set of principles which enable the legal consequences of any act to be predicted with some certainty ............. 2
- A set of principles which provide a framework within which individual cases can be considered ............. 3

IV. General University Experiences

22. During third term this year approximately how many study hours a week have you averaged?

("Study" means your own study apart from lectures and tutorials)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (write in name)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-11</th>
<th>12-15</th>
<th>16+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23a. How often have you taken part in study or work discussion groups organized by students? (i.e. apart from official tutorials and other classes)

- Never ......................................................... 1
- About once a month or less .................................. 2
- About once every two to three weeks ..................... 3
- Once a week or more often ................................ 4
b. Have you found these sessions:

- Very useful ........................................... 1
- Useful .................................................. 2
- Not very useful ........................................ 3
- Have never taken part in any ....................... 4

24. Assuming that everyone has to devote a certain proportion of his time to eating, sleeping, family, etc., how would you say you spent the rest of your time during the latter part of this year?

- I devoted **almost all** of my uncommitted time to my work ...... 1
- I devoted the **bulk** of my uncommitted time to my work but saved **a little** for hobbies, non-professional reading, activities with friends, etc. .......................... 2
- I tried to set **definite limits** on my work so that quite a bit of my uncommitted time could be spent on hobbies, non-professional reading, activities with friends, etc. .......................... 3

25. About what proportion of your personal friends are law students? (Circle the appropriate number)

- 0-10% ................................................. 1
- 11-20% .............................................. 2
- 21-30% ............................................. 3
- 31-40% ............................................. 4
- 41-50% ............................................. 5
- 51-75% ............................................ 6
- over 75% ......................................... 7

b. Did you meet these students:

- Before coming to Law School ....................... 1
- After coming to Law School ....................... 2

26. At your place of residence during term do you entertain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Law Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Law Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. During term do you visit socially:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Law Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Law Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

I. Reasons For Choosing Law

(1) Items contributing to 4 clusters.

(a) Interest
   An interest in some aspects of the subject matter of Law.
   A desire to practise Law.
   An interest in the maintenance of individual liberties and civil rights.
   An interest in debating and similar activities.

(b) Prestige
   A desire to be independent of bosses.
   The financial attractiveness of legal practice.
   A desire for a professional career.
   The relatively high social standing of the legal profession.

(c) Negative Orientation
   Lack of qualifications for other courses.
   Failure to gain admission to course of first choice.
   A desire to go to the university and no strong preference for any one course.

(d) Interpersonal Influence
   A close family friend.
   A particular teacher at school.
   Relatives other than parents.
   Parents.
   A careers adviser or vocational guidance officer.
(2) Calculation of cluster scores.

An individual's score on any cluster was obtained by calculating the mean of the ratings assigned to the items contributing to that cluster. In cases where an individual had failed to assign a rating to an item, that item was given value of the mean of the values of all the other items contributing to the cluster. It was only necessary, however, to use this procedure in 70 of the 2,564 factor scores calculated.

It should be noted that, in the possible case of an individual rating only those items which he considered to be important, the procedure outlined above could result in a high cluster score based on a single response. This procedure implies that such an individual attributes a great deal of importance to the cluster in question, although considering only one of its components to be important. While the procedure followed could be attacked on this basis, the number of cases in which this situation may have occurred is very small.

II. Characteristics Important For Success.

(1) Items contributing to 2 clusters.

(a) **Social Background.**

- Being Australian born.
- A family background in Law.
- Being a Protestant.
- Being active in community activities.
- Having been to a good private school.
(b) **Personality Traits and Abilities.**

High standards of honesty and integrity.
Wisdom and maturity of outlook.
A sound knowledge of current interpretations of the Law.
Ability to identify the crucial elements of a case.
An interest in people.

(2) **Calculation of cluster scores.**

Cluster scores were obtained in the same way as for the reasons involved in choosing law. A similarly small percentage of cases was involved in the procedure of weighting the means.
APPENDIX III

Difference Between Perceived and Ideal Course Emphases: Individual Universities

(i) Issue: Development of self-confidence, self-awareness, and an understanding of other people and their motives.

A.N.U. \[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = 0.00 \]

\[ H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

Melbourne \[ H_0: P_1 \leq P_2 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.27 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = -0.52 \]

\[ H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]
Queensland

$H_0: P_1 \leq P_2$

$\chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore z = 0.00$

$\therefore H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Monash

$H_0: P_1 \leq P_2$

$\chi^2 = 0.05 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore z = -0.22$

$\therefore H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

(ii) Issue: Skills, knowledge, and technique for the practise of Law.

A.N.U.

$H_0: P_3 \leq P_4$

$P_3$ - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on the issue

$P_4$ - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

$\chi^2 = 0.92 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore z = +0.96$

$\therefore H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.
Melbourne

$H_0: P_3 \leq P_4$

$\chi^2 = 0.34 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$z = -0.58$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Queensland

$H_0: P_3 \leq P_4$

$\chi^2 = 0.54 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$z = -0.73$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Monash

$H_0: P_3 \leq P_4$

$\chi^2 = 1.92 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$z = +1.39$

$H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

(iii) Issue: Logic and Clear Thinking

A.N.U.

$H_0: P_5 \leq P_6$

$P_5$ - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

$P_6$ - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue
\[ \chi^2 = 1.31 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]
\[
\therefore z = +1.14
\]
\[
\therefore H_0 \quad \text{cannot be rejected at the} \quad 5\% \quad \text{level of significance.}
\]

**Melbourne**
\[ H_0: \quad P_5 \leq P_6 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]
\[
\therefore z = 0.00
\]
\[
\therefore H_0 \quad \text{cannot be rejected at the} \quad 5\% \quad \text{level of significance.}
\]

**Queensland**
\[ H_0: \quad P_5 \leq P_6 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]
\[
\therefore z = 0.00
\]
\[
\therefore H_0 \quad \text{cannot be rejected at the} \quad 5\% \quad \text{level of significance.}
\]

**Monash**
\[ H_0: \quad P_5 \leq P_6 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 2.24 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]
\[
\therefore z = -1.50
\]
\[
\therefore H_0 \quad \text{cannot be rejected at the} \quad 5\% \quad \text{level of significance.}
\]

(iv) **Issue**: A knowledge of the historical development of the legal system and of its present function in society.

**A.N.U.**
\[ H_0: \quad P_7 \leq P_8 \]
\[ P_7 - \text{the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue} \]
the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue.

\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = 0.00 \]

\[ \therefore \text{H}_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Melbourne**  \[ \text{H}_0: \ P_7 \leq P_8 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.53 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +0.73 \]

\[ \therefore \text{H}_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Queensland**  \[ \text{H}_0: \ P_7 \leq P_8 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.55 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +0.74 \]

\[ \therefore \text{H}_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]

**Monash**  \[ \text{H}_0: \ P_7 \leq P_8 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.31 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +0.56 \]

\[ \therefore \text{H}_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the 5\% level of significance.} \]
(v) Issue: A liberal education in philosophy, history, and the nature of contemporary society.

A.N.U.  \[ H_0: \ P_9 \leq P_{10} \]  \[ P_9 \] - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

\[ P_{10} \] - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = 0.00 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Melbourne  \[ H_0: \ P_9 \leq P_{10} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.86 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = -0.93 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Queensland  \[ H_0: \ P_9 \leq P_{10} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 1.01 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ z = +1.00 \]

\[ H_0 \] cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.
Monash

$H_0: \, p_9 \leq p_{10}$

$\chi^2 = 0.87 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore \, z = -0.93$

$\therefore \, H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

(vi) Issue: Knowledge of the various branches of Law.

A.N.U.

$H_0: \, p_{11} \leq p_{12}$

$P_{11}$ - the proportion of continuing students for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

$P_{12}$ - the proportion of dropouts for whom there is no difference between the perceived and the desired emphasis on this issue

$\chi^2 = 0.15 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore \, z = +0.39$

$\therefore \, H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.

Melbourne

$H_0: \, p_{11} \leq p_{12}$

$\chi^2 = 0.15 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1$

$\therefore \, z = +0.39$

$\therefore \, H_0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level of significance.
Queensland  \[ H_0 : P_{11} \leq P_{12} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.00 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = 0.00 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]

Monash  \[ H_0 : P_{11} \leq P_{12} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.06 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \]

\[ \therefore z = +0.24 \]

\[ \therefore H_0 \text{ cannot be rejected at the } 5\% \text{ level of significance.} \]